

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 COREY CORONADO, No. 2:11-cv-00751-MCE-DAD
12 Plaintiff,
13 v. **ORDER CONTINUING TRIAL**
14 CONSTANCE NEISH, ET AL.,
15 Defendants.

17 Due to the Court's high caseload and on the Court's own motion, the
18 July 9, 2015, Final Pretrial Conference and August 10, 2015, Jury Trial are vacated and
19 both hearings will be reset in a forthcoming order. Accordingly, the Motions in Limine
20 (ECF Nos. 25-27 and 29-37) are vacated and denied as moot. The Motions as filed will
21 be considered at the rescheduled Final Pretrial Conference.

22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///
27 ///
28 ///

1 The parties are encouraged to consider consenting to a jury or nonjury trial before
2 the assigned Magistrate Judge¹ as well as availing themselves of the Court's Alternative
3 Dispute Resolution programs.² See E.D. Cal. Local Rs. 171, 301.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: June 29, 2015

6
7 
8 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR. CHIEF JUDGE
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

1 ¹ The Eastern District of California has for years been one of the busiest District Courts in the
2 nation. The parties are reminded that pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 73 and Local Rule 301,
3 the parties may consent to a jury or nonjury trial before the assigned Magistrate Judge. As a result of the
4 Court's high civil case load and the statutory right to a speedy trial in criminal cases, the parties are
5 encouraged to consider the advantages of consenting to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. Magistrate Judges
6 can assign civil litigants a trial date much sooner and with more certainty than District Court Judges. In
7 addition, since Magistrate Judges do not try felony cases, a trial date assigned by one can be considered
8 a firm date which will not be preempted by a criminal case. Exercise of this jurisdiction by a Magistrate
9 Judge is however, permitted only if all parties file a voluntarily consent form. Parties may, without adverse
10 substantive consequences, withhold their consent, but this will prevent the Court's case dispositive
11 jurisdiction from being exercised by a Magistrate Judge.

12

13 ² The Court may, at the election of all the parties, refer certain actions to the Voluntary Dispute
14 Resolution Program ("VDRP"). If the parties believe that participation in a mediation and/or a settlement
15 conference with a Magistrate Judge would be beneficial, they are encouraged to contact the Court's
16 Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Division, in writing, at the address or email address below: ADR
17 Division, Attention: Sujean Park, U.S. District Court, 501 I Street, Suite 4-200, Sacramento, CA 95814,
18 email: spark@caed.uscourts.gov. Alternatively, the parties may request referral to the VDRP by filing a
19 Stipulation and Proposed Order reflecting the agreement of all parties to submit the action to the VDRP
20 pursuant to Local Rule 271. Should the parties reach a settlement or otherwise resolve their case by
21 agreement of the parties, they are reminded that it is the duty of counsel to immediately file a notice of
22 settlement or resolution as set forth in Local Rule 160.