1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	
9 10	GENERAL ELECTRIC CAPITAL) CORPORATION, a Delaware) corporation,)
11) 02:09-cv-02379-GEB-KJM Plaintiff,)
12	v.) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING)
13	DAVINA C. CARRIER, a citizen) <u>CONFERENCE</u> and resident of California,)
14 15	Defendant.
13)

16 The September 1, 2009 Order Setting Status (Pretrial 17 Scheduling) Conference scheduled a status conference in this case 18 for January 19, 2010 and required the parties to file a joint 19 status report no later than fourteen days prior to the scheduling 20 conference. The Order further required that a status report be 21 filed regardless of whether a joint report could be procured. No 22 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 January 22, 2010, why sanctions should not be imposed against it and/or its 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 its counsel is at fault, and whether a hearing

1

1	is requested on the OSC. 1 If a hearing is requested, it will be
2	held on March 1, 2010, at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the status
3	conference, which is rescheduled to that date and time. A status
4	report shall be filed no later than fourteen days prior to the
5	status conference.
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	Dated: January 14, 2010
8	1152 11
9	GARLAND E. BURRELL, JB. United States District Judge
10	United States District Stage
11	
12 13	
13 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
26	of sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that is where the impact of the sanction should be lodged." Matter of
27	Sanction of Baker, 744 F.2d 1438, 1442 (10th Cir. 1984), <u>cert. denied</u> , 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).