

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA FORESTRY ASSOCIATION      No. 2:05-cv-00905-MCE-GGH  
and AMERICAN FOREST & PAPER  
ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

GAIL KIMBELL,<sup>1</sup> Chief, United  
States Forest Service;  
MIKE JOHANNNS, Secretary.  
United States Department of  
Agriculture; JACK A. BLACKWELL,  
Regional Forester, Pacific  
Southwest Region,

**ORDER**

Defendants.

and

SIERRA NEVADA FOREST PROTECTION  
CAMPAIGN, et al.,

Intervenor-Defendants.

///

///

---

<sup>1</sup> Current U.S. Forest Service Chief Gail Kimbell is  
"automatically substituted" for former Forest Service Chief Dale  
Bosworth, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d).

1 On September 24 2008, this Court denied Plaintiffs' Motion  
2 for Summary Judgment, except to the limited extent that the  
3 Court, in reliance on the Ninth Circuit's decision in Sierra  
4 Forest Legacy v. Rey, 526 F.3d 1228, 1231-32 (9th Cir. 2008),  
5 found that the Forest Service violated the National Environmental  
6 Policy Act ("NEPA") by failing to consider a sufficient range of  
7 alternatives in adopting the 2004 Framework. Summary  
8 adjudication in favor of Plaintiffs was granted on that issue, as  
9 set forth in the Second Cause of Action. Correspondingly, the  
10 Forest Service's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment was granted in  
11 its entirety except as to the Second Cause of Action.

12 Given the Court's directive ordering separate briefing as to  
13 the question of remedy following its liability findings as set  
14 forth above, those issues were briefed by the parties and a  
15 hearing set for December 19, 2008.

16 Plaintiffs have advised the Court that they request no  
17 further remedy, and simply ask that the declaratory relief  
18 awarded in the Court's September 24, 2008 Memorandum and Order be  
19 reduced to judgment. As set forth in the concurrently filed  
20 remedy orders entered in the related cases of Sierra Nevada Forest  
21 Protection Campaign v. Rey, No. 2:05-cv-0205-MCE-GGH, and People  
22 of the State of California v. United States Dept. of Agriculture,  
23 No. 2:05-cv-0211-MCE-GGH, however, counsel for Defendant-  
24 Intervenors Quincy Library Group and TuCare, et al. have advised  
25 the Court that Petitions for Rehearing have been filed as to the  
26 Ninth Circuit's panel decision in Sierra Forest Legacy v. Rey,  
27 supra, and that the Ninth Circuit had ordered Plaintiff in that  
28 case to respond to those petitions by August 22, 2008.

1 Although the parties indicate that all papers regarding the  
2 rehearing petitions were filed by September 17, 2008, no decision  
3 on the petitions have been forthcoming. Accordingly, mandate back  
4 to this Court under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41(b) has  
5 not yet issued.

6 Given the fact that the appellate decision underlying this  
7 Court's finding on behalf of Plaintiffs in this matter remains  
8 non-final given the pending rehearing petitions, and in view of  
9 recent developments which may inform the Ninth Circuit's ultimate  
10 decision whether to take the matter en banc, including not only  
11 the Ninth Circuit's own subsequent decision in Lands Council v.  
12 McNair, 537 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 2008), but also the Supreme  
13 Court's even more recent pronouncement in Winter v. Natural  
14 Resources Defense Council, 129 S. Ct. 365 (2008), this Court  
15 believes it would be premature to fashion a remedy, and enter any  
16 final judgment in this matter, until after the rehearing  
17 petitions have been adjudicated and mandate has been formally  
18 transferred back to the Court. As counsel for the Intervenor-  
19 Defendants have pointed out, any district court proceedings on a  
20 remedy while logically antecedent issues remain before an  
21 appellate court may ultimately be null and void, and may  
22 consequently have to be redone following the issuance of mandate.  
23 See Kusay v. United States, 62 F.3d 192, 193-96 (7th Cir. 1995);  
24 United States v. Thorp, 655 F.2d 997, 999 (9th Cir. 1981). The  
25 Court wishes to avoid any potential waste of judicial resources  
26 in that regard and therefore declines to act on the question of  
27 remedy before the aforementioned decision in Sierra Forest Legacy  
28 v. Rey is final and mandate to this Court has been issued.

1 If the panel opinion in Rey is vacated, the need for a remedies  
2 hearing may be entirely obviated should this Court then determine  
3 that the 2004 Framework's consideration of project alternatives  
4 was otherwise sufficient.

5 Plaintiffs are directed to notify the Court once a decision  
6 on the rehearing petitions in Rey has been made. At that point,  
7 the instant remedies hearing will be rescheduled as necessary.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: January 9, 2009

10 

11 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.  
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28