CASE NO. 18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD

Case_3:18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD Document 17 Filed 03/25/19 PageID.65 Page 1 of 4

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 spont*e 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.

///

· ·
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
Details Manch 25, 2010 Dry a/Danalag A Battit Egg
Dated: March 25, 2019 By: s/ Douglas A. Pettit, Esq. Douglas A. Pettit, Esq.
Julia Dalzell, Esq. Attorneys for Defendants GINA M. AUSTIN and AUSTIN LEGAL GROUP APC dpettit@pettitkohn.com jdalzell@pettitkohn.com
GROUP APC
jdalzell@pettitkohn.com

176-1154

- 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law before all of the courts of the State of California, and am a partner 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 spont*e 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, my office 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.
- 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 25th day of March 2019, at San Diego, California.

s/ Douglas A. Pettit, Esq. Douglas Pettit, Esq.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 I hereby certify that the following document(s): 2 DECLARATION OF DOUGLAS A. PETTIT IN SUPPORT OF 3 MOTION AND EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT 4 was served on this date to counsel of record: 5 **BY MAIL:** By placing a copy of the same in the United States Mail, 6 postage prepaid, and sent to their last known address(es) listed below. 7 BY E-MAIL DELIVERY: Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission, I sent the above 8 document(s) to the person(s) at the e-mail address(es) listed below. I did not receive, within a reasonable amount of time after the 9 transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful. 10 BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I electronically filed the X11 above document(s) with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system. The CM/ECF system will send notification of this filing to the 12 person(s) listed below. 13 Jacob P. Austin, Esq. THE LAW OFFICE OF JACOB AUSTIN 1455 Frazee Road, Suite 500 San Diego, CA 92108 Tel: 619-357-6850 14 15 Fax: 888-357-8501 16 E-mail: JPA@jacobaustinesq.com Attorney for Plaintiffs 17 DARRYL COTTON and JOE HURTADO 18 Executed on March 25, 2019, at San Diego, California. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 176-1154 DEC OF DOUGLAS A. PETTIT ISO MTN & EX PARTE MTN FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

CASE NO. 18-cv-02751-GPC-MDD