

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Sifuentes v. Meta Platforms, Inc.

Sifuentes · No. 25-cv-04479-JST · Decided December 19, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Plaintiff David Angel Sifuentes’s motions for summary judgment as premature because a motion to dismiss remained pending, the pleadings were unsettled, and discovery had not occurred. The court also noted that the plaintiff’s multiple summary judgment filings did not comply with the applicable standing order, and stated that he should not refile such a motion unless and until Meta answers the complaint.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jon S. Tigar
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	December 19, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-04479-JST
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff attempted to file three motions for summary judgment while Defendant's motion to dismiss was pending. The court denied the summary judgment motions without prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	David Angel Sifuentes v. Meta Platforms, Inc.

TOPICS

- summary judgment
- motions to dismiss
- pleadings
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's summary judgment motions were premature while Defendant's motion to dismiss was pending, the pleadings were unsettled, and no fact discovery had occurred.
2. Whether Plaintiff's three attempts to file summary judgment motions complied with Judge Tigar's Civil Standing Order limiting each party to one summary judgment motion absent good cause.

HOLDINGS

1. The summary judgment motions were premature because Defendant's motion to dismiss remained pending, the pleadings had not been settled, and no fact discovery had occurred.
2. Plaintiff's three attempts to file summary judgment motions did not comply with Section G of Judge Tigar's Civil Standing Order, which permits the court to consider only one summary judgment motion per party absent good cause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[a]bsent good cause, the Court will consider only one motion for summary judgment per party.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff David Angel Sifuentes filed three attempts to seek summary judgment against Meta Platforms, Inc. The attempts occurred while Meta's motion to dismiss was pending, before the pleadings had been settled and before any fact discovery had taken place. The motions also exceeded the standing-order limitation of one summary judgment motion per party absent good cause.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

While Defendant's motion to dismiss remained pending, Plaintiff attached a cross-motion for summary judgment to his opposition, filed a separate summary judgment motion, and filed an amended summary judgment motion. The court determined that the motions were premature because the pleadings had not been settled and no fact discovery had occurred. The court also found that the three attempts did not comply with Section G of Judge Tigar's Civil Standing Order.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The motions were denied without prejudice. Plaintiff was instructed not to refile such a motion at least unless and until Defendant Meta answers the complaint. Meta's motion for an extension of time to respond to the summary judgment motion was terminated as moot.

CASES CITED

- *Strojnink v. Resort at Indian Springs, LLC*, No. 19-CV-04616-SVK, 2019 WL 6913039, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2019)

OPINION

Sifuentes

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 DAVID ANGEL SIFUENTES, Case No. 25-cv-04479-JST 8 Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR

9 v. SUMMARY JUDGMENT

10 META PLATFORMS, INC., Re: ECF No. 35, 40

Defendant. 11 12 13 While a motion to dismiss in this case was pending before the Court, Plaintiff David Angel 14 Sifuentes attempted to file three motions for summary judgment. He first attached to his 15 opposition to the motion to dismiss a “cross-motion for summary judgment and opposition to 16 defendant’s motion to dismiss.” ECF No. 25 at 7. Second, he filed a separate motion for 17 summary judgment. ECF No. 35. Third, he filed an amended motion for summary judgment. 18 ECF No. 40. 19 Any summary judgment motion is premature, as the motion to dismiss is still pending, the 20 pleadings have not yet been settled, and there has been no fact discovery in this case. See *Strojnik v. Resort at Indian Springs, LLC*, No. 19-CV-04616-SVK, 2019 WL 6913039, at *9 (N.D. Cal.

22 Dec. 19, 2019) (denying as premature pro se plaintiff’s motion for partial summary judgment, 23 which was brought before the pleadings were settled and before any discovery had occurred). 24 In addition, the Court notes that Sifuentes’s three attempts to file a summary motion do not 25 comply with Section G of Judge Tigar’s Civil Standing Order, available at 26 <https://cand.uscourts.gov/judges/jst/tigar-jon-s>, which states that “[a]bsent good cause, the Court 27 will consider only one motion for summary judgment per party.” 1 prejudice. Sifuentes shall not refile such a motion at least unless and until Defendant Meta 2 || answers the complaint. Meta’s motion for an extension of time to file a response to the motion for 3 summary judgment, ECF No. 37, is terminated as moot. 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. 5 Dated: December 19, 2025 .

6 JON S. TIGA

7 United States District Judge 8 9 10 11 a 12 15 16 it 4 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28