

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASEY GERRY SCHENK
FRANCAVILLA BLATT & PENFIELD
LLP *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

ESTATE OF ROBERT COWAN *et al.*,

Defendants;

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIM
AND CROSSCLAIM.

Civil No. 10cv821-L(BGS)

**ORDER GRANTING EX PARTE
APPLICATION TO EXTEND TIME
TO RESPOND TO THE
COMPLAINT AND THE
CROSSCLAIM**

On June 30, 2010 Defendants Suzanne Dimeff (“Dimeff”) and Oleta L. Cowan Trust (“Trust”) filed an ex parte application requesting an extension of time to respond to the complaint and the “Counter/Cross Claim” of Defendant Estate of Robert Cowan (“Estate”). This is their fourth request for extension of time.

In this interpleader action Plaintiffs request the court to determine how to distribute the late Robert Cowan’s share of the attorney’s fees and costs earned in the Exxon Valdez litigation among three claimants – the Estate, Robert Cowan’s sister Suzanne Dimeff, and Robert Cowan’s late mother’s trust, the Oletta L. Cowan Trust. These claimants are currently involved in probate

1 litigation¹ in the Superior Court for the State of Alaska which involves, among other things, their
2 respective right to a distribution of Robert Cowan's portion of the Exxon Valdez attorney's fees
3 and costs. In that litigation, pursuant to the Estate's motion, the Alaska probate court enjoined
4 Dimeff and the Trust from filing claims in other proceedings. According to Dimeff and the
5 Trust, the order precludes them from filing answers and their own counterclaim against Plaintiffs
6 and crossclaim against the Estate. While they filed a motion to vacate the order in probate
7 action,² the order so far has not been vacated.³ (Ex parte App. at 2; Decl. of Don Howrath filed
8 June 30, 2010 ("Howrath Decl.") at 1.)

9 Based on the foregoing, Dimeff and the Trust request another extension of time to
10 respond to the complaint and the Estate's crossclaim. While Plaintiffs allegedly agreed to an
11 extension until July 15, 2010, the Estate would prefer a stay of this case. (Howrath Decl. at 2.)

12 In addition to requesting the extension of time to respond, Dimeff and the Trust suggest
13 that this court should *sua sponte* take action to enjoin the Estate's activities or the probate action
14 in Alaska. (Ex parte App. at 3, 4; Howrath Decl. at 1.) They have not filed any motions
15 requesting this type of relief. If they want the court to issue an order enjoining the probate
16 action or the Estate's related activities, they must do so by a motion and state precisely what
17 relief they seek. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 7(b). If they choose to file such motion, they should
18 discuss, in addition to all other pertinent issues, the probate exception to federal jurisdiction in
19 order to define the scope of any appropriate relief. *See Marshall v. Marshall*, 547 U.S. 293
20 (2006); *see also Franklin Life Ins. Co. v. Mast*, 435 F.2d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 1970)

23 ¹ To date no party has indicated when the probate litigation commenced. As Mr.
24 Cowan died in 2003 (Compl. at 1), it appears that the proceedings have been pending for several
25 years now.

26 ² Contrary to their representation (Ex parte App. at 2), this court has not received a
27 courtesy copy of the motion to vacate filed in the probate action. The court typically does not
28 consider papers which have not been filed in this court's file. Merely delivering them to
chambers would not be sufficient to warrant consideration.

³ Dimeff and the Trust do not state whether the order has not been vacated because
their motion has not been ruled upon or because their motion was denied.

1 (interpleader).⁴

2 Based on the foregoing, the court finds good cause pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
3 Procedure 6(b) and Civil Local Rule 12.1, to **GRANT** the ex parte application. No later than
4 **July 15, 2010** Defendants Suzanne Dimeff and Oleta L. Cowan Trust shall file and serve
5 responses to the complaint and the crossclaim. If they want the court to issue injunctive or any
6 other relief, they must file an appropriate motion.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 DATED: July 6, 2010

10 
11 M. James Lorenz
United States District Court Judge

12 COPY TO:

13 HON. BERNARD G. SKOMAL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 ALL PARTIES/COUNSEL
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ⁴ In suggesting that the court should act *sua sponte* on their behalf in enjoining the
27 probate action, Dimeff and the Trust rely entirely on out-of-circuit precedent. (See Ex parte
28 App. at 4.) Should in any future filings they again desire to rely on persuasive rather than
binding precedent, they must state that despite diligent research, they were not able to find a
binding precedent addressing the issue, whether contrary to or in support of their position.