

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LBUBS 2004-C6 STOCKDALE OFFICE
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

TERRY MORELAND, et al.,

 Defendants.

Case No.: 1:13-cv-00294 LJO JLT

ORDER ON STIPULATION
REPRESENTING THE MATTER HAS BEEN
SETTLED

(Doc. 32)

On August 27, 2013, the parties filed a stipulation setting forth that they have come to terms on a settlement and are merely in process of obtaining signatures on the settlement agreement. (Doc. 32) They report they expect all signatures to be obtained by August 30, 2013 and a stipulated dismissal filed by September 6, 2013. Id. at 1-2. Based thereon, they request the Court amend the scheduling order to extend deadlines that are fast-approaching (and one which has expired). However, the parties fail to explain why the amendment is needed. In light of counsels’ representation that “by the end of this week, all signatures on the settlement documents should be in place and the parties will be in a position next week to file a stipulation requesting dismissal of this action” (Id. at 1-2), the Court **ORDERS:**

1. No later than September 6, 2013, the parties **SHALL** file their stipulated request for dismissal;

1 2. All pending dates, motions, conferences and hearings, including the trial date, are
2 **VACATED;**

3 **Failure to comply with this order may be grounds for the imposition of sanctions on**
4 **counsel or the parties who contributed to violation of this order. See Local Rules 110, 160.**

5

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: August 27, 2013

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28