1	O
2	JS6
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	K.L., by her Guardian Ad Litem Osiel Lopez; CASE NO.: CV-11-08484 ODW (SHx)
12)
13	Plaintiffs, VS. Plaintiffs, OPPUR CRANTING
14	CITY OF GLENDALE; et al., ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR
15	Defendants. Defendants. Dismissal and VACATING THE ORDER
16	TO SHOW CAUSE HEARING
17	}
18	In accordance with Plaintiffs' request, the Court DISMISSES WITH
19	PREJUDICE the claims against Defendants the County of Los Angeles, Gilda
20	Davis, and Thomas Van Hoof. Because all Plaintiffs have reached the age of
21	majority, the case no longer involves any minor and no minor's compromises are
22	needed for its resolution. See Central District Local Rule 83-5.1. The Court,
23	however, retains jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement agreement for a
24	period of one year from the date of this order.
25	It is so ORDERED.
26	Al melles
27	Dated: September 16, 2013
28	HONORABLE OXIS D. WRIGHT, II United States District Judge
	/