1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	CHRIS M
9	
10	V.
11	CHASE H 30,
12	
13	
14	On
15	defendant
16	to clarify v
17	responded
18	necessary.
19	one of the
20	as a motion
21	DISMISSI
22	
23	IT IS SO
24	Dated: Oc
25	
26	
27	
28	

	DICTRICT COLUDT	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
NORTHERN DISTRI	ICT OF CALIFORNIA	
SAN JOSE DIVISION		
MONET,	) Case No.: 10-CV-00135-LHK	
Plaintiff, v.	ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITH PREJUDICE	
E HOME FINANCE LLC, and DOES 1-	) ) )	
Defendants.	) ) )	

On October 14, 2011, Plaintiff dismissed with prejudice all claims against the only known defendant in this case, Chase Home Finance LLC. ECF No. 90. The Court then ordered Plaintiff to clarify whether he wished to dismiss any remaining claims against Doe defendants. Plaintiff responded that because there are no Doe defendants named in this case, "dismissal is not necessary." ECF No. 92. However, once an action is filed, it remains pending until dismissed by one of the parties or the Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41. The Court will construe Plaintiff's response as a motion to dismiss any remaining claims, and hereby orders this case in its entirety DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. The Clerk shall close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 17, 2011

\_\_ |

United States District Judge

28

Case No.: 10-CV-00135-LHK

ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITH PREJUDICE

Lucy H. Koh