Mary Sud	deth v	Target Corporation et al	D
ERROR! MAIN DOCUMENT ONLY.LAW OFFICES OF PRINDLE, AMARO, GOETZ, HILLYARD, BARNES & REINHOLTZ LLP			
	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
	5		
	6		
	7		
	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – WESTERN DIVISION	
	10		
	11	MARY SUDDETH,	CASE NO. CV12-7002 JAK (AGRx)
	12	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING STIPULATION
	13	v.	FOR DISMISSAL OF DEFENDANT, TARGET STORES, A DIVISION OF TARGET CORPORATION
	14	TARGET CORPORATION, and DOES	TARGET CORPORATION
	15	TARGET CORPORATION, and DOES 1 through 30, Inclusive,	JS-6
	16	Defendants.	
	17		
	18	Pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1), the settlement reached by the parties and the Stipulation for Dismissal, the Court hereby dismisses the complaint, with prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED DATED: August 28, 2013	
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		10
	23	U.S. District Judge John Kronstadt	
	24		
	25		
	26		
	27		
	28		1
DDC/TADC	ET/DLE A	OF DEFT.,	RDER REGARDING STIPULATION FOR DISMISSAL TARGET STORES, A DIVISION OF TARGET CORP.

Doc. 19