1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KIM ZIMAN, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	CASE NO. 05-CV-2344 W (AJB)
12	and the general public,	ORDER GRANTING
13	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT'S UNOPPOSED MOTION TO DISMISS WITH
14	VS.	PREJUDICE (DOC. 46)
15	LIBERTY MUTUAL FIRE	
16	INSURANCE COMPANY,	
17	Defendant.	
18	Pending before the Court is Defendant Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company's	
19	("Liberty Mutual") motion to dismiss. Plaintiff Kim Ziman ("Plaintiff") has not opposed.	
20	The Court decides the matter on the papers submitted and without oral	
21	argument. See S.D. Cal. Civ. R. 7.1(d.1). For the reasons stated below, the Court	
22	GRANTS the motion to dismiss (Doc. 46) with prejudice.	
23		
24	I. <u>Background</u>	
25	On April 1, 2010, this Court dismissed Plaintiff's case with leave to amend. On	
26	April 20, 2010, Plaintiff filed his Second Amended Complaint ("SAC"). (Doc. 43.) On	
27	May 13, 2010, Liberty Mutual filed a motion to dismiss.	
28	The motion to dismiss was set for hearing on July 12, 2010. As such, any	
	-	1 - 05cv2344W

opposition to that motion was due June 25, 2010. <u>See</u> S.D. Cal. Civ. R. 7.1(e.2) To date, Plaintiff has not filed an opposition.

3

4

1

2

## II. <u>Standard</u>

5 The Court must dismiss a cause of action that fails to state a claim upon which 6 relief can be granted. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). A motion to dismiss under Rule 7 12(b)(6) tests the complaint's sufficiency. North Star Int'l. v. Arizona Corp. Comm'n, 720 F.2d 578, 581 (9th Cir. 1983). All material allegations in the complaint, "even if 8 doubtful in fact," are assumed to be true. <u>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</u>, 550 U.S. 544, 9 555(2007). The court must assume the truth of all factual allegations and must 10 "construe them in the light most favorable to [the non-moving party]." Gompper v. 11 VISX, Inc., 298 F.3d 893, 895 (9th Cir. 2002); Walleri v. Fed. Home Loan Bank of 12 13 Seattle, 83 F.3d 1575, 1580 (9th Cir. 1996).

14 As the Supreme Court explained, "[w]hile a complaint attacked by a Rule 15 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss does not need detailed factual allegations, a plaintiff's obligation to provide the 'grounds' of his 'entitlement to relief' requires more than labels 16 and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not 17 18 do." Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555 (citations omitted). Instead, the allegations in the complaint "must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." Id. A 19 complaint may be dismissed as a matter of law either for lack of a cognizable legal theory 20 or for insufficient facts under a cognizable theory. Robertson v. Dean Witter Reynolds, 21 22 Inc., 749 F.2d 530, 534 (9th Cir. 1984).

23

## 24 III. <u>Discussion</u>

The Court grants Liberty Mutual's motion based upon Plaintiffs' failure to file an opposition as required by Civil Local Rule 7.1. The Ninth Circuit has held that pursuant to a local rule a district court may properly grant a motion to dismiss for failure to respond. <u>See generally Ghazali v. Moran</u>, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir.1995) (affirming dismissal for failure to file timely opposition papers where plaintiff had notice of the
 motion and ample time to respond); accord <u>Martinez v. Stanford</u>, 323 F.3d 1178, 1183
 (9th Cir. 2003) (affirming Ghazali's applicability to Rule 12(b) motions).

Moreover, Civil Local Rule 7.1(f.3.c) expressly provides that "[i]f an opposing
party fails to file papers in the manner required by Local Rule 7.1(e) (2), that failure may
constitute a consent to the granting of that motion or other ruling by the court." Here,
Plaintiff has failed to oppose or to request an extension of time in which to do so.
Relying on Civil Local Rule 7.1(f.3.c), the Court interprets Plaintiff's failure to oppose
Liberty Mutual's motion to dismiss as a consent to its merits.

Additionally, the Court notes that Plaintiff has already amended his complaint
twice. (See Docs. 13, 43.) By failing to respond, Plaintiff has also failed to argue for
leave to file a Third Amended Complaint.

Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Liberty Mutual's motions to dismiss WITH
PREJUDICE. This Order closes this case in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: July 12, 2010

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

homas J. Whelan nited States District Judge