

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT THOMAS,	1:10cv02173 AWI DLB PC
Plaintiff, v. J. RAZO, et al.,	ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO NOTIFY THE COURT WHETHER A SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE BEFORE A UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE WOULD BE BENEFICIAL
Defendants.	ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO SERVE PLAINTIFF AT SATF FIFTEEN DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Robert Thomas ("Plaintiff") is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on an Eighth Amendment excessive force claim against Defendants Razo, Moreno, Brown, Vera, Vasquez and Holguin.

Trial is currently set for February 25, 2014.

On October 21, 2013, the Court ordered the parties to notify the Court whether a Court settlement conference would be beneficial in resolving this action.

On November 5, 2013, Defendants indicated that they would participate in good faith in a settlement conference.

Plaintiff has not responded.

Therefore, Plaintiff is ORDERED, within fifteen days of the date of service of this order, to notify the Court whether he believes a settlement conference would be beneficial. If he agrees, the Court will issue a further scheduling order setting this matter for settlement conference before a Magistrate Judge or District Judge from the United States District Court, Eastern District of California.

1	In the interests of avoiding the unnecessary expenditure of resources regarding trial
2	preparation should settlement be feasible, the Court researched Plaintiff's place of incarceration. It
3	appears that Plaintiff is now incarcerated at California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility in
4	Corcoran, California. Accordingly, the Clerk's Office is directed to serve a courtesy copy of this
5	order on Plaintiff at the <u>California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility</u> . ¹
6	
7	
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	Dated: November 15, 2013 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
10	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

Plaintiff has not filed a change of address, and will be required to do so in order to have his address change reflected in the docket.