Rollins v. Mabus et al Doc. 17

1 MELINDA HAAG (CSBN 132612) United States Attorney JOANN M. SWANSÓN (CSBN 88143) 2 Chief, Civil Division 3 JAMES A. SCHARF (CSBN 152171) Assistant United States Attorney 150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900 5 San Jose, CA 95113 Telephone: (498) 535-5044 Facsimile: (408) 535-5081 6 7 Attorneys for Federal Defendants 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 PETER B. ROLLINS, No. C 12-2047 PSG 12 Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] ORDER RE 13 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS v. AND CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE 14 RAYMOND E. MABUS, SECRETARY OF) 15 THE NAVY, KENNETH W. BENCH, JEFFREY S. PRAY, SHAYNE GARDNER 16 and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 17 Defendants. 18 On July 5, 2012, federal defendants filed a non-dispositive motion to dismiss. Document 19 9. In that motion, federal defendants argued: 20 (1) Plaintiff's tort claims for defamation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and 21 assault must be dismissed because Title VII is plaintiff's exclusive remedy. 22 (2) Plaintiff's tort claims are defective because (a) they are barred by sovereign immunity 23 because plaintiff has not exhausted his administrative remedies as required by the FTCA; (b) 24 individual federal defendants are not proper defendants under the FTCA; (c) defamation and 25 assault claims are excepted from the FTCA; and (d) the FTCA bars claims for punitive damages. 26 27 PROPOSED ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE Case No. C 12-2047 PSG

(3) Plaintiff's Title VII causes of action contain defective claims that fail Title VII's timeliness and administrative exhaustion requirements because (a) those claims involve discrete acts that must meet Title VII's timeliness and administrative exhaustion requirements; (b) plaintiff's discrimination and retaliation claims regarding reassignment fail Title VII's timeliness requirement; and (c) plaintiff's discrimination claim regarding light duty assignments fail Title VII's administrative exhaustion requirement.

(4) Plaintiff's retaliation claim regarding plaintiff's AWOL charges must be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6).

On August 15, 2012, plaintiff filed a statement of non-opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss. Document 13.

On August 21, 2012, defendant's motion to dismiss and a case management conference came on for hearing. Eugene S. Thompson appeared for plaintiff Peter B. Rollins. Assistant United States Attorney James A. Scharf appeared for the federal defendants. Plaintiff Peter B. Rollins was also present in the courtroom. At the hearing, the parties jointly proposed that the Court issue an order on defendant's pending motion to dismiss, clarifying which claims survive defendant's motion, and requiring defendant to file an answer to plaintiff's Complaint for Damages filed April 24, 2012, Document 1, as modified by the Court's order on defendant's motion to dismiss. The Court directed AUSA Scharf to submit a proposed order after hearing, including a proposed case management schedule, for the Court's review.

For the reasons set forth in defendant's unopposed motion to dismiss, and pursuant to the agreement of the parties, the Court hereby dismisses with prejudice all claims against all defendants except plaintiff's claim for discrimination under Title VII against Raymond E. Mabus, Secretary of the Navy, based on plaintiff being charged with AWOL and receiving a Decision on his Proposed Suspension.

Defendant shall file an answer to plaintiff's Complaint for Damages filed April 24, 2012, as modified by this Order, within 30 calendar days of the filing of this Order.

PROPOSED ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS AND CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULE Case No. C 12-2047 PSG

Further, again pursuant to the agreement of the parties, the Court adopts the following case management schedule as proposed in the parties' joint case management conference statement:

Fact Discovery Cutoff: March 1, 2013

Plaintiff's Expert Disclosure with Reports: March 15, 2013

Defendant's Expert Disclosure with Reports: April 12, 2013

Rebuttal Expert Disclosure with Reports: May 3, 2013

Expert Discovery Cutoff May 17, 2013

Motions Hearing Deadline June 4, 2013

Final Pretrial Conference August 6, 2013, 2:00 p.m.

Jury Trial August 19, 2013

Good cause appearing, and pursuant to the stipulation of the parties, it is so ordered.

Dated: August

Pore S. Aure