

2007 WL 2935840

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.
United States District Court,
E.D. California.

Ralph COLEMAN, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

Arnold SCHWARZENEGGER, et al., Defendants.

No. CIV S-90-0520 LKK JFM P. | Oct. 5, 2007.

Attorneys and Law Firms

Amy Whelan, Jane E. Kahn, Lori Ellen Rifkin, Michael Bien, Thomas Bengt Nolan, Rosen Bien & Galvan, LLP, Claudia B. Center, San Francisco, CA, Donald Specter, Prison Law Office, San Quentin, CA, for Plaintiffs.

Lisa Anne Tillman, Office of the Attorney General, Misha D. Igra, California Department of Justice, Sacramento, CA, Paul B. Mello, Hanson Bridgett Marcus Vlahos and Rudy, Rochelle C. East, Attorney General's Office, Martin H. Dodd, Futterman & Dupree LLP, San Francisco, CA, Michael R. Capizzi, Law Office of Michael R. Capizzi, Santa Ana, CA, for Defendants.

Opinion

ORDER

LAWRENCE K. KARLTON, Senior Judge.

*1 Plaintiffs are state prisoners proceeding through counsel with this class action lawsuit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

Footnotes

¹ On September 21, 2007, defendants filed a motion for an extension of time to file objections to the findings and recommendations. On September 28, 2007, defendants filed objections to the findings and recommendations. Good cause appearing, defendants' motion for extension of time will be granted and defendants' objections deemed timely filed.

On September 11, 2007, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. Defendants have filed objections to the findings and recommendations, and plaintiffs have filed a response to defendants' objections.¹

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants' September 21, 2007 motion for extension of time is granted;
2. Defendants' September 28, 2007 objections to the September 11, 2007 findings and recommendations are deemed timely filed;
3. The findings and recommendations filed September 11, 2007, are adopted in full;
4. Plaintiffs' July 25, 2007 motion to compel disputed fees and costs is granted in part and denied in part; and
5. Within thirty days from the date of this order the parties shall meet and confer concerning payment of attorneys' fees and costs incurred by plaintiffs in connection with their November 13, 2006 motion to convene a three-judge panel and their November 2, 2006 motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction but not in connection with their July 13, 2006 motion to compel discovery.