

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRENCE LAMAR WILBURN,
Plaintiff,
v.
GARREN BRATCHER, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0699 TLN GGH PS

ORDER

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se in this action, referred to the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21).

Presently calendared for hearing on June 4, 2015 are motions to dismiss filed by defendants City of Sacramento (erroneously sued as Sacramento Police Department), Somers, Jr., Chargin, Yepes, Sood, Daniels, Ratcliffe, and Patton, (ECF No. 5), and by defendants County of Sacramento, Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department, Jones, Sacramento County District Attorney’s Office, Sacramento County Public Defender’s Office, West, Huang, Yee, and Hester. (ECF No. 10.) Plaintiff has filed an opposition. (ECF No. 18.) Having reviewed the record, the court has determined that oral argument would not be of material assistance in determining the pending motion. Accordingly, the court will not entertain oral argument, and will determine the motions on the record, including the briefing in support of and in opposition to the pending motions. See E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(g).

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

Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The June 4, 2015 hearing on the motion to dismiss filed by defendants City of Sacramento (erroneously sued as Sacramento Police Department), Somers, Jr., Chargin, Yepes, Sood, Daniels, Ratcliffe, and Patton, (ECF No. 5), and the motion to dismiss by defendants County of Sacramento, Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department, Jones, Sacramento County District Attorney’s Office, Sacramento County Public Defender’s Office, West, Huang, Yee, and Hester, (ECF No. 10), is vacated; and
2. The motions are submitted on the record.

Dated: May 26, 2015

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

GGH:076/Wilburn0699.vac