

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

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

STEPHEN C. PEHLE,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-06-1889 MCE EFB

vs.

RONALD DAVID DUFOUR; and
DUFOUR ENTERPRISES, INC.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On November 18, 2010, the district judge in this action issued a minute order referring the matter to the undersigned for a two day bench trial to be held within ninety days. Dckt. No. 46. The minute order also provided that a final pretrial order shall be issued by the undersigned and scheduled a hearing on defendants' counsel's motion to withdraw as counsel for hearing before the district judge on January 13, 2011. *Id.* Therefore, on November 23, 2010, the undersigned issued an order directing the parties to meet and confer and to file, on or before December 8, 2010, a joint status report addressing various scheduling matters. Dckt. No. 47.

On December 8, 2010, the parties filed a joint status report and requested that the court defer the parties' required completion of the status report until after the district judge rules on defendants' counsel's motion to withdraw as counsel for defendants, which was noticed for hearing on January 13, 2011 and which was taken under submission by the district judge on

1 January 11, 2011.¹ Dckt. Nos. 34, 46, 49. The parties contend that aspects of the status report,
2 “such as choosing trial dates cannot be performed until defendants’ counsel’s status is
3 determined and, in any event, would be rendered moot if the case is resolved. Dckt. No. 48.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within fourteen days of the filing of any
5 order regarding defendants’ counsel’s motion to withdraw, the parties shall once again meet and
6 confer about the matters set forth in the December 8, 2010 order and shall file a further status
7 report addressing those matters.

8 DATED: January 19, 2011.

9 
EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

¹ The parties also note that the district judge set “a coordinated period of time for the
25 settlement to occur,” and therefore request that the deadline for completion of the status report be
26 continued to sometime after January 13, 2011. Although it is unclear what the referenced
“coordinated period of time” includes, the completion deadline for the status report will be after
the January 13, 2011 date, which is what the parties have requested.