

1 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP
 THOMAS R. KAUFMAN, Cal. Bar No. 177936
 2 tkaufman@sheppardmullin.com
 GREGG A. FISCH, Cal. Bar No. 214486
 3 gfisch@sheppardmullin.com
 JASON P. BROWN, Cal. Bar No. 296688
 4 jpbrown@sheppardmullin.com
 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1600
 5 Los Angeles, California 90067-6055
 Telephone: 310.228.3700
 6 Facsimile: 310.228.3701

7 Attorneys for Defendant
 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.
 8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION
 11

12 PATRICIA ANNE T. SAMSON, an
 Individual,
 13
 Plaintiff,
 14
 v.
 15 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., a South
 16 Dakota Corporation; and DOES 1
 through 100, Inclusive,
 17
 Defendants.
 18

Case No. 2:16-cv-04839 BRO
 Assigned to:
 Hon. Beverly Reid O’Connell ___
JUDGMENT
 Complaint Filed: May 20, 2016

1 **ORDER**

2 The Motion for Summary Judgment or, in the Alternative, Partial Summary
3 Judgment of Defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (“Wells Fargo”) came on regularly
4 for hearing on May 15, 2017, at 1:30 p.m., before this Court in Courtroom 7C, the
5 Honorable Beverly Reid O’Connell, presiding. All parties were represented by their
6 respective counsel.

7 After considering the moving and opposing papers, the Statement of
8 Uncontroverted Facts and Conclusions of Law, arguments of counsel, and all other
9 matters presented to the Court, FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, the Court finds that
10 there is no triable issue of material fact and that Wells Fargo is entitled to summary
11 judgment as a matter of law as to the following issues or claims for relief.
12 Specifically, the Court finds that:

13 1. Wells Fargo is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff’s claim for
14 FEHA age discrimination because Plaintiff failed to exhaust her administrative
15 remedies as to this claim.

16 2. Wells Fargo is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff’s claim for
17 FEHA gender discrimination because Plaintiff failed to exhaust her administrative
18 remedies as to this claim.

19 3. Wells Fargo is entitled to summary judgment on Plaintiff’s claim for
20 FEHA national origin discrimination because Plaintiff failed to exhaust her
21 administrative remedies as to this claim.

22 4. Plaintiff’s disability discrimination and retaliation claims, and the
23 derivative wrongful termination claim, fail because Plaintiff lacks “specific,
24 substantial evidence” that the rationale for eliminating her position was a pretext for
25 intentional discrimination or retaliation.

26 5. Plaintiff’s failure to accommodate claim fails because it is derivative of
27 Plaintiff’s underlying FEHA claims, which fail as a matter of law.

28

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

6. As a result of the Court's rulings on the other issues and claims for relief, Plaintiff has no basis to seek punitive damages against Wells Fargo.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, that judgment is entered in this action as follows:

1. Plaintiff Patricia Anne Samson shall recover nothing from Wells Fargo;
2. Wells Fargo's Motion for Summary Judgment is granted in its entirety and judgment is entered forthwith in favor of Wells Fargo as to the issues and claims for relief set forth above; and
3. Wells Fargo shall recover from Plaintiff Patricia Anne Samson its costs in the sum determined by the Clerk of the Court pursuant to Local Rule 54-1, *et seq.*

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 19, 2017

By: 

Honorable Beverly R. O'Connell
United States District Court Judge