

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

STEPHANIE HALE and O'BRIAN  
RANGEL individually, on behalf of  
themselves, and all others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ENSIGN UNITED STATES DRILLING  
(CALIFORNIA), INC., ENSIGN  
ENERGY SERVICES, INC., and ENSIGN  
UNITED STATES DRILLING, INC.,

Defendants.

No. 1:15-cv-01042-DAD-JLT

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

(Doc. No. 90, 92)

On September 28, 2017, the court granted defendants' motion for summary judgment. (Doc. No. 88.) The matter was referred back to the assigned magistrate judgment for further proceedings solely because the parties had indicated the possibility that resolution of the motion for summary judgment with respect to plaintiff's federal WARN Act and California WARN Act claims might not fully resolve potential claims to be brought on behalf of other Ensign California workers who were terminated in 2014. (*Id.* at 18.) Therefore, in granting defendants' motion for summary judgment, the court directed the parties to inform the court of their intention with

////

1 respect to the potential additional claims and indicated that if no new plaintiffs or claims would  
2 be joined, the action would be dismissed. (*Id.* at n.8.) On November 6, 2017, plaintiffs filed a  
3 notice of intent not to amend and request for dismissal on the basis that no new parties would be  
4 added to this action. (Doc. No. 90.)<sup>1</sup> Thereafter, defendants objected to plaintiffs' request for  
5 dismissal and sought entry of judgment in light of the court's granting of their motion for  
6 summary judgment with respect to the only claims brought in this action. (Doc. No. 92.)

7 In the court's September 28, 2017 order granting defendants' motion for summary  
8 judgment, judgment was entered in defendants' favor with respect to plaintiffs' federal WARN  
9 Act and California WARN Act claims—the only two claims brought in this action. (*See* Doc. No.  
10 1 at 10–13). Because plaintiff has advised that no additional claims will be brought, the Clerk of  
11 the Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of defendants pursuant to the September 28, 2017  
12 order and to close this case.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: November 20, 2017

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's other requests were related to the status conference which was subsequently vacated  
by the assigned magistrate judge. (Doc. No. 93.)