

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
EUREKA DIVISION

BRIAN CHAVEZ, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA,  
Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-05277-RMI

**ORDER DENYING MOTION**

Re: Dkt. No. 144

Before the court is a Motion to Partake in the Pending Enforcement Hearing Before Magistrate Judge Cousins in this Consent Decree (dkt 144) filed *pro se* by Mr. Howard Hershops. In the Motion, Mr. Hershops references his currently pending action in this court, *Hershops v. State of California Superior Court et al*, 3:20-cv-07208-JD, and requests that, based on the discovery he has received in that action, he be allowed to file documentation (over 500 pages) of evidence of the County’s violations of the consent decree in this action. *See generally* Mot. (Dkt 144). Previously, Mr. Hershops filed a Motion to Intervene (dkt. 117) and a Motion for Civil Contempt (dkt. 116). In the Order denying those motions (dkt. 119), the court explained to Mr. Hershops that his “interests are adequately represented by” class counsel in this matter and denied his request to intervene in this case on a *pro se* basis. Nothing in this most recent filing alters that analysis and decision. If Mr. Hershops believes he has something of import regarding the enforcement of this consent decree, he should simply provide it to class counsel.

Accordingly, the Motion to Partake in the Pending Enforcement Hearing Before Magistrate Judge Cousins in this Consent Decree (dkt 144) is DENIED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: April 18, 2024

  
ROBERT M. ILLMAN  
United States Magistrate Judge