

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRENCE VAIL,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF SACRAMENTO,
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-2673 DB PS

ORDER

On April 4, 2017, the court issued an order setting this matter for a Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference on May 26, 2017.¹ (ECF No. 7.) On May 26, 2017, the Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference was held. Plaintiff Terrence Vail appeared in person on his own behalf. There was no appearance, however, on behalf of defendant City of Sacramento. The failure of a party to comply with any order of the court “may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” Local Rule 110.

////

////

¹ The parties have consented to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1). (ECF No. 12.)

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendant show cause in writing within fourteen days of the date of this order as to why defendant should not be sanctioned for failing to appear at the May 26, 2017 Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference; and

2. The May 26, 2017 Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference is continued to **Friday, July 7, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.**, at the United States District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California, in Courtroom No. 27, before the undersigned.²

DATED: May 26, 2017

/s/ DEBORAH BARNES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DLB:6
DB/orders/orders.consent/vail2673.osc.cont

² Defendant's May 16, 2017 amended status report (ECF No. 11) indicates that, despite having filed an answer to the complaint, defendant may attempt to proceed on a dispositive motion. If defendant intends to file such a motion, defendant is instructed to do so forthwith, so as to avoid further delaying this action.