

1 **JOSEPH C. HOWARD, JR. [SBN: 050784]**
 2 **TODD H. MASTER [SBN: 185881]**
 3 **HOWARD ROME MARTIN & RIDLEY LLP**
 4 1775 Woodside Road, Suite 200
 Redwood City, CA 94061
 Telephone: (650) 365-7715
 Facsimile: (650) 364-5297

5 Attorneys for Defendants
 6 CITY OF SAN CARLOS, OFFICERS ARMAND BONVICINO,
 7 DAVID BUELOW, and NICK NGUYEN

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 BRUCE HOPKINS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 OFFICER A. BONVICINO, et al.

15 Defendants.

Case No. C 05-2932 JSW

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
 ORDER TO STAY ALL PROCEEDINGS
 PENDING DEFENDANTS' PETITION FOR
 WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
 STATES SUPREME COURT**

**Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White:
 Courtroom: 11**

19
 20 In light of the fact that defendants ARMAND BONVICINO and DAVID BUELOW
 21 (collectively, "defendants") will be filing a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari with the United States
 22 Supreme Court in response to the Ninth Circuit's July 16, 2009 Opinion and the Ninth Circuit's
 23 September 14, 2009 Order denying their Petition for Rehearing, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by
 24 and between the parties hereto, through their respective attorneys of record, and respectfully
 25 requested that the District Court issue an order staying all proceedings before it until the United
 26

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER TO CONTINUE STATUS CONFERENCE; Case No. C 05-2932 JSW

HOWARD ROME MARTIN & RIDLEY LLP
 1775 WOODSIDE ROAD, SUITE 200
 REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA 94061
 TELEPHONE (650) 365-7715

1 States Supreme Court has ruled on defendants' petition. Defendants' petition must be filed with
2 the United States Supreme Court on or before December 11, 2009.

3 This appeal pertains to the District Court's denial of defendants' motion for summary
4 judgment on their claim of qualified immunity. See December 21, 2006 Order Granting in Part and
5 Denying in Part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Document No. 31]. On July 16,
6 2009, the Ninth Circuit issued its Opinion, affirming in part and reversing in part, the District
7 Court's December 21, 2006 Order. In so ruling, defendants contend that the Ninth Circuit
8 misinterpreted United States Supreme Court precedent (Welsh v. Wisconsin, 466 U.S. 740 (1984)),
9 effectively overturning a recent California Supreme Court decision (People v. Thompson, 38
10 Cal.4th 811 (2006)) that specifically addresses whether and when a California law enforcement
11 officer may make a warrantless entry into a residence to arrest an individual for DUI – the very
12 issue that is before the Court in the instant case. In light of the fact that the Ninth Circuit's Opinion
13 directly contradicts the California Supreme Court's Thompson decision and, as defendants
14 contend, also contradicts the United States Supreme Court decision in Welsh, defendants believe
15 that they have a compelling reason to seek review pursuant to United States Supreme Court Rule
16 10(a).

17 Defendants contend that they are entitled to qualified immunity. Qualified immunity is “an
18 entitlement not to stand trial or face the burdens of litigation.” Mitchell v. Forsyth, 472 U.S. 511,
19 526 (1095). It is “an immunity from suit rather than a mere defense to liability; and like absolute
20 immunity, it is effectively lost if a case is erroneously permitted to go to trial.” Id. As such, courts,
21 not juries, are to settle ultimate questions of qualified immunity. Johnson v. County of Los
22 Angeles, 340 F.3d 787, 791 (9th Cir. 2003).

23 Given the foregoing, the parties respectfully request that the District Court issue an order
24 staying all proceedings until defendants have exhausted their final appeal on the issue of qualified
25

1 immunity and the applicability of the Welsh and Thompson decisions. Without a stay, and if
2 permitted to go to trial before the United States Supreme Court responds to defendants' petition,
3 defendants would effectively lose any qualified immunity defense they may have.

4
5 HOWARD ROME MARTIN & RIDLEY LLP

6 Dated: October 28, 2009

7 By: /s/ Todd H. Master
8 Todd H. Master
9 Attorneys for Defendants

10 LAW OFFICE OF ANTHONY BOSKOVICH

11 Dated: October 28, 2009

12 By: /s/ Anthony Boskovich
13 Anthony Boskovich
14 Attorney for Plaintiff


15 **ORDER**

16 Pursuant to the above stipulation, and finding that there is good cause to permit defendants
17 the ability to exhaust their appellate rights on the issue of qualified immunity prior to trial, IT IS
18 HEREBY ORDERED that the trial of this matter is stayed until defendants' petition to the United
19 States Supreme Court is resolved. All parties will be required to attend a Case Management
20 Conference before this Court after the United States Supreme Court renders its decision.

21 The Status Conference set for December 4, 2009 is VACATED. The Court requests a
22 status report from the parties in 120 days if the petition has not been resolved.

23 It is FURTHER ORDERED that the parties shall continue to submit status reports every 120 days
24 thereafter until the petition is resolved and the stay may be lifted.

25 Date: October 28, 2009

26 By: 
Hon. Jeffrey S. White

HOWARD ROME MARTIN & RIDLEY LLP
1775 WOODSIDE ROAD, SUITE 200
REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA 94061
TELEPHONE (650) 365-7715