

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

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

HANFORD EXECUTIVE	)	1:11-cv-00828-AWI-DLB
MANAGEMENT EMPLOYEE	)	
ASSOCIATION, CATHY CAIN, LOUIS	)	ORDER RE: MOTION FOR
CAMARA, GEORGE THOMAS DIBBLE,	)	SANCTIONS
TIMOTHY IERONIMO, MARY ROSE	)	
LINDSAY, CARLOS MESTAS,	)	(Docs. 47-49)
SCOTT YEAGER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
CITY OF HANFORD, HILARY STRAUS,	)	
DAN CHIN, SUE SORENSEN, JIM	)	
IRWIN, LOU MARTINEZ,	)	
JOLEEN JAMESON,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

The Court refers the parties to the orders issued November 17, 2011 (*Hanford Executive Management Association v. City of Hanford*, slip copy, 2011 WL 5825691 (E.D.Cal. 2011)) and February 22, 2012 (*Hanford Executive Management Association v. City of Hanford*, slip copy, 2012 WL 603222 (E.D.Cal. 2012)) for a complete chronology of the proceedings.

On May 19, 2011, plaintiffs Hanford Executive Management Employee Association, Cathy Cain, Louis Camara, George Thomas Dibble, Timothy Ieronimo, Mary Rose Lindsay, Carlos Mestas and Scott Yeager (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiffs") filed their complaint for damages and

1 injunctive relief against defendants City of Hanford, Hilary Straus, Dan Chin, Sue Sorensen, Jim  
2 Irwin, Lou Martinez and Joleen Jameson (hereinafter referred to as “Defendants”).

3 On June 14, 2011, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the complaint for lack of subject  
4 matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1)  
5 and 12(b)(6), respectively. On July 9, 2011, while Defendants’ motion to dismiss was pending,  
6 Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65.  
7 On November 17, 2011, the Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants’ motion to dismiss  
8 the complaint and denied Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction.

9 On December 15, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration and/or motion to alter  
10 or amend judgment in response to the Court’s November 17, 2011 order. On February 22, 2012, the  
11 Court denied Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration.

12 On March 16, 2012, Defendants filed a motion for sanctions, contending Plaintiffs’ motion  
13 for reconsideration violated Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. On April 16, 2012, Plaintiffs filed  
14 their opposition to Defendants’ motion. On April 23, 2012, Defendants filed their reply to Plaintiffs’  
15 opposition.

16 Having reviewed the pleadings of record and all competent and admissible evidence  
17 submitted by the parties, the Court finds no Rule 11 violation occurred. Accordingly, Defendants’  
18 motion for sanctions is DENIED. The Court reserves jurisdiction over an award of attorneys’ fees  
19 and costs incurred in connection with the motion as requested by Plaintiffs pursuant to Rule 11(c)(2)  
20 pending further order of the Court or trial of the action.

21  
22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: April 25, 2012

24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
27