

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SHIGE TAKIGUCHI, FUMI NONAKA,
MITSUAKI TAKITA, KAORUKO KOIZUMI,
TATSURO SAKAI, SHIZUKO ISHIMORI,
YOKO HATANO, YUKO NAKAMURA,
HIDEHITO MIURA, YOSHIKO TAZAKI,
MASAAKI MORIYA, HATSUNE HATANO,
SATORU MORIYA, HIDENAO TAKAMA,
SHIGERU KURISU, SAKA ONO, KAZUHIRO
MATSUMOTO, KAYA HATANAKA, IROKA
YAMAJIRI, KIYOHARU YAMAMOTO,
JUNKO YAMAMOTO, KOICHI INOUE,
AKIKO NARUSE, TOSHIMASA NOMURA,
and RITSU YURIKUSA, Individually and On
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MRI INTERNATIONAL, INC., EDWIN J.
FUJINAGA, JUNZO SUZUKI, PAUL
MUSASHI SUZUKI, LVT, INC., dba
STERLING ESCROW, and DOES 1-500,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-01183-HDM-VCF

ORDER GRANTING
**STIPULATION AND PROPOSED
ORDER TO AMEND FOURTH
AMENDED COMPLAINT TO
CONVERT CERTAIN PLAINTIFFS
FROM NAMED PLAINTIFFS TO
UNNAMED MEMBERS OF THE
PROPOSED CLASS**

STIPULATION

2 The parties hereby stipulate and agree that it would aid the efficient litigation of this action
3 if the number of named plaintiffs were reduced, and accordingly they jointly request that the Court
4 allow the Fourth Amended Complaint to be amended to change the status of the following
5 individuals from named plaintiffs to unnamed members of the proposed class:

KAORUKO KOIZUMI

YOKO HATANO

HIDEHITO MIURA

YOSHIKO TAZAKI

SATORU MORIYA

SHIGERU KURISU

SAKA ONO

KAZUHIRO MATSUMOTO

KAYA HATANAKA

HIROKA YAMAJIRI

KIYOHARU YAMAMOTO

JUNKO YAMAMOTO

KOICHI INOUE

AKIKO NARUSE

TOSHI MASA NOM

RITSU YURIKUSA

The parties stipulate and agree that the

22 The parties stipulate and agree that the conversion of the status of these individuals from
23 named plaintiffs to unnamed members of the class will not in any way change or diminish the
24 nature and extent of any monetary and/or other claims they may have against the defendants as set
25 out in the Fourth Amended Complaint.

26 The parties further stipulate and agree the foregoing amendment of the Fourth Amended
27 Complaint does not provide grounds for any party to file a motion to dismiss the complaint and all

1 Answers to the Fourth Amended Complaint will be deemed to serve as Answers to the further
2 amended complaint.

3 DATED: February 3, 2016

**MANNING & KASS
ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP**

5 By: /s/ James Gibbons
6 JAMES E. GIBBONS
7 STEVE RENICK
8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

9 DATED: February 3, 2016

LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT W. COHEN, APC

10 By: /s/ Robert W. Cohen
11 ROBERT W. COHEN
12 MARIKO TAENAKA
13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

14 DATED: February 3, 2016

ZACCARO MORGAN LLP

15 By: /s/ Nicolas Morgan
16 NICOLAS MORGAN
17 Attorneys for Defendants
18 Junzo Suzuki, Paul Musashi Suzuki

19 DATED: February 3, 2016

HITZKE & ASSOCIATES

20 By: /s/ Erick Ferran
21 ERICK M. FERRAN
22 Attorneys for Defendants
23 MRI International, Inc., Edwin J Fujinaga

24 DATED: February 3, 2016

SKLAR WILLIAMS PLLC

25 By: /s/ Robert Goldstein
26 ROBERT A. GOLDSTEIN
27 Attorneys for Defendant
28 LVT, Inc.

1
2 The stipulation of the parties (#363) is GRANTED.
3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.
5

Howard D. McKibben

6 DATED: February 4, 2016.
7

8 _____
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MANNING & KASS
ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW