late claim<sup>1</sup> other than to state it was "just presented." <u>Id</u>. at 2. This seems to indicate plaintiff submitted the claim more than a year after the February 2, 2018 events. If the Board denies the request to submit the late claim, the plaintiff must petition the Superior Court to be relieved from the necessity of compliance with the claims-presentation procedure. Cal. Gov. Code § 946.6. For this relief to be granted, "a petitioner must show more than his or her failure to discover a fact until too late; the petitioner must establish that in the use of reasonable diligence he or she failed to discover it." Munoz v. State of California, 33 Cal.App.4th 1767, 1784 (1995).

Though the Court has few details related to the claim or why the plaintiff did not submit it before now. However, it appears unlikely that a determination of the claim's merits will made any time soon and there is substantial reason to think that the plaintiff will not be permitted to proceed on state law claims. Thus, any request to file a second amended complaint is unripe. The plaintiff may re-submit the stipulation if she satisfies the requirements for the Government Code or a court excuses her from doing so. Thus, the stipulation is **DENIED** as **UNRIPE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: **May 10, 2019** 

<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the stipulation does not assert that a petition for leave to submit a late claim was presented at all. Rather, it indicates only that the plaintiff submitted a "claim pursuant to California Govt. Code § 910, et seq." (Doc. 21 at 2)