1		
2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11		
12	MARIA W. LEE, et al.,	Case No. 15-CV-04768-LHK
13	Plaintiffs,	ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO PLAINTIFF LIN LEE
14	V.	
15 16	RETAIL STORE EMPLOYEE BUILDING CORPORATION, et al.,	Re: Dkt. Nos. 60, 69
10 17	Defendants.	
18	Plaintiffe Maria Loo, Wan Loo, and Lin	Les bring this action against Potail Store
19	Plaintiffs Maria Lee, Wen Lee, and Lin Lee bring this action against Retail Store	
20	Employee Building Corporation ("Retail Store"); Casa del Pueblo Apartment ("CDP"); and	
21	Barcelon Associates Management Corp ("Barcelon"). Before the Court are two motions to dismiss	
22	the First Amended Complaint, one filed by Barcelon Associates Management Corp. and another	
	filed by Retail Store Employee Building Corporation and Casa del Pueblo Apartment. ECF No.	
23	69 ("Barcelon Mot."); ECF No. 60 ("Retail Store Mot."); ECF No. 52 ("FAC").	
24	The instant Order pertains only to Plaintiff Lin Lee ("Lin") because Lin, unlike Plaintiffs	
25	Maria Lee ("Maria") and Wen Lee ("Wen"), did not file a response to either Barcelon or Retail	
26		
27		
28		1

28

Case No. 15-CV-04768-LHK ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO PLAINTIFF LIN LEE

10 11 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Store and CDP's motions to dismiss.¹ This is, moreover, not the first time that Lin has failed to file a response or opposition.

Notably, the FAC also named Preservation Partners Management Group, Inc. ("PPMG") as a Defendant. On May 9, 2016, PPMG moved for summary judgment. On June 13, 2016, Maria and Wen stipulated to dismiss PPMG with prejudice. ECF No. 71. Lin, however, did not file a response or opposition to PPMG's motion for summary judgment. U.S. Magistrate Judge Howard Lloyd, to whom this action was originally assigned, found PPMG's motion for summary judgment well-founded in fact and in law. Consequently, Judge Lloyd issued a Report and Recommendation which recommended that PPMG's motion for summary judgment be granted as to Lin. ECF No. 79. The instant action was reassigned to the undersigned judge on June 21, 2016. ECF No. 80.

Lin did not object to Judge Lloyd's Report and Recommendation. Accordingly, on July 6, 2016, the Court adopted Judge Lloyd's Report and Recommendation in full. ECF No. 83. Lin did not appeal the Court's July 6, 2016 Order.

Finally, on July 28, 2016, the parties filed their joint case management statement in advance of the August 11, 2016 initial case management conference. ECF No. 92. Lin did not participate in the preparation of this statement. As counsel for Maria and Wen explain, Lin is "unrepresented in this matter and ... Maria and Wen['s] ... counsel ha[ve] not been able to meet and confer with her." Id. at 1. Lin's failure to participate in preparing the joint case management statement is in violation of Civil Local Rule 16-9. See Civil L.R. 16-9(a) (requiring all parties to meet, confer, and prepare a joint case management statement at least seven days in advance of the case management conference).

23 To summarize, Lin (1) did not respond to or oppose PPMG's motion for summary judgment; (2) did not object to Judge Lloyd's Report and Recommendation; (3) did not appeal the 24 25 Court's order adopting Judge Lloyd's Report and Recommendation; (4) did not participate in

26

Case No. 15-CV-04768-LHK ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO PLAINTIFF LIN LEE

¹ The Court will issue a forthcoming Order that addresses the motions to dismiss as to Maria and 27 Wen. 2 28

preparing the joint case management statement; and (5) did not oppose the instant motions to dismiss filed by Barcelon, Retail Store, and CDP.

In light of the foregoing, the motions to dismiss filed by Barcelon and by Retail Store and CDP are GRANTED without prejudice as to Lin. Moreover, the Court ORDERS Lin to show cause why she should not be dismissed with prejudice from this action for failure to prosecute. Lin has until August 19, 2016 to file a written response, not to exceed three pages in length, to this Order to Show Cause. A hearing on this Order to Show Cause is set for August 25, 2016, at 1:30 p.m. If Lin fails to respond to this Order to Show Cause and fails to appear at the August 25, 2016 Order to Show Cause hearing, the Court will dismiss Lin from this action with prejudice for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 5, 2016.

Case No. 15-CV-04768-LHK

ucy H. Koh

LUCY H. KOH United States District Judge

ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO DISMISS AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AS TO PLAINTIFF LIN LEE