28

2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION 5 DAVID BURKE, et al., Case No: C 06-4533 SBA 7 Plaintiffs, ORDER DENYING PENDING MOTIONS AS MOOT 8 vs. COUNTY OF ALAMEDA, et al., 10 Defendants. 11 **12** On January 10, 2008, the Court granted Defendants' motion for summary judgment, in part, 13 and denied Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, and entered judgment for Defendants 14 accordingly. Defendants filed a Motion for Attorneys' Fees and a Bill of Costs, which Plaintiffs 15 moved to stay pending the Ninth Circuit's consideration of the appeal. The Ninth Circuit has since 16 issued its mandate which reverses the Court's ruling in part and vacates the judgment. **17** Accordingly, 18 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Defendants' Motion for Attorneys' Fees (Docket 124) 19 and Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay (Docket 128) are DENIED AS MOOT. This Order terminates 20 Docket Nos. 124 and 128. 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 23 Dated: March 15, 2010 24 United States District Judge 25 26 27