2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 ROBERTO JUAREZ, Case No.: 11 1:11-CV-00733-LJO-SMS [Hon. Lawrence J. O'Neill, District 12 Plaintiffs, Judge; Hon. Sandra M. Snyder, *Magistrate Judge*] 13 VS. 14 R RE STIPULATION OF CITY OF COALINGA, CHIEF CAL THE PARTIES FOR 15 MINOR, CALIFORNIÁ HIGHWAY DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE PATROL, CAPTAIN DANIEL MINOR. OF PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS, IN 16 and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive, **PART** 17 Defendants. Complaint Filed: 02/10/2011 18 19 20 PURSUANT TO THE STIPULATION OF THE PARTIES, and pursuant to 2.1 the Court's inherent and statutory authority, including but not limited to the Court's 22 authority under the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States 23 District Court, Eastern District of California Local Rules; after due consideration of 24 all of the relevant pleadings, papers, and records in this action; and upon such other evidence or argument as was presented to the Court; Good Cause appearing therefor, 26 and in furtherance of the interests of justice, 27 28

1 2

Regarding the matter of *Juarez, Roberto v. City of Coalinga, et al.*, United States District Court, Eastern District of California case no. 1:11-CV-00733-LJO-SMS:

- 1. Plaintiff's Fourth Cause of Action for Violation of Civil Rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as to defendants CITY OF COALINGA ("City") and CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL ("CHP") and as to the State of California, including but not limited to any and all of plaintiff's claims against these defendants for Unconstitutional Policy or Custom of Civil Rights Violations (*Monell*) and/or Deliberate Indifference to Hiring, Training, and Supervising Defendants' Peace Officers (*Monell/Canton*). To the extent that plaintiff claims for Unconstitutional Policy or Custom of Civil Rights Violations (*Monell*) and/or Deliberate Indifference to Hiring, Training, and Supervising Defendants' Peace Officers (*Monell/Canton*) pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against defendants CHIEF CALVIN MINOR or CAPTAIN DAVID MINOR or any other individual law enforcement officer, such claims are also hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.
- 2. Nothing in this Order shall be construed so as to effect a dismissal of those claims in plaintiff's Fourth Cause of Action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against defendants CHIEF CALVIN MINOR or CAPTAIN DAVID MINOR or any other individual law enforcement officers employed by the City or the CHP who may later be identified as one or more of Doe Defendants 1-10 for claims of Excessive Force, Unlawful Seizure, or Unlawful Search. Nothing in this Order shall be construed so as to effect a dismissal of plaintiff's Fourth Cause of Action in its entirety.
- 3. Plaintiff's Fifth Cause of Action (Negligence, under California law), plaintiff's Sixth Cause of Action (Negligence *Per Se*, under California law including Penal Code sections 240 and 242), and plaintiff's Seventh Cause of Action

(Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress, pursuant to California Civil Code section 1714) are also hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE solely as to defendant City and defendant CHP and as to the State of California.

- 4. Nothing in this Order shall be construed so as to effect a dismissal of those claims in plaintiff's Fifth Cause of Action, plaintiff's Sixth Cause of Action, or plaintiff's Seventh Cause of Action against defendants CHIEF CALVIN MINOR or CAPTAIN DAVID MINOR or any other individual law enforcement officers employed by the City or the CHP who may later be identified as one or more of Doe Defendants 1-10. Nothing in this Order shall be construed so as to effect a dismissal of plaintiff's Fifth, Sixth, or Seventh Cause(s) of Action in its/their entirety.
- 5. Plaintiff's Eighth Cause of Action (Negligent Failure to Supervise and Train, pursuant to California Government Code section 815.2) is hereby DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE in its entirety and as to all parties.
- 6. Furthermore, plaintiff, defendant City, and defendant CHP mutually waive all costs, court fees, and attorneys' fees arising out of the litigation between these parties solely and only as to the aforementioned claims for which dismissal is hereby Ordered.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:June 17, 2011/s/ Lawrence J. O'NeillUNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE