

1 F.2d 915, 924 (9th Cir. 1986) (providing “great leniency” when evaluating pro se plaintiff’s
2 compliance with technical rules of civil procedure). In so doing, for the reasons stated below, the
3 motion will be denied as moot.


4 On November 13, 2017, in response to an order issued by this court (see ECF No. 63),
5 defense counsel filed a declaration stating that she had informally discussed settlement with
6 plaintiff and that she believed that a settlement conference would be beneficial to the parties prior
7 to setting the case for trial. (See ECF No. 64 at 2). In December 2017, plaintiff filed a request for
8 a settlement conference as well as a status update on that request. (See ECF Nos. 66, 67).
9 Thereafter, plaintiff filed the instant motion in January 2018. (ECF No. 68). In it, plaintiff does
10 not provide any reasons in support of his request for a status conference. He simply states that he
11 is “prepared to go to trial if the Defendants choose not to settle this case.” (Id.).

12 On January 25, 2018, the court issued an order scheduling a settlement conference for the
13 parties on March 8, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. (ECF No. 70). At that time, an order directing plaintiff’s
14 custodian to produce him in this court on that date was also issued. (See ECF No. 71). To date,
15 neither party has contested either the conference date or its settlement content. Therefore, it is
16 presumed that both parties are still willing to attempt to settle this case and that there is no current
17 need to schedule the status conference plaintiff has requested.

18 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for a status conference
19 (ECF No. 68) is DENIED as moot.

20 The settlement conference currently scheduled for March 8, 2018 (see ECF No. 70) will
21 proceed as planned.

22 Dated: February 15, 2018

23
24
25 
26 DEBORAH BARNES
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28
29 DLB:13
30 DB/ORDERS/ORDERS.PRISONER.CIVIL RIGHTS/moor1232.stat.conf.req .rev