1 2	JAMES K. WARD, ESQ. (SBN 117639) DANIEL P. JAY, ESQ. (SBN 215860)	
3	EVANS, WIECKOWSKI & WARD, LLP 745 University Avenue	
	Sacramento, CA 95825	
4	Telephone: (916)923-1600	
5	Facsimile: (916)923-1616 Attorneys for Defendant	
6	TWAIN HARTE COMMUNITY SERVICES	S DISTRICT
_	PUBLIC ENTITY-FILING FEE WAIVEI	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	YVONNE HILTON ,) Case No. 1:12-cv-01360-LJO-SMS
11 12	Plaintiff,) STIPULATION AND ORDER FOR DISMISSAL OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES
13	VS.) ALLEGATIONS
14 15	TWAIN HARTE COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT, and DOES ONE THROUGH TWENTY, Inclusive,)))
16 17	Defendants,))
18		<u></u>
19 20	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by Plaintiff, YVONNE HILTON, by and through he	
21	attorneys, and Defendant, TWAIN HARTE COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT, by and	
22	through its attorneys, that Plaintiff shall be allowed to dismiss and strike from the Complaint the	
23	following allegations regarding punitive damages:	
24	1. First Cause of Action , paragraph 41, page 8, lines 12 through 14: entire paragraph	
25 26	which states, "Plaintiff alleges that punitive damages are available to a plaintiff in a civil action	
27	under the FEHA. Plaintiff requests an award of punitive damages as a result of the acts o	
28	Defendants as set forth below.	

14

16

24

- 2. **Second Cause of Action**, paragraph 53, page 10, lines 5 through 7: entire paragraph which states, "Plaintiff alleges that punitive damages are available to a plaintiff in a civil action under Title VII. Plaintiff requests and award of punitive damages as a result of the acts of Defendants as set forth below."
- 3. **Third Cause of Action**, paragraph 61, page 11, lines 14 through 16: entire paragraph which states, "Plaintiff alleges that punitive damages are available to a plaintiff in a civil action under the FEHA. Plaintiff requests an award of punitive damages as a result of the acts of Defendants as set forth below."
- 4. Paragraphs 63 and 64, page 11, line 22 through page 12, line 16: "CLAIM FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES ¶ Plaintiff incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 62 inclusive, as though set forth here in full, and as a claim for Punitive damages against all Defendants further alleges: ¶ The acts taken toward Plaintiff were despicable and carried out by managerial employees acting in a deliberate, cold, callous, fraudulent, and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff. Plaintiff therefore requests the assessment of Punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof. Defendants' conduct was malicious in that Defendants, and each of them, intentionally discriminated against Plaintiff with full knowledge that Defendants, and each of them, were violating Plaintiff's rights and that she would suffer actual personal injuries. Defendants' conduct was oppressive because Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known that Plaintiff was and is entirely dependent on her employment and wages to support herself and her family, and the unfair, discriminatory, and unlawful treatment would create a cruel and unjust hardship for Plaintiff. Defendants' conduct was fraudulent in that it seeks to offer false pretexts for the wrongful and unlawful tortious conduct of Defendants, and each of them. Defendants knew of United States and California law

governing discrimination, harassment, and retaliation for complaining about discrimination and harassment, and then did nothing while Plaintiff endured discrimination from her supervisors and co-workers of Defendant. Defendant Employer finally terminated Plaintiff for a discriminatory and retaliatory purpose. Defendants, and each of them, had actual knowledge of their conduct as well as the outrageous nature of the conduct of Defendant's managerial employees. Further, Defendant authorized its managerial employees' wrongful acts. Defendant Employer's callous disregard for Plaintiff's life, safety, and interests entitles Plaintiff to an award of Punitive and exemplary damages, according to proof at trial."

5. **Prayer at number 7**, page 13, line 7 which states: "Punitive damages in the sum according to proof."

IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED by the parties that upon execution of the order filed herewith, the Court will dismiss without prejudice Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Complaint (currently scheduled for November 1, 2012 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 4) because it is moot.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: October 1, 2012 EVANS, WIECKOWSKI & WARD, LLP

/s/ James K. Ward

JAMES K. WARD
DANIEL JAY
Attorneys for Defendant TWAIN HARTE
COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Dated: October ___, 2012 LAW OFFICES OF RAND L. STEPHENS

RAND L. STEPHENS
Attorneys for Plaintiff YVONNE HILTON

1.5

RICHARD N. KOSS

Attorney for Plaintiff YVONNE HILTON

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties and good cause appearing, the Court orders that the following allegations are stricken from the Complaint:

- 1. **First Cause of Action**, paragraph 41, page 8, lines 12 through 14: entire paragraph which states, "Plaintiff alleges that punitive damages are available to a plaintiff in a civil action under the FEHA. Plaintiff requests an award of punitive damages as a result of the acts of Defendants as set forth below.
- 2. **Second Cause of Action**, paragraph 53, page 10, lines 5 through 7: entire paragraph which states, "Plaintiff alleges that punitive damages are available to a plaintiff in a civil action under Title VII. Plaintiff requests and award of punitive damages as a result of the acts of Defendants as set forth below."
- 3. **Third Cause of Action**, paragraph 61, page 11, lines 14 through 16: entire paragraph which states, "Plaintiff alleges that punitive damages are available to a plaintiff in a civil action under the FEHA. Plaintiff requests an award of punitive damages as a result of the acts of Defendants as set forth below."
- 4. **Paragraphs 63 and 64**, page 11, line 22 through page 12, line 16: "CLAIM FOR PUNITIVE DAMAGES ¶ Plaintiff incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 62 inclusive, as though set forth here in full, and as a claim for Punitive damages against all Defendants further alleges: ¶ The acts taken toward Plaintiff were despicable and carried out by managerial

23 24

26

25

27

28

employees acting in a deliberate, cold, callous, fraudulent, and intentional manner in order to injure and damage Plaintiff. Plaintiff therefore requests the assessment of Punitive damages against Defendants, and each of them, in an amount according to proof. Defendants' conduct was malicious in that Defendants, and each of them, intentionally discriminated against Plaintiff with full knowledge that Defendants, and each of them, were violating Plaintiff's rights and that she would suffer actual personal injuries. Defendants' conduct was oppressive because Defendants, and each of them, knew or should have known that Plaintiff was and is entirely dependent on her employment and wages to support herself and her family, and the unfair, discriminatory, and unlawful treatment would create a cruel and unjust hardship for Plaintiff. Defendants' conduct was fraudulent in that it seeks to offer false pretexts for the wrongful and unlawful tortious conduct of Defendants, and each of them. Defendants knew of United States and California law governing discrimination, harassment, and retaliation for complaining about discrimination and harassment, and then did nothing while Plaintiff endured discrimination from her supervisors and co-workers of Defendant. Defendant Employer finally terminated Plaintiff for a discriminatory and retaliatory purpose. Defendants, and each of them, had actual knowledge of their conduct as well as the outrageous nature of the conduct of Defendant's managerial employees. Further, Defendant authorized its managerial employees' wrongful acts. Defendant Employer's callous disregard for Plaintiff's life, safety, and interests entitles Plaintiff to an award of Punitive and exemplary damages, according to proof at trial."

5. **Prayer at number 7**, page 13, line 7 which states: "Punitive damages in the sum according to proof."

It is further ordered that the Defendant's Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Complaint set for November 1, 2012 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 4 is VACATED given that this order renders Defendant's motion moot. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Dated: October 12, 2012