1			
2			
3			
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
5	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
6			
7	JACK MITCHELL, JR.; AND MARJA	No. 2:15-cv-00058-GEB-CMK	
8	MITCHELL,		
9			
10		SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE; FED. R.	
11	STEVEN CULVER., individually and as a Federal Ranger;	CIV. P. 4(M) NOTICE	
12	Individually and as a rederat		
13	Ranger,	Defendants.	
14	Defendants.		
15			
16	The January 9, 201	015 Order Setting Status (Pretrial	
17	Scheduling) Conference schedul	ed a status conference in this case	
18	on April 20, 2015, and requ	ired the parties to file a joint	
19	status report no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the		
20	scheduling conference. The January 9, 2015 Order further required		
21	a status report be filed regardless of whether a joint report		
22	could be procured. No status re	eport was filed as ordered.	
23	Therefore, Plaintiff	s are Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC")	
24	in a writing to be filed no	b later than April 24, 2015, why	
25	sanctions should not be imposed against them and/or their counsel		
26	under Rule 16(f) of the Fede	eral Rules of Civil Procedure for	
27	failure to file a timely sta	atus report. The written response	
28			
		1	

1 shall also state whether Plaintiffs or their counsel is at fault, 2 and whether a hearing is requested on the OSC.¹ If a hearing is 3 requested, it will be held on June 8, 2015, at 9:00 a.m., just 4 prior to the status conference, which is rescheduled to that date 5 and time. A joint status report shall be filed no later than 6 fourteen (14) days prior to the status conference.

7 Further, Plaintiffs are notified under Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that failure to serve each 8 9 Defendant with process within the 120 day period prescribed in 10 that Rule may result in the unserved defendant(s) and/or this 11 action being dismissed. To avoid dismissal, on or before May 11, 2015, Plaintiffs shall file proof of service for each Defendant 12 13 or a sufficient explanation why service was not completed within Rule 4(m)'s prescribed service period. 14

IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: April 14, 2015

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

GARIAND E. BURRELL, JR. Senior United States District Judge

"If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact of 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), cert. denied, 471 U.S. 1014 (1985). Sometimes the faults of attorneys, and their consequences, are visited upon 28 clients. Myers v. Shekter (In re Hill), 775 F.2d 1385, 1387 (9th Cir. 1985).