Case 3:18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD Document 15 Filed 03/22/19 PageID.54 Page 1 of 4 12 B.Z Douglas A. Pettit, Esq., Bar No. 160371 Julia Dalzell, Esq., Bar No. 323335 1 PETTIT KÓHN ÍNGRASSIA LUTZ & DOLIN PC 2 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92130 3 Telephone: (858) 755-8500 Facsimile: (858) 755-8504 4 E-mail: dpettit@pettitkohn.com idalzell@pettitkohn.com 5 Attorneys for Defendants 6 GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP APC 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DARRYL COTTON, an individual, CASE NO.: 18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD 12 JOE HURTADO, an individual 13 Plaintiffs. NOTICE OF MOTION AND EX PARTE MOTION FOR 14 **EXTENSION OF TIME TO** V. **RESPOND TO PLAINTIFFS'** 15 COMPLAINT LARRY GERACI, an individual; REBECCA BERRY a/k/a REBECCA ANN BERRY RUNYAN, an 16 2D (2<sup>nd</sup> Floor) Gonzalo P. Curiel individual; MICHAEL R. Courtroom: 17 WEINSTEIN, an individual; SCOTT TOOTHACRE, an individual; FERRIS & BRITTON APC, a District Judge: Magistrate Judge: Andrew G. Schopler 18 Complaint Filed: December 6, 2018 Trial Date: None California corporation; GINA M. 19 AUSTIN, an individual; AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP APC, a California corporation; SEAN MILLER, an 20 individual; FINCH THORTON & 21 BAIRD, a limited liability partnership; DAVID DEMIAN, an 22 individual; ADAM WITT, an 23 individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive. 24 Defendants. 25 26 27 28

176-1154

Pursuant to Southern District of California Local Rule 12.1, Defendant GINA M. AUSTIN, an individual, and Defendant AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP APC, a California corporation ("Defendants"), hereby file this Ex Parte Motion for Extension of Time to File a Responsive Pleading to Plaintiffs' Complaint.

- 1. On or about December 6, 2018, Plaintiffs filed this Complaint, now assigned Case No.: 3:18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD. Thereafter, on December 20, 2018, the Clerk of the Court, *sua sponte*, deemed this matter related to low-numbered Case No.: 3:18-cv-00325-GPC-MDD, filed February 9, 2018.
- 2. Defendants were served with the Summons and Complaint on March 5, 2019, necessitating a responsive pleading due March 26, 2019.
- 3. Defendants intend to respond to the Complaint with a substantive pleading challenge.
- 4. The related case was *sua sponte* stayed by this Court by Order dated February 28, 2019, pending a resolution of a parallel state court action pursuant to the *Colorado River Doctrine*. (Dkt. No. 7, in Case No.: 3:18-cv-00325-GPC-MDD.) The court found all eight-factors of assessing appropriateness of *Colorado River Doctrine* to favor a stay and noted Plaintiff was "clearly forum shopping." (Dkt. No. 7, at 10:6-8, in Case No.: 3:18-cv-00325-GPC-MDD.)
- 5. On March 22, 2019, counsel for Defendants contacted the Clerk to determine whether the Court intended to also stay this matter, as it involves the same or substantially the same parties or property, calls for a determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law, and arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, happenings, or events.
- 6. Because the Court did not *sua sponte* stay or consolidate the two related federal cases, Defendants are evaluating the procedural complexities of a substantive pleading challenge to this Complaint, and its perceivable effect on matters in the related federal stayed case.

28 ///

- 7. Plaintiffs currently have one state court action pending, this instant federal court action pending, and one federal court action stayed. All actions arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, events, and facts, and involve the same or substantially the same parties. The two federal actions include both federal claims and state law claims. This Court is not sitting in diversity and has only supplemental jurisdiction over the state law causes of action.
- 8. Defendant is analyzing these procedural intricacies before filing a responsive pleading to avoid unnecessary duplicity, and efficiently and effectively file a substantive response without wasting judicial time and resources.

For these reasons, Defendants seek an extension of 30 days, up to and including April 25, 2019, to respond to the Complaint.

Good cause exists to grant the relief requested. Reasons of judicial economy favor foreseeable procedural issues be determined prior to Defendants preparing and filing a substantive, and possibly dispositive, pleading challenge to the Complaint.

## PETTIT KOHN INGRASSIA LUTZ & DOLIN PC

Dated: March 22, 2019 By: s/Julia Dalzell. Esq

Douglas A. Pettit, Esq. Julia Dalzell, Esq.

Attorneys for Defendants

GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL

GROUP APC dpettit@pettitkohn.com

dpettit@pettitkohn.com jdalzell@pettitkohn.com

176-1154

1 2 3 4 5 6	Douglas A. Pettit, Esq., Bar No. 160371 Julia Dalzell, Esq., Bar No. 323335 PETTIT KOHN INGRASSIA LUTZ 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92130 Telephone: (858) 755-8500 Facsimile: (858) 755-8504 E-mail: dpettit@pettitkohn.com	& DOLIN PC
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		CACTANO 10 - 02551 CDC ACD
11	DARRYL COTTON, an individual, JOE HURTADO, an individual	CASE NO.: 18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD
12	Plaintiffs,	DECLARATION OF JULIA
13	V.	DALZELL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION AND EX PARTE
14	LARRY GERACI, an individual;	MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO
15	LARRY GERACI, an individual; REBECCA BERRY a/k/a REBECCA ANN BERRY RUNYAN, an individual; MICHAEL R.	PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT
16	WEINSTEIN, an individual; SCOTT TOOTHACRE, an individual;	Courtroom: 2D (2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor)
17	FERRIS & BRITTON APC, a	District Judge: Gonzalo P. Curiel Magistrate Judge: Andrew G. Schopler Complaint Filed: December 6, 2018
18	California corporation; GINA M. AUSTIN, an individual; AUSTIN	Trial Date: None
19	LEGAL GROUP APC, a California corporation; SEAN MILLER, an	
20	individual; FINCH THORTON & BAIRD, a limited liability	
21	partnership; DAVID DEMIAN, an individual; ADAM WITT, an individual; and DOES 1 through 50,	
22	individual; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	
23	Defendants.	
24		
25	я	
26		
27		
28		
		1

I, Julia Dalzell, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law before all of the courts of the State of California, and am an associate with the law firm of Pettit Kohn Ingrassia Lutz & Dolin PC, attorneys of record for Defendants GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP APC ("Defendants"), in the above-captioned case. I am familiar with the facts and proceedings of this case and if called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the following facts of my own personal knowledge.
- 1. On or about December 6, 2018, Plaintiffs filed this Complaint, now assigned Case No.: 3:18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD. Thereafter, on December 20, 2018, the Clerk of the Court, *sua sponte*, deemed this matter related to low-numbered Case No.: 3:18-cv-00325-GPC-MDD, filed February 9, 2018.
- 2. Defendants were served with the Summons and Complaint on March 5, 2019, necessitating a responsive pleading due March 26, 2019.
- 3. Defendants intend to respond to the Complaint with a substantive pleading challenge.
- 4. The related case was *sua sponte* stayed by this Court by Order dated February 28, 2019, pending a resolution of a parallel state court action pursuant to the *Colorado River Doctrine*. (Dkt. No. 7, in Case No.: 3:18-cv-00325-GPC-MDD.) The court found all eight-factors of assessing appropriateness of *Colorado River Doctrine* to favor a stay and noted Plaintiff was "clearly forum shopping." (Dkt. No. 7, at 10:6-8, in Case No.: 3:18-cv-00325-GPC-MDD.)
- 5. On March 22, 2019, I contacted the Clerk to determine whether the Court intended to also stay this matter, as it involves the same or substantially the same parties or property, calls for a determination of the same or substantially identical questions of law, and arises from the same or substantially identical transactions, happenings, or events.

28 ///

- 6. Because the Court did not *sua sponte* stay or consolidate the two related federal cases, Defendants are evaluating the procedural complexities of a substantive pleading challenge to this Complaint, and its perceivable effect on matters in the related federal stayed case.
- 7. Plaintiffs currently have one state court action pending, this instant federal court action pending, and one federal court action stayed. All actions arise from the same or substantially identical transactions, events, and facts, and involve the same or substantially the same parties. The two federal actions include both federal claims and state law claims. This Court is not sitting in diversity and merely has supplemental jurisdiction over the state law causes of action.
- 8. Defendant is analyzing these procedural intricacies before filing a responsive pleading to avoid unnecessary duplicity and efficiently and effectively file a substantive response without wasting judicial time and resources.
- 9. For these reasons, Defendants seek an extension of 30 days, up to and including April 25, 2019, to respond to the Complaint. Good cause exists to grant the relief requested. Reasons of judicial economy favor foreseeable procedural issues be determined prior to Defendants preparing and filing a substantive, and possibly dispositive, pleading challenge to the Complaint.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of March 2019, at San Diego, California.

s/ Julia Dalzell, Esq. Julia Dalzell, Esq.

176-1154