Injazat Technology	Fund B.S.C. v. Najafi et al Case 2:11-cv-01355-JCM-GWF Document 2	Doc. 27 7 Filed 10/04/22 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
6	* * *	
7	INJAZAT TECHNOLOGY FUND B.S.C.,	Case No. 2:11-CV-1355 JCM (GWF)
8	Plaintiff(s),	ORDER
9	v.	
10	DR. HAMID NAJAFI,	
11	Defendant(s).	
12		
13	Presently before the court is defendant Hamid Najafi ("defendant")'s motion to declare	
14	an expired judgment void and unenforceable. (ECF No. 24). Plaintiff Injazat Technology Fund,	
15	B.S.C. has not filed a response, and the time to do so has now passed.	
16	Pursuant to District of Nevada Local Rule 7-2(d), "the failure of an opposing party to file	
17	points and authorities in response to any motion constitutes a consent to the granting of the	
18	motion." LR 7-2(d); see Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) ("Failure to follow a	
19	district court's local rules is a proper ground for dismissal.").	
20	However, the court will not automatically grant every unopposed motion. First, the court	
21	must weigh the following factors: "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation;	
22	(2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the	
23	public policy favoring disposition of cases of their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic	
24	sanctions." Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 53.	
25	Having considered defendants' motion in light of the Ghazali factors, the court grants it.	
26	The first three factors-the public's interest in expeditiously resolving this litigation, the court's	
27	interest in managing the docket, and the risk of prejudice to defendants-all weigh in favor of	
28	dismissal. See id.; Anderson v. Air West, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976) (holding that a	
James C. Mahan		

U.S. District Judge

Case 2:11-cv-01355-JCM-GWF Document 27 Filed 10/04/22 Page 2 of 2

presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay). This judgment is
 eleven years old (and there has been no attempt at renewal) and there is a high risk of prejudice
 should an unenforceable judgment be permitted to remain against defendant. Therefore,
 dismissal is appropriate.

Accordingly,

6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that defendant's motion to
7 declare the expired judgment void and unenforceable (ECF No. 24) be, and the same hereby is,
8 GRANTED.

DATED October 4, 2022.

Uns C. Ma UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE