

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA**

**Laura Melina Roberts v. Conduent State and Local Solutions, LLC,
et al.**

Roberts · No. 1:25-cv-01329-CDB · Decided November 6, 2025

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 LAURA MELINA ROBERTS, Case No. 1:25-cv-01329-CDB 12 Plaintiff,
ORDER ON STIPULATION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO REMAND AND 13
v. INITIAL SCHEDULING CONFERENCE 14 CONDUENT STATE AND LOCAL (Doc. 10)
SOLUTIONS, LLC, et al., 15 ORDER VACATING HEARING ON Defendants. MOTION TO
REMAND AND INITIAL 16 SCHEDULING CONFERENCE 17 (Docs.

2, 3) 18 Clerk of the Court to Appoint District Judge 19 20 Background 21 Plaintiff Laura Melina
Roberts (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action with the filing of a 22 complaint in state court on
September 11, 2025, against Defendants Conduent State and Local 23 Solutions, LLC
(“Conduent”), and Ameera Zughayer (collectively, “Defendants”). (Doc. 1-1 at 24 6-28).

Defendant Conduent removed the action on October 6, 2025. (Doc. 1). On October 22, 25 2025,
Plaintiff filed a motion to remand the action, setting a motion hearing date of December 26 3,
2025, before the undersigned. (Doc. 3). Defendant Conduent filed an opposition on October 27
30, 2025. (Doc. 9). Defendant Zughayer has not yet been served with the summons and complaint.

See (Docs. 3, 9). 1 Pending before the Court is the parties’ stipulated request to continue both the
hearing 2 on the motion to remand and the initial scheduling conference, filed on October 30,
2025. (Doc. 3 10). The parties represent that Defendant Conduent’s counsel is unavailable on date
of the 4 hearing on the motion for remand (December 3, 2025) and the date of the initial
scheduling 5 conference (January 22, 2026).

Id. at 2. The parties request the Court continue the hearing on 6 the motion to remand to
December 18, 2025, and the initial scheduling conference to February 7 23, 2026. Id. 8 Discussion
9 Consent to magistrate judge jurisdiction may not be entered absent consent of all parties, 10
including unserved defendants. *Williams v. King*, 875 F.3d 500, 504 (9th Cir.

2017). Here, 11 Defendant Zughayer remains unserved. Thus, because there is not full consent
among all parties 12 to the jurisdiction of a magistrate judge, Plaintiff has improperly noticed the
motion to remand 13 before the undersigned. See *Flam v. Flam*, 788 F.3d 1043, 1047 (9th Cir.
2015) (holding that a 14 motion to remand is dispositive). Additionally, it follows that, as the

motion to remand is 15 dispositive and a ruling on the motion may dispose of all federal proceedings in this case, the 16 initial scheduling conference may, therefore, be rendered moot.

17 As such, the Court will vacate the hearing on the motion to remand and the initial 18 scheduling conference and direct the Clerk of the Court to randomly assign a district judge to 19 this action. Following reassignment of the action, Plaintiff may re-notice the hearing on the 20 motion to remand in front of the assigned district judge. 21 Conclusion and Order 22 The Clerk of the Court is directed to randomly assign a District Judge.

23 For the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 24 1. The parties' stipulated request to continue both the hearing on Plaintiff's motion to 25 remand and the initial scheduling conference (Doc. 10) is DENIED as moot; 26 2.

The initial scheduling conference set for January 22, 2026, is VACATED, to be reset 27 as necessary following disposition of Plaintiff's pending motion to remand; and 1 3. The hearing on Plaintiff's pending motion to remand (Doc. 3) is VACATED. 2 | ITISSO ORDERED. 3 Dated: _ November 5, 2025 |) ww ~~ 4 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28