

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADVANCED BUILDING &
FABRICATION, INC., a
California Corporation; and
ROBERT HONAN, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL;
JOHN WILSON, an individual;
CURTIS J. AYERS an
individual; and DOES 1 to 20,
inclusive,

Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-02380-GEB-CKD

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND
CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL
SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE**

The June 27, 2014 Order to Show Cause, (ECF No. 10), continued the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference until August 4, 2014, and required the parties to file a joint status report no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduling conference. No status report was filed as ordered.¹


Therefore, each party is Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than August 4, 2014, why sanctions should not be imposed against the party and/or the party's counsel under Rule 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to file a timely status report. The written

¹ This is the second occasion that the parties have failed to timely file a status report.

1 response shall also state whether the party or the party's
2 counsel is at fault, and whether a hearing is requested on the
3 OSC.² If a hearing is requested, it will be held on August 18,
4 2014, at 9:00 a.m., just prior to the status conference, which is
5 rescheduled to that date and time. **A joint status report shall be**
6 **filed no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the status**
7 **conference.**

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: July 23, 2014

10
11
12 
13 _____
14 GARIAND E. BURRELL, JR.
15 Senior United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ² "If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact of
27 sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that is where
28 the impact of the sanction should be lodged." In re 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. Myers v. Shekter (In re Hill), 775 F.2d 1385, 1387 (9th Cir. 1985).