

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION - FLINT

FILED
AUG 18 3 11 PM '02
CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EAST. DIST. MICH.

RODERICK WALKER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v

NO: 81-40336

PERRY JOHNSON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

The parties are hereby advised as to the following
rulings in the captioned case.

A. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration

Having analyzed plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration, and having applied the appropriate standard as stated in Eastern District Local Rule 17(k)(3), the Court hereby denies objections 3 through 8 of the said motion for reconsideration. The Court finds, however, that objections 1 and 2 appear to be well taken. Therefore, defendants are hereby ordered to show cause within ten (10) days from the date of this order as to why the proposed additional language set out in plaintiffs' objections 1 and 2 should not be added as an amendment to the procedural due process portion of the Court's June 21, 1982 order.

B. Motion for Stay

Having considered defendants' motion for a stay pending appeal of the Court's June 21, 1982 order, the Court hereby denies the said motion to the extent that it pertains to the procedural due process aspect of the June 21, 1982 order.

m
97

Following the resolution of objections 1 and 2 of the motion for reconsideration, the Court will order defendants to comply with the appropriate procedural due process measures within a reasonable time period.


Having considered defendants' motion for a stay as it pertains to the non-procedural due process aspects of the Court's June 21, 1982 order, the Court hereby grants the said motion. Therefore, defendants' obligation to implement the non-procedural due process measures of the June 21, 1982 order is hereby stayed pending a ruling by the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.


C. Plaintiffs' Contempt Motion

Plaintiffs' motion seeking a contempt order is denied for the reason that the said motion is moot in light of the above rulings. It is noted, however, that plaintiffs retain the option to refile a contempt motion in the event that defendants do not comply with later orders of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

 8/18/82



STEWART A. NEWBLATT
United States District Judge

Colette J. Lehoux, Secretary to
Stewart A. Newblatt
United States District Judge