

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 11-5115

September Term 2011

1:02-cv-02364-RMC

Filed On: July 20, 2012

Dianna Johnson,

Appellee

Rubbiya Muhammed,

Appellant

Carolyn Montgomery,

Appellee

Dianne Wilkes, et al.,

Appellants

Donna Curtis, on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Appellee

Sandra Clyburn, also known as Sandra
Clayborne,

Appellant

Sheryl Rutledge,

Appellee

Anita Johnson Hairston,
Appellant

v.

Government of the District of Columbia and
Todd Dillard, Individually and Officially, United
States Marshal, D.C. Superior Court,

Appellees

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 11-5115

September Term 2011

BEFORE: Rogers, Tatel, and Garland, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion for summary affirmance and the response thereto, appellants' motion regarding future proceedings and the federal appellee's response thereto, and the federal appellee's motion to govern further proceedings and appellants' opposition thereto, it is

ORDERED that this case be returned to the court's active docket. The court has determined that additional briefing of the motion for summary affirmance will not aid its disposition. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for summary affirmance be denied. The merits of the parties' positions are not so clear as to warrant summary action. See Taxpayers Watchdog, Inc. v. Stanley, 819 F.2d 294, 297 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam).

Because the court has determined that summary disposition is not in order, the Clerk is instructed to enter a briefing schedule and to calendar this case for presentation to a merits panel.

Per Curiam