

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

R.R. a minor by and through his guardian ad litem Debra Ruiz, et al.,

CASE NO. 1:16-CV-0570 AWI SKO

Plaintiff,

ORDER DISMISSING DEFENDANT CITY OF VISALIA

(Doc. No. 21)

COUNTY OF TULARE, et al.,

v.

Defendant.

On August 9, 2016, Plaintiffs and Defendant the City of Visalia filed a stipulated dismissal of the City of Visalia only. <u>See</u> Doc. No. 21. Although other defendants have filled answers, no other defendant signed the stipulation. To date, no other defendant has responded or objected to the August 9 stipulation.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a) "allows plaintiffs voluntarily to dismiss some or all of their claims against some or all defendants." Romoland Sch. Dist. v. Inland Empire Energy Ctr., LLC, 548 F.3d 738, 748 (9th Cir. 2008). Where a defendant has served an answer, but has not signed a stipulation to dismiss, a plaintiff's voluntary dismissal of an "action" must be effected through Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2). See Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41(a); Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1999); Local 2-1971 of PACE Intl. Union v. Cooper, 364 F.Supp.2d 546, 551 (W.D. N.C. 2005); Sullivan b. Bankhead Enterprises, Inc., 108 F.R.D. 378, 382 (D. Mass. 1985). Rule 41(a)(2) provides in pertinent part: "Except as provided in Rule 41(a)(1), an action may be dismissed at the plaintiff's request only by court order, on terms that the court considers proper." Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41(a)(2). "A district court should grant a motion for voluntary dismissal under Rule 41(a)(2) unless a defendant can show that it will suffer some plain legal prejudice as a result." Smith v. Lenches, 263 F.3d 972, 975 (9th Cir. 2001).

Here, this case is in the early stages of litigation. No other defendant has objected or responded to the stipulated dismissal of the City of Visalia. Given the time that has now passed, the Court will view stipulation as being unopposed. So viewing the stipulation, there is no reason apparent to deny the stipulated dismissal. <u>See</u> Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 41(a)(2); <u>Smith</u>, 263 F.3d at 975.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 41(a)(2), Defendant the City of Visalia is DISMISSED from this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>August 17, 2016</u>

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE