| 1 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 3 | AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 4 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMPOSED OF THREE JUDGES | |
| 5 | PURSUANT TO SECTION 2284, TITLE 28 UNITED STATES CODE | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | RALPH COLEMAN, et al., | |
| 8 | Plaintiffs, | |
| 9 | V. | NO. 2:90-cv-0520 LKK DAD (PC) |
| 10 | EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al., | THREE-JUDGE COURT |
| 11 | Defendants. | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | MARCIANO PLATA, et al., | NO. C01-1351 TEH |
| 14 | Plaintiffs, | THREE-JUDGE COURT |
| 15 | v. | ORDER TO FILE PROPOSED |
| 16 | EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al., | <u>ORDERS RE: DEFENDANTS</u> <u>REQUEST TO EXTEND</u> DODULATION DEDUCTION |
| 17 | Defendants. | <u>POPULATION REDUCTION</u> <u>DEADLINE</u> |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | This Court has repeatedly extended the meet-and-confer process, and by virtue thereof | |
| 20 | the date for the State's compliance, in hopes that the parties could reach agreement on how | |
| 21 | this Court can best ensure a durable solution to the prison population problem as required by | |
| 22 | our orders of August 4, 2009, June 30, 2011, and June 20, 2013. It now appears that no such | |
| 23 | agreement will be reached, and the Court therefore intends to issue an order within the next | |
| 24 | 30 days as to whether it will grant, deny, or grant in part and deny in part the State's request | |
| 25 | for an extension of time in which to comply with those orders. Because, as a result of the | |
| 26 | recent process in which the parties have engaged, they may have modified their views as to | |
| 27 | the appropriate content of the order to be issued by this Court, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED | |
| 28 | that, on or before January 23, 2014, plaintiffs and defendants shall each file proposed orders | |
| | | |

1 for this Court to consider as it determines how to rule on the pending request. These 2 proposed orders shall not be statements of the parties' ultimate wishes but, rather, shall 3 include those terms, and only those terms, that the parties believe are best suited to achieve 4 durable compliance with this Court's orders to maintain a prison population of no more than 5 137.5% design capacity. Either plaintiffs or defendants may, at their option, not later than January 28, 2014, file comments on or objections to the proposed order submitted by their 6 7 opponents of not more than seven pages. 8 The current April 18, 2014 deadline for compliance with our orders is hereby 9 extended by the time between the date of this order and the date of the order ruling on 10 defendants' request for extension. 11 12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** 13 14 Dated: 01/13/14 15 TATES CIRCUIT JUDGE IRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS 16 17 Dated: 01/13/14 18 19 TATES DISTRICT JUDGE STERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 20 21 22 Dated: 01/13/14 23 VITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE HERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 24 25 26 27 28 2