

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

TRAVELERS CASUALTY AND SURETY)	
COMPANY OF AMERICA, a)	2:11-cv-00716-GEB-EFB
Connecticut corporation,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND</u>
)	<u>CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL</u>
v.)	<u>SCHEDULING) ORDER</u>
)	
DICK EMARD ELECTRIC, INC. dba)	
EMARD ELECTRIC, a California)	
corporation; LUKE EMARD, an)	
individual; CARRIE EMARD, an)	
individual; EMARD'S ELECTRICAL)	
HOME TECHNICIANS, INC., an)	
entity of unknown form; EMARD)	
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, a)	
California corporation; and DOES)	
1 through 20, inclusive,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	


The March 16, 2011, Order Setting Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference scheduled a status conference in this case on July 11, 2011, and required the parties to file a joint status report no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduling conference. The March 16, 2011 Order further required that a status report be filed regardless of whether a joint report could be procured. No status report was filed as ordered.

Therefore, Plaintiff is Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than 4:00 p.m. on July 8, 2011, why

1 sanctions should not be imposed against it and/or its counsel under Rule
2 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to file a
3 timely status report. The written response shall also state whether
4 Plaintiff or its counsel is at fault, and whether a hearing is requested
5 on the OSC.¹ If a hearing is requested, it will be held on August 1,
6 2011, at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the status conference, which is
7 rescheduled to that date and time. A status report shall be filed no
8 later than fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: June 29, 2011

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

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