David Laughing Ho	orse Robinson et al v. U.S. Department of Interior	et al	Doc. 209
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	DAVID LAUGHING HORSE	CASE NO. 09-cv-01977-BAM	
11	ROBINSON, ET AL.	ORDER RE CLARIFICATION OF	
12	Plaintiffs,	COURT'S ORDER TO DISMISS (I	Joc. 205)
13	VS.		
14	KEN SALAZAR, ET AL.,		
15	Defendants.		
16	/		
17	On February 7, 2012, plaintiffs filed an ex parte request for clarification of this Court's Order		
18	on Defendants' Motions to Dismiss. (Doc. 205). In the Court's Order, the Court dismissed plaintiffs'		
19	California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") claim, among other claims. Plaintiffs seek clarification		
20	of whether the CEQA claim was dismissed without prejudice or with prejudice to filing the claim in state		
21	court.		
22	As to the CEQA claim, the Court's Order stated:		
23	"The Court GRANTS the motions to dismiss without leave to amend as to the Fourth Claim for Relief for Violation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Govt. Code 65352.3 against Kern, TRC and TMV."		
24			
25			
26	The Court clarifies its Order as follows. The Court dismissed without leave to amend these claims in		
27			
28	/////		
		1	
		P	kets.Justia.com
		Doci	งอเอ.บนอแส.0011

the current action before this Court. The Court dismissed on jurisdictional grounds. The Court did not reach the merits of the claims and did not dismiss these claims with prejudice to refiling in an appropriate forum, where it would be subject to any of defendants' defenses. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE **Dated:** February 10, 2012