| 1  |  |                               |         |
|----|--|-------------------------------|---------|
| 2  |  |                               |         |
| 3  |  |                               |         |
| 4  |  |                               |         |
| 5  |  |                               |         |
| 6  |  |                               |         |
| 7  |  |                               |         |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                               |         |
| 9  | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                               |         |
| 10 |  |                               |         |
| 11 | DAVID MUGRIDGE,  | Case No. 1:15-cv-00834-I      | LJO-SAB |
| 12 | Plaintiff,   | ORDER SETTING SHOW<br>HEARING | V CAUSE |
| 13 | V.   | September 15, 2015 at 9:30    | 0 a.m.  |
| 14 | MARQUEZ J L PROPERTIES LLC, et al.,  | -                             |         |
| 15 | Defendants.  |                               |         |
| 16 |  |                               |         |
| 17 | On September 15, 2015, the Court held a show cause hearing for Plaintiff David                   |                               |         |
| 18 | Mugridge to show cause why sanctions should not be issued against him for failing to comply      |                               |         |
| 19 | with two court orders. Plaintiff's attorney was ordered to appear in person. However, Plaintiff  |                               |         |
| 20 | failed to appear at the show cause hearing. Accordingly, the Court issues sanctions as set forth |                               |         |
| 21 | below.   |                               |         |
| 22 | I.   |                               |         |
| 23 | BACKGROUND   |                               |         |
| 24 | On June 1, 2015, the Court issued an Order Setting Mandatory Scheduling Conference               |                               |         |
| 25 | ("the June 1 Order"). (ECF No. 3.) The June 1 Order set a scheduling conference for September    |                               |         |
| 26 | 15, 2015 at 9:30 a.m. in Courtroom 9 (SAB) before the undersigned magistrate judge. The June     |                               |         |
| 27 | 1 Order also ordered Plaintiff to serve a copy of the June 1 Order on Defendants promptly in     |                               |         |
| 28 | order to provide Defendants with notice of the scheduling conference. (See Order Setting         |                               |         |

1

Mandatory Scheduling Conference, at pg. 2:3-7.) The June 1 Order further required all parties to
 file a Joint Scheduling Report one week prior to the scheduling conference date. (See Order
 Setting Mandatory Scheduling Conference, at pg. 2:14-15.) Accordingly, the Joint Scheduling
 Report was due in this action on September 8, 2015.

No Joint Scheduling Report was filed by any party in this action. On September 11,
2015, three days after the deadline for the Joint Scheduling Report, the Court issued an order to
show cause why the parties should not be sanctioned for their failure to comply with the June 1
Order ("the September 11 OSC"). (ECF No. 7.) Written responses to the Court's order to show
cause were due by noon on September 14, 2015.

On September 12, 2015, Defendant Marquez J L Properties LLC filed a response to the
September 11 OSC. (ECF No. 8.) Defendants Michelle Barnett and Barnett Insurance Agency
filed their response on September 14, 2015. (ECF No. 10.) Plaintiff did not file a response.
Plaintiff did, however, file a Notice of Settlement and Request for Dismissal on September 13,
2015. (ECF No. 9.) The Notice of Settlement contained no reference to the September 11 OSC.

On September 14, 2015, the Court issued an order discharging the September 11 OSC
with respect to Defendants based upon their written responses ("the September 14 Order").
However, the September 11 OSC was not discharged with respect to Plaintiff. The Court set a
show cause hearing for September 15, 2015 at 9:30 a.m. and ordered Plaintiff's attorney to
appear in person to show cause why sanctions should not be issued against him.<sup>1</sup>

20 On September 15, 2015, the order to show cause hearing was held by the Court. Neither21 Plaintiff nor his attorney appeared.

22

23

## II.

## DISCUSSION

24 "Failure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules or with any order of the
25 Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute
26 or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court." Local Rule 110. The Court possesses

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although the September 15 show cause hearing was set on short notice in the September 14 order, the Court deliberately set the hearing for the same date, time, and place as the initial scheduling conference, which Plaintiff should have been planning on attending since the initial scheduling conference was never vacated.

inherent authority to impose sanctions to manage its own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and
 expeditious disposition of cases. <u>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.</u>, 501 U.S. 32, 43 (1991).

In order to compensate the Court for the time and resources wasted on this matter,
including the time spent issuing multiple orders arising from the failure to comply with the June
1 Order and the time spent holding a show cause hearing where Plaintiff failed to appear, the
Court will sanction Plaintiff in the amount of \$100.00, payable to the Clerk of the Court.

In order to coerce Plaintiff to comply with the Court's orders, the Court will issue
additional sanctions at a rate of \$100 per day for every day Plaintiff fails to respond to the
Court's orders to show cause. See Lasar v. Ford Motor Co., 399 F.3d 1101, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005)
(discussing court's authority to impose civil sanctions "intended to be remedial by coercing the
defendant to do what he had refused to do."). These daily sanctions will cease accumulating if
and when Plaintiff files a written response explaining his failure to comply with the Court's prior
orders.

Finally, the Court sets a further show cause hearing on Tuesday, September 22, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. Both Plaintiff and his attorney shall be required to appear at the show cause hearing in person. Plaintiff is forewarned that failure to appear at the show cause hearing will result in further sanctions, including revocation of Plaintiff's attorney's admission to practice in this district. <u>See Chambers</u>, 501 U.S. at 43.

## CONCLUSION AND ORDER

III.

Based upon the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- Plaintiff and his attorney are sanctioned in the amount of \$100.00 for their failure
   to comply with the Court's orders and failure to appear at the September 15 show
   cause hearing;
- 25
  2. Plaintiff and his attorney shall be sanctioned \$100.00 per day, starting on
  26
  26 September 15, 2015, for every day Plaintiff fails to file a written response to the
  27 Court's orders to show cause;

28 ///

19

20

21

| 1  | 3.                          | 3. Plaintiff and his attorney shall appear in person for a show cause hearing on |                                |  |
|----|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| 2  |                             | Tuesday, September 22, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. in Courtroom 9 (SAB) before United      |                                |  |
| 3  |                             | States Magistrate Judge Stanley A. Boone; and                                    |                                |  |
| 4  | 4.                          | The Clerk of the Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff's   |                                |  |
| 5  |                             | attorney at the following address:   |                                |  |
| 6  | Law Offices of Layne Hayden |  |                                |  |
| 7  | 110510, 011 95705           |  |                                |  |
| 8  |                             | <u>laynehayden@yahoo.com</u>   |                                |  |
| 9  | IT IS SO OR                 | DERED.   | SIR                            |  |
| 10 | Dated: Se                   | eptember 15, 2015  | Jung A. are                    |  |
| 11 |                             |  | JNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |  |
| 12 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 13 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 14 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 15 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 16 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 17 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 18 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 19 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 20 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 21 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 22 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 23 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 24 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 25 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 26 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 27 |                             |  |                                |  |
| 28 |                             |  |                                |  |
|    |                             | Α  |                                |  |