1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JESSE WASHINGTON,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-06-1994 WBS DAD P
12	VS.
13	J. BROWN, et al.,
14	Defendants. ORDER
15	/
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with an action pursuant to 42 U.S.C.
17	§ 1983. On September 9, 2010, defendants requested leave to file a dispositive motion out of
18	time. <sup>1</sup> Defendants maintain that on April 5, 2010, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held in
19	Holley v. Cal. Dep't of Corr., 599 F.3d 1008 (9th Cir. 2010) that monetary damages are
20	unavailable under RLUIPA against state officials in their individual and official capacities.
21	Defendants contend that in light of Holley, plaintiff's RLUIPA claim in this case must be
22	dismissed because he seeks only monetary damages against defendants. Defendants further
23	contend that they were unable to present the court with this argument in their September 16, 2009
24	motion for summary judgment because their motion was filed well before the Ninth Circuit's
25	<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the court's March 25, 2000 order, all dispositive motions in this case were

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the court's March 25, 2009 order, all dispositive motions in this case were to be filed on or before September 25, 2009. (Doc. No. 81.)

1	decision in <u>Holley</u> . The undersigned finds good cause to grant defendants' motion under these
2	circumstances and to resolve this issue following briefing by the parties .
3	Accordingly, good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
4	1. Defendants' September 9, 2010 request for leave to file a dispositive motion
5	with respect to plaintiff's RLUIPA claim (Doc. No. 124) is granted;
6	2. Defendants shall file and serve their dispositive motion within thirty days of
7	the date of this order; plaintiff's opposition or statement of non-opposition and defendants' reply,
8	if any, shall be filed and served in accordance with Local Rule 230(1); and
9	3. The court's August 31, 2010 scheduling order (Doc. No. 122) is vacated; the
10	court will reissue a scheduling order setting dates for pretrial statements and jury trial following
11	the adjudication of defendants' dispositive motion.
12	DATED: September 10, 2010.
13	2
14	Dale A. Droget
15	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16	DAD:sj wash1994.leave
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I