IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
TREVOR WEEKS,	Case No.: 1:13-cv-01641 AWI JLT
Plaintiff,	ORDER TO PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS, UP TO AND INCLUDING DISMISSAL,SHOULD NOT BE ISSUED FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE COURT'S ORDERS AND FOR PLAINTIFF'S FAILURE TO
VS.	
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,	
Defendant.	PROSECUTE THE ACTION
This matter was initiated in this Court on October 10, 2013 when Plaintiff filed his	
complaint for damages alleging that he suffered from unlawful discrimination by Defendant.	
(Doc. 1) Plaintiff brings his claims under the Ar	nericans with Disabilities Act, the Fair
Employment and Housing Act and California's I	Labor Code. <u>Id</u> .
On January 23, 2014, the Court issued its	s scheduling conference order. (Doc. 11) In it,
the Court ordered the parties to exchange their ir	nitial disclosures no later than February 14, 2014.
Id. at 3. Moreover, the Court set a mid-discover	y status conference to occur on June 2, 2014. Id.
at 4. Counsel were ordered to file a joint stateme	ent describing the discovery efforts made to date
	ent describing the discovery efforts made to date I failed to cooperate in the filing of the report and,
	I failed to cooperate in the filing of the report and,
in the case. <u>Id</u> . Nevertheless, Plaintiff's counsel the report detailed only Defendant's efforts. (Do	I failed to cooperate in the filing of the report and,
	FOR THE EASTERN DIS TREVOR WEEKS, Plaintiff, vs. UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, Defendant. This matter was initiated in this Court on complaint for damages alleging that he suffered (Doc. 1) Plaintiff brings his claims under the Ar Employment and Housing Act and California's I On January 23, 2014, the Court issued its the Court ordered the parties to exchange their in

1	Plaintiff's behalf. Moreover, Plaintiff had failed to respond to discovery propounded by
2	Defendant in a timely fashion. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Court was concerned about
3	Plaintiff's failure to conduct discovery, the Court set a further status conference to occur on
4	August 22, 2014. Due to the failure of Plaintiff's counsel to cooperate with the preparation of the
5	previous joint statement, the Court explicitly ordered counsel to file a joint status conference
6	report.
7	Nevertheless, once again, Plaintiff's counsel failed to cooperate in the preparation of the
8	status conference report and, once again, the Court was provided no indication that Plaintiff has
9	engaged in any discovery. (Doc. 17) Further, Defendant reports that Plaintiff still has not made
10	his initial disclosures that were due more than six months ago. <u>Id</u> . at 6. Therefore, because it
11	appears that Plaintiff's counsel has repeatedly failed to comply with the Court's orders and, it
12	appears, Plaintiff has failed to prosecute this action, the Court ORDERS:
13	1. No later than September 5, 2014, Plaintiff's counsel <b>SHALL</b> show cause in
14	writing why sanctions, up to and including an order of dismissal, should not issue for his failure
15	to comply with the Court's orders and Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this action;
16	2. In light of the information provided that Defendant is taking reasonable efforts to
17	complete its discovery efforts in a timely fashion as required, the status conference, currently set
18	on August 22, 2014 is VACATED.
19	
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.
21	Dated: August 19, 2014 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
22	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	