1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	KIT P. JORY,	No. 1:16-cv-00941-DAD-MJS	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY	
14	CALIBER HOME LOANS, INC.;	SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED	
15	SUMMIT MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC; DOES 1-20 inclusive,	(Doc. No. 20)	
16	Defendants.		
17			
18	Defendants Caliber Home Loans, Inc. and Summit Management Company removed this		
19	action from Stanislaus Superior Court of California on June 26, 2016. (Doc. No. 1.) The court		
20	subsequently scheduled a hearing for September 6, 2016 on a motion to dismiss brought by		
21	defendant Bank of America, N.A. (Doc. No. 7) and motion to remand brought by plaintiff (Doc.		
22	No. 9). (See Doc. Nos. 10 and 14.) On the n	norning of the scheduled hearing plaintiff's counsel	

Defendants Caliber Home Loans, Inc. and Summit Management Company removed this action from Stanislaus Superior Court of California on June 26, 2016. (Doc. No. 1.) The court subsequently scheduled a hearing for September 6, 2016 on a motion to dismiss brought by defendant Bank of America, N.A. (Doc. No. 7) and motion to remand brought by plaintiff (Doc. No. 9). (*See* Doc. Nos. 10 and 14.) On the morning of the scheduled hearing plaintiff's counsel informed the court via email that the parties had reached a global settlement in the matter. However, at the scheduled hearing that same day – at which plaintiff's counsel did not appear – defendant Bank of America's counsel David Pinch appeared and informed the court that although defendant had previously made a settlement offer to plaintiff, the parties had not in fact reached a settlement. Accordingly, the court continued the motions hearing to October 6, 2016. (Doc. No. 18.) On September 8, 2016, plaintiff filed a notice of conditional settlement of the entire matter.

(Doc. No. 19.) The notice stated that a request for dismissal would be filed with the court no later than October 24, 2016. (Doc. No. 19.) Based upon this notice, the assigned magistrate judge issued an order on September 15, 2016 vacating all court dates set and requiring that dispositional documents be submitted no later than forty-five days from the date of the order. (Doc. No. 20.) The magistrate judge noted that "[f]ailure to comply with this order may be grounds for the imposition of sanctions against anyone who contributes to its violation." (*Id.* at 2.)

On October 7, 2016, plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i) against defendant Bank of America, N.A. (Doc. No. 21.) Accordingly, the court terminated defendant Bank of America, N.A. from the action and found that the motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 7) filed by Bank of America, N.A. had been rendered moot. (Doc. No. 22.)

Nonetheless, plaintiff's counsel has not filed dispositional documents with respect to plaintiff's claims against the remaining two defendants, Caliber Home Loans, Inc. and Summit Management Company. The parties did file on October 24, 2016 a stipulation that a settlement agreement with respect to those defendants and claims was expected to be finalized and a stipulation of dismissal filed no later than November 23, 2016. (Doc. No. 23 at 2.) On November 22, 2016, the parties filed another stipulation indicating that the settlement agreement was expected to be finalized and a stipulation of dismissal filed no later than January 4, 2017. (Doc. No. 24 at 2.) January 4, 2017 has come and gone, but the remaining parties in this litigation have not filed dispositional documents or otherwise contacted the court.

Accordingly, within fourteen days of the date of this order, counsel for plaintiff and for defendant Caliber Home Loans, Inc. and Summit Management Company shall show cause in writing why sanctions should not be imposed due to their for failure to file the dispositional documents as indicated in their stipulations which have been filed with the court in this action. Alternatively, counsel may file the stipulated dismissal. The parties are forewarned, that should they fail to respond to this order to show cause in writing and/or fail to file dispositional documents, as required by this order, sanctions will likely be imposed. *See Chambers v. NASCO*,

1	Inc., 501 U.S. 32, 42–46 (1991) (recognizing that it is within the inherent authority of the court t		
2	control its docket and require compliance with its orders).		
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
4	Dated: January 18, 2017		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			