

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,
12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,
15 Defendants.
16

No. CIV. S-90-520 LKK/DAD (PC)

ORDER

17 On January 21, 2013, the parties filed post-hearing briefs
18 on plaintiffs' motion concerning housing and treatment of
19 mentally ill inmates in segregation. (ECF Nos. 4985, 4988.) On
20 February 5, 2014, plaintiffs filed a response to defendants'
21 post-hearing brief. (ECF No. 5051.) On February 10, 2014,
22 defendants filed objections and a request to strike that brief.
23 (ECF No. 5062). On the same day, plaintiffs filed an opposition
24 to defendants' motion (ECF No. 5063), and the next day defendants
25 filed a reply (ECF No. 5064).


26 The dispute between the parties arises from a discrepancy
27 between the court's oral ruling concerning closing briefs at the
28 conclusion of the evidentiary hearing on December 19, 2013 and

1 the minutes issued the same day. Compare Reporter's Transcript
2 (RT) (ECF No. 5020) at 3751:22-3752:6 with ECF No. 4972. Good
3 cause appearing, plaintiffs' response will be considered and
4 defendants will be granted fifteen days to file a response to
5 plaintiffs' closing brief.¹

6 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. Defendants' February 10, 2014 request to strike
8 plaintiffs' reply brief (ECF No. 5062) is denied; and
9 2. Defendants are granted fifteen days from the date of
10 this order in which to file and serve a response to
11 plaintiffs' closing brief on plaintiffs' motion
12 concerning housing and treatment of mentally ill inmates
13 in segregation. Thereafter the matter will stand
14 submitted.

15 DATED: February 19, 2014.

16
17
18 
19 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
20 SENIOR JUDGE
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ The court must note that this dispute, which generated three additional
27 filings by the parties plus an order by the court, could easily have been
28 resolved by a joint request for clarification accompanied by a stipulation of
the parties agreeing to a solution and a proposed order thereon. Going
forward, the court expects the parties to work together wherever possible to
decrease, rather than expand, their areas of disagreement.