| 1 | | |
|----|--|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 7 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | CHEVRON ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT COMPANY | |
| 10 | AND CHEVRON USA, | CASE NO. 1:11-cv-1396 LJO-BAM |
| 11 | Plaintiffs, | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS RECOMMENDATIONS ON MOTIONS |
| 12 | VS. | FOR GOOD FAITH SETTLEMENT |
| 13 | v 5. | (Docs. 153, 154, 155) |
| 14 | BKK CORPORATION, et. al, | (D003. 155, 154, 155) |
| 15 | Defendants. | |
| 16 | / | |
| 17 | On January 24, 2013, Plaintiffs Chevron En | vironmental Management Company and Chevron |
| 18 | USA ("Plaintiffs") filed several Motions for Good Settlement Determination (Docs. 137, 138, 139) | |
| 19 | requesting approval of individual settlements and barring future claims against defendants: Burtch | |
| 20 | Trucking, Inc. (Doc. 137), San Joaquin Refining Co., Inc. (Doc. 138) and Ensign United States Drilling | |
| 21 | (California) Inc. (Doc. 139). | |
| 22 | On March 6, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issue | ed Findings and Recommendations that the Motions |
| 23 | for Good Settlement Determination be GRANTE | D. (Docs. 153, 154, 155). The Findings and |
| 24 | Recommendations were served on all parties and co | ontained notice that any objections were to be filed |
| 25 | within fifteen (15) days of the date of service. More t | han fifteen (15) days have passed and no objections |
| 26 | have been filed. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(c), this Court has | |
| 27 | conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that | |
| 28 | the Findings and Recommendations are supported b | by the record and proper analysis. |
| | | |

| 1 | | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| 2 | 1. | The Findings and Recommendations issued March 6, 2013 (Docs. 153, 154, 155) are | |
| 3 | | ADOPTED IN FULL; and | |
| 4 | 2. | Plaintiffs' Motions for Good Faith Settlement Determination (Docs. 137, 138, 139) are | |
| 5 | | GRANTED; | |
| 6 | 3. | Any and all claims for equitable comparative contribution, and partial and complete | |
| 7 | | comparative indemnity, based on comparative negligence or comparative fault, against | |
| 8 | | Burtch Trucking, Inc., San Joaquin Refining Co., Inc., and Ensign United States Drilling | |
| 9 | | (California) Inc. are forever barred pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure | |
| 10 | | §877.6 (c); | |
| 11 | 4. | Burtch Trucking, Inc., San Joaquin Refining Co., Inc., and Ensign United States Drilling | |
| 12 | | (California) Inc. be DISMISSED with prejudice; | |
| 13 | 5. | The Clerk of the Court is DIRECTED to terminate docket numbers 137, 138 and 139. | |
| 14 | | | |
| | | | |
| 15 | IT IS SO OF | RDERED | |
| 15 16 | IT IS SO OF | | |
| | | RDERED. March 25, 2013 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| 16 | | | |
| 16 17 | | | |
| 16 17 18 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 | | | |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 | | | |