

EXHIBIT “A”

col

FILED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
JUN 14 2007
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY *[Signature]* DEPUTY

Priority
 Send
 Clsd
 Enter
AD JS-2/JS-3
JS-2/JS-3
 Scan Only

SCANNED

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AUGUSTA MILLENDER, BRENDA
MILLENDER, WILLIAM JOHNSON,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET
AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. CV 05-2298 DDP (RZx)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' EX
PARTE APPLICATION FOR STAY OF
TRIAL PENDING APPEAL**

[Application filed on 6/8/07]

ENTERED
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
JUN 14 2007
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY *[Signature]* DEPUTY

S

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants' ex parte application for an order staying the trial proceedings pending disposition of their appeal of this Court's March 19, 2007 Order denying in part their motion for summary judgment on the grounds of qualified immunity.

The Ninth Circuit has set forth rules governing whether a district court should stay trial proceedings pending an appeal of an order denying qualified immunity. If this Court finds that the Defendants' claim of qualified immunity is frivolous or has been waived, the Court may certify, in writing, that Defendants have forfeited their right to pretrial appeal, and may proceed with

IN
JENNIFER
SCANNED

1 trial. Chuman v. Wright, 960 F.2d 104, 105 (9th Cir. 1992).
2 the absence of such certification, however, the Court is
3 automatically divested of jurisdiction to proceed with trial
4 pending appeal. Id.

5 Defendants argue that their appeal is a nonfrivolous
6 disagreement this the Court's ruling on qualified immunity as to
7 the overbreadth of the warrant issue. The Court's partial denial
8 of qualified immunity turned on its finding that the warrant
9 affidavit was overbroad. Although the Court stands by its analysis
10 of the overbreadth issue, it recognizes that Defendants'
11 disagreement with the Court's finding is nonfrivolous. If the
12 Ninth Circuit disagrees with the Court's finding of overbreadth, it
13 would likely reverse the Court's denial of qualified immunity.

14 Plaintiffs' opposition does not address whether Defendants'
15 appeal is frivolous or has been waived. Instead, it argues that if
16 the Court grants Defendants' application because it agrees that
17 "there should only be one trial on all issues," the Court should
18 reconsider its denial of Plaintiffs' application for certification
19 of issues for interlocutory appeal. However, the standard the
20 Court must use to decide Defendants' application is significantly
21 more lenient than the standard used to decide motions for
22 certification of issues for interlocutory appeal - here, if the
23 Court finds the Defendants' appeal is not frivolous, it is actually
24 divested of jurisdiction to proceed with trial. Moreover, as the
25 Court noted in its order denying Plaintiffs' motion, the Court
26 cannot justify certifying a question for interlocutory appeal that
27 it would not otherwise certify simply because Defendants' have
28 appealed the Court's denial of qualified immunity. (See March 25,

1 2007 Order Denying Plaintiffs' Application for Order for
2 Certification of Order for Interlocutory Appeal at 13.)

3 Accordingly, because the Court does not find that Defendants'
4 appeal is frivolous or has been waived, the Court lacks
5 jurisdiction to proceed with the trial. Therefore, the Court
6 grants Defendants' ex parte application and hereby stays all trial
7 proceedings pending Defendants' appeal.

8

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10

11

12

Dated: 6-14-07



DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SCANNED