

O

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 09-03067 AHM (AGR_x) Date March 9, 2012

Title RICHARD LEE v. LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT et al.

Present: The Honorable A. HOWARD MATZ, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen Montes

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys **NOT** Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys **NOT** Present for Defendants:

Proceedings: IN CHAMBERS (No Proceedings Held)

Following numerous extensions and delays, the bench trial in this case is scheduled for April 3, 2012. The Court is not willing to continue this date. After the November 28, 2011, status conference, the Court scheduled a pre-trial conference for March 19, 2012. (Dkt. 129 at 1 n.2.) The Court ordered the parties “to comply with Local Rule 16 and file the necessary pre-trial briefs and memoranda.” (Dkt. 129 at 1 n.2.)

Local Rule 16 requires the parties to separately file (1) a Witness List, and (2) a Memorandum of Contentions of Fact and Law. In addition, the parties are required to file (1) a Joint Exhibit List and (2) a Joint Pre-Trial Conference Order. The Court’s Scheduling and Case Management Order of July 8, 2009, repeats these requirements. (Dkt. 12.)

Defendants have filed a Witness List, a Memorandum of Contentions of Fact and Law, and an Exhibit List. *Pro se* Plaintiff Richard Lee has not filed these documents. The parties have also not filed a Joint Pre-Trial Conference Order. Defendants state that this is because Plaintiff has not prepared a draft of this document as he is required to do pursuant to Local Rule 16–7. (Dkt. 138 at 2.) Similarly, the parties have not filed a Joint Exhibit List. Defendants state that this is because Plaintiff did not respond to Defendants’ request to provide the necessary information. (Dkt. 141 at 1.)

///

///

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	CV 09-03067 AHM (AGR _x)	Date	March 9, 2012
Title	RICHARD LEE v. LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT et al.		

The Court’s Scheduling and Case Management Order states that a plaintiff’s non-compliance with the pre-trial filing requirements will result in a dismissal for failure to prosecute. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff Richard Lee to show cause in writing, by no later than March 16, 2012, why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Initials of Preparer _____ : _____
SMO