

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DANIELLE CURLEY, et al.,

Plaintiffs

v.

CUSTOMER CONNEXX LLC, et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00233-APG-DJA

Order on Mandate

The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued its opinion reversing the judgment entered in this case. That court also remanded the case to me to consider “whether time spent shutting down computers is compensable, whether the time spent booting up and down the computers is not compensable under the *de minimis* doctrine, and whether Connexx had no knowledge of the alleged overtime such that it is not in violation of 29 U.S.C. § 207.” ECF No. 121 at 20. The parties are to confer about how to proceed on these issues (*e.g.*, whether a trial or evidentiary hearing is needed to resolve them, a schedule for briefs and hearings, etc.). The parties are to submit either a stipulated plan or alternative proposals.

I THEREFORE ORDER that the mandate be spread upon the records of this court.

I FURTHER ORDER the parties to confer by phone or in person about how to proceed on the issues remanded by the Ninth Circuit. By December 16, 2022, the parties will file either a stipulated plan or alternative proposals. The plan or proposals should address, at a minimum, whether a trial or evidentiary hearing is needed to resolve the remanded issues and a schedule for briefs and hearings.

DATED this 18th day of November, 2022.



ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE