

ORIGINAL

FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S.D.C. Atlanta

MAR 25 2003

LUTHER D. THOMAS, Clerk
By: *B. McLawrence*
Deputy Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

FARRIS YARBROUGH,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION NO.
	:	1:00-CV-1183-JOF
LOCKHEED MARTIN	:	
AERONAUTICS COMPANY, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

This matter is before the court on Defendants' motion for reconsideration [302] and Defendants' motion to dismiss. Plaintiffs filed the instant civil rights actions on May 10, 2000, alleging claims of employment discrimination against Defendants Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company and Lockheed Martin Corporation. On August 2, 2001, this court issued an order denying Plaintiffs' motion for class certification, and on July 17, 2002, this court directed the clerk of the court to drop all named Plaintiffs except the first and allowing the remaining Plaintiffs to file suit individually.

On July 26, 2002, this court held a hearing in which the Union Defendants discussed the possibility of the court reconsidering in a limited fashion the July 17, 2002 order. The

310

Union Defendants stated that they entered into a settlement agreement with Plaintiffs on May 9, 2001, and that Plaintiffs no longer have any claim for damages against them. The Union Defendants argued, therefore, that it may be dismissed from this action. The Union Defendants noted, however, that because each Plaintiff may file suit individually as a result of this court's July 17, 2002 order, the Union Defendants would now be forced to file separate motions to dismiss for each individual suit that was subsequently filed. In an effort to simplify the procedure, the Union Defendants asked the court to modify its July 17, 2002 order by dismissing the Union Defendants from the action prior to dropping all Plaintiffs but the first. The court granted the Union Defendants permission to file an untimely motion for reconsideration in order to simplify the record, and they did so on August 7, 2002.

In their motion, the Union Defendants ask to be dismissed from the instant action with respect to all Plaintiffs, with the exception that the court retain jurisdiction over the Union Defendants pursuant to Rule 19 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the duration of the lawsuit in the event that complete relief cannot be accorded among the remaining parties *without the presence of the Union Defendants*. Neither Plaintiffs nor the remaining Defendants offer any objection. Accordingly, this court's order of July 17, 2002 is hereby MODIFIED as follows: The Union Defendants are hereby DISMISSED as Defendants from any claims brought by individual Plaintiffs. Pursuant to Rule 19 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, however, the court retains jurisdiction over the Union

Defendants for the duration of the remaining suit or suits in the event that any additional equitable relief must be fashioned, or in the event that complete relief cannot be accorded among the remaining parties without the presence of the Union Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 24th day of March 2003.



J. OWEN FORRESTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE