

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

FILED

2012 JUL -9 AM 10:29

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY WSP DEPUTY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MARUSSIA SILVA,

Plaintiff,

vs.
REGENT ASSET MANAGEMENT
SOLUTIONS, INC.; IMPERIAL
RECOVERY PARTNERS, LLC; DOES 1
to 25,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 11cv1365 WQH (WVG)
ORDER

HAYES, Judge:

On June 17, 2011, Plaintiff initiated this action by filing the Complaint.¹ (ECF No. 1). On October 3, 2011, the summons was returned executed on behalf of Defendants Regent Asset Management Solutions, Inc and Imperial Recovery Partners, LLC. On November 4, 2011, the Clerk of the Court entered default against Defendants Regent Asset Management Solutions, Inc and Imperial Recovery Partners, LLC. Since November 4, 2011, the docket reflects that no action has been taken by either party in this case with regards to Defendants Regent Asset Management Solutions, Inc and Imperial Recovery Partners, LLC.

On June 4, 2012, this court issued an Order stating:

Pursuant to Local Rule 41.1, “[a]ctions or proceedings which have been pending in this court for more than six months, without any

¹ Plaintiff asserted claims against Defendants Regent Asset Management Solutions, Inc, Imperial Recovery Partners, LLC, Dennis Scott Carruthers, and Dennis Scott Carruthers, Attorneys at law. On February 8, 2012, Dennis Scott Carruthers and Dennis Scott Carruthers, Attorneys at law were dismissed with prejudice from this action.

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

proceeding or discovery having been taken therein during such period, may, after notice, be dismissed by the court for want of prosecution.” S.D. Cal. Civ. Local Rule 41.1; *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). It appearing to the Court that dismissal for want of prosecution may be appropriate in this case, Plaintiff is hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE as to why this case should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute.


Plaintiff shall file a written response to this ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE on or before July 5, 2012. If Plaintiff does not respond, the Court will dismiss this case without prejudice.

(ECF No. 17 at 1-2).

To date, Plaintiff has failed to file a written response to the ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE. Accordingly, this case is DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/7/12


WILLIAM Q. HAYES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE