

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

YOUNG’S COMMERCIAL TRANSFER, INC., a corporation, and RIGOBERTO FERNANDEZ JIMENEZ, an individual, d/b/a JIMENEZ TRUCKING,

Defendants.

No. 1:13-cv-01506-DAD-EPG

ORDER DISMISSING PARTIES IN LEAD CASE OF CONSOLIDATED ACTION

(Doc. No. 50)

AND CONSOLIDATED ACTION


On January 21, 2016, plaintiff National Railroad Passenger Corporation and defendants Young’s Commercial Transfer, Inc. and Rigoberto Fernandez Jimenez, individually and d/b/a Jimenez Trucking, filed a joint stipulation dismissing *National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Young’s Commercial Transfer, Inc., et al.*, with prejudice, with each party to bear its own costs and attorneys’ fees in this consolidated action. (Doc. No. 50.) In light of the parties’ stipulation, the complaint filed by plaintiff National Railroad Passenger Corporation against defendants Young’s Commercial Transfer, Inc. and Rigoberto Fernandez Jimenez, as an individual, d/b/a Jimenez Trucking is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice and without an award of attorneys’ fees

1 and costs to either party. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii); *Wilson v. City of San Jose*, 111 F.3d
2 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997). The action is terminated as to plaintiff National Railroad Passenger
3 Corporation and defendants Young's Commercial Transfer, Inc. and Rigoberto Fernandez
4 Jimenez, as an individual, d/b/a Jimenez Trucking only as to the claims brought by plaintiff
5 National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

6 This order and dismissal, however, does not affect the status of the claims brought by
7 plaintiff Celia Ramirez in her complaint against defendants Rigoberto Fernandez Jimenez,
8 Jimenez Trucking, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Barbara Neu, BNSF Railway
9 Company, Young's Commercial Transfer, Inc. and Does 1 through 200. The case number with
10 respect to claims brought by the remaining plaintiff against the remaining defendants will
11 continue to be 1:13-cv-01506-DAD-EPG.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14
15 Dated: January 25, 2016



16 DALE A. DROZD

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28