1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	ROCIO GONZALEZ et al.,	Case No. 1:13-cv-02039-LJO-BAM
11	Plaintiffs,	
12	V.	ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT
13	GOLD DIGGERS GENTLEMEN'S CLUB et al.,	CONFERENCE
14	Defendants.	
15		
16		
17	On April 24, 2014, parties filed a Joint Scheduling Report, which indicates that parties	
18	have agreed to participate in a settlement conference during settlement week. Pursuant to the	
19	parties' request, a Settlement Conference will be set for June 10, 2014 at 10:00 AM in Courtroom	
20	10 (GSA) before Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin.	
21	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
22	1. A Settlement Conference has been SET for June 10, 2014 at 10:00 AM in Courtroom	
23	10 (GSA) before Magistrate Judge Gary S. Austin.	
24	2. Parties are instructed to have a principal with full settlement authority present at the	
25	Settlement Conference or to be fully authorized to settle the matter on any terms. The	
26	individual with full authority to settle must also have "unfettered discretion and	
27	authority" to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. The purpose	
28		1

1	behind requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement authority is that the	
2	parties' view of the case may be altered during the face to face conference. An	
3	authorization to settle for a limited dollar amount or sum certain can be found not to	
4	comply with the requirement of full authority to settle. ¹	
5	3. The parties are directed to submit their confidential settlement conference statements	
6	to the Court using the following email address: gsaorders@caed.uscourts.gov. If a	
7	party desires to share additional confidential information with the Court, they may do	
8	so pursuant to the provisions of Local Rule 270(d) and (e). Statements are due at least	
9	7 days prior to the Settlement Conference.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated: April 25, 2014 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe	
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	¹ 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	
22	 conferences" <u>United States v. United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands</u>, 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. <u>G. Heileman Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp.</u>, 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), <u>cited with approval in Official Airline Guides</u>, 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. <u>Pittman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc.</u>, 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003), <u>amended on recon. in part</u>, <u>Pitman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc.</u>, 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. <u>Pitman</u>, 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 	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	authority to settle. <u>Nick v. Morgan's Foods, Inc.</u> , 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8 th Cir. 2001). 2	