1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 DAVID HARRINGTON, 9 2:10-cv-00783-GEB-DAD Plaintiff, 10 V. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND 11 CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL OASIS FINANCIAL SOLUTIONS, LLC, SCHEDULING) ORDER 12 a corporation; KASHANDA BROCK, an individual, 13 Defendants. 14 15 An order issued on September 14, 2010, which continued the 16 Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference until 9:00 a.m. on December 13, 17 2010, based upon Plaintiff's representations concerning his efforts to 18 obtain default judgments against both defendants. (ECF No. 21.) The 19 September 14, 2010 Order prescribed: 20 If a Defendant appears in this action, a Joint 21 Status Report shall be filed fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference. Alternatively, if 22 there is no appearance, Plaintiff shall file a Status Report fourteen (14) days prior to the 23 status conference in which he is only required to explain the status of the default judgments. If 24 Plaintiff fails to file a motion for entry of default judgments, he shall file an explanation as 25 to why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute no later than fourteen (14) 26 days prior to the status conference. 27 Id. at 2:2-10. No status report was filed as required. 28

1 | 2 | fix 3 | no 4 | Fe 5 | re 6 | co 7 | a 8 | a 9 | da 10 | da 11 | 12 | Da 13 | 14 |

Plaintiff is Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than 4:00 p.m. on January 4, 2010, 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 whether a hearing is requested on the OSC. If a hearing is requested, it will be held on January 18, 2011, at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the status conference, which is rescheduled to that date and time. A status report shall be filed no later than fourteen days prior to the status conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 6, 2010

GARLAND E. BURREIL, JR. United States District Judge

[&]quot;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 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).