1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6		
7 8	ADVANCED BUILDING & No. 2:13-cv-02380-GEB-CKD FABRICATION, INC., a California Corporation; and	
9	ROBERT HONAN, an individual, ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND	
10	Plaintiff,CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE	
11	v.	
12	CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL; JOHN WILSON, an individual;	
13	CURTIS J. AYERS an individual; and DOES 1 to 20,	
14	inclusive,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	The February 11, 2014 Order Granting Stay, (ECF No. 9),	
18	continued the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference until July	
19	7, 2014, and required the parties to file a joint status report	
20	no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduling	
21	conference. No status report was filed as ordered.	
22	Therefore, each party is Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC")	
23	in a writing to be filed no later than July 7, 2014, why	
24	sanctions should not be imposed against the party and/or the	
25	party's counsel under Rule 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil	
26	Procedure for failure to file a timely status report. The written	
27	response shall also state whether the party or the party's	
28	counsel is at fault, and whether a hearing is requested on the	

1

1	OSC. <sup>1</sup> If a hearing is requested, it will be held on August 4,
2	2014, at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the status conference, which is
3	rescheduled to that date and time. A joint status report shall be
4	filed no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the status
5	conference.
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	Dated: June 27, 2014
8	
9	Ambel E. Runelly
10	GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. Senior United States District Judge
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that is where the impact of the sanction should be lodged." In re Sanction of Baker, 744
27	F.2d 1438, 1442 (10th Cir. 1984), <u>cert. denied</u> , 471 U.S. 1014 (1985). Sometimes the faults of attorneys, and their consequences, are visited upon
28	clients. <u>Myers v. Shekter (In re Hill)</u> , 775 F.2d 1385, 1387 (9th Cir. 1985). 2