

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
6 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

7  
8 RESOL GROUP LLC,  
9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 SIDNEY T. SCARLETT, et al.,  
12 Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-05212-BLF](#)

**ORDER DISSOLVING ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE**

13  
14 On November 17, 2015, the Court ordered Defendant Sidney Scarlett to show cause why  
15 sanctions should not be imposed for removing state court action case number 114-CV-267656 for  
16 the fourth time. ECF 6. On December 15, 2015, Defendant Scarlett filed a motion seeking an  
17 extension of time to respond to the order to show cause. ECF 19. In his motion, Defendant  
18 Scarlett indicated that he had not been served with this Court's order in case number 15-cv-03245  
19 which remanded his third removal attempt of the state court action. *Id.* at 2. That order put  
20 Defendant Scarlett on notice that any further attempts to remove the state court action may result  
21 in sanctions, including the institution of a pre-filing order. *See* Aug 31 Order at 3, *Resol Grp. LLC*  
22 *v. Scarlett*, No. 15-CV-03245-BLF, ECF 28 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2015).


23 After reviewing the Court's files, it appears that the Aug 31 Order was mailed to  
24 Defendant Scarlett but returned as undeliverable.<sup>1</sup> Since the Court does not have a record of  
25 Defendant Scarlett having received the Aug 31 Order, the Court DISSOLVES the order to show

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes that the July 20, 2015 order from case number 15-cv-03245 was also returned as  
28 undeliverable but Defendant Scarlett appears to have received it based on his subsequent filings  
responding to that order and his attachment of that order to his Notice of Order of Complete Case  
Record at ECF 9.

1 cause and Defendant Scarlett is not required to respond in writing to the order to show cause or  
2 appear at a hearing.<sup>2</sup> Defendant Scarlett is now on notice that that any further attempts to remove  
3 Case No. 114-CV-267656 may result in sanctions, including the institution of a pre-filing order.  
4 *Bridgewater v. Hayes Valley Ltd. Partnership*, No. 10-03022 CW, 2011 WL 635268 at \*4 (N.D.  
5 Cal., Feb. 11, 2011); *see generally Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir.  
6 2007).

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: December 16, 2015

9   
10 BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 <sup>2</sup> Defendant's motion to enlarge time to respond to the order to show cause is DENIED AS MOOT.