UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JOSEPH DIAZ JR., Case No. 5:20-cv-02332-JWH-KKx Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS [ECF No. 9] WITHOUT PREJUDICE v. RALPH HEREDIA, true name RAFAEL HEREDIA TARANGO, a/k/a RAFAEL HEREDIA, a/k/a RAFAEL BUSTAMANTE; JOHN DOE, ESQ.; and JANE DOES 1 through 20, Defendants. 

Currently pending before the Court is the motion of Defendant Ralph Heredia to dismiss the Complaint of Plaintiff Joseph Diaz, Jr., pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.<sup>1</sup> The Court finds this matter appropriate for resolution without a hearing. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; L.R. 7-15. After considering the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the Motion,<sup>2</sup> the Court orders that the Motion is **DENIED without prejudice**, as set forth herein.

L.R. 7-3 requires "counsel contemplating the filing of any motion first [to] contact opposing counsel to discuss thoroughly . . . the substance of the contemplated motion and any potential resolution." L.R. 7-4 further provides that the "Court may decline to consider a motion unless it meets the requirements of L.R. 7-3 through 7-8."

This Court expects and requires strict compliance with the Local Rules. Here, Heredia's counsel admittedly failed to engage in *any* Conference of Counsel before filing the Motion, as required by L.R. 7-3.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, pursuant to L.R. 7-4, the Court declines to consider the Motion. The Court admonishes counsel henceforth to comply strictly with all Local Rules, including L.R. 7-3.

Based on the foregoing, the Court hereby **ORDERS** that Heredia's Motion is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 5, 2021

John W. Holcomb UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Def.'s Mot. to Dismiss Compl. (the "Motion") [ECF No. 9].

The Court considered the following papers: (1) the Motion (including its attachments); (2) Pl.'s Opp'n to the Motion [ECF No. 14]; and (3) Def.'s Resp. in Supp. of the Motion (the "Reply") [ECF No. 17].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Reply 2:7–9.