

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CORY NAROG,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-03237-DMR](#)

**ORDER**

The parties have attended three settlement conferences before Judge Beeler. The first settlement conference, held on December 8, 2014, lasted seven hours and thirty minutes. *See* Docket No. 88. The second settlement conference, held on February 6, 2015, lasted five hours. *See* Docket No. 98. The parties attended a third settlement conference before Judge Beeler on March 31, 2015, during which the case settled. *See* Docket No. 115. The settlement conference was attended by all parties and counsel. It lasted five hours. At the conclusion, the parties indicated that they reached a full settlement and submitted a stipulated dismissal with prejudice, which this court signed. Docket Nos. 113, 114. All parties signed the settlement agreement.

Plaintiff has now filed an “Opposition,” stating that Plaintiff “disput[es] the settlement conference” because he was “intimidated and coerced into signing a [settlement] against his best interest,” “unable to make any decisions because of the medications and disabilities [he] was enduring at the time,” and “prevented from consulting with another person for advice and . . . denied additional time to review the documents and terms.” Docket No. 116.

Prior to the settlement conference, on March 20, 2015, this court conducted an *ex parte* hearing on a motion by Plaintiff’s counsel to withdraw from this case. Plaintiff and his counsel, but no other parties or counsel, attended the *ex parte* hearing. Without revealing the contents of

1 that hearing, based on repeated remarks by Plaintiff, this court is convinced that Plaintiff had full  
2 confidence in his counsel.

3 Under these circumstances, Plaintiff's assertions that he was pressured to sign the  
4 settlement agreement without being able to fully consider his options are unavailing. The case  
5 has been settled and dismissed with prejudice; a subsequent change of mind does not alter this  
6 outcome. The case is closed.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 7, 2015



---

Donna M. Ryu  
United States Magistrate Judge