IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

DAVID RUIZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

Civil Action No. H-78-987

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Intervenor,

vs.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
ENTERED

SEP 2 5 1996

Michael N. Milby, Clerk

ORDER

The Court has reviewed defendants' Supplemental Motion to Vacate Final Judgment, filed September 6, 1996, under the Prison Litigation Reform Act ("PLRA"), and plaintiffs' response thereto. The Court also takes note of defendants' Motion to Vacate Final Judgment filed March 25, 1996, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), and the parties' Report to the Court filed August 8, 1996, contemplating the development of a factual record and an evidentiary hearing.

It is impossible for the Court to resolve defendants' motions within the 30-day period specified in 18 U.S.C. sec. 3626(e)(2)(A)(i), or the 180-day period in subsection (A)(ii). The Court believes that the status quo should be preserved pending the resolution of defendants' motions, and finds that the PLRA "automatic stay" provisions violate the Separation of Powers and due process of law,

51555,1



substantially for the reasons discussed in <u>Hadix v. Johnson</u>, No. 80-CV-73581, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9864 (E.D Mich. July 5, 1996), and <u>Gavin v. Rav</u>, No. 4-78-CV-70062 (S.D. Iowa, Sept. 18, 1996).

Accordingly, the Court will proceed to give due consideration to both of defendants' motions when the parties are ready for a hearing on them. In the meantime, the Final Judgment remains in full force and effect.

Dated September 23, 1996 aprillo

INITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE