

1 regardless of whether the party against whom the motion for summary judgment is
2 directed has filed any opposition. *See Cristobal v. Siegel*, 26 F.3d 1488, 1491 (9th Cir.
3 1994).

4 Here, Northland filed a motion for summary judgment in which it demonstrates
5 the absence of genuine issues of material fact and Plaintiffs have failed to file an
6 opposition. Accordingly, the Court concludes that Northland's motion for summary
7 judgment should be granted.

8 The Court, having considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the
9 remainder of the file, does hereby find and **ORDER** that Northland's motion for
10 summary judgment (Dkt. 30) is **GRANTED** and the claims alleged in Plaintiffs'
11 complaint against Northland are **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

12 Dated this 9th day of October, 2012.

13
14 

15

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22