

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

S.V.,

v.

Plaintiff,

**RULE 16 TELEPHONE
SCHEDULING CONFERENCE**

KENNETH KRATZ,

Case No. 10-C-919

Defendant,

and

STATE OF WISCONSIN,

Proposed
Intervenor.

HONORABLE WILLIAM C. GRIESBACH, presiding
Deputy Clerk: Cheryl
Proceeding Held: March 9, 2011

Tape: _____
Hearing Began: 9:05 a.m.
Hearing Ended: 9:35 a.m.

Appearances:

Plaintiff(s): Michael R. Fox

Defendant(s): Robert E. Bellin, Jr.

**Proposed
Intervenor:** Monica Brist

Scheduling:

Initial Disclosures: **May 1, 2011**

The parties address the State of Wisconsin's motions to intervene and bifurcate.
The plaintiff opposes the motion.
The Court **GRANTS** the motion to intervene and defers ruling on the motion to bifurcate.
(See final ruling in these minutes)

The parties and Court discuss the sufficiency of the equal protection claim.
Attorney Fox states there is sufficient case law to support the claim.
Attorney Bellin does not believe there is a claim and suggests further discussion to resolve the matter.
Attorney Brist suggests briefing on the matter and that it is premature to discuss resolution at this point.

The Court inquires as to subject matter/supplemental jurisdiction over the State of Wisconsin/Kratz matter and how to most efficiently move this case forward.

Parties suggest briefing on motion to intervene.

The Court VACATES the order granting the motion to intervene and sets briefing schedule on the motion.

Any **response** to the motion to intervene is due on or before **March 21, 2011**.

Any **motion to dismiss** is due on or before **April 11, 2011**.

The State may withdraw their motion to intervene without prejudice, but shall notify the parties of their intention.