

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RALPH COLEMAN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,
Defendants.

No. CIV. S-90-520 LKK/DAD (PC)

ORDER

On January 21, 2013, the parties filed post-hearing briefs on plaintiffs' motion concerning housing and treatment of mentally ill inmates in segregation. (ECF Nos. 4985, 4988.) On February 5, 2014, plaintiffs filed a response to defendants' post-hearing brief. (ECF No. 5051.) On February 10, 2014, defendants filed objections and a request to strike that brief. (ECF No. 5062). On the same day, plaintiffs filed an opposition to defendants' motion (ECF No. 5063), and the next day defendants filed a reply (ECF No. 5064).


The dispute between the parties arises from a discrepancy between the court's oral ruling concerning closing briefs at the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing on December 19, 2013 and

1 the minutes issued the same day. Compare Reporter's Transcript
2 (RT) (ECF No. 5020) at 3751:22-3752:6 with ECF No. 4972. Good
3 cause appearing, plaintiffs' response will be considered and
4 defendants will be granted fifteen days to file a response to
5 plaintiffs' closing brief.¹

6 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. Defendants' February 10, 2014 request to strike
8 plaintiffs' reply brief (ECF No. 5062) is denied; and
9 2. Defendants are granted fifteen days from the date of
10 this order in which to file and serve a response to
11 plaintiffs' closing brief on plaintiffs' motion
12 concerning housing and treatment of mentally ill inmates
13 in segregation. Thereafter the matter will stand
14 submitted.

15 DATED: February 19, 2014.

16
17
18 
19 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
20 SENIOR JUDGE
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ The court must note that this dispute, which generated three additional
27 filings by the parties plus an order by the court, could easily have been
28 resolved by a joint request for clarification accompanied by a stipulation of
the parties agreeing to a solution and a proposed order thereon. Going
forward, the court expects the parties to work together wherever possible to
decrease, rather than expand, their areas of disagreement.