

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAE DEAN STRAWN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
BRUCE SOKOLOFF, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-01245-ADA-EPG  
**ORDER FOR DEFENSE COUNSEL TO  
SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD  
NOT ISSUE FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY  
WITH COURT ORDERS TO ATTEND THE  
NOVEMBER 13, 2023 MID-DISCOVERY  
STATUS CONFERENCE**  
(ECF Nos. 32, 36)

Plaintiff alleges civil rights and tort claims in this case. (ECF No. 26). The following attorneys appear on the docket as representing all Defendants: Bradley James Swingle and Laura A. McGee.

This matter was scheduled for a mid-discovery status conference on November 13, 2023, at 10 a.m. (ECF Nos. 32, 35, 36). Ahead of the conference, the parties filed a joint status report, with Attorney Bradley Swingle signing as defense counsel. (ECF No. 35). The joint status report noted the correct date and time for the conference. While the parties asked the Court to vacate the conference, the Court entered a minute order on October 24, 2023, confirming the conference:

This matter is before the Court on the parties’ joint status report in advance of the mid-discovery status conference set for November 13, 2023, at 10 a.m. (ECF No. 35 ). Within this report, the parties ask the Court to vacate the conference as they believe it to be unnecessary; alternatively, they ask that they be permitted to appear telephonically. The Court will not vacate the conference. However, the Court directs the parties’ attention to the scheduling order, which has already granted the parties permission to appear telephonically by dialing 1-888-251-2909

1 and entering access code 1024453.  
2 (ECF No. 36).

3 On November 13, 2023, the Court attempted to hold the conference at 10 a.m. The Court,  
4 its staff, and Plaintiff's counsel Ryan P. Sullivan were present telephonically, and the Court  
5 waited a few minutes for defense counsel to join. However, no attorney appeared on Defendants'  
6 behalf.

7 Given these circumstances, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 8 1. Defense counsel shall show cause why sanctions should not issue for the failure of any of  
9 Defendants' attorneys to attend the conference as required by the Court's orders. (ECF  
10 Nos. 32, 36).
- 11 2. Defense counsel<sup>1</sup> has until November 20, 2023, to file a written response explaining why  
12 counsel did not attend the conference.
- 13 3. After reviewing counsel's response, the Court will consider whether sanctions are  
14 appropriate and determine whether to reschedule the mid-discovery status conference.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: November 13, 2023

17 /s/ Eric P. Gray  
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Any of Defendants' attorneys may respond to this order.