Case 08-45664-dml11 Doc 3914-2 Filed 11/04/09 Entered 11/04/09 15:26:00 Desc Exhibit B Page 1 of 4

Exhibit B

Court Order

2008 Mar-11 PM 04:12 U.S. DISTRICT COURT N.D. OF ALABAMA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHWESTERN DIVISION

JENNIFER HALL, individually)	
and on behalf of all others)	
similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No. 07-S-484-NW
)	
PAUL WHITE, and PHYLLIS)	
THOMAS,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This action is before the court on defendants' motion to dismiss,¹ and, plaintiff's motion to modify the stay on discovery previously entered by this court.² In accordance with the memorandum opinion entered contemporaneously herewith, defendants' motion to dismiss is DENIED. However, plaintiff is ORDERED to file an amended complaint, on or before **March 21**, **2008**, supplying factual allegations to support the conclusory assertion that an agreement was reached by defendants (and/or by either or both of the named defendants and other, unnamed human resources personnel at other Gold Kist and/or Pilgrim's Pride facilities) to conduct

¹ See doc. no. 9.

² See doc. nos. 26 (order staying case) and 27 (plaintiff's motion to modify stay).

or participate in the affairs of the Gold-Kist/Pilgrim's-Pride enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity by committing two or more predicate offenses,³ or that the defendants named in this complaint knew that unnamed individuals at other facilities aspired toward the same illegal objective to further the enterprise's affairs. Additionally, plaintiff must specifically allege injury as a result of the predicate acts in the amended complaint. Failure to correct these deficiencies will result in dismissal of the complaint.

Finally, plaintiff's motion for a modification of the stay imposed on these proceedings by previous order is granted, but only to the following, limited extent: discovery initially must focus upon and be limited to those facts (if any) tending to substantiate plaintiff's allegations of a RICO conspiracy at the poultry processing facility located in Russellville, Alabama. Only if there is evidence to support the alleged RICO conspiracy at that locale will the court entertain an appropriate motion by plaintiff for permission to broaden the scope of discovery, to investigate activities

³ In other words, plaintiff must allege in good faith — because she ultimately must prove: see Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)(3) — that the defendants, by their "words and actions, . . . objectively manifested an agreement to participate, directly or indirectly, in the affairs of [the Gold-Kist/Pilgrim's-Pride] enterprise through the commission of two or more predicate crimes." United States v. Elliott, 571 F.2d 880, 903 (5th Cir. 1978). Stated differently, plaintiff must allege in good faith objective facts likely to have evidentiary support and tending to show that defendants knowingly and willfully agreed to become members of a conspiracy with the intention of participating in, and furthering the affairs of, the Gold-Kist/Pilgrim's-Pride enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity that included two or more violations of the immigration statutes cited in plaintiff's complaint.

at other Gold Kist and/or Pilgrim's Pride plants in other locations and, thereafter, to address the question of whether a class should be certified.

DONE and ORDERED this 11th day of March, 2008.

United States District Judge