

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**NICOLE HUGHES,**

Plaintiff,

v.

S.A.W. ENTERTAINMENT, LTD,

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-03371-YGR

**ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED ORDER
REGARDING SCHEDULING AND ORDER TO
SHOW CAUSE RE: REASSIGNMENT**

Re: Dkt. No. 46

Having considered the stipulations made by the parties in their Joint Case Management Statement the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

1. Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, Stay Action ("Motion to Dismiss"), Dkt. No. 44, shall be filed no later than **November 22, 2016**.

2. Defendants' reply in support of their Motion to Dismiss shall be filed no later than **November 29, 2016**.

3. Plaintiffs' reply in support of their Motion for Conditional Certification and Issuance of Notice Pursuant § 216(b) of the FLSA ("Motion for Conditional Certification"), Dkt. No. 37, shall be filed no later than **November 29, 2016**.

4. The hearing on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss will be advanced from January 10, 2017, to **December 13, 2016, at 2:00 p.m.** to be heard with the pending Plaintiffs' Motion for Conditional Certification of FLSA Class.

5. The Initial Case Management Conference currently set for November 28, 2016, is **CONTINUED to December 13, 2016, at 2:00 p.m.**

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

Defendants are further **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why this action should not be reassigned to Magistrate Judge Laurel Beeler. Defendants shall file a written response to this Order to Show Cause no later than **November 28, 2016**. As the parties are aware, Magistrate Judge Beeler previously considered a motion to relate this action to *Roe v. SFBSC Management, LLC*, 3:14-cv-03616-LB (N.D. Cal.) (“*Roe*”), and agreed that the cases were related but found she could not order them related because Plaintiff had declined magistrate judge jurisdiction. After the undersigned permitted Plaintiff to withdraw her declination and consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction, defendants then opposed the renewed request to relate by stating that it had determined to block such relation by declining to consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction in the instant case. (*Roe*, Dkt. No. 95.) Now, those same defendants seek to dismiss or stay the instant action on the grounds that the cases are related “and indeed subsumed by” the *Roe* before Magistrate Judge Beeler.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 22, 2016


YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE