

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 MAURICE MUHAMMAD,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 v.  
13 MORENO, et al.,  
14 Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00577-LJO-EPG (PC)

ORDER VACATING INITIAL  
SCHEDULING CONFERENCE AND  
REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO SERVE  
DEFENDANTS WITH HIS INITIAL  
DISCLOSURES AND FILE A  
SCHEDULING CONFERENCE  
STATEMENT

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO SEND  
PLAINTIFF A COPY OF THE ORDER  
REQUIRING INITIAL DISCLOSURES  
(ECF NO. 19)

TWENTY-EIGHT DAY DEADLINE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 Maurice Muhammad (“Plaintiff”) is a former state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in*  
20 *forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

21 On May 4, 2018, the Court issued an order setting an initial scheduling conference,  
22 requiring the parties to exchange initial disclosures, and requiring the parties to file scheduling  
23 conference statements. (ECF No. 19).

24 The deadline for exchanging initial disclosures passed, and according to Defendants,  
25 Plaintiff failed to provide Defendants with his initial disclosures (ECF No. 22, p. 2).  
26 Additionally, the deadline for filing scheduling conference statements has passed, and Plaintiff  
27 has failed to file his scheduling conference statement.

28 Therefore, the Court will vacate the initial scheduling conference that is currently set for

1 August 29, 2018, at 3:00 p.m., and give Plaintiff four weeks to serve Defendants with his initial  
2 disclosures and to file a scheduling conference statement. Plaintiff's scheduling conference  
3 statement should confirm that he has served Defendants with his initial disclosures.

4 Failure to comply with this order may result in the dismissal of this case with prejudice  
5 for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.<sup>1</sup>

6 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. Within **twenty-eight (28) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall  
8 serve Defendants with his initial disclosures and file a scheduling conference  
9 statement. Plaintiff's scheduling conference statement should confirm that he has  
10 served Defendants with his initial disclosures. The Court will reset the initial  
11 scheduling conference if it receives a scheduling conference statement from Plaintiff  
12 that complies with this Court's orders;
- 13 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to send Plaintiff a copy of the order requiring initial  
14 disclosures (ECF No. 19); and
- 15 3. Failure to comply with this order may result in the dismissal of this case with  
16 prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders.

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: August 22, 2018

20 /s/ Eric P. Gray  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes that one of Plaintiff's prior cases, Muhammad v. Komin, E.D. CA, 1:15-cv-01373, was recently dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders. Muhammad v. Komin, ECF No. 40.