1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	JOUBIN MORTEZAPOUR AND SEYED) RAZAVI, Individually and on Behalf of)	Civil No. 10cv2158 L(RBB)	
12	All Others Similarly Situated,	 ORDER STRIKING FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT [doc. #10] 	
13	Plaintiffs,		
14	V. ())	
15	DIRECTV, INC. AND DIRECTV) HOLDINGS LLC,)		
16) Defendants.		
17			
18			
19			
20	Local Rules, plaintiffs were required to file their opposition to defendants' motion by January		
21	24, 2011. Instead of filing a response to defendants' motion on January 24, 2011, plaintiffs filed		
22	a first amended complaint. ¹		
23	Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1)(B) allows a party to "amend its pleading once as		
24 25			
25 26			
26 27	¹ The Court notes plaintiffs failed to provide a certificate of service with their first		
27 28	amended complaint in violation of the Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual §2(d)(2). Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules or Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual may lead to penalties under Civil Local Rule 83.1.		

10cv2158

(f), whichever is earlier. FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(1)(B). After the time has expired, "a party may amend its pleading only with the opposing party's written consent or the court's leave." FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a)(2).

As noted above, defendants filed their motion on December 22, 2010. Plaintiffs were entitled to file a first amended complaint as a matter of course by January 12, 2011. They did not do so, instead waiting until January 24, 2011 to do so. Accordingly, plaintiffs' first amended complaint is untimely.

Based on the foregoing, plaintiffs' first amended complaint is STRICKEN from the record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 26, 2011

United States District Court Judge

COPY TO:

HON. RUBEN B. BROOKS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

ALL PARTIES/COUNSEL