

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

Hunt v. Liquid Transport Corp.

Hunt · No. 2:25-cv-03558-MCS-RAO · Decided June 4, 2025

OPINION

Terrell Hunt v. Liquid Transport Corp, an Indiana Corporation

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL

Case No. 2:25-cv-03558-MCS-RAO Date June 4, 2025 Title Hunt v. Liquid Transport Corp.
Present: The Honorable Mark C. Scarsi, United States District Judge Stephen Montes Kerr —
———NotReported Deputy Clerk Court Reporter Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff: Attorney(s)
Present for Defendants: None Present None Present Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER RE:
MOTION TO REMAND (ECF No. 12) (JS-6) Defendants Liquid Transport Corp, Liquid
Transport LLC, and Dana Transport, Inc., removed this case from state court on the basis of
diversity jurisdiction. (Notice of Removal, ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff Terrell Hunt filed a motion to
remand arguing that Defendants’ removal was untimely. (Mem., ECF No. 13.) Defendants did not
file a timely opposition brief. The Court deems Plaintiff’s motion appropriate for decision without
oral argument. Fed. R. Civ. P. 78(b); C.D. Cal. R. 7-15. Plaintiff filed his motion on May 22, 2025,
and set a hearing 32 days later, on June 23, 2025. Local rules require opposition papers to be filed
no later than 21 days before the date designated for the hearing of the motion. C.D. Cal. R. 7-9;
(see also Initial Standing Order § 9(B), ECF No. 8). As of June 4, 2025, Defendants have not filed
any opposition brief. The Court deems Defendants’ failure to timely respond to the motion as their
consent to the granting of the motion. C.D. Cal. R. 7-12: e.g., *Duke Partners, LLC v. Wardrop*, No.
5:16-cv-00950-CAS(DTBx), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80716, at *2 n.1 (C.D. Cal. June 20, 2016)
 (“[D]efendants’ failure to file an opposition to the instant motion to remand provides grounds for
granting the motion.”); *Shaw v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, No. 2:25-cv-03035 MWC (MARx),
Page 1 of 2 CIVIL MINUTES — GENERAL Initials of Deputy Clerk SMO 2025 U.S. Dist.
LEXIS 104336, at *3 (C.D. Cal. June 2, 2025) (collecting cases for the proposition that “[c]ourts
consistently grant motions to remand based on [a] defendant’s failure to oppose the motion.”).
Plaintiff’s motion is granted. The case is remanded to Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case
No. 24STCV10101. The Court directs the Clerk to effect the remand immediately and close the
case. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-central-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/hunt-v-liquid-transport-corp-y8yrpn4w>