

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



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RUTH HANCOCK,)	Case No. EDCV 10-01933 DDP (CWx)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO ENFORCE
v.)	SETTLEMENT
)	
TARGET CORPORATION,)	
)	[Dkt. No. 20]
Defendant.)	
_____)	

Presently before the court is Plaintiff's Motion to Enforce Settlement. The settlement agreement provides that "the parties have determined through information provided by [Plaintiff] . . . that the conditional payments made on behalf of [Plaintiff] related to this claim are approximately \$tbd." (Mot., Ex. A) (first emphasis added). While it appears that Plaintiff attempted to provide conditional payment information, the letter submitted to Defendant referenced an incident separate and apart from that at issue here. It does not appear that Plaintiff has yet provided

///
///

1 Defendant with the information necessary to process the settlement
2 payment. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Enforce Settlement is
3 DENIED.

4

5

6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8

9

10 Dated: January 15, 2013

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28


DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge