. .

V.

CALIFORNIA,

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORDER

No. 2:01-cv-01520-MCE-GGH

Plaintiff,

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA; and CITY OF SOUTH LAKE TAHOE,

Defendants.

AND ALL RELATED ACTIONS.

----00000----

On March 11, 2010, the United States and the Federal Defendants (collectively referred to as "United States") and the South Tahoe Public Utility District ("District") filed the Joint Motion now before the Court, which requests dismissal, with prejudice, of certain claims made in conjunction with this lawsuit. Specifically, both parties ask that the claim for Quiet Title against the United States, as set forth in the District's Second Amended Third Party Cross-Complaint, be dismissed with prejudice.

Both parties further request that the District's Fourth Party Complaint against the Federal Defendants for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief under the Administrative Procedures Act also be dismissed with prejudice. Finally, the parties ask that the United States' Third Party Cross-Claims against the District for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, and for Trespass and Ejectment, be dismissed with prejudice as well. All of the above enumerated claims were previously dismissed, without prejudice, by the Court's Order filed January 27, 2010 (Docket No. 369). The instant Motion was filed given certain terms of the Settlement Agreement between the parties providing that a motion for dismissal with prejudice would be filed once certain appeals period had run. No opposition to the present Motion has been made.

Given that lack of opposition, and good cause appearing therefor, the parties' Joint Motion for Dismissal (Docket No. 372) is GRANTED. The April 8, 2010 hearing date on said Motion is accordingly vacated. The above-described claims are hereby dismissed, with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 31, 2010

MORRISON C.

ENGLAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

26 27

28

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

¹ Because oral argument was not of material assistance, the Court orders this matter submitted on the briefs. Local Rule 230(q).