

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Pembrick v. Loyal Source Government Services, LLC

Pembrick · No. 3:24-cv-01524-RBM-DEB · Decided August 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of California granted the parties’ joint stipulation to remand a representative PAGA action to the San Diego Superior Court. The court also ordered each party to bear its own attorneys’ fees and costs related to removal and remand.

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 MONIQUE PEMBRICK, on behalf of Case No.: 3:24-cv-01524-RBM-DEB
herself and all others similarly situated, 12 ORDER GRANTING JOINT 13 Plaintiff,
STIPULATION TO REMAND REMOVED ACTION 14 v. 15 LOYAL SOURCE
GOVERNMENT [Doc. 23] SERVICES, LLC, a Florida Limited 16 Liability Company, et al., 17
Defendants.

18 19 20 On July 22, 2024, Plaintiff Monique Pembrick (“Plaintiff”), on behalf of herself and 21
all others similarly situated, filed a Representative Action Complaint for Civil Penalties 22 Under
the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”), California Labor Code § 2698 et seq. 23
 (“Complaint”) in the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Diego (“San 24
 Diego Superior Court”).

(Doc. 1-2 [“Compl.”] at 6–17.1) On August 27, 2024, Defendant 25 Loyal Source Government
Services, LLC (“Defendant”) filed a Notice of Removal of Civil 26 27 28 1 1] Action with this
Court. (Doc. 1.) On January 24, 2025, Defendant filed a Motion to 2 ||Compel Arbitration (Doc.
9), which this Court denied on July 28, 2025 (Doc. 22). 3 The Parties have now filed a Notice of
Settlement and Joint Stipulation to Remand 4 ||Removed Action (“Joint Motion”), in which the
Parties’ stipulate and agree, “subject to 5 ||the approval of the Court, that: (1) [t]his Action shall be
remanded to the [San Diego 6 || Superior Court], where the Action was originally filed[;] (2)
[e]ach Party shall bear its own 7 || attorneys’ fees and costs with respect to the removal and
remand[;] (3) [t]he Parties jointly 8 ||request that the Court issue an order remanding this Action
accordingly.” (Doc.

23 at 2- 9 ||3.) The Parties explain that “Plaintiff disputes the propriety of Defendant’s removal, 10
||including whether removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1) and the federal enclave doctrine 11 ||
was proper, and whether this Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the Action[.]” □□□□ 12]

at 2.) 13 Accordingly, the Parties' Joint Motion is GRANTED, and the Court REMANDS 14 || this action to the San Diego Superior Court.

See Crowder v. Sprouts Farmers Mkt., LLC, 15 || No. 23-CV-00140-H-JLB, 2023 WL 2258324, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2023) (granting 16 || joint motion and remanding action back to the San Diego Superior Court). Each party shall 17 || bear its own attorneys' fees and costs with respect to the removal and remand. 18 IT IS SO ORDERED. 19 Dated: August 22, 2025 Fe Bo Gs?

L > 20 HON. RUTH BERMUDEZ MONTENEGRO 21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22 23 24 25 26 27 28