

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

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

JUAN SARAVIA, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

No. C 14-05003 WHA

v.


DYNAMEX, INC., DYNAMEX FLEET SERVICES, INC., DYNAMEX OPERATIONS EAST, INC., and DYNAMEX OPERATIONS WEST, INC.,

Defendants.

**NOTICE RE  
DECERTIFICATION MOTION**

On the motion to decertify, plaintiffs' counsel shall set forth in detail in their opposition a plan to try the case on a class-wide basis, including specifically a method of proof to establish liability across the board on a class-wide basis. Put differently, how can we avoid a trial within a trial as to each opt-in's situation, for example, to find out how many employees work for each opt-in and so forth. Both sides shall further brief (movant on its reply) what would keep, if we did decertify, each opt-in from commencing his own action against Dynamex in this court. Is opting-in equivalent to intervention such that we must keep all of the opt-ins as individual plaintiffs anyway?

Dated: July 19, 2016

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE