

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 DWAYNE EICHLER,
12 Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:06-CV-02894-JAM-CMK

13 vs.

ORDER

14 TILTON, et al.,
15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se with an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
18 The court finds this case appropriate for referral to mediation. This case will be referred to Jay
19 Dyer to conduct the mediation on August 11, 2010, at 10:00 a.m. Both parties will be required to
20 submit confidential settlement conference statements setting forth a *brief* description of the case,
21 their respective positions as to the active claims/defenses, and a settlement demand/response.
22 The settlement conference statements are not to exceed five (5) pages in length, and are not to
23 include exhibits or attachments.

24 Plaintiff will be required to appear by video conference from his current place of
25 confinement. A separate order and writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum will issue with this
26 order.

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

2 1. This case is set for mediation on August 11, 2010, at 10:00 a.m., Courtroom
3 #1, at the U. S. District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

4 2. Plaintiff shall personally attend the mediation, via video conference.

5 3. Defendants' lead counsel and a person with full and unlimited authority to
6 negotiate and enter into a binding settlement on defendants' behalf shall also attend in person.¹

7 4. Those in attendance must be prepared to discuss the claims, defenses and
8 damages. The failure of any counsel, party or authorized person subject to this order to appear
9 in person may result in the imposition of sanctions. Sanctions will include, but will not be
10 limited to, the attorney fees and travel costs of the other parties and/or the mediator. In addition,
11 the conference will not proceed and will be reset to another date.

12 5. The parties are directed to provide confidential settlement conference
13 statements to Sujean Park, 501 I Street, Suite 4-200, Sacramento, California 95814, or via email
14 at spark@caed.uscourts.gov, so that they arrive no later than July 30, 2010.

15 DATED: June 15, 2010

16 
17 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
19

20 ¹The term "full authority to settle" means that the individuals attending the mediation
21 conference must be authorized to fully explore settlement options and to agree at that time to any
22 settlement terms acceptable to the parties. G. Heileman Brewing Co., Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp.,
23 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), cited with approval in Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss, 6
24 F. 3d 1385, 1396 (9th Cir. 1993). The individual with full authority to settle must also have
25 "unfettered discretion and authority" to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate.
26 Pittman 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).