UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM J. GRADFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

MCDOUGALL, et al.,

Defendants.

1:17-cv-00201-DAD-GSA-PC

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

THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE

I. BACKGROUND

William J. Gradford ("Plaintiff") is a prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action now proceeds with Plaintiff's initial Complaint, filed on February 13, 2017, against defendants Tiexiera and McCarthy for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment. (ECF No. 1.)

On September 26, 2018, Plaintiff filed a request in which he expressed willingness to discuss settlement of this case, either between the parties or with the court's assistance. (ECF No. 53.)

II. SETTLEMENT CONFERENCES

The court is able to refer cases for mediation before a participating United States Magistrate Judge. Settlement conferences are ordinarily held in person at the court or at a prison in the Eastern District of California. The court will not schedule a settlement conference without

1 2

assurances by all of the parties that they are willing to participate and believe, in good faith, that settlement in this case is a possibility.

The court therefore, shall require Plaintiff and Defendants to respond to this order within thirty days indicating whether they wish the court to schedule a settlement conference, notifying the court of their willingness to participate, and stating whether they believe, in good faith, that settlement of this case is a possibility. In this case, Defendants' counsel shall also notify the court whether there are security concerns that would prohibit scheduling a settlement conference. If security concerns exist, counsel shall notify the court whether those concerns can be adequately addressed if Plaintiff is transferred for settlement purposes only, and upon completion of the settlement conference returned to prison for housing.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff and Defendants shall file a written response to this order.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 14, 2018 /s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The parties may wish to discuss the possibility of settlement by telephone in determining whether they believe settlement is feasible and whether they are certain they want the court to schedule a settlement conference.

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