1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 RICHARD M. GILMAN, et al., 10 NO. CIV. S-05-830 LKK/GGH 11 Plaintiffs, 12 v. ORDER 13 EDMUND J. BROWN, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 On August 17, 2011, the court denied Darrel King and Timothy 16 Leang Jones' motion for permissive joinder. (Doc. No. 361). On 17 18 August 29, 2011, Mr. King and Mr. Jones filed a motion for 19 reconsideration. (Doc. No. 364). In essence, they are arguing that 20 this court should make them class representatives. If, as they 21 contend, Mr. King and Mr. Jones are class members and, thus, they 22 do not need to notify the court - Mr. King's and Mr. Jones's 23 interests are already represented in this action as class members. No action is required of the court to allow Mr. King and Mr. Jones 24 25 to obtain relief,, if any, through this class action. 26 Mr. King and Mr. Jones are free to contact class counsel with

1

1 any concerns about the case. The court has certified the class 2 action and class counsel, thus, represent all members of the class. 3 Class counsel are available at the following addresses: 4 Daniel J. Broderick 5 Monica Knox 6 David M. Porter Office of the Federal Defender 7 801 I Street 3rd Floor 8 Sacramento, CA 95814 9 Carter Capps White King Hall Civil Rights Clinic 10 UC Davis School of Law One Shields Avenue, Bldg. TB 30 11 Davis, CA 95616 12 The court reiterates that Mr. King and Mr. Jones need not take

13 any action to be considered class members. All individuals who fall 14 within the class definition are class members. Absent any 15 suggestion by Mr. King and Mr. Jones that class counsel are not 16 adequately representing their interests, the court will not take 17 any further action on their concerns.

Further, the court denies Mr. King and Mr. Jones' request for an interlocutory appeal. Again, the court reiterates that Mr. King and Mr. Jones need not take any action in order to benefit from relief, if any, from the class action if they are indeed class members.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. King and Mr. Jones's motion for reconsideration and request for an interlocutory appeal (Doc. No. 364) is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is instructed to serve this order upon Mr. King and Mr. Jones at the addresses listed on the

motion. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: September 1, 2011. LAWRENCE K. KARLTON SENIOR JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT