

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney
THOMAS H. PETERS, Chief Assistant City Attorney
ERIC BROWN, Deputy City Attorney (State Bar No. 170410)
Email: Eric.Brown@lacity.org
200 North Main Street, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: 213.978.7508
Facsimile: 213.978.7011

**Attorneys for Defendant CITY OF LOS ANGELES, LT. ANDREW MATHIS,
SGT. HAMER and SGT. RICHTER**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARL MITCHELL, MICHEAL
ESCOBEDO, SALVADOR ROQUE,
JUDY COLEMAN, as individuals; LOS
ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER,
CANGRESS, as organizations,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal
entity; LT. ANDREW MATHIS, SGT.
HAMER and SGT. RICHTER, in their
individual and official capacities,

DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO. CV16-01750 SJO (JPRx)
*[Assigned to the Honorable S. James
Otero, Courtroom 1]*

**SECOND STIPULATION TO
CONTINUE HEARING DATE OF
THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES’
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF
ORDER**

[Submitted with proposed order]

Date: July 25, 2016

Time: 10 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 1

STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME

It is hereby stipulated between Plaintiffs and the City of Los Angeles, Lt.
Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter (collectively “the City”) as follows:

1 1. The City has filed a Motion for Clarification of the Court’s order of
2 April 13, 2016 issuing a preliminary injunction. The motion is set for July 25, 2016.

3 2. The City and Plaintiffs had a mediated session on the City’s concerns
4 underlying the motion on May 9, 2016, before the Honorable Carla Woehrle.
5 Progress was made at that session, and the parties agreed that an additional session
6 might prove fruitful.

7 3. The parties have scheduled an additional mediation session before Judge
8 Woehrle to take place on July 7, 2016.

9 4. Plaintiffs’ opposition to the motion is currently due July 5, 2016.

10 5. In order to avoid the necessity of Plaintiffs opposing the motion when a
11 mediation on the same subject matter is pending, the parties request that the motion
12 hearing date be continued.

13 6. In light of the schedules of the various counsel in this action, the most
14 convenient date to which to continue the motion would be August 15, 2016.

15 7. The Plaintiffs and the City hereby stipulate, subject to Court approval, to
16 continue the hearing date of the motion for clarification to August 15, 2016, in order
17 to give the parties an opportunity to reach consensus on the issues underlying the
18 motion.

19 It is so stipulated.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

