

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO  
GORDON D SCHABER COURTHOUSE**

**MINUTE ORDER**

DATE: 11/09/2021

TIME: 09:00:00 AM

DEPT: 54

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Christopher Krueger

CLERK: G. Toda

REPORTER/ERM:

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: N. Alvi, J. Reilly

CASE NO: **34-2021-00302934-CU-PO-GDS** CASE INIT.DATE: 06/17/2021

CASE TITLE: **O'Sullivan vs. Ghost Gunner Inc.**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited

---

**EVENT TYPE:** Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice - Civil Law and Motion

---

**APPEARANCES**

---

**Nature of Proceeding:** Motion for Admission Pro Hac Vice (James J. McGuire)

**TENTATIVE RULING**

The petition of James J. McGuire for admission pro hac vice is UNOPPOSED, but is DENIED without prejudice.

The notice of motion does not provide notice of the Court's tentative ruling system, as required by Local Rule 1.06. Moving counsel is directed to contact opposing counsel and advise him/her of Local Rule 1.06 and the Court's tentative ruling procedure and the manner to request a hearing. If moving counsel is unable to contact opposing counsel prior to hearing, moving counsel is ordered to appear at the hearing.

The proof of service filed with the application does not reflect that any papers were actually served "on the State Bar of California at its San Francisco Office." (Cal. Rule of Court 9.40(c)(1).) Although the moving papers state that copies of the application and supporting papers "have been served on all interested parties and the California State Bar, which has also been provided with the \$50.00 processing fee," no supporting sworn declaration attests to such payment, and the proof of service does not reflect service upon the State Bar of California at its San Francisco Office. As such, there is no actual evidence of service on the State Bar of California or any such \$50 payment before the Court. Given the apparent failure to serve the State Bar of California, it does not appear that the requisite application fee has actually been paid. (Cal. Rule of Court 9.40(e).)

The proof of service filed with the application also does not reflect service on "all parties who have appeared in the cause" as required by Rule 9.40(c)(1). The proof of service only reflects service on Plaintiffs' counsel, yet multiple other defendants have appeared.

The minute order is effective immediately. No formal order pursuant to CRC Rule 3.1312 or further notice is required.

**COURT RULING**

There being no request for oral argument, the Court affirmed the tentative ruling.