1

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	BRYAN THEODORE,)
12	Plaintiff,)) 0RDER RE: SETTLEMENT
13	v.) <u>AND DISPOSITION</u>
14	I.Q. DATA INTERNATIONAL, INC.,
15	Defendant.
16	/

On June 17, 2009, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Settlement 17 in which he states "a settlement of the present matter has been 18 19 reached . . . which Plaintiff anticipates will be finalized within the next 40 days." Therefore, a dispositional document shall be 20 filed no later than July 27, 2009. Failure to respond by this 21 22 deadline may be construed as consent to dismissal of this action 23 without prejudice, and a dismissal order could be filed. See L.R. 24 16-160(b) ("A failure to file dispositional papers on the date 25 prescribed by the Court may be grounds for sanctions.").

Further, the status (pretrial scheduling) conference scheduled for July 13, 2009, is rescheduled to commence at 9:00 a.m. on August 24, 2009, in the event that no dispositional document is

1

1	filed, or if this action is not otherwise dismissed. A joint status
2	report shall be filed fourteen days prior to the status conference. 1
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: June 30, 2009
5	ANTRAL
6	GARIAND E. BURBELL, JB.
7	United States District Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	¹ The status conference will remain on calendar, because the mere representation that an action has been settled does not
26	justify removal of the action from a district court's trial docket.
27	<u>Cf.</u> <u>Callie v. Near</u> , 829 F.2d 888, 890 (9th Cir. 1987) (indicating that a representation that claims have been settled does not
28	necessarily establish the existence of a binding settlement agreement).