Case 8:10-cv-01573-AG -PLA Document 75 Filed 03/19/11 Page 1 of 3 Page ID #:1608

DR. ORLY TAITZ, ESQ SB#223433 29839 SANTA MARGARITA PKWY RANCHO SANTA MARGARITA CA 92688, STE 100 PH 949-683-5411 FAX 949-766-7603 Attorney FOR "DEFEND OUR FREEDOMS" FOUNDATION, ORLY TAITZ, INC, "APPEALING DENTISTRY"

7		
	CHARLES LINCOLN,) CASE NO.: 8:10-CV-01573-AG
8	PLAINTIFF,) DEFENDANTS, "DEFEND OUR
9	vs.) FREEDOMS FOUNDATION, ORLY
10	DAYLIGHT CHEMICAL, et al) TAITZ INC, AND APPEALING
11	DEFENDANT) DENTISTRY NOTICE OF MOTION
12) AND MOTION TO DISMISS THE
12) CASE IN ITS' ENTIRETY BASED
13) ON RULE $41(b)$ and $12B(1)$ OF
14) FRCP
15) Date: April 18, 2011
		Time: 10 AM
16		Hon Andrew Guilford
17		Courtroom 10D

TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 18, 2011 Defendants "Defend our Freedoms Foundation", Orly Taitz, inc and Appealing Dentistry (collectively "Defendants") will move the court to dismiss this case in its' entirety based the motion below and oral argument at the motion hearing.

The court was very generous with the Plaintiff in this action, Charles Lincoln. In spite of the fact that the court found no jurisdiction in Federal court and no value in 12 out of 13 causes of action and dismissed all but one minor state cause of action, the court gave the plaintiff an extra month

28

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

Orly Taitz, inc and "Appealing Dentistry" Motion to Dismiss 1

to file a second amended complaint. The second amended complaint was not filed. The only remaining cause of action in this case is cause of action for quantum meruit against one 2 defendant Orly Taitz for \$47,000 amount, which is less than \$75,000 required to maintain a legal 3 action in the federal court. Though the defense argues that Plaintiff was paid for the services he provided, that the amount he claims of \$47,000 is an outrageous invented number and the 5 Plaintiff actually owes the Defendants a full refund and damages for tremendous damage the 6 Plaintiff caused the Defendants, even if the court will put all of these arguments aside and rules 7 solely on the amount claimed in the First Amended Complaint and assumes as true the allegation by the Plaintiff, that the defendant owes him \$47,000, it is still below \$75,000 required to maintain a legal action in the Federal court under FRCP 12 (b) and the court is simply without subject matter jurisdiction to maintain this action any further. Considering highly offensive nature of the complaint, maintaining it, only serves as further harassment and causes tremendous 12 emotional distress. Additionally, while the Plaintiff claimed hardship in denial of Pro Hac Vice 13 for PA attorney Philip Berg, the Defense wanted to remind the court that The Plaintiff, himself is an attorney. Even though he is disbarred, he can represent himself, he has necessary education, 15 as he is a graduate of the University of Chicago 1992, has nearly 20 years of experience and he 16 maintained some 70 legal actions in Federal courts, where he was a party. Plaintiff filed his complaint and First Amended Complaint pro se, as he believed that he does not need another 18 attorney and he was capable to file a second amended complaint by the deadline of March 16, 19 2011 ordered by the court. Additionally, the Plaintiff still has his local attorney Gary Kreep and 20 he could get assistance of Philip Berg in drafting and assistance of Gary Kreep in drafting and filing electronically. There was no excuse or justification for the Plaintiff not to file the second 22 amended complaint. As the second amended complaint was never filed and the remaining cause 23 of action against one defendant does not provide for subject matter jurisdiction in the Federal 24 court, Defendants respectfully move this court to dismiss this case in its' entirety under 41b and 25 12 (b)1 FRCP and grant the defendants attorneys' fees and any other relief the court finds just 26 and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted 28

1

4

8

9

10

11

14

17

21

27

Orly Taitz, inc and "Appealing Dentistry" Motion to Dismiss 2

С	ase 8:10-cv-01573-AG -PLA Document 75 Filed 03/19/11 Page 3 of 3 Page ID #:1610	
1	/s/ Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ	
2	03.19.2011	
3		
4	FEDERAL COURT PROOF OF SERVICE	
5	I certify under penalty of perjury and under the laws of CA that I served the Plaintiff and his	
6	counsel via ECF and or mail on 03.19.2011	
7		
8	Dated this 03.19.2011 /s/Orly Taitz	
9	Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ	
10	Dr. Orly Taitz, ESQ 29839 Santa Margarita Pkwy Rancho Santa Margarita CA 92688	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	Orly Taitz, inc and "Appealing Dentistry" Motion to Dismiss 3	