| 1        |  | **E-Filed 1/15/10**                                  |
|----------|--|--|
| 2        |  |  |
| 3        |  |  |
| 4        |  |  |
| 5        | UNITED STATES DIST   | DICT COUDT   |
| 6        | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 7        | SAN JOSE DIVISION  |  |
| 8        |  |  |
| 9        |  |  |
| 10       |  | Case No. C-07-02681-JF-PVT<br>Case No. C-07-05706-JF |
| 11       | WILTON MIWOK RANCHERIA, a formerly federally recognized Indian Tribe, ITS MEMBERS and DOROTHY ANDREWS, | ORDER <sup>1</sup> REQUESTING FURTHER<br>BRIEFING    |
| 12<br>13 | Plaintiffs,<br>v.  |  |
| 14       | KENNETH L. SALAZAR, et al.,  |  |
| 15       | Defendants.  |  |
| 16       | ME-WUK INDIAN COMMUNITY OF THE WILTON RANCHERIA,   |  |
| 17       | Plaintiffs,  |  |
| 18       | V.   |  |
| 19       | KENNETH L. SALAZAR, et al.,  |  |
| 20       | Defendants.  | ]  |
| 21<br>22 | On July 16, 2009, pursuant to a stipulation between the parties after more than two years              |  |

of litigation and many months of settlement negotiations, the Court entered judgment in the above-entitled actions. On August 4, 2009, the County of Sacramento, California and the City of Elk Grove, California (collectively "Proposed Intervenors") moved to intervene, to re-open and vacate the judgment, and to dismiss the actions for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

28

23

24

25

26

27

<sup>1</sup> This disposition is not designated for publication in the official reports.

Case No. C-07-02681-JF-PVT Case No. C-07-05706-JF ORDER REQUESTING FURTHER BRIEFING (JFLC3)

In an order dated December 9, 2009, the Court indicated it was not inclined to dismiss the
actions for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and requested supplemental briefing by the parties
and Proposed Intervenors as to the relevance of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Carcieri v. Salazar*, 129 S.Ct. 1058 (2009). All parties have submitted the requested briefing.

In their supplemental briefing, the Proposed Intervenors requested that the Court certify the jurisdictional issue under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) for interlocutory appeal to the Ninth Circuit and stay implementation of the judgments pending resolution of the appeal. To aid its consideration of these requests, the Court requests responses from the other parties to Proposed Intervenors' arguments with respect to the appropriateness of an interlocutory appeal. Such briefing shall be filed on or before January 22, 2010.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 15, 2010

United States D strict Judge