

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
AND THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT COMPOSED OF THREE JUDGES
PURSUANT TO SECTION 2284, TITLE 28 UNITED STATES CODE

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:90-cv-0520 KJM DB P
THREE-JUDGE COURT

MARCIANO PLATA, et al.,¹
Plaintiff,
v.
EDMUND G. BROWN JR., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 01-cv-01351-JST
THREE-JUDGE COURT
ORDER RE: STATUS OF INTERVENORS

Before trial in this matter, the court granted motions to intervene by various counties, legislators, district attorneys, sheriffs, sheriff-coroners, county probation officers, and one city chief of corrections. ECF Nos. 817/2376, 857/2427.² The court subsequently granted stipulations to dismiss several intervenors with prejudice. ECF No. 2121/3536, 2131/3550, 2302/3808.

¹ The parties in the individual Plata v. Brown case have agreed that Marciano Plata should be terminated as an individual plaintiff. Given the long history of this litigation and the general familiarity with the Plata case name, the Plata court has decided not to change the case caption.

² All filings in this Three-Judge Court are included in the individual docket sheets of both Plata v. Brown, No. 01-cv-01351-JST (N.D. Cal.), and Coleman v. Brown, No. 2:90-cv-0520 KJM DB P (E.D. Cal.). This court includes the docket number of Plata first, then Coleman.

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
28

To ensure that the docket for this case is accurate, counsel for all remaining intervenors shall consult with their clients to determine (a) whether the individuals or entities listed on the court docket sheets wish to continue as intervenors in this case and (b) if so, whether any substitutions need to be made pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d). Intervenors who wish to remain in this case shall file a notice of intention to remain an intervenor on or before **October 12, 2017**. Any intervenor who does not timely file such notice will be terminated from this case with prejudice. See *Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. Hercules Inc.*, 146 F.3d 1071, 1074 (9th Cir. 1998) (“[D]istrict courts have inherent power to control their dockets [unless] its exercise would nullify the procedural choices reserved to parties under the federal rules.”).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 12, 2017


STEPHEN REINHARDT
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE
NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Dated: September 12, 2017


KIMBERLY J. MUELLER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: September 12, 2017


JON S. TIGAR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA