

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Bruce Michael Broaddus,)	
)	2:10-cv-02856-GEB-DAD
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND</u>
)	<u>CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL</u>
Dennis Bunting; Azniv Darbinian;)	<u>SCHEDULING) ORDER</u>
Romona M. Margherio; Solano)	
County Office of County Counsel;)	
and DOES 1-20 inclusive,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The October 22, 2010, Order Setting Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference ("October 22 Order") scheduled a status conference in this case on March 14, 2011, and required the parties to file a joint status report no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduling conference. The parties did not file a Joint Status Report until March 4, 2011. (ECF No. 13.)

Therefore, the parties are Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than 4:00 p.m. on March 28, 2011, why sanctions should not be imposed against them and/or their 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 the parties or their counsel are at fault, and whether a hearing is

1 requested on the OSC.¹ If a hearing is requested, it will be held on
2 April 11, 2011, at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the status conference, which
3 is rescheduled to that date and time. A further joint status report
4 shall be filed no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the status
5 conference.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: March 7, 2011

8
9 
10 _____
11 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 _____
26 ¹ "If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact
27 of sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that
28 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).