

1" Dela Rosa v. Scottsdale Memorial Health Systems, Inc., 136
2 F.3d at 1241, 1244 (9th Cir. 1998). A sanction may be imposed under
3 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(f) unless the judge finds the
4 noncompliance with a filing requirement "was substantially justified
5 or that other circumstances" show it should not issue. See Ayers v.
6 City of Richmond, 895 F.2d 1267, 1269-70 (9th Cir. 1990) (upholding
7 sanction where counsel failed to appear for a settlement conference
8 because the date "slipped by him"); Ikerd v. Lacy, 852 F.2d 1256,
9 1258-59 (10th Cir. 1988) ("Neither contumacious attitude nor chronic
10 failure is a necessary threshold to the imposition of sanctions under
11 Rule 16").

12 The primary purpose of sanctions in the Rule 16 context "is
13 to insure reasonable management requirements for case preparation."
14 Matter of Sanction of Baker, 744 F.2d 1438, 1441 (10th Cir. 1984); see
15 also 1983 Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f) ("[The]
16 explicit reference to sanctions reenforces the rule's intention to
17 encourage forceful judicial management."). Thus, violations of Rule
18 16 are not merely technical or trivial, but involve a "matter most
19 critical to the court itself: management of its docket," and the
20 avoidance of unnecessary delays and problems in the administration of
21 its cases. Baker, 744 F.2d at 1441.

22 It behooves counsel to comply with court orders. As the
23 First Circuit observed in Legault v. Zambrano, 105 F.3d 24, 28 (1st
24 Cir. 1997), "the trial judge has an independent responsibility to
25 enforce the directives he has laid down for the case."

26 Rules are rules - and the parties must play by
27 them. In the final analysis, the judicial process
28 depends heavily on the judge's credibility. To
ensure such credibility, a district judge must
often be firm in managing crowded dockets and

