

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

West Justice Center
8141 13th Street
Westminster, CA 92683

SHORT TITLE: Cordero vs. United Studios FR, LLC

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

CASE NUMBER:
30-2021-01230615-CU-MC-WJC

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that the following document(s), Minute Order dated 02/22/23, have been transmitted electronically by Orange County Superior Court at Santa Ana, CA. The transmission originated from Orange County Superior Court email address on February 22, 2023, at 10:53:34 AM PST. The electronically transmitted document(s) is in accordance with rule 2.251 of the California Rules of Court, addressed as shown above. The list of electronically served recipients are listed below:

FORWARD COUNSEL LLP
MCASPINO@FORWARDCOUNSEL.COM

MBK CHAPMAN, P.C.
JBOSS@MBKCHAPMAN.COM

Clerk of the Court, by:



_____, Deputy

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF ORANGE
WEST JUSTICE CENTER**

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 02/22/2023

TIME: 01:30:00 PM

DEPT: W02

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Nathan Scott

CLERK: J. Castorena

REPORTER/ERM:

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: D. Acosta

CASE NO: **30-2021-01230615-CU-MC-WJC** CASE INIT.DATE: 11/09/2021

CASE TITLE: **Cordero vs. United Studios FR, LLC**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Misc Complaints - Other

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 73955540

EVENT TYPE: Ex Parte

MOVING PARTY: Musashi & Associates, Inc., United Studios FR, LLC

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Ex Parte Application - Other, 02/21/2023

APPEARANCES

There are no appearances by any party.

10:30 AM Ex Parte Application is read and considered in chambers.

Defendants' ex parte application came regularly for hearing on 2/22/23. After reviewing the application, opposition and pleadings, the court exercises its discretion to decide the matter without oral argument. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 166, subd. (a)(1).) Good cause having been shown, the court now rules.

The application is granted in part to continue the 3/24/23 hearing on plaintiff's motion to compel to 4/21/23 at 10 am, when the sanctions motion is on calendar. It is otherwise denied.

Even if one assumes the court will grant defendants' motion for sanctions and strike the challenged complaint (ROA #2) – which are two separate issues; the court expresses no opinion on either the merits of the sanctions motion or the appropriate remedy – the challenged complaint has been superseded by the FAC (ROA #111). Thus, even granting defendants the relief that they seek in the sanctions motion may not necessarily end the litigation. While defendants assert the FAC “made no substantive changes to the original Complaint” (Ex parte at p. iii, fn. 1), the court need not make that determination today.

That said, it would serve judicial economy to hear the two pending motions on the same day.

This is the order of the court. Defendants shall give notice.