1

2

3

4

5 6 7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 SAN JOSE DIVISION 10 RICHARD C. HENNING, CASE NO. 5:13-cv-00443 EJD 11 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S Plaintiff(s), MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT 12 DOMINIC CHIRCO, et. al., 13 [Docket Item No. 21] 14 Defendant(s). 15 16 Presently before the court in this action under the Americans With Disabilities Act, 42 17 U.S.C. § 12101 et. seq., is Plaintiff Richard C. Henning's ("Plaintiff") Motion to Enforce a 18 Settlement Agreement. See Docket Item No. 21. Plaintiff contends the parties settled this action at 19 a court-sponsored mediation on November 18, 2013, and contemporaneously executed a term sheet

Federal jurisdiction arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Defendant did not file written opposition to the motion, and the time for filing an opposition has passed. See Civ. L.R. 7-3(a).

that would later be expanded into a settlement agreement. Plaintiff's counsel drafted the agreement,

revised it at Defendants' direction, obtained Plaintiff's signature on the document and forwarded it

Defendant's counsel. Defendant, ultimately, did not sign the document. Instead, Plaintiff's counsel

was contacted by an attorney on Defendant's behalf to renegotiate the amount due. This motion was

27

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

filed shortly thereafter.

28

1

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Having carefully reviewed Plaintiff's motion in conjunction with the settlement documents, and considering the absence of opposition, the court finds as follows:

- 1. The term sheet executed subsequent to the mediation on November 18, 2013, is a complete agreement and no material facts remain in dispute. See Maynard v. City of San Jose, 37 F.3d 1396, 1401 (9th Cir. 1994). Both parties have agreed to the terms of the settlement as evidenced by the signatures on the settlement documents. See Harrop v. Western Airlines, Inc., 550 F.2d 1143, 1144-45 (9th Cir. 1977).
- 2. As to the settlement agreement drafted by Plaintiff's counsel, its terms are consistent with that of the term sheet, and it may be enforced even without Defendant's signature on the document. See Doi v. Halekulani Corp., 276 F.3d 1131, 1139-40 (9th Cir. 2002).

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Enforce the Settlement Agreement is GRANTED.

In order to ensure compliance with the terms of the settlement, the parties are ordered to appear on July 18, 2014, at 10:00 a.m. to show cause why the case should not be dismissed as contemplated by the settlement agreement. On or before **July 11, 2014**, the parties shall file a joint statement in response to this Order to Show Cause setting forth the status of payment due under the settlement agreement and indicating when this case can be dismissed. If payment according to the settlement agreement is not made before July 18, 2014, Defendant should also be prepared to show cause why the court should not impose any and all appropriate sanctions, including monetary sanctions, for failure to comply.

The Order to Show Cause shall be automatically vacated and the parties relieved of the obligation to file a joint statement if a stipulated dismissal is filed on or before July 11, 2014.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 21, 2014

25 26

27

28

¹ Plaintiff's motion to file the settlement documents under seal (Docket Item No. 26) is GRANTED.

United States District Judge