

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE M. PASION,
Plaintiff,
v.
JOHN A. HAVILAND, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:10-cv-3227 TLN AC P

ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT
CONFERENCE

Plaintiff is a former state prisoner proceeding through counsel with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court has determined that this case will benefit from a settlement conference. Therefore, this case will be referred to Magistrate Judge Kendall J. Newman to conduct a settlement conference at the U. S. District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814 in Courtroom #25 on June 27, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. This case is set for a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Kendall J. Newman on June 27, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the U. S. District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814 in Courtroom #25.


///
///
///

1 2. A representative with full and unlimited authority to negotiate and enter into a binding
2 settlement shall attend in person.¹

3 3. Those in attendance must be prepared to discuss the claims, defenses, and damages.
4 The failure of any counsel, party, or authorized person subject to this order to appear in person
5 may result in the imposition of sanctions. In addition, the conference will not proceed and will be
6 reset to another date.

7 4. The parties are directed to exchange non-confidential settlement statements seven days
8 prior to the settlement conference. These statements shall simultaneously be delivered to the
9 court using the following email address: kjnorders@caed.uscourts.gov. If a party desires to share
10 additional confidential information with the court, they may do so pursuant to the provisions of
11 Local Rule 270(d) and (e).

12 DATED: June 10, 2016

13 
14 ALLISON CLAIRE
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16
17
18 ¹ While the exercise of its authority is subject to abuse of discretion review, “the district court has
19 the authority to order parties, including the federal government, to participate in mandatory
20 settlement conferences” United States v. United States Dist. Court for the N. Mariana
21 Islands, 694 F.3d 1051, 1053, 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2012)(“the district court has broad authority to
22 compel participation in mandatory settlement conference[s].”). The term “full authority to settle”
23 means that the individuals attending the mediation conference must be authorized to fully explore
24 settlement options and to agree at that time to any settlement terms acceptable to the parties. G.
25 Heileman Brewing Co. v. Joseph Oat Corp., 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), cited with
26 approval in Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss, 6 F.3d 1385, 1396 (9th Cir. 1993). The
27 individual with full authority to settle must also have “unfettered discretion and authority” to
28 change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. Pitman v. Brinker Int’l., Inc., 216
F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003), amended on recon. in part, Pitman v. Brinker Int’l., Inc.,
2003 WL 23353478 (D. Ariz. 2003). The purpose behind requiring the attendance of a person
with full settlement authority is that the parties’ view of the case may be altered during the face to
face conference. Pitman, 216 F.R.D. at 486. An authorization to settle for a limited dollar
amount or sum certain can be found not to comply with the requirement of full authority to settle.
Nick v. Morgan’s Foods, Inc., 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8th Cir. 2001).