

1 BRYAN SCHWARTZ LAW
2 Bryan J. Schwartz (SBN 209903)
3 Rachel M. Terp (SBN 290666)
4 Maren I. Christensen (SBN 320013)
5 180 Grand, Suite 1380
6 Oakland, CA 94612

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Putative*
8 *Class and Collective Action Members*

9 Timothy M. Freudenberger, State Bar No. 138257
10 Amy S. Williams, State Bar No. 228853
11 Kimberly M. Jansen, State Bar No. 243216
12 Brian E. Cole II, State Bar No. 305830
13 CAROTHERS DISANTE & FREUDENBERGER LLP
14 18300 Von Karman, Suite 800
15 Irvine, CA 92612

16 Attorneys for Defendant
17 CORELOGIC VALUATION SOLUTIONS. INC.

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
19 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 HARRIETT MITCHELL, JASON
21 SUMMERS, and JOSEPH ADAMS
22 individually, on behalf of other similarly
23 situated, and on behalf of the general
24 public,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 vs.

27 CORELOGIC INC., CORELOGIC
28 SOLUTIONS, LLC, CORELOGIC
VALUATION SOLUTIONS, INC., and
DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendant(s).

) Case No. 8:17-cv-02274-DOC-DFMx

) **ORDER GRANTING**
) **STIPULATED INJUNCTION**
) **[158]**

1 For good cause shown, and based upon the parties' stipulation, the Court
2 adopts the following stipulated injunction:

- 3 1. Defendant will not terminate or threaten to terminate, or retaliate or
4 discriminate against employees who are participants in this lawsuit in any
5 way, based on Defendant's knowledge of an employee's participation in or
6 statements given in support of this case; and
- 7 2. Defendant and its agents shall have no communications with potential class
8 members regarding this lawsuit during the opt-in period, and no
9 communications with class members regarding this lawsuit during or after
10 the opt-in period, without first obtaining written permission from the Court.
11 If Defendant wishes to have any such communications, it must submit a
12 statement to the Court setting forth the information that it wishes to
13 communicate, the means it intends to use to make the communication, and
14 the identity of the individual(s) who will make the communication.
- 15 3. On March 1, 2019, Defendant shall transmit the following statement to all
16 CoreLogic appraisers, informing them of their right to speak with
17 Plaintiffs' counsel and join this case free from retaliation or threats of
18 retaliation or intimidation by Defendant:

19
20 You are protected by the Fair Labor Standards Act and have the right to
21 participate freely in the lawsuit regarding overtime wages, Mitchell, et al.
22 v. CoreLogic, brought by Plaintiffs' counsel Bryan Schwartz Law. Your
23 employer is prohibited from retaliating against you in any way because of
24 your participation in the case, including any statements you may make as
25 part of the case.

26 CoreLogic will not coerce, retaliate against, threaten to retaliate against,
27 intimidate, or attempt to influence or in any way threaten employees for
28 participating in this lawsuit.

Nothing in this statement prevents CoreLogic from ensuring that its
employees comply with CoreLogic's legitimate timekeeping policies.

1 The Temporary Restraining Order (ECF 146), as modified (ECF 157), shall be
2 replaced by this Stipulated Injunction.

3 The Court vacates the Order to Show Cause and preliminary injunction
4 hearing set for March 11, 2019.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: March 4, 2019

David O. Carter

9
10 Hon. David O. Carter
11 Judge, United States District Court
12 Central District of California

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
