

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DURBIN, et al.,		Case No. 1:11-cv-01484-AWI-JLT (PC)
v. BONILLA, et al.,	Plaintiffs,	ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
	Defendants.	(Doc. 62) RESPONSE DUE APRIL 20, 2015

Plaintiffs are state prisoners who were confined in the Security Housing Unit ("SHU") at the California Correctional Institution ("CCI") in Tehachapi. (Doc. 19 at 2.) The parties were previously ordered to submit statements regarding whether a settlement conference would be of assistance. (Doc. 59.) In response, a stipulation to stay discovery and to extend the filing deadline for their response to the Court's inquiry until the end of February was filed. (Doc. 60.) On February 4, 2015, an order issued staying discovery and granting the parties until February 27, 2015 to submit statements indicating whether in good faith they were interested in having a settlement conference scheduled in this action. (Doc. 61.) The deadline lapsed without response from either side. Thus, on March 4, 2015, an order issued for the parties to show cause within fourteen days why sanctions should not be imposed for their failure to respond to the February 4th order. (Doc. 62.)

On March 16, 2015 defense counsel filed a response for both sides in this action. (Doc. 63.) In this response, defense counsel indicated that the parties had agreed she would provide the

response to the February 4th order, but due to trial in another action, she inadvertently forgot to file the response. She further indicates that the parties have been engaging in good faith settlement negotiations and that she is scheduled to meet with her clients on March 27, 2015. (*Id*.) While defense counsel's explanation for her inattention to this file is accepted, she is reminded that deadlines in every action are important and that being occupied with other proceedings is good cause to request extensions of time before a court deadline has lapsed. Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that: (1) the Order to Counsel to Show Cause Why Sanctions Should Not be Imposed for Their Failure to Comply with the Court's Order, dated February 4, 2015 (Doc. 61), is **DISCHARGED**; and (2) no later than **April 20, 2015**, the parties shall submit statements indicating whether they believe, in good faith, settlement is possible and whether they wish the Court to set a settlement conference. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston Dated: **March 17, 2015** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE