1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Case No. 1:20-cv-00524-NONE-SKO (PC) 11 GILBERT NAVARRO, 12 Plaintiff. ORDER REFERRING CASE TO POST-SCREENING ADR AND STAYING CASE 13 v. FOR 90 DAYS 14 J. STCLAIR, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action. As set forth in its 18 screening order, the Court has found that Plaintiff states at least one cognizable claim for relief. 19 (Doc. 10; see also Doc. 16.) On December 7, 2020, Defendants Day, McKay, and St. Clair filed 20 an answer to Plaintiff's complaint. (Doc. 20.) On March 24, 2021, the Court dismissed 21 Defendant Hernandez from this action. (Doc. 24.) 22 The Court is referring all civil rights cases filed by *pro se* inmates to Alternative Dispute 23 Resolution (ADR) to attempt to resolve such cases more expeditiously and less expensively. In 24 appropriate cases, defense counsel from the California Attorney General's Office have agreed to 25 participate in ADR. No claims, defenses, or objections are waived by the parties' participation. 26 The Court, therefore, STAYS this action for 90 days to allow the parties to investigate 27 Plaintiff's claims, meet and confer, and participate in an early settlement conference. The Court 28 presumes that all post-screening civil rights cases assigned to the undersigned will proceed to a

26

27

28

Dated: March 25, 2021

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	GILBERT NAVARRO,	Case No. 1:20-cv-00524-NONE-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	NOTICE REGARDING EARLY SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE
13	v.	
14	J. STCLAIR, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17		
18	The party believes that an early settlement conference would be productive and wishes to	
19	engage in an early settlement conference.	
20	Yes No	
21		
22		
23	Dated:	
24		Plaintiff or Counsel for Defendants
25		Training of Courses for Defendants
26		
27		
28		