1	ANTHONY JOHNSON	
2	1728 Griffith Ave.	
3	Las Vegas, NV 89104 Telephone: (619) 246-6549	
4	Email: flydiversd@gmail.com	
5	Dec G	
	Pro Se	
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ANTHONY JOHNSON, an individual,	Case No. 3:19-cv-1185-H-BLM
12		
13	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR AN UNDERTAKING
14	V.	PURSUANT TO C.C.P. § 1030 BY
15	MANUEL ALTAMIRANO, an individual,	DEFENDANTS ALTAMIRANO,
	RICHARD TURNER, an individual, DAVID KINNEY, an individual,	TURNER, KINNEY AND HUFFMAN
16	DAVID KINNET, an individual,	Hearing Date: October 7, 2019
17	PAUL TYRELL, an individual,	Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.
18	SEAN SULLIVAN, an individual,	Judge: Hon. Marilyn L. Huff
19	STORIX, INC,. a California Corporation, and DOES 1-5, inclusive,	Dept.: Courtroom I 5A
20		Complaint Filed: June 24, 2019
21	Defendants.	Trial Date: Not Set
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO STORIX'S MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

19cv01185

I. OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION

Plaintiff Anthony Johnson ("Johnson") hereby opposes *DEFENDANTS*' *MOTION FOR AN UNDERTAKING* ("Motion") pursuant to C.C.P. § 1030. Defendants move this Court to impose a bond on Johnson on grounds that (1) Johnson is an out-of-state plaintiff, and (2) because there is a possibility they might prevail in the action. Defendants' own Motion defeats both grounds.

First, Defendants argue that Johnson must post a bond – not because they might have difficulty enforcing a judgment against an out-of-state plaintiff, but because "the success of these enforcements is tenuous given Johnson admits he sold his house in San Diego 'to afford the first bond'" (Motion at p. 20) and Johnson's "ability to satisfy a judgment and/or cost bill seems unlikely." (Motion at p. 21.) Defendants offer no argument as to how Johnson's out-of-state residence imposes any burden otherwise. Instead, they admittedly bring their Motion knowing the added financial burden will likely prevent Johnson from pursuing his claims against them if granted. "In requiring a security bond for defendants' costs, care must be taken not to deprive a plaintiff of access to the federal courts." (Simulnet East Assocs. v. Ramada Hotel Operating Co., 37 F.3d 573, 576-7 (9th Cir. 1994) (Simulnet).)

Second, if Defendants expect to defeat Johnson's claims at this preliminary stage based *only* on technical defenses, then why are they demanding an \$85,000 bond for their costs they expect to incur through trial? Defendants correctly cite the factors this Court must weigh in determining their Motion, including "(i) the degree of probability/improbability of success on the merits, ..." (Motion at p. 6; *Simulnet*, *supra*, 37 F.3d at 576.) Defendants make no attempt to argue the merits of any claims. Instead, they rely on the same technical arguments set forth in their concurrent *Motion to Dismiss* and *Special Motion to Strike*. Their Motion dictates that no cost bond is necessary because, for every one of their arguments that succeed, there will be there will be one less claim to defend. Instead of showing the

costs they expect to incur, they effectively argue they won't be incurring any unless their Motion fails. But in that case, of course, they haven't shown a possibility of success and thus no need for Johnson to pay a bond. Furthermore, Defendants are required to show a reasonable possibility of prevailing on all claims since otherwise they can't be the "prevailing party" entitled to *any* costs.

It's hard to imagine what Defendants hoped to achieve with their 21-page Motion except to burden Johnson and the Court with numerous duplicative motions in order to further delay their answer until they can finally Johnson out of the litigation. This is the same shameless abuse of process that unnecessarily doubled the cost and length of all the state court litigation and gave rise to many of the current claims.

This Court must deny Defendants motion since they demonstrated no possibility of prevailing in the litigation. The Court should also order sanctions against the Defendants and their attorneys for their frivolous motions in order to finally deter their persistent misconduct and allow the litigation to proceed without further delay.

DATED: September 21, 2019 Respectfully submitted,

By:

ANTHONY JOHNSON, In Pro Per

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1 2

I, the undersigned certify and declare as follows:

3

4

5

7

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

18

2122

2324

2526

27

28

I am over the age of eighteen years and self-represented in this action. My address is 1728 Griffith Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada, which is located in the county where the service described below took place.

On September 12, 2019, from my address in Las Vegas, Nevada, I served a copy of the following document(s):

1. PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR AN UNDERTAKING PURSUANT TO C.C.P. § 1030 BY DEFENDANTS ALTAMIRANO, TURNER, KINNEY AND HUFFMAN

by depositing the document(s) in a sealed envelope with the U.S. Postal Service. The undersigned hereby certifies that he caused a copy of the foregoing document(s) to be delivered to the Clerk of the U.S District Court, Southern District of California, by thereby mail.

The undersigned also certifies that the following recipients have consented to service by email and have been delivered a copy of the document(s) by sending to the email addresses listed below:

Marty B. Ready

Michael P. McCloskey

WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN

& DICKER, LLP

401 West A Street, Suite 1900

San Diego, CA 92101

Email: marty.ready@wilsonelser.com

Email: michael.mccloskey@wilsonelser.com

Tel: (619) 881-6431

(Attorney for Defendants Altamirano,

Turner, Kinney & Huffman)

Paul A. Tyrell

Sean Sullivan

PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES &

SAVITCH LLP

525 B Street, Suite 2200

San Diego, CA 92101

Email: paul.tyrell@procopio.com
Email: sean.sullivan@procopio.com

Tel: (619) 619.238.1900

(Defendants, Attorneys for corporate defendant,

Storix, Inc.)

I certify and declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of American and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 12, 2019 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

By:

Matthew Johnson