UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiffs, v.

CAMP PENDLETON & QUANTICO HOUSING LLC, and LPC PENDLETON QUANTICO PM LP,

RYAN PRUNTY, et al.,

Case No. 20-cv-572-MMA (AGS)

ORDER RE: JOINT STIPULATION AND REQUEST FOR DISMISSAL ORDER

[Doc. No. 34]

The parties have filed a joint stipulation and request for a dismissal order of the action with prejudice and with each party bearing its own attorneys' fees and costs. *See* Doc. No. 34. Given the joint stipulation and its basis under Rule 41, this case has been **DISMISSED with prejudice** in its entirety and the action has been terminated with each party bearing its own attorneys' fees and costs. *See Commercial Space Mgmt. Co. v. Boeing Co.*, 193 F.3d 1074, 1078 (9th Cir. 1999) ("[O]nce a notice of voluntary dismissal is filed, the district court in which the action is pending loses jurisdiction and cannot exercise discretion with respect to the terms and conditions of the dismissal."); *see also Duke Energy Trading & Mktg., L.L.C. v. Davis*, 267 F.3d 1042, 1049 (9th Cir. 2001) ("The [filing of a Rule 41(a)(1)(i) notice] itself closes the file."); *Acosta v. Lopez*, No.

Defendants.

1:18-cv-00625-AWI-SKO, 2019 WL 5536321, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2019) ("Once the stipulation between the parties who have appeared is properly filed or made in open court, no order of the court is necessary to effectuate dismissal. Case law concerning stipulated dismissals under Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii) is clear that the entry of such a stipulation of dismissal is effective automatically and does not require judicial approval."); Milton v. Lawton, No. 1:04-cv-05556-AWI-WMW, 2009 WL 530909, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2009) (same). The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to close the case. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 13, 2020 United States District Judge