Lemus v. H&R Block Tax and Business Services, Inc. et al.

Doc. 44

| 1 | NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES HERETO STIPULATE AND |
|---|---|
| 2 | RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT THE COURT ORDER AS FOLLOWS: |
| 3 | Pursuant to the Parties' stipulation, Plaintiffs' Third Claim is hereby DISMISSED |
| 4 | without prejudice. Further, paragraph 22, and paragraph 59, line 17, of Plaintiff's Third |
| 5 | Amended Complaint are STRICKEN without prejudice. |
| 6 | |
| 7 | DATED: August 4, 2010 SEYFARTH SHAW LLP |
| 8 | |
| 9 10 | By: /s/ Andrew M. McNaught Andrew M. McNaught |
| 11 | Attorneys for Defendant |
| 12 | H&R BLOCK ENTERPRISES LLC |
| 13 | DATED: August 4, 2010 MARLIN & SALTZMAN |
| 14 | |
| 15 | By: /s/ Louis Marlin |
| 16 | Louis Marlin Attorneys for Plaintiffs |
| 17 | ARABELLA LEMUS |
| 18 | MALVIN A. AYALA |
| 19 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. | PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| | Suran Illaton |
| 23 | Dated: |
| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COUP 25 | HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE |
| | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |