

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 CONTINUING STATUS  
(PRETRIAL SCHEDULING)  
CONFERENCE

\_\_\_\_\_ /

This matter came before the court on December 4, 2009, for Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference pursuant to the court’s order filed October 6, 2009. Plaintiff Robert P. Amatrone, proceeding with this action pro se, appeared on his own behalf. Kevin E. Gilbert, Esq. appeared on behalf of the City of Benicia defendants.

Upon consideration of the parties’ timely filed status reports and their statements in open court, the court continued the status conference.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference is continued to **February 5, 2010, at 11:00 a.m.**, in Courtroom No. 27, before Magistrate Judge Dale A. Drozd.

2. Parties may appear at the status conference either in person or telephonically. To arrange telephonic appearance, the party shall contact Pete Buzo, the courtroom deputy of the

1 undersigned magistrate judge, at (916) 930-4128 no later than three days before the Status  
2 (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference.

3 3. A joint supplemental status report, or separate supplemental status reports,  
4 shall be filed on or before **February 1, 2010**. The status report(s) shall advise the court whether  
5 an early settlement conference is desired by all parties and shall address the following matters:

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

26 4. Failure to file a timely status report or to appear at the status conference in  
person or telephonically may result in sanctions. See Local Rules 110 and 183.

DATED: December 7, 2009.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DALE A. DROZD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:kw  
Ddad1\orders.prose\amatrone1831.oasc.120409