

1 MARA E. ROSALES, State Bar No. 104844  
 mara@rosaleslawpartners.com  
 2 MICHELLE SEXTON, State Bar No. 138536  
 michelle@rosaleslawpartners.com  
 3 ROBERT D. SANFORD, State Bar No.129790  
 dusty@rosaleslawpartners.com  
 4 ROSALES LAW PARTNERS LLP  
 433 California Street, Suite 630  
 5 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 Telephone: (415) 986-4760

6 Attorneys for Defendant and Cross-Claimant  
 7 PACIFIC GATEWAY CONCESSIONS LLC

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

11 RACHEL HOCHSTETLER,  
 CIRENA TORRES,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 vs.

14 PACIFIC GATEWAY CONCESSIONS LLC, et  
 al.,

15 Defendants.

17 PACIFIC GATEWAY CONCESSIONS LLC, et  
 al.,

18 Cross-Claimant,

19 vs.

20 POINT SOLUTIONS, LLC

21 Cross-Defendant.

) CASE NO. 3:14-CV-04748-TEH

) **STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~**  
 ) **ORDER CONTINUING INITIAL CASE**  
 ) **MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

) Date: June 15, 2015  
 ) Time: 1:30 p.m.  
 ) Courtroom: 12

1 **STIPULATION**

2 Plaintiffs Rachel Hochstetler and Cirena Torres, Defendant and Cross-Claimant Pacific  
3 Gateway Concessions LLC ("PGC"), and Cross-Defendant Point Solutions, LLC ("PS") hereby  
4 stipulate as follows:

5 **Recitals**

6 1. The Initial Case Management Conference in this action was originally scheduled  
7 for February 2, 2015, per the Clerk's Notice Scheduling Case Management Conference on  
8 Reassignment (Docket 12), then continued until April 13, 2015 since PS had not yet appeared in  
9 the action (Docket 24).

10 2. On April 1, 2015, the parties participated in a mediation before court-appointed  
11 mediator David Bluhm. As a result of the mediation, Plaintiffs and PGC reached a tentative  
12 settlement of the class action by agreeing to a settlement fund for putative class members as well  
13 as equitable relief. The parties filed a stipulation and proposed order to continue the April 13,  
14 2015 Case Management Conference, to allow Plaintiffs and PGC to discuss payment of attorney  
15 fees and costs to Plaintiffs' counsel if counsel is appointed class counsel and payment of an  
16 incentive award to the Plaintiffs if they are appointed class representatives, and to allow PGC  
17 and PS to continue settlement negotiations begun during the mediation. The Court continued the  
18 April 13, 2015 Case Management Conference to June 15, 2015 (Docket No. 29).

19 3. Plaintiffs and PGC have agreed on a class settlement, and have memorialized all  
20 key terms in a written Memorandum of Understanding of Settlement ("MOU") which has been  
21 signed by Plaintiffs and PGC.

22 4. There are a few issues which Plaintiffs and PGC continue to work on.  
23 Specifically, Plaintiffs and PGC are working to prepare a long-form settlement agreement,  
24 including the Short-Form Notice to the Settlement Class (and the locations within each store  
25 where it will be placed), the Full Notice to the Settlement Class and the Claim Form. The MOU  
26 requires Plaintiffs and PGC to work together and take all steps necessary and appropriate to  
27 effectuate the settlement, and expressly states as follows:

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

**“Cooperation to Effectuate Settlement.”**

The Parties agree to cooperate and take all steps necessary and appropriate to effectuate the settlement. This includes, consistent with the terms of this MOU, the Parties' agreement to work together in good faith to prepare and sign a long-form settlement agreement, including the Short-Form Notice (and the locations within each store where it will be placed), the Full Notice and the Claim Form, all of which are to be submitted to the Court in connection with Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval of the settlement. The Parties shall diligently work together to seek preliminary and final court approval of the settlement."

5. The MOU also provides that if Plaintiffs and PGC cannot agree on these few issues, the MOU shall nonetheless be fully enforceable by the Court and the Court shall resolve any such differences:

**“MOU Is Fully Enforceable, and any Disputes Shall Be Decided By Court.”**

The Parties agree that this MOU shall be fully enforceable by the court. To the extent that there is any disagreement in preparing a long-form settlement agreement, including the Short-Form Notice (and the locations within each store where it will be placed), the Full Notice and the Claim Form, the Parties agree that the Court shall resolve any such differences and the Court shall look to and use the terms of this MOU in resolving any such differences."

6. Thus, the MOU is a fully enforceable class-wide settlement, subject to the Court's approval.

7. Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires the Court's approval of all class action settlements. Accordingly, Plaintiffs will file a motion seeking the Court's preliminary approval of the class settlement in this case.

8. Plaintiffs and PGC continue to work together and they expect that a motion for preliminary approval of the class action settlement will be filed in approximately sixty (60) days.

9. PS is considering filing a motion to sever PGC's cross-claim.



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, it is so ordered. The Initial Case Management Conference shall occur on 08/31, 2015 at 1:30 PM in Courtroom 12 on the 19th floor, United States District Courthouse, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102. Not less than seven days prior, counsel shall submit a joint case management conference statement, and all other deadlines are continued according to the new date of the Initial Case Management Conference.

Dated: June 10, 2015

