nidalgo et al	V. CL	viedicai inc. et ai		DO
HERSHANDHERSH A Professional Corporation	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	NANCY HERSH, ESQ., State Bar No. 49091 MARK E. BURTON, JR., ESQ., State Bar No. 178400 HERSH & HERSH, A Professional Corporation 601 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 2080 San Francisco, CA 94102-6316 (415) 441-5544 Attorneys for Plaintiffs UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
	8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	9	SHEILA HIDALGO and FERNANDO) CASE NO.: 3:12-cv-05664 SI	
	10	HIDALGO,)) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]	
	11	Plaintiffs,	ORDER RE DISMISSAL	
	$\begin{bmatrix} 12 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix}$	vs.))	
	14	CL MEDICAL INC., UROPLASTY, INC.,	,))	
	15	and DOES 1-20 inclusive, and each of them,	,))	
	16	Defendants.))	
	17		,)	
	18	Plaintiffs Sheila Hidalgo and Fernando Hidalgo, and Defendant Uroplasty, Inc.,		
	19	stipulate through authorized counsel to the following:		
	20	Plaintiffs' Complaint asserts that plaintiff was implanted with a CL Medical I-Stop		
	21	medical device on approximately September 14, 2010. Uroplasty, Inc. has represented to		
	22	plaintiffs that it was a previous distributor for CL Medical devices, but terminated its		
	23	distribution agreement with CL Medical in March of 2007 and did not sell any I-Stop devices		s
	24	after 2007. Plaintiffs rely on this fact as represented by Uroplasty, Inc.		
	25	Based on these representations, plaintiffs agree to dismiss Uroplasty, Inc. without		
	26	prejudice. The parties agree that if evidence is revealed in the litigation between plaintiffs and		nd
	27	-1-		
	28	STIPULATION AND (PROP	3:12-cv-0566 OSED] ORDER RE DISMISSAL	4 SI

D00 21

HERSHANDHERSH A Professional Corporation