1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 PICAYUNE RANCHERIA OF **CASE NO. 1:16-CV-0950-AWI-EPG** 12 **CHUKCHANSI INDIANS** ORDER AUTHORIZING PLAINTIFF 13 Plaintiff, TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING 14 v. 15 UNITED STATES DEPARMENT OF THE 16 INTERIOR; SALLY JEWELL, Secretary of the Interior; and LAWRENCE S. ROBERTS, Acting Assistant Secretary of 17 the Interior for Indian Affairs, 18 Defendants. 19 The parties to this action completed briefing on cross-motions for summary judgment on 20 May 25, 2017. Roughly one month later, intervenor-defendant North Fork Rancheria of Mono 21 Indians ("North Fork") submitted a notice of supplemental authority, modifying its position 22 regarding the propriety of a stay. Doc. 38. Plaintiff Picayune Rancheria of Chukchansi Indians 23 24 ("Chukchansi") objects to what it characterizes as supplemental substantive briefing on the propriety of a stay. Doc. 39. Chukchansi is correct that North Fork walked back its prior position 25 regarding the propriety of a stay and now suggests that the Ninth Circuit has conclusively 26

decided that the test for whether a stay should issue in this situation is governed by the Colorado

River standard rather than the Landis standard. Doc. 38 at 2; see Colorado River Water

27

Conversation District v. United States, 424 U.S. 800 (1976); Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248 (1936). In support of that argument, North Fork relies upon authority long preceding the parties' briefing in this case. See Doc. 38 at 2-3 (citing, inter alia, Minucci v. Agrama, 868 F.2d 113, 1115 (9th Cir. 1989)).

Chukchansi asks the court to either disregard the unauthorized supplemental briefing or afford Chukchansi an opportunity to respond when its lead counsel returns from his time abroad. Doc. 39 at 3. The issue briefed by North Fork is of significance to the Court. Accordingly, the latter request will be granted. Chukchansi will be permitted to file a responsive brief, not to exceed eight pages, no later than August 8, 2017. That briefing may only address the standard to be applied in determining whether to issue a stay.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>July 11, 2017</u>

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE