1 2 3 4 5	Adam Wang, Esq. (201233) Adam Pedersen, Esq. (261901) Law Offices of Adam Wang 12 South First Street, Suite 708 San Jose, CA 95113 Telephone: 408 421-3403 Facsimile: 408 416-0248 Attorneys for Plaintiff ALMA YADIRA	<u>*E-FILED - 5/13/11*</u>	
6	Victoria L.H. Booke Fahmy & Booke		
7	606 North First Street San Jose, CA 95112		
8 9	(408) 286-7000 Fax: (408) 286-7111		
10	Email: vbooke@gmail.com		
10	Attorney for Defendant JESUS FERNANDEZ		
11			
12	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
16			
17 18	YADIRA, et. al.; Plaintiffs,	CASE NUMBER: C 08 05721 RMW RELATED CASE: C 08 05722 RMW	
19			
20	V.	JOINT STIPULATION AND	ATE
20	JESUS FERNANDEZ dba MARIA'S NIGHTCLUB; TONY'S POOL HALL	MATTERS FOR TRIAL AND TO MODIFY THE COURT'S SCHEDULIN	NG
22	AND FLAMINGO NIGHTCLUB; DOES 1- 10;	ORDER; and	
23	Defendente	[]] ORDER THEREON	
24	Defendants,		
25	1 MITEDEAS the shows continued encour	and Vadira v Formandez C 00 0E721 DM	X A7
26	1. WHEREAS , the above captioned cases cases, <u>Yadira v. Fernandez</u> , C 08 05721 RMW,		.vv,
27	and , <u>Mondragon v, Fernandez</u> , C 08 05722 RMW were filed at the same time.		
28			
	Yadira, et al./Mondragon v. Fernandez:	C08 05721RMW and C08 05722RMW	
	Joint Stipulation and	Schoduling Order	Dockets.Ju

2. WHEREAS, Both cases involve the same Defendants, contain the same allegations and are based on largely the same facts. Parties in both cases are represented by the same counsel. However, the issues in the case diverge in that in the YADIRA action the Plaintiffs are hourly employees, and in the other related matter, the Plaintiff is a salaried and alleged managerial employee.

- 3. **WHEREAS,** Parties are nearing their date for trial and are working to complete the discovery process.
- 4. WHEREAS, Parties still have several key issues to work through in regard to the completion of discovery including but not limited to two pending motions to compel, ongoing meet and confer efforts and several pending subpoenas for third-party documents.
- 5. **WHEREAS,** Plaintiff has concluded the deposition of Defendant Defendant has completed depositions of the Plaintiff of both actions.

6. **WHEREAS**, the current discovery cut-off in this action is May, 2 2011.

7. **WHEREAS,** Plaintiff has filed a Motion For Summary Judgment which in part seeks clarification of specific legal issues, including applicable statutes of limitations, the resolution of which could both define the scope of discovery subject to dispute and guide parties settlement discussions.

8. **WHEREAS**, parties are willing to continue informal efforts to both complete discovery and move toward settlement while they await the Court's decision on these legal points.

9. **WHEREAS,** the parties also seek to resolve as many issues as possible prior to the trial of these actions.

Yadira, et al./Mondragon v. Fernandez: C08 05721RMW and C08 05722RMW Joint Stipulation and Scheduling Order 10. **WHEREAS**, the facts revealed by both written discovery and depositions currently underway have begun to substantially narrow the issues in this case.

- 11. **WHEREAS**, despite the ongoing dispute, parties are resolute that some if not all of these cases may be resolve by mediation.
- 12. **WHEREAS**, parties have not yet had an opportunity to mediate at all the <u>Yadira</u> matter, either by private or court-sponsored mediation.
- 13. **WHEREAS**, the parties feel that if time can be given to address these legal and factual issues, settlement of this matter can be had.
- 14. **WHEREAS**, Parties agree a conference with a magistrate judge would greatly aid them in this regard and to that end would like to request the Court's aid by way of settlement conference.
- 15. WHEREAS, because of the commonality of the facts, relationship between the parties and because the Defendant in both actions is the same, the parties are further in agreement that these matters should be consolidated for the purposes of trial in order that they be resolved in the most effective manner possible.
- 16. **WHEREAS**, the current schedule in both of these matters does not allow for this occur under the current case scheduling order;

17. THE PARTIES HEREBY STIPULATE to the following:

 That the hearing on Plaintiffs pending motions to compel be continued from their current date from 5/17/2011 hearing to 6/7/2011¹, pending this Court's resolution of Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment in the <u>Yadira</u> matter, which parties intend to have re-noticed for hearing on 6/3/2011, currently set for hearing on 5/20/2011.

Yadira, et al./Mondragon v. Fernandez; C08 05721RMW and C08 05722RMW Joint Stipulation and -----Scheduling Order

¹ Plaintiffs' counsel has already re-noticed the pending motions to compel to conform herewith.

//

//

2. That the parties agree to conduct a private mediation session in front of a mutually agreeable neutral at some point following the Court's resolution of Plaintiff's motion for summary, with mediation currently set for June 27, 2011. 3. That the matters be consolidated for the purposes of trial. 4. That the consolidated trial of both matters be conducted, per the availability of the Court, beginning on September 12, 2011 and that the previously calendared dates of June 27, 2011 (08-5721 – the <u>Yadira</u> matter) and June 20, 2011 (08-5721 – the Mondragon matter) be taken off-calendar. 5. That a single pre-trial conference now be held for the consolidated matters on August 25, 2011, and that the previous conferences set for June 9, 2011 be taken off-calendar. 6. That the current discovery cut-off be extended until July 15, 2011. 7. That the deadline for hearing of dispositive motions in only the <u>Mondragon</u> matter be extended until July 29, 2011, and in the <u>Yadira</u> matter that the deadline to hear dispositive motions be set for 6/3/2011, to allow parties to re-notice the current motion in order to accommodate the schedule of counsel. 8. That parties, should they not be able resolve the matter on their own through mediation, the parties are to have a settlement conference with Magistrate Judge Lloyd prior to the pretrial conference. 9. That, the Court's schedule permitting, this conference shall occur prior to the conduct of the parties pre-trial conference on August 25, 2011.

> Yadira, et al./Mondragon v. Fernandez: C08 05721RMW and C08 05722RMW Joint Stipulation and ------ Scheduling Order

3			
4	_/s/Adam Pedersen		
5	Adam Pedersen, Esq.		
6	Attorney for Plaintiffs		
7	Dated: Apr 25, 2011		
8			
9	/s/Victoria Booke Victoria Booke, Esq.		
10	Attorney for Defendant		
11			
12			
13	<u>ORDER</u>		
14	Good cause appearing, pursuant to the parties stipulation, the above modification to the		
15	scheduling order is adopted, and the dates set forth in the parties agreement shall control from		
16	here forward. Furthermore, this Court hereby grants the parties' request to consolidate the two		
17 18	matters referenced therein, case number C08-5721 and case number C08-5722, for the purposes		
10	of trial.		
20			
21	Dated:, 2011		
22	Ronald M. Whyte		
23	Honorable Ronald M. Whyte		
24	US District Court Judge		
25			
26			
27			
28			
	Yadira, et al./Mondragon v. Fernandez; C08 05721RMW and C08 05722RMW Joint Stipulation and Scheduling Order 5		

Dated: Apr 25, 2011