1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 8 GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE NO. 1:09-CV-00512-AWI-GSA COMPANY, an Ohio corporation, 9 ORDER DISMISSING Plaintiff. **DEFENDANT FOREMAN** 10 FINANCIAL, INC., ONLY, IN v. LIGHT OF STIPULATION OF 11 HACIENDA MOTORS, INC., a DISMISSAL California corporation, et al., 12 Defendants. 13 14 15 On September 3, 2009, the Plaintiff filed a stipulation of dismissal of Defendant Foreman 16 Financial, Inc., only, without prejudice, pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(ii). 17 Rule 41(a)(1), in relevant part, reads: 18 an action may be dismissed by the plaintiff without order of court (i) by filing a 19 notice of dismissal at any time before service by the adverse party of an answer or of a motion for summary judgment, whichever first occurs, or (ii) by filing a stipulation of dismissal signed by all parties who have appeared in the action. 20 Unless otherwise stated in the notice of dismissal or stipulation, the dismissal is 21 without prejudice, except that a notice of dismissal operates as an adjudication upon the merits when filed by a plaintiff who has once dismissed in any court of 22 the United States or of any state an action based on or including the same claim. Rule 41(a)(1)(ii) thus allows the parties to dismiss an action voluntarily after service of an 23 24 answer by filing a written stipulation to dismiss signed by all of the parties, although an oral 25 stipulation in open court will also suffice. Carter v. Beverly Hills Sav. & Loan Asso., 884 F.2d 1186, 1191 (9th Cir. 1989); Eitel v. McCool, 782 F.2d 1470, 1472-73 (9th Cir. 1986). Once the 26 stipulation between the parties who have appeared is properly filed or made in open court, no 27 28 order of the court is necessary to effectuate dismissal. Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41(a)(1)(ii); Eitel, 782

1	F.2d at 1473 n.4. "Caselaw concerning stipulated dismissals under Rule 41(a) (1) (ii) is clear
2	that the entry of such a stipulation of dismissal is effective automatically and does not require
3	judicial approval." In re Wolf, 842 F.2d 464, 466 (D.C. Cir. 1989); Gardiner v. A.H. Robins Co.,
4	747 F.2d 1180, 1189 (8th Cir. 1984); see also Gambale v. Deutsche Bank AG, 377 F.3d 133, 139
5	(2d Cir. 2004); Commercial Space Mgmt. Co. v. Boeing Co., 193 F.3d 1074, 1077 (9th Cir.
6	1999) <u>cf</u> . <u>Wilson v. City of San Jose</u> , 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997) (addressing 41(a)(1)(i)).
7	"The plaintiff may dismiss some or all of the defendants, or some or all of his claims, through a
8	Rule 41(a)(1) notice," and the dismissal "automatically terminates the action as to the defendants
9	who are the subjects of the notice." Wilson, 111 F.3d at 692; Concha v. London, 62 F.3d 1493,
10	1506 (9th Cir. 1995).
11	Because Plaintiff filed a voluntary dismissal under Rule 41(a)(1)(ii) as to only Foreman
12	Financial, Inc., that is signed by all parties who have made an appearance, this case has
13	terminated as to Foreman Financial, Inc., only. See Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41(a)(1)(ii); In re Wolf, 842
14	F.2d at 466; Gardiner, 747 F.2d at 1189; see also Gambale, 377 F.3d at 139; Commercial Space
15	Mgmt, 193 F.3d at 1077; cf. Wilson, 111 F.3d at 692.
16	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Foreman Financial, Inc., is DISMISSED
17	from this case without prejudice in light of Plaintiff's filed and properly signed Rule 41(a)(1)
18	voluntary dismissal.
19	
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.
21	Dated: September 10, 2009 /s/ Anthony W. Ishii CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22	CHILI ONTED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23	
24	
25	
26	