

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

\_\_\_\_\_  
NIKITA PETTIES, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al.,  
Defendants.  
\_\_\_\_\_

Civil Action No. 95-0148 (PLF)

**FILED**

MAR 13 2002

NANCY MAYER WHITTINGTON, CLERK  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

ORDER

Plaintiffs have filed a consent motion to hold in abeyance plaintiffs' motion for specific relief pursuant to the July 10, 2001 consent order. Plaintiffs represent that the reasons for filing the motion for specific relief may be resolved through the cooperation of the parties making it unnecessary for the Court to decide the motion. Rather than hold the motion in abeyance, however, the Court will deny the motion without prejudice to its renewal. Although plaintiffs do not request that the August 31, 2001 motion for an order for defendants to show cause why they should not be held in contempt be held in abeyance, they do acknowledge that it may be appropriate to do so. In light of the representations in the consent motion, the Court will deny the motion for a show cause order without prejudice to its renewal. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that plaintiffs' consent motion to hold in abeyance plaintiffs' motion for specific relief pursuant to the July 10, 2001 consent order [887-1] is DENIED; it is

(N)

889

FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion for specific relief pursuant to the July 10, 2001 consent order [826-1] is DENIED without prejudice to its renewal; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion for an order for defendants to show cause why they should not be held in contempt [836-1] is DENIED without prejudice to its renewal.

SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: 3/13/02

Copies to:

Elise T. Baach, Esq.  
Beth Goodman, Esq.  
Bradford P. Johnson, Esq.  
Kelly Bagby, Esq.  
Jesse D. Stein, Esq.  
Robert Utiger, Esq.  
Daniel A. Rezneck, Esq.  
Jonathan F. Potter, Esq.  
Veleter Mazyck, Esq.  
Cathye Hopkins, Esq.