

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PAUL GOODMAN, WILLIS KINDLEY,	)	
TIMOTHY M. KUNST, BRIDGE RANDALL,	)	Case No. 3:16-cv-04861-VC
CLAYTON RULEBBER, XEFF SCOLARI,	)	
DANNY LEE SISEMORE, JOHN S.	)	<del>PROPOSED</del> ORDER DISMISSING
WALLIS, WILLIAM N. WEARE JR,	)	ACTION
individually, and on behalf of all others	)	
similarly situated.	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	
AT&T, Corp.	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

1 The Court, having considered the submissions of Plaintiffs Paul Goodman, Willis Kindley,  
2 Timothy M. Kunst, Bridge Randall, Clayton Rulebber, Xeff Scolari, Danny Lee Sisemore, John S.  
3 Wallis and William N. Weare, Jr. (collectively, "Named Plaintiffs") and Defendant Pacific Bell  
4 Telephone Company ("Pac Bell")<sup>1</sup> (together, "the Parties"), and having considered the oral  
5 presentation by counsel for all Parties, and good cause appearing therefor, this Court orders as  
6 follows:

- 7 1. The individual causes of action of Plaintiffs Paul Goodman, Willis Kindley, Timothy M.  
8 Kunst, Bridge Randall, Clayton Rulebber, Xeff Scolari, Danny Lee Sisemore, John S.  
9 Wallis and William N. Weare, Jr. are hereby dismissed with prejudice;
- 10 2. The class allegations asserted in the operative complaint in this action are dismissed  
11 without prejudice to any unnamed class members;
- 12 3. Defendant shall give notice of this dismissal to the Communications Workers of  
13 America: Local 9400;
- 14 4. Defendant shall file proof of service of such notice of the dismissal of this action on the  
15 Communications Workers of America: Local 9400 within fourteen (14) days of entry of  
16 the Order dismissing the action; and
- 17 5. Each of the Parties shall bear their own costs and attorneys' fees.

18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20  
21 Dated: February 14, 2018

  
22 HON. VINCE CHHABRIA

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> The Parties previously agreed that Defendant Pacific Bell Telephone Company erroneously was sued as "AT&T Corp."  
28 *See Larson v. Pacific Bell Telephone Company*, Case No. 3:16-cv-04858-VC (ECF 12, 20, 40).