

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
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK HUESTIS; DIANE HUESTIS,)	2:09-cv-01739GEB-DAD
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE</u>
)	<u>AND CONTINUING STATUS</u>
v.)	<u>(PRETRIAL SCHEDULNG)</u>
)	<u>CONFERENCE</u>
INDYMAC FEDERAL BANK; HOME LOAN)	
SERVICING; INDYMAC BANK, F.S.B.,)	
QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORP.;)	
MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION)	
SYSTEMS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	


The June 24, 2009, Order Setting Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference scheduled a status conference in this case for September 21, 2009, and required the parties to file a joint status report no later than fourteen days prior to the scheduling conference. The Order further required that a status report be filed regardless of whether a joint report could be procured. No status report was filed as ordered.

Plaintiff is Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than 4:00 p.m. on October 5, 2009, why sanctions should not be imposed against him and/or his counsel under Rule 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to file a timely status report. The written response shall also state whether Plaintiff or his counsel is at fault, and

1 whether a hearing is requested on the OSC.¹ If a hearing is
2 requested, it will be held on October 19, 2009, at 9:00 a.m., just
3 prior to the status conference, which is rescheduled to that date.
4 A status report shall be filed no later than fourteen days prior to
5 the status conference.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: September 15, 2009

8
9 
10 _____
11 GARLAND E. BURRILL, JR.
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 ¹ "If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact
27 of sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that
28 is where the impact of the sanction should be lodged." Matter of
Sanction of Baker, 744 F.2d 1438, 1442 (10th Cir. 1984), cert. denied,
471 U.S. 1014 (1985). Sometimes the faults of attorneys, and their
consequences, are visited upon clients. In re Hill, 775 F.2d 1385, 1387
(9th Cir. 1985).