Smith v. Greyhound Lines, Inc.

Doc. 10

WHEREAS Plaintiff filed a Class Action against Defendant in the Superior Court of California for the County of Sacramento, Case No. 34-2017-00219188 on September 15, 2017;

WHEREAS Defendant removed Plaintiff's Action to the United States Superior Court for the Eastern District of California and filed a Notice of Removal on October 25, 2017;

WHEREAS Defendant filed a Notice of Related Cases on October 25, 2017 wherein Defendant alleged that an action previously filed in the Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. RG16815313 by Plaintiff Robnesha Scott against Defendant was related to Plaintiff's Action;

WHEREAS Plaintiff filed a Motion to Remand on November 21, 2017 and the Hearing for that Motion is scheduled for January 11, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. in Courtroom 2, 15th Floor of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California;

WHEREAS Defendant filed a Motion to Stay the Action on November 21, 2017 and the Hearing for that Motion is scheduled for January 11, 2018 at 2:00 p.m. in Courtroom 2, 15th Floor of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California;

WHEREAS Defendant has not yet filed an opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand;

WHEREAS Plaintiff has not yet filed an opposition to Defendant's Motion to Stay the Action;

WHEREAS Defendant's counsel has represented to Plaintiff's counsel that it attended a mediation of the Alameda County State Court case and is working to finalize a settlement in a related case that includes settlement of the class action claims Plaintiff alleged in his Complaint;

WHEREAS the Parties agree it is in their best interest to continue the motion hearings in this case pending a finalized settlement agreement that Defendant has represented settles the class action claims Plaintiff alleged, which would otherwise render Plaintiff's class claims moot;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the Parties, subject to the approval of the Court, as follows:

- 1. That the Court will continue Plaintiff's Motion to Remand Hearing currently set for 2:00 p.m. on January 11, 2018 to 2:00 p.m. on March 22, 2018;
- 2. That the Court will continue Defendant's Motion to Stay Hearing currently set for 2:00 p.m. on January 11, 2018 to 2:00 p.m. on March 22, 2018;

STIPULATION & ORDER 2:17-CV-02238-TLN-AC 2

	1				
1	3. That all opposition and reply briefs due to be filed in connection with the Motion				
2	Remand and/or Motion to Stay will be now be due based on the newly set hearing dates and in				
3	accordance with Local Rules; and				
4	4.	4. That nothing in this stipulation and proposed order, or the act of entering into this			
5	stipulation and proposed order, shall prejudice Plaintiff or Defendant in any argument they may				
6	otherwise make in the opposition and/or reply briefs.				
7					
8				Shimoda Law Corp.	
9					
10	Dated: Decem	nber 18, 2017	By:	/s/ Justin P. Rodriguez Galen T. Shimoda	
11				Justin P. Rodriguez	
12				Attorneys for Plaintiff	
13					
14					
15				LITTLED MENDELGON D.C.	
16				LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.	
17	Dated: Decen	aber 18, 2017	By:	/s/ David J. Dow	
18	Dated. Decen	1001 10, 2017	Бу	David J. Dow	
19				(as authorized on 12/18/17) Kelsey E. Papst	
20				Attorneys for Defendant	
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	i				

STIPULATION & ORDER 2:17-CV-02238-TLN-AC 3

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6

27

28

1

ORDER

The COURT, having considered the above stipulation and finding good cause, HEREBY ORDERS that:

- 1. Plaintiff's Motion to Remand Hearing currently set for 2:00 p.m. on January 11, 2018 is continued to 2:00 p.m. on March 22, 2018;
- 2. Defendant's Motion to Stay Hearing currently set for 2:00 p.m. on January 11, 2018 is continued to 2:00 p.m. on March 22, 2018;
- 3. All opposition and reply briefs due to be filed in connection with the Motion to Remand and/or Motion to Stay will be now be due based on the newly set hearing dates and in accordance with Local Rules; and
- 4. Nothing in this stipulation order, or the act of entering into this stipulation and order, shall prejudice Plaintiff or Defendant in any argument they may otherwise make in the opposition and/or reply briefs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 18, 2017

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge

STIPULATION & ORDER 2:17-CV-02238-TLN-AC 4