1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DONALD ANDERSON, ET AL. ,	No. 2:12-cv-01057-MCE-GGH
12	Plaintiffs,	
13	ν.	ORDER
14	CENTURY SURETY COMPANY, ET AL.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED this matter is confirmed for an eight (8) day jury	
19	trial on January 30, 2017, at 9:00 a.m., in courtroom 7. Due to this Court's high criminal	
20	and civil case load, the Court will not consider a request for continuance of this	
21	confirmed trial date. The parties shall file trial briefs not later than January 9, 2017.	
22	Counsel are directed to Local Rule 285 regarding the content of trial briefs.	
23	Accordingly, a Final Pretrial Conference is set on December 1, 2016, at	
24	2:00 p.m., in Courtroom 7. The Joint Final Pretrial Statement is due not later than	
25	November 17, 2016, and shall comply with the procedures outlined in the Court's	
26	Pretrial Scheduling Order (ECF No. 26). The personal appearances of the trial attorneys	
27	or person(s) in pro se is mandatory for the Final Pretrial Conference. Telephonic	
28	appearances for this hearing are not permitted.	
		1

1	Any evidentiary or procedural motions are to be filed by November 9, 2016.	
2	Oppositions must be filed by November 16, 2016 and any reply must be filed by	
3	November 23, 2016. The motions will be heard by the Court at the same time as the	
4	Final Pretrial Conference.	
5	Due to the Court's high civil caseload, the parties are encouraged to consider	
6	consenting to a jury or nonjury trial before the assigned Magistrate Judge ¹ as well as	
7	availing themselves of the Court's Alternative Dispute Resolution programs. ² See E.D.	
8	Cal. Local Rs. 171, 301.	
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10	DATED: May 17, 2016	
11	MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	¹ The Eastern District of California has for years been one of the busiest District Courts in the nation. The parties are reminded that pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 73 and Local Rule 301, the parties may consent to a jury or nonjury trial before the assigned Magistrate Judge. As a result of the Court's high civil case load and the statutory right to a speedy trial in criminal cases, the parties are encouraged to consider the advantages of consenting to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. Magistrate Judges can assign civil litigants a trial date much sooner and with more certainty than District Court Judges. In addition, since Magistrate Judges do not try felony cases, a trial date assigned by one can be considered a firm date which will not be preempted by a criminal case. Exercise of this jurisdiction by a Magistrate Judge is however, permitted only if all parties file a voluntarily consent form. Parties may, without adverse substantive consequences, withhold their consent, but this will prevent the Court's case dispositive jurisdiction from being exercised by a Magistrate Judge.	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	² The Court may, at the election of all the parties, refer certain actions to the Voluntary Dispute Resolution Program ("VDRP"). If the parties believe that participation in a mediation and/or a settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge would be beneficial, they are encouraged to contact the Court's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Division, in writing, at the address or email address below: ADR Division, Attention: Sujean Park, U.S. District Court, 501 I Street, Suite 4-200, Sacramento, CA 95814, email: spark@caed.uscourts.gov. Alternatively, the parties may request referral to the VDRP by filing a Stipulation and Proposed Order reflecting the agreement of all parties to submit the action to the VDRP pursuant to Local Rule 271. Should the parties reach a settlement or otherwise resolve their case by agreement of the parties, they are reminded that it is the duty of counsel to immediately file a notice of settlement or resolution as set forth in Local Rule 160.	
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	