

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOUIS LOPEZ AND KAREN LOPEZ,
both individually and dba
DREAMS RECYCLING,

CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00491-SMS

ORDER TAKING JUDICIAL NOTICE

Plaintiff,

v.

THE CITY OF KERMAN and
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

(Docs. 18 and 19-3)

Defendant City of Kerman has requested that this Court take judicial notice of the following:

1. Kerman Ordinance No. 178 (February 16, 1970);
2. Kerman Ordinance No. 94-08 (November 15, 1994);
3. Kerman Ordinance No. 08-02 (June 4, 2008);
4. City of Kerman Resolution No. 08-34 (May 21, 2008); and
5. Senate Bill 2241.

(Doc. 18).

1 Plaintiffs Louis and Karen Lopez do not object to Defendant’s request and themselves request
2 that the Court take judicial notice of

- 3 1. Kerman Ordinance 08-02;
- 4 2. Kerman Ordinance 178;
- 5 3. Kerman Ordinance 216;
- 6 4. Kerman Ordinance 91-21;
- 7 5. Kerman Ordinance 94-08;
- 8 6. Kerman Ordinance 96-12; and
- 9 7. Kerman Ordinance 06-05.

10 (Doc. 19-3).

11
12 “A judicially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either
13 (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2) capable of accurate
14 and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.”
15 Fed.R.Evid. 201(b). “A court shall take judicial notice if requested by a party and supplied with
16 the necessary information.” Fed.R.Evid. 201(d).

17
18 The parties having requested that the Court take judicial notice of the documents set forth
19 above and having provided information necessary to confirm that these documents are generally
20 known within this Court’s jurisdiction and capable of accurate and ready determination, this
21 Court hereby takes judicial notice of the documents noted herein.

22
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24
25 **Dated: August 5, 2010**

26 **/s/ Sandra M. Snyder**
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE