1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 MATTHEW JAMES GRIFFIN, Case No.: 1:11-cv-00210-DAD-BAM (PC) 12 ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT Plaintiff, **CONFERENCE** 13 v. Date: November 14, 2017 14 CALDWELL, Time: 9:30 a.m. 15 Defendant. 16 Plaintiff Matthew James Griffin is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma 17 pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court has determined that 18 this case will benefit from a settlement conference. Therefore, this case will be referred to 19 Magistrate Judge Carolyn K. Delaney to conduct a settlement conference at the U. S. District 20 Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814 in Courtroom #24 on November 14, 2017 at 21 9:30 a.m. 22 A separate order and writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum will issue concurrently with 23 this order. 24 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 25 1. This case is set for a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Carolyn K. 26 Delaney on November 14, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. in Courtroom #24 at the U. S. District 27 Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814. 28

- 3. Parties are instructed to have a principal with full settlement authority present at the Settlement Conference or to be fully authorized to settle the matter on any terms. The individual with full authority to settle must also have "unfettered discretion and authority" to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. The purpose behind requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement authority is that the parties' view of the case may be altered during the face to face conference. An authorization to settle for a limited dollar amount or sum certain can be found not to comply with the requirement of full authority to settle.
- 4. Parties are directed to submit confidential settlement statements no later than November 7, 2017. Plaintiff shall mail his confidential settlement statement Attn: Magistrate Judge Carolyn K. Delaney, USDC CAED, 501 I Street, Suite 4-200, Sacramento, California 95814 so it arrives no later than November 7, 2017. The envelope shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT." Defendant shall send the statement to ckdorders@caed.uscourts.gov. Parties are also directed to file a "Notice of Submission of Confidential Settlement Statement" (See L.R. 270(d)).

///

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

While the exercise of its authority is subject to abuse of discretion review, "the district court has the authority to order parties, including the federal government, to participate in mandatory settlement conferences...." United States v. United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, 694 F.3d 1051, 1053, 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2012) ("the district court has broad authority to compel participation in mandatory settlement conference[s]."). The term "full authority to settle" means that the individuals attending the mediation conference must be authorized to fully explore settlement options and to agree at that time to any settlement terms acceptable to the parties. G. Heileman Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp., 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), cited with approval in Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss, 6 F.3d 1385, 1396 (9th Cir. 1993). The individual with full authority to settle must also have "unfettered discretion and authority" to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. Pitman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003), amended on recon. in part, Pitman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc., 2003 WL 23353478 (D. Ariz. 2003). The purpose behind requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement authority is that the parties' view of the case may be altered during the face to face conference. Pitman, 216 F.R.D. at 486. An authorization to settle for a limited dollar amount or sum certain can be found not to comply with the requirement of full authority to settle. Nick v. Morgan's Foods, Inc., 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8th Cir. 2001).

27

28