

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (SBN 44332)
 United States Attorney
 2 JOANN M. SWANSON (SBN 88143)
 Chief, Civil Division
 3 ABRAHAM A. SIMMONS (SBN 146400)
 Assistant United States Attorney

4 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
 5 San Francisco, California 94102-3495
 Telephone: (415) 436-7264
 6 Facsimile: (415) 436-6748
 Email: abraham.simmons@usdoj.gov

7
 8 JASON S. HEGY, ESQ.
 EEOC/OGC

9 1801 L. Street, N.W., 7th Fl.
 Washington, D.C. 20507
 10 Telephone: (202) 663-4028
 Facsimile: (202) 663-7045
 11 Email: jason.hegy@eoc.gov

12 Attorneys for Federal Defendant

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 LWANDA OKELLO,)	No. C 04-2528 MHP
)	No. C 06-7921 MHP
17 Plaintiff,)	
)	
18 v.)	[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING
)	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO VACATE
19 NAOMI EARP, Chair, U.S. Equal)	
20 Employment Opportunity Commission,)	
)	
21 Defendant.)	Before: Hon. Marilyn H. Patel

22
 23 On February 25, 2008, the parties to these two related civil actions entered into a
 24 stipulation of settlement. [Docket No. 100.] The parties submitted the settlement to the court for
 25 approval and signature and this Court entered the signed the agreement into the record on
 26 February 27, 2008. [Docket No. 101.] Pursuant to the agreement, plaintiff received a lump sum
 27 payment of \$15,000 in exchange for dismissal of the lawsuits. [Docket No. 101.] Plaintiff had
 28 voluntarily retired on disability almost a year and a half earlier in September of 2006. [See
 Docket No. 45.] No provisions in the settlement agreement addressed processing of plaintiff's

1 retirement. [Docket No. 101.] This Court entered a dismissal with prejudice in accordance with
2 the settlement agreement on May 8, 2008. [Docket No. 103.]

3 Pursuant to the settlement, plaintiff received the compensation called for under the
4 agreement. More than five months after the stipulation dismissing the case with prejudice,
5 plaintiff filed the pending motion to vacate the settlement agreement and dismissal. In support of
6 his motion, plaintiff states Judy Furukawa and OPM miscalculated his “creditable retirement
7 years to include my prior military service . . .” Motion [Docket No. 104] at 1 (Emphasis in
8 original). Plaintiff claims that as a result of this apparent miscalculation, he thought he would be
9 receiving 29 years of credit for military service and a benefit of \$1995.00 per month. Motion
10 [Docket No. 104] at 1. Plaintiff claims that months after the settlement of this case, his military
11 years of service was corrected and the recalculated amount of his benefit was only \$700.17 per
12 month. According to plaintiff, Ms. Furukawa or others may have intentionally misapplied the
13 number of retirement years in a “successful presentation to force me into retirement.” Motion
14 [Docket No. 104] at 2. Plaintiff does not appear to claim that he was entitled to 29 years of
15 creditable service, only that the earlier miscalculation was intentional and unlawful. Motion
16 [Docket No. 104] at 2.

17 The Human Resources Specialist that calculated plaintiff’s retirement benefit is Judy S.
18 Furukawa. She has submitted a declaration stating that plaintiff’s lawsuit played no part in her
19 calculation of plaintiff’s benefit. Declaration of Judy S. Furukawa (“Furukawa Decl.”) at ¶ 3.

20 Plaintiff is not entitled to renege on the settlement of these two cases because he is
21 receiving less in retirement compensation than the thought he would. Nothing in the agreement
22 states that plaintiff will be entitled to a particular retirement benefit. To the contrary, the
23 agreement contains an integration clause that states that “no warranties or other representations
24 have been made on any subject other than as set forth in this Agreement.” Document 101 at ¶ 15.
25 Further, pursuant to the settlement agreement, plaintiff released all claims of which he was aware
26 and all claims of which he was not aware at the time he signed the settlement agreement.
27 Document 101 at ¶¶ 5, 6.

1 Similarly, pursuant to the settlement agreement, any disputes that arise with respect to the
2 implementation of the terms of the Agreement must be resolved by filing a separate action “to
3 enforce the Agreement in district court.” Document 101 at ¶ 11. The settlement agreement
4 further provides that in the event of such a dispute, “plaintiff will not seek to rescind the
5 Agreement . . .” Document 101 at ¶ 11.

6 Equally as important, plaintiff has made no showing that anyone intentionally misled
7 him. Judy Furukawa has declared that she did not know the status of plaintiff’s lawsuit when she
8 calculated his benefit and that she performed all calculations in accordance with EEOC Office of
9 Personnel rules and regulations. See Furukawa Decl. at ¶ 4. Indeed the evidence is that plaintiff
10 ignored requests for further information and documentation. See Furukawa Decl. at ¶ 6.

11 For all these reasons, plaintiff’s motion is **DENIED**.

12
13 2/19/2009 _____
14 DATE

