

1 Eve H. Cervantez (SBN 164709)
 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
 2 177 Post Street, Suite 300
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 3 Tel. (415) 421-7151
 Fax (415) 362-8064
 4 Email: ixervantez@altber.com

5 Harvey Sohnen (SBN 62850)
 Patricia Kelly (SBN 99837)
 6 LAW OFFICES OF SOHNEN & KELLY
 2 Theatre Square, Suite 230
 7 Orinda, CA 94563
 Tel. (925) 258-9300
 8 Fax (925) 258-9315
 Email: netlaw@pacbell.net

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**
 12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**
 13

14 CYNTHIA BROOKS, an individual,)	Case No. C12-4935 EMC (JSC)
)	
15 Plaintiff,)	
)	STIPULATION FOR FILING FIRST
16 v.)	AMENDED COMPLAINT; ORDER
)	
17 U.S. BANK, N.A. and DOES 1 through 10)	
inclusive)	Judge: Edward M. Chen
)	
18 Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	

22 Plaintiff CYNTHIA BROOKS and Defendant U.S. BANK, N.A. hereby stipulate as follows:

23 WHEREAS Plaintiff CYNTHIA BROOKS seeks an order for leave to file her proposed First
 24 Amended Complaint for Damages, Penalties and Injunctive Relief (First Amended Complaint)
 25 attached as Exhibit A hereto;

26 WHEREAS, Plaintiff Brooks sent a letter to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency
 27 (“LWDA”) on July 5, 2012 alleging Defendant’s violation of California Labor Code Section 1198
 28 and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 4-2001;

1 WHEREAS, Plaintiff Brooks filed her original Complaint on August 21, 2012;

2 WHEREAS, Plaintiff Brooks and proposed additional Plaintiff, Jacob Swoyer, sent another
3 letter to the LWDA on June 20, 2013, alleging Defendant’s violation of California Labor Code
4 Section 1198 and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 4-2001 section 14(A) and (B),
5 California Labor Code section 226.7(a), and Industrial Welfare Commission Wage Order 4-2001
6 section 12(A);

7 WHEREAS, Plaintiff Brooks and proposed additional Plaintiff Swoyer submitted to
8 Defendant a proposed First Amended Complaint on July 1, 2013 and requested that Defendant
9 stipulate to the filing of the proposed First Amended Complaint;

10 WHEREAS, Defendant entering into this stipulation is not to be deemed a concession that
11 the proposed First Amended Complaint is meritorious; indeed, Defendant does not waive any
12 argument concerning the sufficiency of the pleading and/or any defenses to the claims or parties
13 therein, including, but not limited to, the applicable statute of limitations on the claims in the
14 proposed First Amended Complaint, failure of the newly-added claims to relate back to the date of
15 filing of the original Complaint, and any circumstances rendering proposed additional Plaintiff
16 Swoyer an improper plaintiff.

17 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties that Plaintiff shall
18 have leave to file the proposed First Amended Complaint; and that Defendant shall file a responsive
19 pleading within 30 days after the filing of the First Amended Complaint.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

ORDER

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, AND FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/31, 2013

