

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


JIMMY J. McAFEE, et. al.,)	Case No.: 5:11-CV-00821-LHK
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT
)	NEPTUNE’S ACCOUNT’S MOTION
)	FOR AN ORDER SHORTENING TIME
THOMAS FRANCIS, et. al.,)	ON ITS MOTION TO QUASH SERVICE
)	AND MOTION TO DISMISS FOR
Defendants.)	LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION
)	

On November 18, 2011, Defendant Neptune’s Account, LLC (“Defendant”) moved the Court for an Order Shortening Time on Defendant’s Motion to Quash Service of Summons and Complaint and for Dismissal of Action for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction. *See* ECF No. 43. In filing its Motions to Quash and to Dismiss, Defendant did not comply with the Court’s Standing Order Regarding Case Management in Civil Cases, which clearly states that civil motions under Civil Local Rule 7-2 in cases assigned to the undersigned may be noticed for hearing only after contacting the Courtroom Deputy, Martha Parker Brown, and obtaining an available date. Accordingly, the Court moved the date of the hearing on Defendant’s motions to the next available date, March 1, 2012. Defendant now moves the Court to consolidate the hearing on its Motions to Quash and to Dismiss with the hearings on two other motions in this case scheduled for December 8, 2011.

1 This case, however, is not the only matter set for hearing on December 8, 2011. Defendant,
2 like all other litigants appearing in this Court, must comply with the Court-ordered procedures laid
3 out in the Court's Standing Order, which are essential to the Court's docket management and
4 administration. The next available hearing date is March 1, 2012. The fact discovery cutoff date in
5 this case is not until June 15, 2012, and the expert discovery cutoff date is June 30, 2012, leaving
6 ample time for Defendant to engage in discovery should it not prevail on its Motions to Quash and
7 to Dismiss. The Court does not find that Defendant has demonstrated good cause for shortening
8 time on its Motions to Quash and to Dismiss, and its motion is therefore DENIED.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10
11 Dated: November 23, 2011


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge