1 2	Eugene P. Ramirez, State Bar No. 134865 L. Trevor Grimm, State Bar No. 186801 MANNING & MARDER		
3	KASS, ELLROD, RAMIREZ LLP	KASS, ELLROD, RAMIREZ LLP	
4	801 South Figueroa Street		
5	Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone: (213) 624-6900 Facsimile: (213) 624-6999		
6	Email: epr@mmker.com		
	Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S		
7	II DEPARTMENT SHERIFF LEROY BACA SCOTT WALKER RICK RECTOR		
8	SCHLEGEL), DEPUTY BRICE STELLA (erroneously sued	DONALD NICHIPORUK, RICHARD SCHLEGEL, (erroneously sued as M. SCHLEGEL), DEPUTY BRICE STELLA (erroneously sued as D. STELLA), JACK DEMELLO, (erroneously sued as J. DERNELLO), DAVID O'SULLIVAN, JAMES RITENOUR, IAN STADE, ROBERT J. LAWRENCE and CURT	
9		RITENOUR, IAN STADE, ROBERT J. LAWRENCE and CURT MESSERSCHMIDT	
10			
11		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
13	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
14		( 2200 DDD (DZ)	
15	MILLENDER, WILLIAM JOHNSON,	5-2298 DDP (RZx)	
16	Plaintiffs, APPLICATIO	N FOR STAY OF	
17	vs. PETITION FO	EEDINGS PENDING OR CERTIORARI TO	
18	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS  OUNITED STATES SUPREME  COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF		
19	DEPARTMENT, LEROY BACA; et al.,	AUTHORITIES	
20	Defendants. (Declaration of Defendants.)	Julie Fleming and riled concurrently]	
21	21)		
22			
23	TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:		
24	Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY		
25	SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, SHERIFF LEROY BACA, SCOTT WALKER, RICK		
26	RECTOR, DONALD NICHIPORUK, RICHARD SCHLEGEL, DEPUTY BRICE		
27	STELLA JACK DEMELLO, DAVID O'SULLIVAN, JAMES RITENOUR, IAN		
28	STADE, ROBERT J. LAWRENCE and CURT MESSERSCHMIDT apply, ex parte, to		
	II		

the court, pursuant to Local Rule 7-19, for an order staying the trial proceedings pending 1 disposition of Defendants' Petition for Certiorari to the United States Supreme Court for 2 review of the Ninth Circuit's Opinion of August 24, 2010, affirming the district court's 3 denial of qualified immunity to Defendants with respect to the alleged overbreadth of 4 the search warrant. 5 This application is made on the ground that Defendants' Petition for Certiorari 6 will present legitimate issues of law for review, and a stay of the trial proceedings 7 pending disposition of the review to the United States Supreme Court will be judicially 8 efficient. 9 Ex parte relief is necessary because a status conference is scheduled for October 10 14, 2010, at which time Defendants wish to move the court for the stay in lieu of setting 11 a trial date. 12 This application is based upon this Ex Parte Application, the attached Declaration 13 of Julie Fleming, the Proposed Order and upon such further argument or evidence 14 deemed appropriate by the Court at the hearing on this matter. 15 Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, this ex parte application is made following the 16 conference of counsel on October 12, 2010. Notice of this ex parte was given on 17 October 12, 2010, to plaintiff's counsel, Don Cook. (Fleming Decl., ¶2.) 18 19 Dated: October 12, 2010 MANNING & MARDER 20 KASS, ELLROD, RAMIREZ LLP 21 By: /s/ Eugene P. Ramirez 22 Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF LOS ANGÉLES, LOS 24 ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, SHERIFF LEROY BACA, 25 SCOTT WALKÉR, RICK RECTOR, DONALD NICHIPORUK, RICHARD SCHLEGEL. DEPUTY BRICE STELLA. JACK DEMELLO, DAVID O'SULLIVAN JAMES RITENOUR, IAN STADE, ROBERT J. LAWRENCE and CURT 28

**MESSERSCHMIDT** 

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

## 1. STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 19, 2007, the Court entered its Order granting in part and denying in part Plaintiffs and Defendants' cross-motions for summary judgment. The Court denied qualified immunity on the challenged scope of the warrant.

On April 10, 2007, Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ROBERT J. LAWRENCE and CURT MESSERSCHMIDT timely filed a Notice of Appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals from the order denying, in part, their motion for summary judgment on grounds of qualified immunity as to the alleged overbreadth of the warrant.

On June 14, 2007, the Court granted Defendants' ex parte application for an order staying the trial proceedings pending disposition of their appeal of the Court's March 19, 2007, Order denying qualified immunity on the challenged scope of the warrant. The Court made a specific finding that Defendants' appeal was nonfrivolous.

On May 6, 2009, the Ninth Circuit vacated the district court's denial of qualified immunity, and remanded the case with instructions to grant Defendants qualified immunity on the challenged scope of the warrant.

On August 24, 2010, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's determination that Defendants were not entitled to qualified immunity with respect to the alleged overbreadth of the search warrant.

Defendants seek an Order staying further district court proceedings in this case, pending disposition of Defendants' Petition for Certiorari to the United States Supreme Court for review of the Ninth Circuit's Opinion of August 24, 2010, affirming the district court's denial of qualified immunity to Defendants with respect to the alleged overbreadth of the search warrant.

///

7 | ///

28 //

## 2. THE TRIAL SHOULD STAY THE ENTIRE PROCEEDINGS IN THE INTERESTS OF JUDICIAL ECONOMY.

Defendants will file a Petition for Certiorari to the United States Supreme Court for review of the Ninth Circuit's Opinion of August 24, 2010, affirming the district court's denial of qualified immunity to Defendants, within the 90-day statutory deadline. 28 U.S.C. §2101(c). Defendants' Petition for Certiorari is a nonfrivolous disagreement with the Court's legal ruling on qualified immunity as to the overbreadth of the warrant issue. The warrant affidavit stated that Messerschmidt believed the items sought would be in Bowen's possession and the recovery of the weapon could be invaluable in the successful prosecution of the suspect, and the curtailment of further crimes being committed. Valid warrants commonly allow police to search for "firearms and ammunition" as well as documents and effects which tend to show possession, occupancy, ownership and/or control over the residence to be searched. *See United States v. McLaughlin*, 851 F.2d 283, 286 (9th Cir. 1988) ("A search warrant may be used, not only to gather evidence of a criminal activity, but also to gather evidence of who controlled the premises suspected of connection with criminal acts.")

The Court has the power to stay the proceedings in the interests of judicial economy:

"A district court has inherent power to control the disposition of the causes on its docket in a manner which will promote economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants. The exertion of this power calls for the exercise of a sound discretion. Where it is proposed that a pending proceeding be stayed, the competing interests which will be affected by the granting or refusal to grant a stay must be weighed. Among these competing interests are the possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay, the hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required to go forward, and the orderly course of justice measured in terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and questions

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of law which could be expected to result from a stay." Filtrol Corp. v. Kelleher, 467

Here, if a stay is not granted, and parties proceed to trial on the remaining issues of whether the SWAT Defendants violated knock and notice requirements, and whether Defendants acted reasonably in the destruction of property, this may result in a second trial on the overbreadth issue if Defendants' Petition for Certiorari is denied. It would be a waste of both judicial resources, and those of the parties, not to wait until Defendants' Petition for Certiorari is decided. There should be one trial only, on all issues, and the determination of what issues remain for trial cannot be made until Defendants' Petition for Certiorari based on qualified immunity is decided.

The Court has already found that Defendants' appeal on the issue of qualified immunity on the breadth of the warrant was nonfrivolous. Defendants' Petition for Certiorari is based on the same nonfrivolous legal argument, i.e., that Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity in regards to the breadth of the warrant. The strong dissent in the Ninth Circuit's August 24, 2010, Opinion reveals that reasonable minds can differ, and Defendants believe the United States Supreme Court would be in agreement with the Dissent and with Defendants' entitlement to qualified immunity.

Accordingly, in the interests of judicial economy, and to avoid needless duplication of trial proceedings, Defendants respectfully request that the Court stay the trial proceedings pending disposition of Defendants' Petition for Certiorari based on the denial of qualified immunity on the overbreadth issue.

///

/// 22

/// 23

/// 24

/// 25

/// 26

/// 27

28

## **CONCLUSION. 3.** 1 Based on the foregoing, Defendants request an Order staying further district court 2 proceedings in this case, pending Defendants' Petition for Certiorari based on the denial 3 of qualified immunity on the overbreadth issue. 4 5 Dated: October 12, 2010 MANNING & MARDER 6 KASS, ELLROD, RAMIREZ LLP 7 By: /s/ Eugene P. Ramirez Eugene P. Ramirez 8 9 Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF LOS ANGÉLES, LOS 10 ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, SHERIFF LEROY BACA, SCOTT WALKER, RICK RECTOR, 11 DONALD NICHIPORUK, RICHARD 12 SCHLEGEL, DEPUTY BRICE STELLA, JACK DEMELLO, DAVID O'SULLIVAN, JAMES RITENOUR, IAN STADE, ROBERT 13 J. LAWRENCE and CURT 14 **MESSERSCHMIDT** 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

27

28