

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIE LEE CARPENTER, Plaintiff, v. W. J. SULLIVAN, et al., Defendants.	CASE NO.: 1:07-cv-00114-AWI-GBC (PC) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR COURT-ORDERED SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE (Doc. 143)
---	--

Plaintiff Willie Lee Carpenter, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on January 22, 2007. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's first amended complaint (Doc. 17), filed on September 17, 2008, against Defendants A. Pfeil, J. Gonzalez, J. Barajas, Ortiz, A. Salazar, J. Martinez, Litton. (Docs. 21, 34, 44, 60, 65, 66).¹ On September 12, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for the Court to order a new settlement conference between Plaintiff and Defendants. (Doc. 143).

While federal courts have the authority to require the parties to engage in settlement conferences, they have no authority to coerce settlements. *Goss Graphic Systems, Inc. v. DEV Industries, Inc.*, 267 F.3d 624, 627 (7th Cir.2001). Defendants have not indicated to the Court that they are willing to participate in a new settlement conference. Moreover, given that Defendants have submitted a motion for summary judgment, it is unlikely that Defendants would be willing to engage in renewed settlement discussions until after the summary judgment motion is resolved. At this

¹ Defendants Sullivan, Evans and Carrasco were dismissed March 28, 2011. (Doc. 110).

1 stage of the litigation, no settlement conference will be scheduled until both parties agree to
2 participate in one.

3 Based on the foregoing, the court HEREBY ORDERS that Plaintiff's motion for a new
4 settlement conference, filed on September 12, 2011, is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE (Doc.
5 143.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: November 3, 2011


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28