

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HUGO SLUIMER,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
VERITY, INC. *et al.*,  
Defendants.

No. C 08-01220 SI

**ORDER RE: PROPOSED JUDGMENT**

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

On November 3, 2008, plaintiff argued by letter brief that this Court's July 22, 2008 Order granting in part plaintiff's motion for summary judgment had disposed of the merits of the case. [Docket No. 62] Plaintiff therefore submitted a proposed judgment and an amended version of defendants' release agreement. On November 24, 2008, the Court issued an order granting plaintiff's motion for attorneys' fees. [Docket No. 70] In its November 24 Order, the Court noted that at oral argument, plaintiff's counsel confirmed that plaintiff is willing to release his claims pending in the Dutch courts for vacation pay and commissions, in exchange for receiving stock options and reimbursement of medical premiums from defendants. *See* November 24 Order, at 6. The Court held that if defendants require plaintiff to execute a release agreement in order to receive benefits, defendants must modify their release agreement to provide that plaintiff does not release his claims to amounts awarded him in this Court or in the now resolved Dutch case over cash severance benefits. *See id.*

Accordingly, the parties are ordered to meet and confer concerning a proposed form of judgment and an amended final release agreement. The parties are ordered to jointly submit a proposed form of judgment and final release agreement to the Court by **December 16, 2008.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: 12/4/08

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge