ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS KENT'S MEATS & GROCERIES, INC. AND KENT W. PFRIMMER

1	
2	$ _{\mathbf{D}}$
3	
4	A
5	R
6	31 Sa
7	Te Fa
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dennis C. Huie (State Bar No. 184377) dhuie@rjo.com

Aaron M. Scolari (State Bar No. 237397)

ascolari@rjo.com

ROGERS JOSEPH O'DONNELL

311 California Street

San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 956-2828 Facsimile: (415) 956-6457

2

WHEREAS, on February 4, 2015, THERESA DUCKWORTH ("Plaintiff") commenced this individual and class action against KENT'S MEATS & GROCERIES, INC. and KENT W. PFRIMMER ("Defendants") in the United States District Court, Eastern District of California-Sacramento Division. In addition to her individual sexual discrimination, harassment and retaliation claims based on violations of the public policy, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), and the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), Plaintiff alleged that Defendants are liable to her and other similarly situated current and former non-exempt, hourly employees in California for unpaid wages and other related relief based on Defendants' alleged failures to (1) provide all rest breaks, (2) provide all meal periods, (3) fairly compete, (4) indemnify for all expenses, (5) provide accurate wage statements, and (6) timely pay final wages upon termination of employment.

WHEREAS, on February 27, 2015, Plaintiff served Defendants with the lawsuit.

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2015, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's wage and hour class claims (Claims for Relief 10 through 16). Defendants argued that the Court lacks supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state wage and hour claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

WHEREAS, Plaintiff does not concede to Defendants' arguments for lack of supplemental jurisdiction over the disputed claims.

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFOR, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- A. Plaintiff will file an amended complaint (attached as Exhibit A to this Stipulation) that omits Claims for Relief 10 through 16.
- B. Plaintiff will file the dismissed claims in the Superior Court of California,
 County of Shasta.

1	C. Any tolling of Plaintiff's statute of limitations for the dismissed claims is
2	governed by federal and/or state law.
3	D. Immediately after filing of this stipulation and before April 9, 2015
4	Defendants will withdraw their motion to dismiss Plaintiff's state claims.
5	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	Dated: April 9, 2015
8	- My - Minter
9	Troy L. Nunley United States District Judge
10 11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
20 27	
28	