

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HALEMA BUZAYAN, an individual,
by and through JAMAL MOHAMED
BUZAYAN, as Guardian Ad Litem
for a Minor,

No. 2:06-cv-01576-MCE-DAD

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

CITY OF DAVIS POLICE DEPARTMENT,
JAMES HYDE, individually and in
his capacity as Chief of Police
of the City of Davis Police
Department, STEVEN PIERCE,
individually and in his official
capacity with the City of Davis
Police Department, PHENG LY,
individually and in his capacity
as an officer of the City of Davis
Police Department, BEN HARTZ,
individually and in his capacity
as an officer of the City of Davis
Police Department, GINA ANDERSON,
individually and as Sergeant of
the City of Davis Police Department,

Defendants.

-----oo0oo-----

By Memorandum and Order dated June 25, 2007, this Court
granted the anti-SLAPP Special Motion to Strike brought by
Defendants Davis Enterprise, Debbie Davis, and Lauren Keene

1 ("Defendants") pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure
2 Section 425.16. Presently before the Court is Defendants'
3 July 12, 2007 Motion for Attorney's Fees as a prevailing party,
4 in the wake of their dismissal from this litigation, pursuant to
5 both Section 425.16 and Local Rule 54-293.

6 The Court may defer its ruling on attorney's fees when an
7 appeal on the merits is pending. See 1993 Advisory Committee
8 notes to FRCP 54(d) ("if an appeal on the merits of the case is
9 taken, the [district] court may rule on the claim for fees, may
10 defer its ruling on the motion, or may deny the motion without
11 prejudice, directing under subdivision (d)(2)(B) a new period for
12 filing after the appeal has been resolved."); Dumas v. New United
13 Motor Mfg., 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49098 (D. Cal. 2007).

14 Subsequent to the filing of Defendants' request for
15 attorney's fees, Plaintiff filed an Interlocutory Appeal with the
16 Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on July 18, 2007. Given the
17 pendency of that appeal, Defendants' Motion for Attorney's Fees
18 is DENIED at this juncture, without prejudice to being renewed
19 following disposition of this matter upon appeal.¹

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: September 18, 2007

22
23 

24 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26

27 ¹ Because oral argument will not be of material assistance,
28 the Court ordered this matter submitted on the briefing. E.D.
Cal. Local Rule 78-230(h).