1 ||

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	VALETTA MCMURRAY,)
12	Plaintiff,) 02:09-cv-02245-GEB-EFB
13	v.) <u>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE</u>) <u>AND CONTINUING STATUS</u>
14	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO;) <u>(PRETRIAL SCHEDULING)</u> CONFERENCE
15	Sheriff JOHN MCGINNESS;) Deputy Sheriffs JAVIER)
16	BUSTAMANTE, V. CANDIDO, L.) CULP, and DOES 1 through 10,)
17	inclusive,)
18	Defendants.)
19	The August 13, 2009, Order Setting Status (Pretr

The August 13, 2009, Order Setting Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference scheduled a status conference in this case for November 30, 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 December 28, 2009, why sanctions should not be imposed against her and/or her counsel

1

1	under Rule 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for
2	failure to file a timely status report. The written response shall
3	also state whether Plaintiff or her counsel is at fault, and
4	whether a hearing is requested on the OSC. 1 If a hearing is
5	requested, it will be held on January 19, 2009, at 9:00 a.m., just
6	prior to the status conference, which is rescheduled to that date.
7	A status report shall be filed no later than fourteen days prior to
8	the status conference.
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.
10	Dated: November 24, 2009
11	1152 11
12	GARLAND E. BURBELL, JB.
13	United States District Judge
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	¹ "If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact of sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that
26	is where the impact of the sanction should be lodged." <u>Matter of</u> Sanction of Baker, 744 F.2d 1438, 1442 (10th Cir. 1984), cert. denied,
27	471 U.S. 1014 (1985). Sometimes the faults of attorneys, and their
28	consequences, are visited upon clients. <u>In re Hill</u> , 775 F.2d 1385, 1387 (9th Cir. 1985).