

FILED
Clerk
District Court

MAR 21 2012

For The Northern Mariana Islands
By _____
(Deputy Clerk)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS**

JANE ROE and JOHN DOE,
Plaintiffs,
vs.
BENIGNO R. FITIAL, *et al.*,
Defendants.

CIVIL CASE NO. 09-00023

ORDER RE: MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

This matter came before the court on July 5, 2011, regarding the defendants' motion to impose sanctions against the plaintiffs' attorney, Mr. Bruce Jorgensen, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). ECF No. 113. The sanction request was due to the motion submitted on May 18, 2011, by Mr. Jorgensen on behalf of his plaintiffs. *See* ECF No. 105. The defendants claim that based on the plaintiffs' motion, which was signed by Mr. Jorgensen, (1) Mr. Jorgensen made factual allegations regarding an alleged conflict of interest that lack evidentiary support; and (2) Mr. Jorgensen failed to base his motion on any case law or rule and instead relied on *ad hominem* attacks on the defendant's attorney and co-counsels. ECF No. 113.

1 It is the finding of this court that the pleading signed by Mr. Jorgensen contains
2 arguments that lack relevance, legal authority or evidentiary support, which in turn has wasted
3 the court's time. Accordingly, Mr. Jorgensen shall have forty-eight (48) hours from the issuance
4 of this order to consider withdrawal of his motion (ECF No. 105). In the event Mr. Jorgensen
5 fails to withdraw said motion, the court will consider imposing fines against Mr. Jorgensen and
6 other sanctions.
7

8 It should be noted that moving forward, this court expects all counsels to proceed with
9 civility and respect, both in the courtroom and in their pleadings.¹
10

11 **SO ORDERED.**



13 /s/ Frances M. Tydingco-Gatewood
14 Designated Judge
15 Dated: Mar 21, 2012
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 ¹ The court recognizes that the plaintiffs' counsels failed to comply with the court order issued on March 19, 2012,
27 requiring counsels to appear by video teleconference during the scheduled hearing on March 21, 2012. *See* ECF 147.
28 However, the court will not issue an order of non-compliance against the plaintiffs' counsels as the court believes that its
stern warning and admonition were sufficient to deter the plaintiffs' counsels from future non-compliance of court orders.