| 1  |  |
|----|--|
| 2  | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
| 3  | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |
| 4  | SAN JOSE DIVISION  |
| 5  | SIMON G. OHAYON, individually and on CASE NO. 5:11-cv-01662 EJD                                      |
| 6  | behalf of all others similarly situated,  ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE  |
| 7  | Plaintiff(s),  |
| 8  | v.<br>THE HERTZ CORPORATION,   |
| 9  | THE HERTZ CORPORATION,   |
| 10 | Defendant(s).  |
| 11 | /  |
| 12 | On March 19, 2012, the court approved the parties' stipulation vacating all deadlines in this        |
| 13 | action in favor of a settlement reached at mediation. See Docket Item No. 38. As part of that        |
| 14 | stipulation, the Plaintiff was ordered to file a Motion for Preliminary Approval of the class action |
| 15 | settlement no later than May 14, 2012. See id. This deadline was subsequently extended to May 28.    |
| 16 | 2012, pursuant to a further stipulation. See Docket Item No. 41. The anticipated Motion for          |
| 17 | Preliminary Approval was scheduled for hearing on June 29, 2012. See id.                             |
| 18 | To date, Plaintiff has not complied with the deadlines as stipulated between the parties and         |
| 19 | ordered by the court. Accordingly, the hearing reserved for June 29, 2012, is VACATED and the        |
| 20 | court issues an Order to Show Cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to           |
| 21 | prosecute. If Plaintiffs do not, by June 29, 2012, demonstrate good cause in writing why this case   |
| 22 | should not be dismissed by explaining the failure to file a timely Motion for Preliminary Approval,  |
| 23 | the Court will dismiss the action with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).  |
| 24 | No hearing will be held on the order to show cause unless otherwise ordered by the Court.            |
| 25 | IT IS SO ORDERED.  |
| 26 | Dated: June 22, 2012  EDWARD J. DAVILA   |
| 27 | United States District Judge   |
| 28 |  |