

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

WYLMINA E. HETTINGA, ET AL., )  
 )  
 Plaintiffs, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 TIMOTHY P. LOUMENA, ET AL., )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No.: C 10-02975 PSG

**ORDER RECOMMENDING DENIAL  
OF APPLICATION TO PROCEED *IN  
FORMA PAUPERIS*; REQUEST FOR  
REASSIGNMENT TO A U.S.  
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE; ORDER  
RECOMMENDING ORDER TO SHOW  
CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO  
PROSECUTE**

Plaintiff Wylmina E. Hettinga has applied to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Having reviewed the papers,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the case shall be reassigned to a U.S. District Judge with a recommendation that Plaintiff's application be denied.

IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that an order to show cause be issued for failure to prosecute.

A case management conference statement was due on September 21, 2010 and a case management conference was scheduled to be held on September 28, 2010.<sup>1</sup> However, Plaintiffs did not file a case management conference statement and did not appear for the conference. Also, by

<sup>1</sup> See 7/7/10 Order Setting Initial Case Mgmt. Conf. and ADR Deadlines (Docket No. 3).

1 September 21, 2010, (at least) Plaintiffs were required either to file written consent to the  
2 jurisdiction of the magistrate judge or to request reassignment to a district judge.<sup>2</sup> None did so.<sup>3</sup>

3 Dated: March 14, 2011

4 

5 PAUL S. GREWAL  
6 United States Magistrate Judge  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>2</sup> See Civ. L.R. 73-1(a)(1).

<sup>3</sup> The court further notes that no counsel has appeared for the four minor co-plaintiffs.