

1 Thomas W. Wolfrum, Esq.
2 California State Bar No. 54837
3 1333 North California Blvd., Suite 150
4 Walnut Creek, California 94596
5 Tel: (925) 930-5645
6 Fax: (925) 930-6208

7 Attorney for Applicant Intervenors

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

10
11 **CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK**

12 **TRIBE,**

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15
16 **CALIFORNIA GAMBLING CONTROL**
17 **COMMISSION, *et al.*,**

18 Defendants.

19
20 **CALIFORNIA VALLEY MIWOK**
21 **TRIBE, CALIFORNIA (a.k.a. SHEEP**
22 **RANCH RANCHERIA OF ME-WUK**
23 **INDIANS, CALIFORNIA), YAKIMA K.**
24 **DIXIE, VELMA WHITEBEAR,**
ANTONIA LOPEZ, ANTONE
AZEVEDO, MICHAEL MENDIBLES
AND EVELYN WILSON

25 Applicant Intervenors.

No: 37-2008-00075326-CU-CO-CTL

[PROPOSED ORDER]

Law and Motion

Hearing Date: December 17, 2010

Hearing Time: 8:30 a.m.

Hearing Place: Department C-62

Trial Date: May 13, 2011

Trial Dept: C-62

Trial Judge: The Hon. Ronald L. Styn

First Amended Complaint Filed: 8/20/08

Code of Civil Procedure §387

26 This matter came on regularly before the Court for hearing on December 17, 2010.

27 Manuel Corrales, Jr. appeared for Plaintiff, California Valley Miwok Tribe, Sylvia Cates appeared

1 for Defendant, The California Gambling Control Commission, and Thomas W. Wolfrum appeared
2 for the Intervenor.

3 The Court, having reviewed the moving and opposing papers on Motion to Intervene,
4 Intervenor's Memorandum of Points and Authorities supporting intervention, and the Complaint
5 in Intervention and hearing oral argument of counsel:

6 The Court finds, adjudges and orders as follows:
7

- 8 1. That Intervenor's motion is GRANTED;
- 9 2. That Intervenor has an interest in the matter in litigation, are so situated that any
10 judgment rendered in their absence may as a practical matter impair or impede their
11 ability to protect that interest and their interest is not adequately represented by the
12 current parties; and
- 13 3. That Intervenor has a direct and immediate interest in the matter in litigation, the
14 intervention will not enlarge the issues raised by the original parties and the reasons
15 for intervention outweigh any opposition by the existing parties.
16

17 4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED as follows:
18

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.
20

21 Date:
22

23 _____
24 The Hon. Ronald L. Styn
25
26
27
28