

1 JOHN L. BURRIS, Esq./ State Bar #69888
 2 BENJAMIN NISENBAUM, Esq./State Bar #222173
 3 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN L. BURRIS
 Airport Corporate Centre
 4 7677 Oakport Street, Suite 1120
 Oakland, California 94621
 Telephone: (510) 839-5200 Facsimile: (510) 839-3882

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 7
 8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 KATHLEEN ESPINOSA, individually and as
 10 personal representative of the Estate of decedent
 11 ASA SULLIVAN; A.S., by and through his
 Guardian ad Litem, NICOLE GUERRA;

Case No. C 06 04686 JSW

**NOTICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO VACATE PRE-TRIAL
 CONFERENCE AND TRIAL DATES AND
 (~~PROPOSED~~) ORDER**

12 Plaintiffs,

[STIPULATED]

13 vs.

14 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
 15 a municipal corporation; HEATHER FONG, in
 16 her capacity as Chief of Police for the CITY
 AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; JOHN
 17 KEESOR, individually, and in his capacity as a
 18 police officer for the CITY AND COUNTY OF
 SAN FRANCISCO; MICHELLE ALVIS,
 19 individually and in her capacity as a police
 officer for the CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
 20 FRANCISCO; PAUL MORGADO, individually
 and in his capacity as a police officer for the
 21 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;
 22 and, San Francisco police officers DOES 1-25,
 inclusive,

No hearing date pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11

Honorable Jeffrey S. White

23 Defendants.

24 /
25
NOTICE

26 NOTICE TO ALL COUNSEL OF RECORD IN THE PRESENT CASE:

27 This Motion for Administrative Relief is brought by Plaintiffs ESPINOSA, et al. and
 28 stipulated to by Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al, pursuant to Civil

1 Local Rules 7-11. No hearing date is scheduled, pursuant to Civ. L. R. 7-11.

2 Because the defendant police officers have filed an interlocutory appeal of the Court's August
3 5, 2008 order denying their claim of qualified immunity, the Court should vacate the Pre-Trial
4 Conference, Pre-trial schedule, and Trial date in this matter. This request and administrative motion
5 is based on the divestment of the Court's jurisdiction of this action upon the filing of appeal with the
6 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which imposes an automatic stay on the District Court action. *U.S. v.*
7 *Clairborne*, 727 F.2d 842, 850 (9th Cir. 1984); *Chumain v. Wright* 960 F.2d 104, 105 n. 1 (9th Cir.
8 1992)

9
10 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

11 On August 5, 2008, the Court issued its Order Re Parties' Cross-Motions for Summary
12 Judgment, which denied Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment and granted in part and denied in
13 part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment with
14 respect to qualified immunity was specifically denied by the Court. On August 15, 2008, Defendants
15 filed a notice of appeal of this Court's Order Re Parties' Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment with
16 the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal. (Exh. A.) Defendants' appeal includes notice of appellate review
17 of the Court's Order regarding qualified immunity. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Time
18 Schedule Order was then filed with this Court on August 25, 2008.

19 Currently, the Pre-Trial Conference date in this Court remains set for October 6, 2008, there
20 are several deadlines for pretrial submissions, and the trial in this Court is set for October 27, 2008.

21 A district court's denial of a summary judgment motion on the qualified immunity defense is
22 appealable under certain circumstances notwithstanding the absence of a final judgment.

23 *Cunningham v. City of Wenatchee*, 345 F.3d 802, 807-08 (9th Cir. 2003). The filing of an appeal of a
24 ruling denying qualified immunity imposes an automatic stay that divests the district court of
25 jurisdiction to proceed with trial. *Chumain v. Wright*, 960 F.2d 104, 105 (9th Cir. 1992). The thirty
26 day time for filing a notice of appeal begins to run upon the entry of the order denying the qualified
27 immunity defense. *Fairly v. Fermaint*, 482 F.3d 897, 901 (7th Cir. 2007). Defendants filed a timely
28 notice of appeal.

1 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should vacate all pending dates in this action, and await
2 the outcome of Defendants' appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Defendants stipulate to the
3 requested relief.

4
5 Respectfully submitted,

6 Dated: September 12, 2008

The Law Offices of John L. Burris

7
8 /s/ 
9 Ben Nisenbaum
Attorney for Plaintiffs

10 STIPULATED:

11 Dated: September 15, 2008

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
JOANNE HOEPER
Chief Trial Attorney
BLAKE P. LOEBS
Deputy City Attorney
PETER J. KEITH
Deputy City Attorney

17 By: /s/ _____
18 PETER J. KEITH
Attorneys for Defendants
19 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
20 et al.

21 **(proposed) ORDER**

22 Defendant officers' filing of an interlocutory appeal of the Court's August 5, 2008 Order
23 denying their claim of qualified immunity imposes an automatic stay. Accordingly, the Court hereby
24 vacates all pending dates in the above-noted action, including the pre-trial deadlines, the Pre-Trial
25 Conference in this matter set for October 6, 2008, and the Trial Date of October 27, 2008.

26 Dated: September 17, 2008

27 
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
Honorable Jeffrey S. White