1	DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669 City Attorney CHERYL ADAMS, State Bar #164194 Chief Trial Deputy MARGARET W. BAUMGARTNER, State Bar #151762 Deputy City Attorney			
2				
3				
4	Fox Plaza 1390 Market Street, 6th Floor			
5	San Francisco, California 94102-5408 Telephone: (415) 554-3859			
6	Facsimile: (415) 554-3837			
7	E-Mail: margaret.baumgartner@sfgov.org			
8	Attorneys for Defendants			
	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,			
9	BLAKE CUNNINGHAM, CONSTANTINE ZACHOS, JOSEPH OBIDI and MARIO MOLIN	NA		
10				
11	INITED STATES DISTRICT COLUDT			
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
14	DAVID CLIFTON,	Case No. C14-03539	9 KAW	
14 1				
	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSED] ORI		
15	Plaintiff, vs.	PLAINTIFF'S MO	DER DISMISSING NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
	vs.	PLAINTIFF'S MO	NELL CLAIM AND ANY	
15		PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF	NELL CLAIM AND ANY	
15 16	vs. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15 16 17 18	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15 16 17 18	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15 16 17 18 19	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15 16 17 18	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15 16 17 18 19	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
115   116   117   118   119   119   120   121   121   131	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   222	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23   24   25   1	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15   16   17   18   19   19   20   21   22   23   24   25   26   10   10   10   10   10   10   10   1	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	
15   16   17   18   19   20   21   22   23   24	vs.  CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and OFFICERS DOES 1-20,	PLAINTIFF'S MO CLAIM BASED OF OF RESIDENCE	NELL CLAIM AND ANY N ENTERING AND SEARCH	

1	STIPULATION		
2	WHEREAS Plaintiff David Clifton included in his amended complaint as the Second Cause		
3	Action a claim against the City and County of San Francisco;		
4	WHEREAS Plaintiff agreed that rather than the City filing a summary judgment motion that		
5	Plaintiff would dismiss the claim against the City;		
6	WHEREAS Plaintiff included in his amended complaint allegations that San Francisco Police		
7	Officer illegal entered and searched his residence;		
8	WHEREAS Plaintiff admits that at the time of the incident he had a search condition that		
9	allowed the officers to lawfully enter and search his residence and person; and		
10	WHEREAS Plaintiff agreed that rather than all Defendants filing a motion for summary		
11	judgment on Plaintiff's claim of illegal entry and/or illegal search that Plaintiff would dismiss that		
12	claim;		
13	NOW THEREFORE BE IT STIPULATED THAT:		
14	Plaintiff dismisses his second cause of action against the City and County of San Francisco		
15	with prejudice.		
16	2. Plaintiff dismisses with prejudice any portion of his first cause of action against all		
17	individual Defendants for violation of the Fourth Amendment to the extent that the claim includes a		
18	claim that the officers unlawfully entered and/or searched his residence.		
19	SO STIPULATED.		
20	Dated: September 3, 2015 DENNIS J. HERRERA		
21	City Attorney MARGARET W. BAUMGARTNER		
22	Deputy City Attorney		
23	By: <u>/s/ Margaret W. Baumgartner</u> MARGARET W. BAUMGARTNER		
24	Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL.		
25	CITT AND COUNTT OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL.		
26	Dated: September 3, 2015 LAW OFFICE OF STANLEY GOFF		
27	By: /s/ Stanley Goff		
28	STANLEY GOFF Attorney for Plaintiff David Clifton		

## PROPOSED ORDER

For good cause shown, and pursuant to agreement of the parties, Plaintiff's second cause of action against the City is dismissed with prejudice, and that any portion of Plaintiff's first cause of action based on an allegation that officers illegal entered or/or searched his residence are both dismissed with prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

Date: 9/10/15

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE KANDIS A. WESTMORE