1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10	EMIR SEHIC,		
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:12-cv-3030 DAD		
12	VS.		
13	WILLIAM VAN ANDERSON;ORDER SETTING STATUSMAYUKA S ANDERSON,CONFERENCE		
14	MATORA 5 ANDERSON, <u>CONTERENCE</u>		
15	Defendants		
16	/		
17	Each of the parties in the above-captioned case have consented to proceed before		
18	the assigned magistrate judge. By order filed March 12, 2013, the action was reassigned to the		
19	undersigned.		
20	On May 24, 2013, the parties appeared before the undersigned, a settlement		
21	conference was held, the parties reached a settlement agreement and the terms and conditions of		
22	that settlement agreement were placed on the record. On June 4, 2013, plaintiff filed a document		
23	with the court indicating that there is now a dispute between the parties over the terms of the		
24	settlement agreement that was reached.		
25	////		
26	////		
	1		

	1	
,	2	,

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

A Telephonic Status Conference is set for Friday, July 26, 2013, at 10:00
 a.m., at the United States District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California, in Courtroom No.
 27, before the undersigned.

Each party shall appear at the Telephonic Status Conference, either by counsel
 or, if proceeding <u>in propria persona</u>, on his own behalf. The parties shall contact Pete Buzo, the
 courtroom deputy of the undersigned magistrate judge, at (916) 930-4128, <u>no later than 48 hours</u>
 <u>before the Telephonic Status Conference</u>; a land line telephone number must be provided.

9 3. Each party may, but is not required to, file and serve a separate status report on
10 or before July 19, 2013, of no more than 5 pages addressing the current state of the parties'
11 dispute.

4. The parties are cautioned that failure to appear at the status conference *will likely* result in an order imposing an appropriate sanction.¹ See Local Rules 110 and 183; see
<u>also Moon v. Newsome</u>, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) ("once a pro se IFP litigant is in
court, he is subject to the relevant law and rules of court, including the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure. These rules provide for sanctions for misconduct and for failure to comply with court
orders.").

8 DATED: June 13, 2013.

Ddad1\orders.consent\sehic3030.ossc2

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

DAD:6

1. A. Dag

DALE A. DROZD UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The Court will drop this matter from the July 26, 2013 calendar if plaintiff files a notice 26 of voluntary dismissal on or before July 22, 2013.