| e, Ir | nc. | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Case5:08-cv-02088-RMW Document4 | 4 Filed03/12/10 Page1 of 2 | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | BRIAN S. KABATECK, SBN 152054 (bsk@kbklawyers.com) RICHARD L. KELLNER, SBN 171416 (rlk@kbklawyers.com) ALFREDO TORRIJOS, SBN 222458 (at@kbklawyers.com) KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP 644 South Figueroa Street Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 217-5000 Facsimile: (213) 217-5010 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class | | |
| 9 | UNITED STATES | S DISTRICT COURT | |
| .0 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| .1 | SAN JOSE DIVISION | | |
| .2 | David Almeida, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, | CASE NO. C 08-02088 RMW | |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | Plaintiff, vs. Google Inc., a Delaware Corporation, and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendant. | PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF NON-OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS Date: April 2, 2010 Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept: 6 Judge: Hon. Ronald M. Whyte | |
| 20 21 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF NON-OPPOSITION | TO DEFENDANT GOOGLE INC 'S MOTION TO | |
| | PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF NON-OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT GOOGLE, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS (CASE NO. C 08-02088 RMW) | | |

| 1 | NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN by and through Plaintiff David Almeida's ("Plaintiff") | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | counsel of record, that Plaintiff does not oppose Defendant Google Inc.'s ("Google") Motion to | | |
| 3 | Dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). | | |
| 4 | Google moves to dismiss the action, with prejudice, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction | | |
| 5 | based on Plaintiff's lack of standing to represent the putative class. Plaintiff does not oppose the | | |
| 6 | dismissal of the action pursuant to FRCP 12(b)(1). However, the Ninth Circuit has held that if a | | |
| 7 | district court dismisses an action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, the dismissal must be | | |
| 8 | made without prejudice. See Kelly v. Fleetwood Enterprises, Inc., 377 F.3d 1034, 1036 (9th Cir. | | |
| 9 | 2004) (stating that the district court should have dismissed the action without prejudice because | | |
| 10 | it lacked subject matter jurisdiction); see also Kendall v. Dept. of Veterans Affairs, 2009 WL | | |
| 11 | 5184127, *1 (9th Cir. 2009). | | |
| 12 | Moreover, Plaintiff has been attempting to stipulate to a dismissal of this action since | | |
| 13 | June 2009. [Storti Decl., ¶¶ 3-6.] | | |
| 14 | Accordingly, Plaintiff does not oppose the dismissal of this action but requests that the | | |
| 15 | dismissal be made without prejudice. | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | DATED: March 12, 2010 By: /s/ KABATECK BROWN KELLNER LLP | | |
| 18 | Brian S. Kabateck Richard L. Kellner | | |
| 19 | Alfredo Torrijos Counsel for Plaintiff and proposed class | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | -2- | | |