

**RICHARD M. GILMAN, et al., Plaintiffs,**  
**v.**  
**EDMUND J. BROWN, et al., Defendants.**

[No. CIV. S-05-830 LKK/GGH.](#)

**United States District Court, E.D. California.**

September 2, 2011.

## **ORDER**

LAWRENCE K. KARLTON, Senior District Judge.

On August 17, 2011, the court denied Darrel King and Timothy Leang Jones' motion for permissive joinder. (Doc. No. 361). On August 29, 2011, Mr. King and Mr. Jones filed a motion for reconsideration. (Doc. No. 364). In essence, they are arguing that this court should make them class representatives. If, as they contend, Mr. King and Mr. Jones are class members and, thus, they do not need to notify the court — Mr. King's and Mr. Jones's interests are already represented in this action as class members. No action is required of the court to allow Mr. King and Mr. Jones to obtain relief, if any, through this class action.

Mr. King and Mr. Jones are free to contact class counsel with any concerns about the case. The court has certified the class action and class counsel, thus, represent all members of the class. Class counsel are available at the following addresses:

Daniel J. Broderick  
Monica Knox  
David M. Porter  
Office of the Federal Defender  
801 I Street  
3rd Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Carter Capps  
White King Hall  
Civil Rights Clinic  
UC Davis  
School of Law  
One Shields Avenue, Bldg. TB 30  
Davis, CA 95616

The court reiterates that Mr. King and Mr. Jones need not take any action to be considered class members. All individuals who fall within the class definition are class members. Absent any suggestion by Mr. King and Mr. Jones that class counsel are not adequately representing their interests, the court will not take any further action on their concerns.

Further, the court denies Mr. King and Mr. Jones' request for an interlocutory appeal. Again, the court reiterates that Mr. King and Mr. Jones need not take any action in order to benefit from relief, if any, from the class action if they are indeed class members.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. King and Mr. Jones's motion for reconsideration and request for an interlocutory appeal (Doc. No. 364) is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is instructed to serve this order upon Mr. King and Mr. Jones at the addresses listed on the motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

