

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

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LETITIA E. PEPPER,
Plaintiff,

Case No.: EDCV 14-00916 JGB (SPx)
Assigned to the Hon. Jesus G. Bernal

**JUDGMENT DISMISSING ACTION
WITH PREJUDICE**

v.

CITY OF RIVERSIDE, a California
municipal corporation; WILLIAM R.
BAILEY, individually and in his
official capacity as Mayor; GREGORY
P. PRIAMOS, individually and in his
official capacity as City Attorney;
SERGIO DIAZ, individually and in his
capacity as Chief of Police,
Defendants.

Plaintiff Letitia E. Pepper (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants City of Riverside,
William R. Bailey, Gregory P. Priamos and Sergio Diaz (“Defendants”), have
stipulated to rendition and entry of judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
Procedure 41 (a) (2).

IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows:

1. Judgment shall be entered forthwith in this matter dismissing
Plaintiff’s complaint against each defendant herein, with prejudice. Such dismissal
with prejudice shall constitute a merger of all Plaintiff’s stated claims and any

1 unstated claims which Plaintiff may have asserted in this action and a bar, without
2 any limitation, to the reassertion of any stated or merged claim.


3 2. Upon notification to Defendants’ counsel of entry of judgment,
4 Defendant City of Riverside (“City”) shall pay the sum of fifty thousand dollars
5 (\$50,000.00) to Plaintiff, hereafter “Settlement Amount,” solely for the purpose of
6 compromising, settling, and fully satisfying any claim for damages, attorney fees
7 costs or other monetary claim that Plaintiff could have asserted or did assert in this
8 action. Defendant City will cause the Settlement Amount to be wire transferred to
9 Thompson Advocacy Attorney-Client Trust Account, within five business days of
10 either notification of Defendants counsel by the Court of the Court’s entry of
11 Judgment Dismissing Action with Prejudice or written transmission by Plaintiff’s
12 counsel to Defendants’ counsel of the details of such trust account, whichever is
13 later.

14 3. Such payment by City is not an implied or express admission of
15 liability on the part of Defendants or any of them.

16 4. Plaintiff and her counsel have reviewed and approved the proposed
17 judgment as to substance and form.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 DATED: May 18,2015



Jesus C. Bernal, United States District Judge