

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

ROBERT P. AMATRONE,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-1831 MCE DAD PS

vs.

STEVE MESSINA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER RE-SETTING STATUS  
(PRETRIAL SCHEDULING)  
CONFERENCE

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Upon removal of this action from the Solano County Superior Court on August 6, 2008, a Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference was set for September 26, 2008. The Status Conference was vacated pending resolution of defendants' subsequent motion for more definite statement. Defendants having now filed an answer to plaintiff's complaint, the Status Conference will be re-set.

Pursuant to the provisions of Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. A Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference is set for **December 4, 2009, at 11:00 a.m.**, in Courtroom No. 27, before Magistrate Judge Dale A. Drozd.

2. Each party shall appear at the Status Conference by counsel or, if proceeding in propria persona, on his or her own behalf. A party may appear at the conference either in person

1 or telephonically. To arrange telephonic appearance, the party shall contact Pete Buzo, the  
2 courtroom deputy of the undersigned magistrate judge, at (916) 930-4128 no later than three days  
3 before the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference.

4 3. Plaintiff shall file and serve a status report on or before **November 20, 2009**,  
5 and defendants shall file and serve a status report on or before **November 30, 2009**. Each status  
6 report shall address all of the following matters:

- 7 a. Progress of service of process;
- 8 b. Possible joinder of additional parties;
- 9 c. Possible amendment of the pleadings;
- 10 d. Jurisdiction and venue;
- 11 e. Anticipated motions and the scheduling thereof;
- 12 f. Anticipated discovery and the scheduling thereof,  
13 including disclosure of expert witnesses;
- 14 g. Future proceedings, including the setting of  
15 appropriate cut-off dates for discovery and for law  
16 and motion, and the scheduling of a final pretrial  
17 conference and trial;
- 18 h. Modification of standard pretrial procedures  
19 specified by the rules due to the relative simplicity  
20 or complexity of the action;
- 21 i. Whether the case is related to any other case,  
22 including matters in bankruptcy;
- 23 j. Whether the parties will stipulate to the magistrate  
24 judge assigned to this matter acting as settlement  
25 judge, waiving any disqualification by virtue of his  
26 so acting, or whether they prefer to have a  
Settlement Conference before another magistrate  
judge;
- 27 k. Whether the parties intend to consent to proceed  
before a United States Magistrate Judge; and
- 28 l. Any other matters that may aid in the just and  
expeditious disposition of this action.

////

1           4. The pro se plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file a timely status report or  
2 failure to appear at the status conference may result in a recommendation that this case be  
3 dismissed for lack of prosecution and as a sanction for failure to comply with court orders and  
4 applicable rules. See Local Rules 11-110 and 83-183.

5 DATED: October 5, 2009.

6  
7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 DALE A. DROZD  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 DAD:kw  
12 Ddad1\orders.prose\amatrone1831.oss2  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26