1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 CHESTER RAY WISEMAN, Case No.: 1:17-cv-01166-AWI-JLT (PC) 11 Plaintiff, ORDER VACATING DISCOVERY AND 12 SCHEDULING ORDER; REFERRING THE CASE TO POST-SCREENING ADR PROJECT: v. 13 and STAYING THE CASE FOR 90 DAYS J. GONZALEZ, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 As set forth in the screening order, the Court has found the plaintiff has stated at least one 17 cognizable civil rights claim. Thus, the Court vacates the current Discovery and Scheduling Order and 18 STAYS this action for 90 days to allow the parties to investigate the plaintiff's claims, meet and 19 confer and participate in a settlement conference. ¹ 20 21 There is a presumption that all post-screening civil rights cases assigned to the undersigned will proceed to settlement conference. However, if after investigating plaintiff's claims 22 and speaking with plaintiff, and after conferring with defense counsel's supervisor, counsel finds in 23 good faith that a settlement conference would be a waste of resources², defense counsel may move to 24 opt out of this pilot project. 25 26 27

¹ If the case does not settle during the stay, Court will thereafter issue a new Discovery and Scheduling Order.

28

² By way of guidance, if the defense intends to file an exhaustion motion and believes in good faith that it has a significant chance of success, this would be a likely circumstance where the opt-out provision should be employed.

Notwithstanding the requirements of Local Rule 270(b), the settlement conference will be conducted by Magistrate Judge Thurston. The Court deems the deviation from the Local Rule to be appropriate and in the interests of the parties and justice and sound case management based upon the location of the parties. If any party prefers that the settlement conference be conducted by a judicial officer who is not assigned to this case, that party is directed to notify the Court in response to this order of this preference and another judicial officer to be assigned to handle the conference. If all parties to the action have consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction, the settlement conference will be reassigned to a different judicial officer.

Within 35 days, the assigned Deputy Attorney General SHALL contact the Courtroom Deputy Clerk at SHall@caed.uscourts.gov, to schedule the settlement conference. If the settlement conference cannot be set quickly due to the court's calendar, the parties may seek an extension of the initial 90-day stay.

Once the settlement conference is scheduled, <u>at least seven days before</u> the conference, the parties shall submit to the assigned settlement judge a confidential settlement conference statement. The parties' confidential settlement conference statement **SHALL** include:

- a. A short statement of the facts and alleged damages;
- b. A short procedural history;
- c. A frank analysis of the likelihood of liability, including a discussion of the efforts made to investigate the claims;
 - d. A discussion of the efforts that have been made to settle the case;
- e. To the extent that Doe Defendants are named and their identities can be ascertained, defense counsel shall indicate the names of the Doe Defendants; and,
 - b. Defense counsel shall indicate whether he/she knows of the location of the defendants;Based upon the foregoing, the Court **ORDERS**:
- 1. This action is STAYED for 90 days to allow the parties an opportunity to settle their dispute before a responsive pleading is filed, or the discovery process begins. No other pleadings or other documents may be filed in this case during the stay. The parties SHALL NOT engage in formal discovery, but they may jointly agree to engage in informal discovery.

The Discovery and Scheduling Order the Court issued on September 4, 2018 (Doc. 27) 8. is **VACATED**. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **October 29, 2018** /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	CHESTER RAY WISEMAN,	,	Case No.: 1:17-cv-01166-AWI-JLT (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,		NOTICE REGARDING EARLY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE	
13	v.		CONFERENCE	
14	J. GONZALEZ, et al.,			
15	Defendants.			
16			_	
17	As required by the Court's order:			
18				
19	1. The party or co	ounsel for the part	y signing below, agrees that there is a good chance that	
20	an early settlement conference will resolve this action and wishes to engage in an early settlement			
21	conference.			
22	Yes	No		
23				
24	2. The party or co	ounsel for the part	y signing below, agrees the assigned Magistrate Judge	
25	may conduct the settlement conference.			
26	Yes	No		
27	///			
28	///			

	1	
1	//	
2	//	
3	3.	The plaintiff (Check one):
4		Would like to participate in the settlement conference in person, OR
5		Would like to participate in the settlement conference by video conference.
6		
7	Dated:	
8		Plaintiff or Counsel for Defendants
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17 18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		