

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  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

<p>U.S. BANK NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Plaintiff(s),</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ANTELOPE CANYON HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Defendant(s).</p>	<p>Case No. 2:15-CV-1423 JCM (PAL)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ORDER</p>
---	---

Presently before this court is the matter of *U.S. Bank N.A. v. Antelope Canyon Homeowners Association, et al.*, case number 2:15-cv-01423-JCM-PAL. On March 15, 2017, this court granted SFR Investment Pool 1, LLC’s (“SFR”) motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 40) and denied U.S. Bank National Association, as trustee for the holders of the WMALT 20060-AR8 trust (“U.S. Bank”); Bank of America, N.A. (“BOA”); and Nationstar Mortgage LLC’s (“Nationstar”) (collectively “the banks”) motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 39). (ECF No. 70). This court then entered final judgment in favor of SFR. (ECF No. 78; *see* ECF Nos. 94; 102). The banks appealed. (ECF No. 95).

The Ninth Circuit held that this court improperly granted summary judgment in favor of SFR, but properly denied the banks’ motion. (ECF No. 107). Consequently, the Ninth Circuit reversed this court’s decision in favor of SFR and remanded this matter for further proceedings. *Id.* The order on mandate was issued on March 21, 2022. (ECF No. 110).

SFR now moves to substitute the law firm, Hanks Law Group, including Karen L Hanks, Esq. and Chantel M. Schimming, Esq. as its counsel in the place and stead of the law firm of Kim

1 Gilbert Ebron, including Diana S. Ebron, Esq., Jacqueline A. Gilbert, Esq. and Howard C. Kim,  
2 Esq. (ECF No. 106). SFR's former counsel all consent to the substitution. *Id.*

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED that this court's order (ECF  
5 No. 70) be, and the same hereby is, VACATED as to its granting summary judgment to SFR.

6 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the judgment entered in favor of SFR (ECF No. 78) be,  
7 and the same hereby is, VACATED.

8 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that SFR's motion to substitute counsel (ECF No. 106) be,  
9 and the same hereby is, GRANTED.

10 The clerk is instructed to reopen this case for further proceedings and to appoint a new  
11 magistrate judge.<sup>1</sup>

12 DATED March 24, 2022.

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> This case is currently referred to former Magistrate Judge Leen, who retired while this case was pending before the Ninth Circuit.