

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JEREMY JONES,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 ARNETTE, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17
18
19

1:16-cv-01212-DAD-GSA-PC

**ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS TO
NOTIFY COURT WHETHER A SETTLEMENT
CONFERENCE WOULD BE BENEFICIAL**

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

20 **I. BACKGROUND**

21 Jeremy Jones (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*
22 with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Americans with Disabilities Act
23 (ADA), 42 U.S.C. § 12132. This case now proceeds with Plaintiff’s ADA claims against
24 defendants Vasquez, Keener, Gonzalez, Flores, Arnett, Zamora, and Lopez; Plaintiff’s Eighth
25 Amendment claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener and Gonzalez; and Plaintiff’s due
26 process claims against defendants Vasquez, Keener, and Gonzalez.

27 On June 6, 2022, Plaintiff filed a request for the Court to schedule this case for a
28 settlement conference. (ECF No. 126.)

1 **II. SETTLEMENT PROCEEDINGS**

2 The Court is able to refer cases for mediation before a participating United States
3 Magistrate Judge. Settlement conferences are ordinarily held in person at the Court or at a prison
4 in the Eastern District of California. Defendants shall notify the Court whether they believe, in
5 good faith, that settlement in this case is a possibility and whether they are interested in having a
6 settlement conference scheduled by the Court.¹

7 Defendants' counsel shall notify the Court whether there are security concerns that would
8 prohibit scheduling a settlement conference. If security concerns exist, counsel shall notify the
9 Court whether those concerns can be adequately addressed if Plaintiff is transferred for settlement
10 only and then returned to prison for housing.

11 **III. CONCLUSION**

12 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within **thirty (30) days** from
13 the date of service of this order, counsel for Defendants shall file a written response to this order,
14 notifying the Court whether they believe, in good faith, that settlement in this case is a possibility
15 and whether they are interested in having a settlement conference scheduled by the Court.²

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: June 7, 2022

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 ¹ The parties may wish to discuss the issue by telephone in determining whether they believe
settlement is feasible.

27 ² The issuance of this order does not guarantee referral for settlement, but the Court will make
28 every reasonable attempt to secure the referral should both parties desire a settlement conference.