

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 AMERICAN VIDEO DUPLICATING,
13 INC., a California corporation; TUSH LAW
14 LTD., a California limited partnership, and
15 KENNETH M. HAHN, a sole proprietor,
16 DBA CAL STATE FINANCIAL,
individually and on behalf of a class of
similarly situation businesses and individuals,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 CITIGROUP INC., CITIBANK, N.A.; U.S.
20 BANCORP., U.S. BANK, N.A.;
21 JPMORGAN CHASE & CO., JPMORGAN
22 CHASE BANK, N.A., WELLS FARGO &
23 CO., WELLS FARGO N.A.; BANK OF
24 AMERICA CO., BANK OF AMERICA
25 N.A.; MUFG BANK LTD., MUFG UNION
BANK N.A.; LIVE OAK BANKSHARES
INC., LIVE OAK BANKING COMPANY;
PAYPAL HOLDINGS, INC.; NEWTEK
BUSINESS SERVICES, INC.; HAVEST
SMALL BUSINESS FINANCE; and; DOE
LENDERS 1 to 4,975, inclusive,

26 Defendants.
27
28

Case No. 2:20-cv-03815-ODW-
AGR

**[PROPOSED] ORDER
GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS BY SPECIALLY
APPEARING DEFENDANT
CITIGROUP INC. AND
DEFENDANT CITIBANK,
N.A. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1),
12(b)(6), & 12(b)(2)]**

Complaint Filed: April 27, 2020

1 This matter coming before the Court on the Motion to Dismiss filed by
2 specially appearing Defendant Citigroup Inc. (“Citigroup”) and Defendant
3 Citibank, N.A. (“Citibank,” and together, the “Citi Defendants”) pursuant to Fed.
4 R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), 12(b)(6), and, with respect to the claims against Citigroup, Fed.
5 R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2), it is hereby ordered that the motion is **GRANTED**. The claims
6 against the Citi Defendants in Plaintiffs’ Complaint are **DISMISSED** in their
7 entirety with prejudice.

8
9 **IT IS SO ORDERED,**

10
11 Date: _____

Honorable Otis D. Wright II