

JAN 24 2025

E. Escobedo

Department 1
Riverside County Superior Court
4050 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92501

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

ENRIQUE ZARAGOZA

CASE NO. CVRI2304884

Petitioner

vs.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

PALOS VERDES BUILDING CORP.

Respondent

JAN 27 2025

without
☒ The entire action is dismissed **WITH PREJUDICE**, including any consolidated complaints, cross-complaints, and complaints in intervention. All future hearings currently scheduled in this action are vacated except for any hearing on a motion to determine good faith settlement.

☐ The complaint is dismissed ☐ in its entirety ☐ only as to defendant(s)

☐ only as to the claims of plaintiff(s)

The cross-complaint[s] of

[is][are] dismissed ☐ in [its][their] entirety ☐ only as to cross-defendant(s)

☐ only as to the claims of cross-complainant(s)

The complaint in intervention filed by

on is dismissed in its entirety.

The dismissal[s] [is] [are] at the request or with the consent of ☐ petitioner(s) ☐ plaintiff(s) in intervention ☐ cross-complainant(s) and [is] [are] ☐ with ☐ without prejudice.

1
2 The dismissal is *with* prejudice and is entered for the following reason(s):

3 ☐ Demurrer sustained without leave to amend (Code Civ. Proc., § 581, subd. (f)(1).)

4 ☐ Failure to amend after demurrer sustained. (Code Civ. Proc., § 581, subd. (f)(2).)

5 ☐ Other: _____

6 ✓ The dismissal is *without* prejudice and is entered for the following reason(s):

7 ☐ Failure of ☐ plaintiff(s) ☐ plaintiff(s) in intervention ☐ cross-complainant(s) to file
8 in a timely fashion a declaration in response to an order to show cause why the
9 matter should not be dismissed. (See RSC Local Rule 3116.)

10 ☐ Failure of ☐ plaintiff(s) ☐ plaintiff(s) in intervention ☐ cross-complainant(s) to
11 show good cause why the matter should not be dismissed.

12 ☐ Failure to comply with Fast Track rules. In light of the plaintiff's persistent failure to
13 prosecute this action in the diligent manner required by the Code of Civil Procedure
14 and the California Rules of Court, the failure of the prior sanctions imposed by the
15 Court to improve the plaintiff's compliance with those requirements, and the plaintiff's
16 failure to appear today or otherwise oppose the dismissal of this action by filing a
17 declaration in response to the OSC, the Court finds that it is not reasonable to expect
18 that the imposition of sanctions less severe than dismissal would be effective in
19 gaining plaintiff's compliance. Accordingly, the matter is dismissed pursuant to
20 Government Code section 68608, subdivision (b).

21 ☐ Failure of ☐ plaintiff(s) ☐ cross-complainant(s) to seek relief from stay.

22 ☐ Failure of ☐ plaintiff(s) ☐ cross-complainant(s) to retain counsel.

23 ☐ Failure to serve summons within 2 years. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.420, subd. (a)(1).)

24 ☐ Failure to serve summons within 3 years. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.250, subd. (a)(2).)

25 ☐ Failure to bring to trial within 2 years. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.420, subd. (a)(2)(B).)

☐ Failure to bring to trial within 3 years. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.420, subd. (a)(2)(A).)

☐ Failure to bring to trial within 5 years. (Code Civ. Proc., § 583.310.)


☐ Failure of ☐ plaintiff(s) ☐ cross-complainant(s) to appear at trial. (Code Civ. Proc.,
§ 581, subds. (b)(5) & (I).)

☐ The Court previously imposed monetary sanctions without effect on _____.

21 ✓ Other: **Failure to locate PAGA representative to substitute for Plaintiff. Counsel**
22 **may file an application to vacate/ set aside court ordered dismissal if a PAGA**
23 **representative to substitute is located.**

24 Date:

1/23/25

25 

Harold W. Hopp, Judge of the Superior Court