	Case 3:10-cv-00940-GPC-WVG Document	403 Filed 04/01/15 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7 8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		Case No. 10cv0940 GPC (WVG)
11	TARLA MAKAEFF, et al., on Behalf of Herself and All Others Similarly Situated,	ORDER:
12	Plaintiffs,	(1) GRANTING DEFENDANTS
13	, in the second	TRUMP UNIVERSITY, LLC AND DONALD J. TRUMP'S EX PARTE
14		MOTION TO DELAY ISSUANCE
15	V.	OF ANY RULING ON DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR
16		SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR ADJUDICATION;
17		,
18		[Dkt. No. 401.]
19	TRUMP UNIVERSITY, LLC, (aka	(2) VACATING APRIL 3, 2015 HEARING DATE;
2021	Trump Entrepreneur Initiative) a New York Limited Liability Company,	(3) VACATING ALL OTHER PRE-
22	DONALD J. TRUMP, and DOES 1	TRIAL DATES
23	through 50, inclusive,	
24	Defendants.	
25		
26	On March 26, 2015, Defendants Trump University, LLC and Donald J. Trump	
27	filed their Ex Parte Motion to Delay Issuance of Any Ruling on Defendants' Motions	
28	for Summary Judgment or Adjudication ("Ex Parte Motion"). (Dkt. No. 401.)	

Defendants' Ex Parte Motion requests the Court delay issuance of its ruling on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment or Adjudication until after the Court either decertifies the Classes or approves a class notice and the notice is provided to the Classes and the "opt-out" period has expired. Defendants argue that otherwise they will be prejudiced based on "one-way intervention." See Schwarzschild v. Tse, 69 F.3d 293, 295 (9th Cir. 1995); Gessele v. Jack in Box, Inc., No. 10-cv-960-ST, 2012 WL 3686274, at *3 (D. Or. Aug. 24, 2012). The hearing on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment or Adjudication is currently set for April 3, 2015.

On March 27, 2015, Plaintiffs filed a response. (Dkt. No. 402.) Plaintiffs argue that it unnecessary to delay ruling on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment or Adjudication because the motions are limited to the named plaintiffs, and therefore do not affect the unnamed class members. (Dkt. No. 402 at 2-3.) In the alternative, Plaintiffs argue that if the Court decides to delay ruling on the Motions for Summary Judgment or Adjudication, it should also postpone the hearing set for April 3, 2015.

While Defendants' could have raised their concerns about "one-way intervention" earlier, after considering Defendants' *Ex Parte* Motion, and finding good cause therefore, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants' *Ex Parte* Motion. The Court also **GRANTS** Plaintiffs' request to postpone the hearing on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment or Adjudication. Finally, the Court **GRANTS** the Parties' joint request to vacate all other pre-trial dates – aside from the motions set for hearing on May 22, 2015 (Dkt. Nos. 380-81) – until after its ruling on Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment or Adjudication. (Dkt. No. 402 at 6.)

28