

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

L.H., A.Z., D.K., and D.R.,
on behalf of themselves and
all other similarly
situated juvenile parolees
in California,

Plaintiffs,

NO. CIV. S-06-2042 LKK/GGH
NO. CIV. S-94-0671 LKK/GGH

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.,
Governor, State of
California, et al,

Defendants.

_____/

JERRY VALDIVIA, et al,

Plaintiffs,

O R D E R

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.,
Governor, State of
California, et al.,

Defendants.

_____/

A hearing on plaintiffs' Motion to Compel 2010 Rates, ECF No.
617, is scheduled for hearing on July 18, 2011. In the motion,

1 plaintiffs seek the court's approval of an increase in the hourly
2 rates for work performed in 2010. As noted in the parties' papers,
3 a similar motion by plaintiffs was submitted to the Northern
4 District of California in Armstrong v. Brown, No. 94-2307. That
5 motion is currently under submission. Plaintiffs proposed that the
6 dispute in this case be resolved according to the court's ruling
7 in Armstrong, but defendants did not stipulate. In Coleman v.
8 Brown, 90-0520, the parties have stipulated "to stay resolution of
9 the rate for work performed in this case in 2010. . . pending
10 resolution of the parties' related litigation on this issue in
11 Armstrong v. Brown." See Stipulation and Order, ECF No. 4029, June
12 28, 2011.

13 Although the parties have not stipulated to stay this issue
14 in this case, the court finds it appropriate to delay decision on
15 plaintiffs' motion until a decision is issued in Armstrong.
16 However, if no decision is issued before August 31, 2011,
17 plaintiffs SHALL re-notice the pending motion to compel fees for
18 hearing. Accordingly, the court ORDERS as follows:

19 [1] The hearing currently scheduled for July 18, 2011 is
20 VACATED.

21 [2] The court will delay decision on the pending motion
22 until a decision is issued on the matter in Armstrong.

23 [3] When a decision on the matter is issued in Armstrong,
24 plaintiffs SHALL re-notice the motion to compel fees for
25 hearing in this court.


26 ////

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

[4] If no decision is issued before August 31, 2011,
plaintiffs SHALL re-notice the motion to compel fees for
hearing in this court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 11, 2011.


LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
SENIOR JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT