1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	OSHAY JOHNSON,
12	Plaintiff, No. 2:08-cv-1494 JAM KJN P
13	VS.
14	CARROL, et al.,
15	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
16	/
17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding with court-appointed counsel, in this civil
18	rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 28, 2012, the district judge adopted
19	the undersigned's findings and recommendations, thereby granting in part, and denying in part,
20	defendants' motion for summary judgment. (See Dkt. Nos. 43, 44.) This action now proceeds
21	on the following claims against the following defendants: (1) Against defendants Carroll and
22	Sisto, on plaintiff's First Amendment free exercise claims, and Fourteenth Amendment equal
23	protection claims; and (2) Against defendants J. Johnson, Fowler, Jackura, San Nicholas, and
24	Kesterson, on plaintiff's First Amendment retaliation and conspiracy claims.
25	Before scheduling this action for pretrial and trial proceedings, the court invites
26	counsel for plaintiff and defendants to consider whether a settlement conference would be helpful

in this action, and should first be set.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within 30 days after the filing date of this order, counsel for all parties shall file a joint statement that informs the court of the following: 1. Whether a settlement conference should be scheduled in this action and, if so, whether the parties agree that the undersigned may preside over the conference or request that another magistrate judge do so. 2. If all parties do not agree that a settlement conference should be set at this time, a joint statement that identifies: (a) the anticipated length of trial; and (b) any dates within the next year when any party may be unavailable for trial or a trial confirmation hearing. SO ORDERED. DATED: September 10, 2012 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE john1494.jt.stat.