

1 NANCY L. ABELL (SB# 88785) nancyabell@paulhastings.com
2 ELENA R. BACA (SB# 160564) elenabaca@paulhastings.com
3 HEATHER A. MORGAN (SB# 177425) heathermorgan@paulhastings.com
4 JOSEPH W. DENG (SB# 179320) josephdeng@paulhastings.com
5 PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
6 515 South Flower Street
7 Twenty-Fifth Floor
8 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2228
9 Telephone: (213) 683-6000
10 Facsimile: (213) 627-0705

11 Attorneys for Defendant
12 CINTAS CORPORATION

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 ROBERT RAMIREZ, ROBERT HARRIS,
17 LUIS POCASANGRE CARDOZA, JOSE
18 SALCEDO, A. SHAPPELLE
19 THOMPSON, CORETTA SILVERS
20 (formerly VICK), SANDRA EVANS,
21 BLANCA NELLY AVALOS, JAMES
22 MORGAN and ANTHONY JONES, on
23 behalf of themselves and all others
24 similarly situated,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 vs.

27 CINTAS CORPORATION,

28 Defendant.

CASE NO. C04-0281-JSW

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER TO HAVE CASES RELATED**

Place: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White

Complaint Filed: January 20, 2004
Trial Date: None Set

LARRY HOUSTON and CLIFTON
COOPER, on behalf of themselves and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CINTAS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

~~PROPOSED~~ RELATED TO
CASE NO. C05-03145 CRB

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

STIPULATION

The parties in the two above-referenced cases, by and through their counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. WHEREAS, Plaintiffs in the action entitled *Robert Ramirez, et al. v. Cintas Corporation*, U.S.D.C., Northern District of California, Case No. C04-0281-JSW (the “*Ramirez Action*”), filed their Fourth Amended Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial on August 3, 2005;

2. WHEREAS, Plaintiffs in the action entitled *Larry Houston, et al. v. Cintas Corporation*, U.S.D.C., Northern District of California, Case No. C05-03145-CRB (the “*Houston Action*”), filed their Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial on August 3, 2005;

3. WHEREAS, the parties in the *Houston Action* are represented by the same counsel as the parties in the *Ramirez Action*;

4. WHEREAS, on August 23, 2005, Defendant filed a Motion for Administrative Relief to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, Pursuant to Northern District Civil Local Rules 3-12 and 7-11 (the “*Motion to Relate Cases*”);

5. WHEREAS, the parties have now agreed that the two actions should be deemed “related” pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(a), and as set forth in the *Motion to Relate Cases*, because (a) the two actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transactions and events; and (b) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense, and a risk of conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different judges; and

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

6. WHEREAS, the parties agree that once the *Houston* Action is deemed related to the *Ramirez* Action, the *Houston* Action should be transferred and reassigned to the Honorable Jeffrey S. White for all purposes;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties in both actions request that the Court order as follows:

A. That the *Houston* Action be deemed related to the *Ramirez* Action.

B. That the *Houston* Action be transferred and reassigned to the Honorable Jeffrey S. White for all purposes.

SO STIPULATED.

DATED: August 31, 2005

GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER, BORGAN & DARDARIAN

By: _____ /s/ Roberta Steele
ROBERTA STEELE

Attorneys for Plaintiffs in both the *Houston* Action and *Ramirez* Action

