12345678CUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
345678FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR ULALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
456778CUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
5
678UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA1011JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,12Plaintiffs,13v.14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
718UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA101011JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,I
8UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA10III11JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,ORDER
9FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA10111110111213v.141515
1011JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,Image: Comparison of the second
11JOSEPH HARDESTY, et al.,No. 2:10-cv-02414-KJM-KJN12Plaintiffs,13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
12Plaintiffs,13v.14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
13v.ORDER14SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,ORDER
14  SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, et al.,
15 et al.,
16 Defendants.
17
18 On March 21, 2017, after a lengthy trial, a jury returned a verdict largely in favor
19 of the Hardesty and Schneider plaintiffs. Hr'g Mins, ECF No. 465; Jury Verdict, ECF No. 469.
20 Although the clerk entered judgment against the defendants at trial, ECF No. 471, the court
21 vacated judgment in light of defendant Dennis O'Bryant's pending interlocutory appeal, ECF N
481, which precluded partial judgment without the court's determination that "there is no just
reason for delay," Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b).
24 In order to obtain final judgment against the defendants at trial, plaintiffs moved
25 sever all adjudicated claims from the remaining claims against O'Bryant. ECF No. 508. Since
26 filing the motion, however, plaintiffs settled with O'Bryant, ECF No. 522, plaintiffs and
27 defendants Bryant, Gay Norris, Steve Testa, Bret Koehler and Curt Taras stipulated to the
28 dismissal of the remaining claims against these defendants in this court, ECF No. 525, the court
1

1	has dismissed those defendants with prejudice, ECF No. 528, and the Ninth Circuit dismissed
2	O'Bryant's appeal, ECF No. 527.
3	Plaintiffs now ask the court to enter judgment on the March 21, 2017 jury verdict.
4	ECF No. 526. Because all claims against all parties have been disposed of by the parties'
5	voluntary dismissal identified above, the court's orders or the jury's verdict, judgment is
6	appropriate under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54 and 58. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(a)–(b),
7	58(a)–(d).
8	Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to enter judgment in favor of
9	plaintiffs according to the March 21, 2017 jury verdict and to CLOSE THIS CASE.
10	Plaintiffs' motion to sever, ECF No. 508, is DENIED as moot.
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.
12	DATED: June 8, 2017.
13	In A malle
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2