

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
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

REGENA BRYANT,
Plaintiff,

v.

OPTUMRX PHARMACY, INC.;
OPTUMRX, INC.; OPTUMRX PBM OF
WISCONSIN, LLC; CATAMARAN
PBM OF ILLINOIS, INC.;
CATAMARAN PBM OF ILLINOIS II,
INC.; UNITED HEALTHCARE
SERVICES, INC.; UNTIED HEALTH
GROUP; UNITED HEALTHCARE
CORPORATION; EMPLOYERS
PARENT, SUBSIDIARY AND
AFFILIATED CORPORATIONS,
THEIR PREDECESSORS, AND EACH
OF THEIR PRESENT OR FORMER
AGENTS, DIRECTORS, OFFICERS,
EMPLOYEES, REPRESENTATIVES,
SHAREHOLDERS, SUCCESSORS
AND ASSIGNS, WHETHER IN THEIR
OFFICIAL OR INDIVIDUAL
CAPACITIES; AND DOES 1 - 50,
inclusive,
Defendants.

Case No. 8:16-cv-00478 DFM

**FINAL JUDGMENT AFTER
JURY TRIAL**

Magistrate
Judge: Douglas F. McCormick
Courtroom: 6B, 6th Floor
FPC: June 16, 2017
Trial Date: June 27, 2017

Case No. 8:16-cv-00478 DFM

1 This action came on regularly for trial on June 27, 2017, in the United States
2 District Court for the Central District of California, Magistrate Judge Douglas F.
3 McCormick presiding. Plaintiff REGENA BRYANT appeared in pro per.
4 Defendants UNITED HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC., OPTUM SERVICES, INC.,
5 UNITEDHEALTH GROUP, INC., and OPTUMRX, INC. (“Defendants”) were
6 represented by Michael S. Kalt and Christina C.K. Semmer of Wilson Turner Kosmo
7 LLP.

8 A jury of 8 persons was impaneled and sworn. Witnesses were sworn and
9 testified. After hearing the evidence and the arguments of the attorneys and parties,
10 the jury was instructed by the Court. The jurors retired to consider their verdict. After
11 returning to Court, the jury announced its verdict in favor of Defendants on Plaintiff’s
12 race discrimination claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and further
13 announced its verdict in favor of Defendants on Plaintiff’s age discrimination claim
14 under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that FINAL
16 JUDGMENT is entered in the above-captioned action in favor of Defendants as the
17 prevailing party in the amount of \$8,157.04, as determined by the Court in its Order
18 denying Plaintiff’s motion to retax costs and denying Plaintiff’s motion to stay the
19 costs judgment pending appeal. (*See* Dkt. No. 232.)

20
21 DATED: September 26, 2017


22 THE HON. DOUGLAS F. MCCORMICK
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE