

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**

|                                     |                       |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| COMPANION PROPERTY AND CASUALTY )   | 3:12-cv-00595-HDM-VPC |
| GROUP, )                            |                       |
| Plaintiff, )                        | ORDER                 |
| vs. )                               |                       |
| CONSOLIDATED AGENCY PARTNERS, dba ) |                       |
| MENICUCCI INSURANCE ASSOCIATES, )   |                       |
| KAREN FAUST, HIGHPOINT RISK )       |                       |
| SERVICES LLC, PINNACLE )            |                       |
| UNDERWRITERS, INC., RISK )          |                       |
| PLACEMENT SERVICES, INC. dba RISK ) |                       |
| PLACEMENT SERVICES, INSURANCE )     |                       |
| BROKERS, JOAN VASCONES, GLORIA )    |                       |
| LAM, SKY HIGH SPORTS, LLC, SKY )    |                       |
| HIGH SPORTS ORANGE COUNTY )         |                       |
| OPERATIONS, LLC, and ROLLAND )      |                       |
| WEDDELL, <i>et al.</i> )            |                       |
| Defendants. )                       |                       |

---

On January 5, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion to enforce its good faith settlement with defendant Highpoint Risk Services, LLC and requested that the settlement be reduced to judgment (#212). The motion included a proposed judgment, attached as Exhibit J, which would award plaintiff the settlement amount of \$250,000.00 plus prejudgment interest at a rate of 5.25% from the date the good faith settlement was approved until the date of judgment and postjudgment interest thereafter at the legal rate until the

1 judgment is satisfied.

2 On February 18, 2015, Highpoint responded to plaintiff's  
3 motion (#221). Although Highpoint does not oppose the motion, it  
4 asks that the court enter an order clearly defining the scope of  
5 the parties' agreement. Highpoint attaches as Exhibit A to its  
6 response a proposed order to that effect. While the proposed order  
7 does not address the issue of interest, Highpoint's response  
8 indicates that it is "agreeable to the form of the order submitted  
9 by Companion as Exhibit J to the Motion to Enforce." As just  
10 noted, Exhibit J is a proposed judgment that includes the payment  
11 of pre- and post-judgment interest.

12 On February 20, 2015, plaintiff filed a reply (#222) along  
13 with a proposed modification of Highpoint's proposed order. The  
14 modification makes clear the only claims dismissed by virtue of the  
15 settlement are those at issue in this action and adds language  
16 regarding the payment of pre- and post-judgment interest.

17 Plaintiff's proposed order, attached as Exhibit A to its  
18 reply, appears to be in accordance with the requests and positions  
19 of both parties. Accordingly, absent objection from Highpoint on  
20 or before March 6, 2015, the court will sign and enter plaintiff's  
21 proposed order (Reply Ex. A) and direct that the settlement of the  
22 parties be reduced to judgment.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 DATED: This 27th day of February, 2015.

25   
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
28