1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ARIA KOZAK, ET AL.,	No. 2:10-cv-01056-MCE-EFB
12	Plaintiffs,	
13	V.	ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL
14	CHABAD-LUBAVITCH INC., ET AL.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED the jury trial is vacated and continued to	
18	January 20, 2015, at 9:00 a.m. in Courtroom 7. The parties shall file trial briefs not later	
19	than November 20, 2014. Counsel are directed to Local Rule 285 regarding the content	
20	of trial briefs.	
21	Accordingly, the November 13, 2014 Final Pretrial Conference is vacated and	
22	continued to December 4, 2014, at 2:00 p.m. in Courtroom 7. The Joint Final Pretrial	
23	Statement is due not later than November 13, 2014 and shall comply with the	
24	procedures outlined in the Court's Pretrial Scheduling Order. The personal appearances	
25	of the trial attorneys or person(s) in pro se is mandatory for the Final Pretrial Conference.	
26	Telephonic appearances for this hearing are not permitted.	
27	///	
28	///	
		1

1	Any evidentiary or procedural motions are to be filed by <b>November 13, 2014</b> .	
2	Oppositions must be filed by November 20, 2014 and any reply must be filed by	
3	November 26, 2014. The motions will be heard by the Court at the same time as the	
4	Final Pretrial Conference.	
5	Due to the Court's high civil caseload, the parties are encouraged to consider	
6	consenting to a jury or nonjury trial before the assigned Magistrate Judge <sup>1</sup> as well as	
7	availing themselves of the Court's Alternative Dispute Resolution programs. <sup>2</sup> See E.D.	
8	Cal. Local Rs. 171, 301.	
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10	DATED: October 9, 2014	
11	CALITAS	
12	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR, CHIEF JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	nation. The parties are reminded that pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 73 and Local Rule 301, the parties may consent to a jury or nonjury trial before the assigned Magistrate Judge. As a result of the Court's high civil case load and the statutory right to a speedy trial in criminal cases, the parties are encouraged to consider the advantages of consenting to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. Magistrate Judges can assign civil litigants a trial date much sooner and with more certainty than District Court Judges. In addition, since Magistrate Judges do not try felony cases, a trial date assigned by one can be considered a firm date which will not be preempted by a criminal case. Exercise of this jurisdiction by a Magistrate	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23	jurisdiction from being exercised by a Magistrate Judge.	
24	<sup>2</sup> The Court may, at the election of all the parties, refer certain actions to the Voluntary Dispute Resolution Program ("VDRP"). If the parties believe that participation in a mediation and/or a settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge would be beneficial, they are encouraged to contact the Court's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Division, in writing, at the address or email address below: ADR Division, Attention: Sujean Park, U.S. District Court, 501 I Street, Suite 4-200, Sacramento, CA 95814, email: spark@caed.uscourts.gov. Alternatively, the parties may request referral to the VDRP by filing a Stipulation and Proposed Order reflecting the agreement of all parties to submit the action to the VDRP pursuant to Local Rule 271. Should the parties reach a settlement or otherwise resolve their case by agreement of the parties, they are reminded that it is the duty of counsel to immediately file a notice of	
25		
26		
27		
28	settlement or resolution as set forth in Local Rule 160.	
	2	