

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA
CENTRAL DIVISION


IN THE MATTER OF AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF STATE, et al.,	*	
	*	
Plaintiffs,	*	4:03-cv-90074 (lead),
	*	4:02-cv-90447, 4:03-cv-90101
v.	*	
	*	
PRISON FELLOWSHIP MINISTRIES, et al.	*	
	*	ORDER NUNC PRO TUNC
Defendants.	*	
	*	

On page twenty nine of this Court’s Order filed on April 29, 2005 (Clerk’s No. 212), the first sentence of the final paragraph reads: “In the interest of economy at trial, the Court strongly suggests that the parties file a joint statement of stipulated facts.” The Court then referred the parties to *Freedom from Religion v. McCallum*, 214 F. Supp. 2d 905, 908-913 (W.D. Wisc. 2002), which included an example for the parties to follow. In its original Order (Clerk’s No. 212) the Court did not intend to merely suggest, however strongly, that the parties agree to a set of facts surrounding the Iowa Department of Corrections funding of the InnerChange program, but, rather, intended to order the parties to do so. This intent is in keeping with the admonition to construe and administer the rules of civil procedure so as “to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

Accordingly, the first sentence of the final paragraph of the Order (Clerk’s No. 212) should read: “In the interest of economy at trial, the Court orders the parties to file a joint statement of stipulated facts surrounding the Iowa Department of Corrections funding of the InnerChange program.”

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this ___30th___ day of August, 2005.



ROBERT W. PRATT
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE