

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**

THOMAS CLINTON,

 Plaintiff,

 vs.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

 Defendants.

No. 2:05-cv-1600-MCE-CMK-P

**ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Plaintiff, a former state prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court has determined that this case will benefit from a settlement conference. Therefore, this case will be referred to Magistrate Judge Victor E. Bianchini to conduct a settlement conference at the U. S. District Court, 411 West Fourth Street, Santa Ana, California 92701-4516 in Courtroom #5 on September 24, 2015 at 11:00 a.m.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:


1. A settlement conference has been set for September 24, 2015 at 11:00 a.m. in Courtroom #5 before Magistrate Judge Victor E. Bianchini at the U. S. District Court, 411 West Fourth Street, Santa Ana, California 92701-4516.
2. A representative with full and unlimited authority to negotiate and enter into a binding settlement on the defendants’ behalf shall attend in person¹.

¹ While the exercise of its authority is subject to abuse of discretion review, “the district court has the authority to order parties, including the federal government, to participate in mandatory settlement

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

3. Those in attendance must be prepared to discuss the claims, defenses and damages.
The failure of any counsel, party or authorized person subject to this order to appear in person may result in the imposition of sanctions. In addition, the conference will not proceed and will be reset to another date.

Dated: September 9, 2015


CRAIG M. KELLISON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

conferences... ” United States v. United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, 694 F.3d 1051, 1053, 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2012)(“the district court has broad authority to compel participation in mandatory settlement conference[s].”). The term “full authority to settle” means that the individuals attending the mediation conference must be authorized to fully explore settlement options and to agree at that time to any settlement terms acceptable to the parties. G. Heileman Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp., 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), cited with approval in Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss, 6 F.3d 1385, 1396 (9th Cir. 1993). The individual with full authority to settle must also have “unfettered discretion and authority” to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. Pitman v. Brinker Int’l, Inc., 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003), amended on recon. in part, Pitman v. Brinker Int’l, Inc., 2003 WL 23353478 (D. Ariz. 2003). The purpose behind requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement authority is that the parties’ view of the case may be altered during the face to face conference. Pitman, 216 F.R.D. at 486. An authorization to settle for a limited dollar amount or sum certain can be found not to comply with the requirement of full authority to settle. Nick v. Morgan’s Foods, Inc., 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8th Cir. 2001).