

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TULARE LOCAL HEALTH CARE	)	Case No. 3:15-CV-02711-SC
DISTRICT, a California local	)	
health care district, dba TULARE	)	ORDER REQUIRING SUPPLEMENTAL
REGIONAL MEDICAL CENTER, et al.,	)	<u>BRIEFING</u>
	)	
Petitioners,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	)	
CARE SERVICES, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

---

Now before the Court is Petitioners Tulare Local Health Care District, et al.'s ("Petitioners") motion for remand. ECF No. 4 ("Mot."). In their opposition brief, Respondents California Department of Health Care Services, et al.'s ("Respondents") assert that "where an action in mandamus seeks to enforce federal law, federal courts routinely retain jurisdiction." ECF No. 14 ("Opp'n") at 8. Respondents' brief, however, fails to provide any examples of a federal court retaining jurisdiction over an action in mandamus that did not involve the court's supplemental

///  
///

1 jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> Because Petitioners' motion turns, in large part,  
2 on the veracity of Respondents' assertion, the Court hereby ORDERS  
3 Respondents to submit a supplemental brief of no more than three  
4 (3) pages within seven (7) days of the date of this order. The  
5 supplemental brief should provide support for Respondents'  
6 assertion and address no other issues. Petitioners may file a  
7 response of no more than three (3) pages within seven (7) days of  
8 the filing of Respondents' supplemental brief. Petitioners'  
9 response should address Respondents' supplemental brief and no  
10 other issues.

11

12

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14

15 Dated: August 18, 2015

16



UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 <sup>1</sup> The cases cited by Respondents are inapposite. See City of Chi,  
26 522 U.S. 156, 160 (1997) (involving claims brought under the  
27 Illinois' Administrative Review Law); Vieux v. E. Bay Reg'l Park  
28 Dist., 906 F.2d 1330, 1338 (9th Cir. 1990) (involving federal  
claims and reviewing the petition for writ of mandate under the  
court's supplemental jurisdiction); Yang v. Cal. Dept. of Social  
Servs., 183 F.3d 953, 955 (1999) (involving federal claims).