٧.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CINTHIA F. MARSHALL,

Plaintiff,

OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No.: 17cv1818-LAB (JMA)

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY MONETARY SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED; AND

ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE

The Court on January 7 ordered Plaintiff to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute, and also why she should not be sanctioned. If she failed to show cause as to her failure to prosecute, the order cautioned, the action could be dismissed without prejudice. But if she failed to show cause for disobeying the Court's earlier order, she was cautioned that she could be sanctioned. (Docket no. 26). The Court's earlier order had required her to file an opposition to Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, which sought dismissal with prejudice. The Court granted Defendant's unopposed motion in part, dismissing the complaint without prejudice.

Plaintiff has not obeyed the January 7 order. If she had showed cause why Defendant's unopposed motion should not be granted and why she should not be

sanctioned but had failed to show cause for her failure to prosecute, this action would have been dismissed without prejudice. But because she has failed to show cause for her multiple acts of disobedience to the Court's orders, the Court now **RECONSIDERS** its partial grant of Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, and **GRANTS** the motion in its entirety, both because Plaintiff has consented to its being granted, see Civil Local Rule 7.1(f)(3)(c), and as a sanction. See Civil Local Rule 83.1(a).

Civil Local Rule 16.1(b) covers counsel's duty of diligence, which it appears Plaintiff's attorney, Moataz Sayed Hamza, Esq., has neglected. In addition, all counsel are expected to act with the highest standards of professionalism. See Civil Local Rule 83.4. This includes, among other things, to avoid wasting judicial resources by failing to respond when directed to do so by the Court, thereby requiring the Court to take extraordinary steps to manage the litigation. This is particularly true when the Court has specifically ordered counsel to do something. The Court's orders requiring the filing of responses concerning dismissal were not conditional and counsel was not free to disregard them if he was no longer intending to prosecute the case. At the very least, he should have filed a notice saying Plaintiff did not oppose dismissal with prejudice. And more importantly, the Court's order to show cause why Plaintiff should not be sanctioned was not optional.

Attorney Moataz Hamza is therefore **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why monetary sanctions should not be imposed on him for disobeying the Court's orders. See Civil Local Rule 83.1(a). He is **ORDERED** file a response, not longer than five pages, by <u>March 25, 2019</u>. If he fails to obey this order, he may be subject to further sanctions or contempt proceedings.

At least one motion seeking an award of costs (Docket no. 24) is still pending before Magistrate Judge Lopez. This order does not dispose of that issue, and does not divest Judge Lopez of authority over it. Nor does this order dispose of

phone number, lists the firm's address as being at 750 B Street.