1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	CURTIS RENEE JACKSON,	Case No. 1:13-cv-01679-SAB-PC	
11	Plaintiff,		
12	V.	ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE	
13	D. MENDENHALL,	CONFERENCE	
14	Defendant.		
15			
16	Plaintiff Curtis Renee Jackson is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights		
17	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court has determined that this case will benefit from a		
18	settlement conference. Therefore, this case will be referred to Magistrate Judge Kendall J.		
19	Newman to conduct a settlement conference at the U. S. District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento,		
20	California 95814 in Courtroom #25 on October 27, 2016 at 1:00 p.m.		
21	A separate order and writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum will issue at the appropriate		
22	time.		
23	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
24	1. This case is set for a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Kendall J.		
25	Newman on October 27, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. at the U. S. District Court, 501 I Street,		
26	Sacramento, California 95814 in Courtroom #25.		
27	2. A representative with full and unlimited authority to negotiate and enter into a binding		
28	1		

1		settlement on the defendants' behalf s	hall attend in person. ¹
2	3.	. Those in attendance must be prepared to discuss the claims, defenses and damages.	
3		The failure of any counsel, party or au	athorized person subject to this order to appear in
4		person may result in the imposition of	sanctions. In addition, the conference will not
5		proceed and will be reset to another d	ate.
6	4.	Judge Newman or another representat	ive from the court will be contacting the parties
7		either by telephone or in person, appre	oximately one week prior to the settlement
8		conference, to ascertain each party's e	expectations of the settlement conference.
9			
10	IT IS SO	ORDERED.	SIL
11	Dated: _	August 12, 2016	IN WITTER OF A TELE MAN CHEET HAD GE
12			UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	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" <u>United States</u>		
23	v. United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, 694 F.3d 1051, 1053, 1057, 1059 (9 th Cir. 2012)("the district court has broad authority to compel participation in mandatory settlement conference[s]."). The		
24	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. <u>G. Heileman Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp.</u> , 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7 th Cir. 1989), cited with approval in Official		
25	Airline Gui	des, Inc. v. Goss, 6 F.3d 1385, 1396 (9 th Cir. 19	93). The individual with full authority to settle must also
26	Brinker Int	1., Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003)	ttlement position of the party, if appropriate. <u>Pitman v.</u>), <u>amended on recon. in part, Pitman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc.</u> , requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement
27	authority is	that the parties' view of the case may be altered	d during the face to face conference. Pitman, 216 F.R.D. nt or sum certain can be found not to comply with the
00	requiremen	t of full authority to settle. Nick v. Morgan's F	oods, Inc., 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8 th Cir. 2001).