Ca	se 2:11-cv-05764-RSWL-MAN Document 12	29 Filed 06/14/13 Page 1 of 2 Page ID #:2517	
1			
2			
3 4			
+ 5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	Aqua Connect, Inc.,	) CV 11-5764 RSWL (MANx)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER re: Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application to	
13	v.	Advance and Deny, or, in the Alternative,	
14	Code Rebel LLC, Arben	<ul> <li>Continue Defendants'</li> <li>Motion for Summary</li> </ul>	
15	Kryeziu, Volodymyr Bykov a/k/a Vladimir Bickov, and	) Judgment [117]	
16 17	Does 1 through 300 inclusive,		
18	Defendants.		
19	Currently before the Court is Plaintiff Aqua		
20	Connect, Inc.'s ("Plaintiff") Ex Parte Application to		
21	Advance and Deny, or, in the Alternative, Continue		
22	Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [117]. Having		
23	considered the Application and the Opposition filed by		
24	Defendants Code Rebel LLC et al. ("Defendants"), <b>THE</b>		
25	COURT NOW FINDS AND RULES AS FOLLOWS:		
26	The Court hereby <b>DENIES</b> Plaintiff's Ex Parte		
27	Application. The Court notes that this is Plaintiff's		
28	second consecutive ex parte	application seeking to	

1

1	and d filing on an activity to Defendents ( nonding	
1	avoid filing an opposition to Defendants' pending	
2	motions. As with the Court's previous denial of	
3	Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application to Strike and/or	
4	Advance and Deny Defendants' Motion re Spoilation	
5	[124], Plaintiff has not shown good cause as to why ex	
6	parte relief is necessary here and how Plaintiff would	
7	be prejudiced if required to file an opposition to	
8	Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [102]. The	
9	arguments made in Plaintiff's present Ex Parte	
10	Application are more appropriate for an opposition to	
11	Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Accordingly,	
12	Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application is <b>DENIED</b> .	
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	DATED: June 14, 2013	
16		
17	HONORABLE RONALD S.W. LEW	
18		
19		
20		
21		
~ ~		
22		
22 23		
23		
23 24		
23 24 25		
23 24 25 26		