

1 MARY SHEA HAGEBOLS, State Bar #113222
 2 SHEA LAW OFFICES
 425 Market Street, Suite 2200
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 Telephone: (510) 208-4422
 Facsimile: (415) 520-9407

5 LESLIE F. LEVY, State Bar #104634
 SHARON R. VINICK, State Bar #129914
 DARCI E. BURRELL, State Bar #180467
 6 EMILY A. NUGENT, State Bar #255048
 DICKSON LEVY VINICK BURRELL
 7 HYAMS LLP
 180 Grand Ave.
 Suite 1300
 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 318-7700
 Facsimile: (510) 318-7701

Attorney for Plaintiffs

DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669
 City Attorney
 ELIZABETH SALVESON, State Bar #83788
 Chief Labor Attorney
 JONATHAN ROLNICK, State Bar #151814
 ROSE-ELLEN H. FAIRGRIEVE, SB #181257
 Deputy City Attorneys
 Fox Plaza
 1390 Market Street, 5th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94102-5408
 Telephone: (415) 554-3845
 Facsimile: (415) 554-4248

Attorneys for Defendant
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 13
 14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 JAMES WILSON, et al.,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

18 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
 FRANCISCO CALIFORNIA, A
 19 MUNICIPAL CORPORATION,

20 Defendant.

Case No. C 07-1016 PJH

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
 CONFERENCE STATEMENT AND
 PROPOSED ORDER**

Hearing Date: N/A

Time:

Courtroom:

Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

21 The parties submit the following Updated Joint Case Management Statement:

22 **I. UPDATED PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

23 On July 13, 2009, the Court stayed the proceedings in this matter pursuant to the parties'
 24 stipulation. The parties were awaiting the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Bamonte v. City of Mesa*, as
 25 case which is directly relevant to the issues at hand. In late March, the Ninth Circuit issued its
 26 decision, holding that under the facts before the Court, the donning and doffing of police uniforms
 27 and equipment was not compensable under the FLSA where neither the employer nor any rule or law
 28

1 required police officers to engage in such activities at work. 598 F.3d 1217, at 1225-34 (9th Cir.
2 2010).

3 Following the issuance of the Ninth Circuit opinion, counsel for the parties met to discuss the
4 possibility of settling the case. Based on these discussions, the parties concluded that another
5 settlement conference with Magistrate Judge Chen would be useful.

6 In order to allow the parties time to adequately prepare for settlement discussions, the parties
7 agreed to set the further settlement conference with Magistrate Judge Chen on October 14, 2010.

8 **II. DISCOVERY TO DATE**

9 In light of the stay the parties have not conducted additional discovery.

10 **III. EXPECTED PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS**

11 In light of the Court's Order granting Plaintiffs' motion for conditional certification, and the
12 Ninth Circuit's decision in *Bamonte, supra*, Defendant may file a motion to decertify the class.

13 The parties will be filing cross-motions for summary judgment.

14 **IV. PROPOSED DEADLINES AND COURT DATES**

15 The Parties request that the case remain stayed until after the October 14, 2010 settlement
16 conference with Judge Chen.

17 The Parties propose that the Court schedule a further status conference for November 18,
18 2010, at which time the parties will report on the status of settlement discussions, discovery and
19 propose a scheduling order for any further non-expert discovery, expert discovery, cross-motions for
20 summary judgment, motion to decertify, and trial.

21
22 Dated: August 23, 2010

23 SHEA LAW OFFICES

24 s:/Mary Shea Hagebols _____
25 MARY SHEA HAGEBOLS
26 Attorney for Plaintiffs
27
28

1 Dated: August 23, 2010

DICKSON LEVY VINICK BURRELL HYAMS LLP

2

3 By: s:/Sharon R. Vinick
SHARON R. VINICK
4 Attorney for Plaintiffs

5 Dated: August 23, 20010

DENNIS J. HERRERA
6 City Attorney
ELIZABETH SALVESON
7 Chief Labor Attorney
JONATHAN ROLNICK
8 ROSE-ELLEN H. FAIRGRIEVE
9 Deputy City Attorneys

10 By: s:/Rose-Ellen H. Fairgrieve
ROSE-ELLEN H. FAIRGRIEVE
11 Deputy City Attorney
Attorneys for Defendant
12 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

The foregoing joint statement is adopted by this Court as the Case Management Order in this action in accordance with Civil Local Rule 16-9 and other applicable Local Rules, and shall govern all further proceedings in this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 8/27/10



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