```
1
3
5
6
                      IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8
    JAMES J. PIERCE, an individual;
9
    DAWN M. PIERCE, an individual,
                                              2:11-cv-02280-GEB-EFB
10
                   Plaintiffs,
                                             ORDER
11
              v.
12
    COUNTY OF SIERRA, CALIFORNIA, a
    political subdivision of the
13
    State of California; OFFICE OF
    SHERIFF OF THE COUNTY OF SIERRA;
14
    JACOB ALLEN MURRAY, an
    individual,
15
                   Defendants.
16
17
              The parties state as follows in the Joint Status Report
18
   Regarding Briefing Schedule filed July 19, 2012 ("JSR"):
19
              [T]he parties . . . have met and conferred regarding a briefing schedule in which to motion
20
              this court for an order determining this court's
21
              subject matter jurisdiction. The parties have
              agreed as follows:
22
              Hearing Date for Motion:
                                              September 10, 2012
23
              Plaintiffs' Opening Brief: August 10, 2012
24
              Defendants' Opposition Brief: August 24, 2012
25
              Plaintiffs' Reply Brief:
                                              August 31, 2012
26
    (ECF No. 18, 1:22-2:1.)
27
28
```

The parties also state in JSR:

Defendants have raised concerns regarding the disclosure of Defendant Murray's addresses, past and present, given the protections afforded information relating to law enforcement personnel under California Penal Code § 832.7. Since Defendant Murray's residence on the date the action was filed is relevant to the issue of diversity jurisdiction, and without waiving any arguments against the asserted protections, counsel for plaintiffs is willing to stipulate that the motion briefs and any exhibits referenced above be filed under seal.

<u>Id.</u> at 2:2-7.

The parties' proposed briefing schedule is adopted. However, the parties' stipulation concerning filing motion briefs under seal is not approved since it appears over-broad, and has not been shown to be authorized under applicable sealing law.

Dated: July 25, 2012

GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.

Senior United States District Judge