

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC)	
SUBSTANCES CONTROL,)	2:02-cv-00018-GEB-GGH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	<u>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND</u>
v.)	<u>CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL</u>
)	<u>SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE</u>
MID VALLEY DEVELOPMENT, INC.,)	
RAVIND SHANKAR, WHITE ROCK &)	
KILGORE, LLC, SHARON STONE,)	
KILGORE & WHITE ROCK, LLC,)	
GORDON TURNER MOTORS, JOHN L.)	
SULLIVAN CHEVROLET, INC., and)	
MAITA CHEVROLET GEO,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	
)	
AND RELATED CROSS-CLAIMS,)	
COUNTERCLAIMS, and THIRD-PARTY)	
ACTIONS)	
_____)	


A Minute Order issued on July 29, 2011, which rescheduled a scheduling conference in this case for April 9, 2012, and required the parties to file a joint status report no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduling conference. No joint status report was filed as ordered.

Therefore, the parties are Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than April 9, 2012, why sanctions should not be imposed against them and/or their counsel under Rule 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to file a timely status

1 report. The written response shall also state whether the parties or
2 their counsel are at fault, and whether a hearing is requested on the
3 OSC.¹ If a hearing is requested, it will be held on May 21, 2012, at 9:00
4 a.m., just prior to the status conference, which is rescheduled to that
5 date and time. A joint status report shall be filed no later than
6 fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference, in which the parties
7 are required to explain whether the terms of the Consent Decrees
8 approved by the Court have been satisfied, such that this case can be
9 closed.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: March 28, 2012

12
13 
14 _____
GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 _____
26 ¹ "If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact
27 of sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that
28 is where the impact of the sanction should be lodged." Matter of
Sanction of Baker, 744 F.2d 1438, 1442 (10th Cir. 1984), cert. denied,
471 U.S. 1014 (1985). Sometimes the faults of attorneys, and their
consequences, are visited upon clients. In re Hill, 775 F.2d 1385, 1387
(9th Cir. 1985).