

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 SANDRIKA MEDLOCK, LISA
12 HARDIMAN, MIRIAM LEYVA, LORAINÉ
13 NARANJO, ENDANG WIDJAJA, KEVIN
14 TAYLOR, DEBRA DOYLE,
CHRISTOPHER DUGGAN, HILARIO
ESCOBAR, and all others similarly situated,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 TACO BELL CORP., and TACO BELL OF
AMERICA, INC.,

18 Defendants.
19

Case No. 1:07-cv-01314-SAB

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR RELIEF
FROM PARAGRAPH XIV.E OF THE
SECOND AMENDED PRETRIAL ORDER
TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF
CONTESTED JURY INSTRUCTIONS

(ECF No. 618)

20 On February 10, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a request from relief from the pretrial order. The
21 pretrial order provides that

22 If any party proposes additional jury instructions that are not agreed upon by all parties,
23 such proposed jury instructions shall be filed with the Court no later than **February 12,**
24 **2016.** Each party may file up to ten (10) proposed jury instructions and identify such as
jury instructions upon which all parties could not agree. Unless prior leave is granted, the
Court will not consider additional proposed jury instructions beyond the first ten (10).

25 (Sec. Am. Pretrial Order 54:19-23, ECF No. 608.)

26 Plaintiffs are seeking to file an additional seven disputed jury instructions. In their
27 motion, Plaintiffs have identified eight jury instructions that are disputed. The Court notes that
28 the majority of these instructions are substantive instructions that will be required to be provided

1 to the jury so Defendants will be providing an alternative instruction. Based upon the number of
2 instructions which are identified in Plaintiffs' motion, the Court shall allow Plaintiffs and
3 Defendants to file up to fifteen proposed jury instructions that have not been agreed upon by all
4 parties.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs and Defendants may file up to
6 fifteen (15) disputed jury instructions. Pursuant to the pretrial order, the parties are reminded
7 that “[a]ll instructions shall be short, concise, understandable, and consist of neutral and
8 accurate statements of the law. Argumentative or formula instructions will not be considered.”
9 (ECF No. 608 at 55:14-16, emphasis in original.)

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: February 11, 2016



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28