

1 BRYAN SCHWARTZ LAW
 2 Bryan J. Schwartz (SBN 209903)
 Rachel M. Terp (SBN 290666)
 3 Maren I. Christensen (SBN 320013)
 180 Grand, Suite 1380
 4 Oakland, CA 94612
 Telephone: (510) 444-9300
 5 Facsimile: (510) 444-9301
 6 Email: bryan@bryanschwartzlaw.com
rachel@bryanschwartzlaw.com
 7 maren@bryanschwartzlaw.com

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

9 Timothy M. Freudenberger, State Bar No. 138257
 10 tfreud@cflaborlaw.com
 Amy S. Williams, State Bar No. 228853
 11 awilliams@cflaborlaw.com
 Kimberly M. Jansen, State Bar No. 243216
 12 kjansen@cflaborlaw.com
 Brian E. Cole II, State Bar No. 305830
 13 bcole@cflaborlaw.com

14 CAROTHERS DISANTE & FREUDENBERGER LLP
 18300 Von Karman, Suite 800
 15 Irvine, CA 92612
 Telephone: (949) 622-1661
 16 Facsimile: (949) 622-1669
 17 Attorneys for Defendant
 CORELOGIC VALUATION SOLUTIONS. INC.

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

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

24 Plaintiffs,

vs.

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

28 Defendant(s).

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

) **STIPULATED INJUNCTION**

1 Plaintiffs Harriett Mitchell, Jason Summers and Joseph Adams (collectively
2 “Plaintiffs”) and Defendant CoreLogic Valuation Solutions, Inc. (“CoreLogic”)
3 stipulate as follows:

4 WHEREAS, on February 15, 2019, Plaintiffs filed an application for a
5 temporary restraining order and order to show cause why a preliminary injunction
6 should not issue.

7 WHEREAS, on February 22, 2019, the Court issued an order granting the
8 temporary restraining order, as modified by the Court, and issued an order to show
9 cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue, with the hearing set for March
10 11, 2019.

11 WHEREAS, the Order expressly stated that “[t]he parties may file a
12 stipulation obviating the need for a preliminary injunction hearing.”

13 WHEREAS, in accordance with the Court’s Order, the parties have met and
14 conferred and have agreed upon the following stipulated injunction, obviating the
15 need for a preliminary injunction hearing:

- 16 1. Defendant will not terminate or threaten to terminate, or retaliate or
17 discriminate against employees who are participants in this lawsuit in any
18 way, based on Defendant’s knowledge of an employee’s participation in or
19 statements given in support of this case; and
- 20 2. Defendant and its agents shall have no communications with potential class
21 members regarding this lawsuit during the opt-in period, and no
22 communications with class members regarding this lawsuit during or after
23 the opt-in period, without first obtaining written permission from the Court.
24 If Defendant wishes to have any such communications, it must submit a
25 statement to the Court setting forth the information that it wishes to
26 communicate, the means it intends to use to make the communication, and
27 the identity of the individual(s) who will make the communication.
- 28 3. On March 1, 2019, Defendant shall transmit by email the following

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

Dated: February 28, 2018

CAROTHERS DISANTE & FREUDENBERGER
LLP

By: /s/ Amy S. Williams
Amy S. Williams
Attorneys for Defendant
CORELOGIC VALUATION SOLUTIONS, INC.