

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JESUS OSUNA et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SPOKEO INC. et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-07310-SB-E

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

On December 19, 2022, the parties filed a third stipulation to extend Defendant’s time to answer the complaint in this case because “the parties have reached an actual settlement” and seek additional time to finalize the agreement. Dkt. No. [14](#) at 2. The Court interprets the request as a notice of settlement. This action is therefore dismissed in its entirety without prejudice. For 30 days from the date of this order, the Court retains jurisdiction to vacate this order and to reopen the action nunc pro tunc on motion of any party.¹ By operation of this order and without further court action, the dismissal in this case will convert to a dismissal with prejudice on the 31st day, absent a timely motion to vacate and reopen. If the case is reopened, the parties should be prepared for an expedited trial schedule.

The Court expects the parties to finalize their settlement or else move to reopen the case for prosecution within the next 30 days as ordered above. *Should the parties file any document that contains a request to extend the deadline for purposes of completing the settlement, counsel for both parties shall submit **at least seven days before the deadline** a declaration with a detailed timeline of all the efforts made to complete the settlement, and the parties shall be prepared to appear in court with a client representative to explain why the settlement could not be completed in the time allowed.* IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹ The parties indicate they need “thirty (30) days to obtain signatures on the finalized agreement, given the intervening holidays.” Dkt. No. [14](#) at 2.

Date: December 20, 2022



Stanley Blumenfeld, Jr.
United States District Judge