

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

PABLO ROBLES,)	Case No. 2:17-CV-01580 JAM-AC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>PRETRIAL CONFERENCE ORDER</u>
)	
v.)	
)	
CITY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Pursuant to court order, a Pretrial Conference was held via video on January 21, 2022 before Judge John Mendez. Kevin W. Harris appeared as counsel for plaintiff; Carl L. Fessenden and John R. Whitefleet appeared as counsel for defendant City of Sacramento. After hearing, the Court makes the following findings and orders:

I. JURISDICTION/VENUE

Jurisdiction is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a) and 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and has previously been found to be proper by order of this court, as has venue. Those orders are confirmed.

II. JURY/NON-JURY

Both parties have demanded a jury trial.

1 III. STATEMENT TO BE READ TO JURY

2 No later than March 14, 2022, the parties shall E-file a joint
3 statement of the case that may be read to the jury at the beginning
4 of jury selection.

5 IV. UNDISPUTED FACTS

6 1. In connection with its operation of the County Jail, the
7 jail staff have access to a database called the Jail Information
8 Management System ("JIMS).

9 2. The County does maintain JIMS.

10 3. JIMS gives access to what information may have been input
11 by superior court staff about the inmate's conviction or sentence.

12 4. JIMS does not give access to the actual court records or
13 allow the County to view the court orders themselves.

14 5. In April through May 2016, the Sheriff's Office's custom
15 was to comply with the information relative to court orders input
16 into JIMS.

17 6. On April 3, 2016, following an arrest for DUI, Plaintiff
18 was held at the Sacramento County jail.

19 7. County staff reviewed JIMS upon Pablo Robles' intake into
20 the jail.

21 8. JIMS indicated there was a court order for Pablo Robles
22 was to return to custody to complete his sentence in connection
23 with a prior sentence.

24 9. On April 19, 2016, Plaintiff submitted a grievance that
25 he was already time served.

26 10. On April 22, 2016, in response to the grievance Plaintiff
27 was informed the sentence from his Sacramento County Case 08F05507
28 is to run consecutively from his state prison commitment for a

1 Santa Clara County conviction.

2 11. Review of the grievance during an appeal may also trigger
3 a further check/review of what has been input into JIMS.

4 12. Plaintiff was released from custody from the Jail on May
5 6, 2016.

6 V. DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES

7 **The parties jointly submit:**

8 1. Whether there was a policy of the Sheriff's Department
9 that was deliberately indifferent to the Due Process Rights of
10 Plaintiff.

11 2. Whether Plaintiff was damaged and to what extent.

12 **Plaintiff also submits:**

13 1. Whether Plaintiff demanded to be brought before a judge

14 2. Despite Pablo Robles' Complaints about him being time
15 served and wanting to be taken before a Superior Court Judge,
16 County Jail Staff did not contact the Superior Court Staff to
17 determine whether the order in the JIMS was accurate.

18 3. Had the County Jail Staff Contacted the Superior Court
19 Staff or taken Pablo Robles before a Superior Court Judge, they
20 would have discovered that the Court information in the JIMS was
21 inaccurate.

22 4. Whether there was a delay in presenting Plaintiff before
23 a Judge?

24 5. Whether the delay was intentional?

25 6. Whether Defendant County's policy resulted in Plaintiff
26 being Falsely Imprisoned?

27 ///

28 ///

1 VI. DISPUTED EVIDENTIARY ISSUES

2 **A. Plaintiff's Statement**

3 Plaintiff anticipates filing the following Motions in
4 Limine:

5 1. Whether plaintiff's subsequent plea to the charge of
6 Driving Under the Influence is admissible?

7 2. Whether Plaintiff's subsequent conviction for possession
8 of cocaine should be admissible at the time of the trial?

9 3. Whether additional information concerning Plaintiff's
10 earnings which occurred after this case was taken off calendar
11 should be admissible regarding his earning capacity?

12 **B. Defendant's Statement**

13 Defendant anticipates filing the following Motions in Limine:

14 1. A Motion in Limine preventing Plaintiff or his counsel
15 from characterizing the information in JIMS as "false."

16 2. A Motion in Limine to prevent evidence or witnesses not
17 produced or disclosed during discovery.

18 3. A motion in limine to prevent evidence regarding alleged
19 failure of being "presented to a judge."

20 4. A motion in limine arguing a phone call to CDCR would have
21 resolved the issue.

22 5. A motion in limine to prevent the calling of certain
23 witnesses on Plaintiff's list.

24 6. A motion in limine to prevent the introduction of certain
25 exhibits on Plaintiff's list.

26 VII. RELIEF SOUGHT

27 **A. Relief Sought by Plaintiff**

28 Plaintiff seeks compensatory and special damages, past and

1 future wages, pain and suffering, and/or nominal damages, and
2 attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. section 1988.

3 **B. Relief Sought by Defendant**

4 Defendant requests that Plaintiff take nothing in this action.
5 Defendant further requests it be awarded attorney's fees and costs
6 of suit, and any additional relief as the Court deems just and
7 proper.

8 VIII. POINTS OF LAW

9 Trial briefs may be E-filed with the court no later than March
10 14, 2022. Any points of law not previously argued to the Court
11 should be briefed in the trial briefs.

12 IX. ABANDONED ISSUES

13 Defendant submits that Plaintiff has abandoned any claims
14 against any individual defendants and any substantive due process
15 claims, and vicarious liability under state law. Plaintiff denies
16 abandoning any claims, but acknowledges the state law claim is
17 directly against the County.

18 X. WITNESSES

19 Plaintiff anticipates calling the following witnesses:

- 20 1. Pablo Robles
- 21 2. Maria Cristina Andrade
- 22 3. Clerk in Sacramento County Superior Court in Department 8
23 or Person Most Knowledgeable
- 24 4. Devenna Wright
- 25 5. Sheriff's Records Officer Rachael Chandler
- 26 6. Sheriff's Records Officer Colleen Swartz
- 27 7. Alexander McCamy
- 28 8. Deputy Hardy (Badge No. 1434)

- 1 9. Deputy Daniel (Badge No. 645)
- 2 10. Deputy Monahan (Badge No. 452)
- 3 11. Deputy PAM (Badge No. 31)
- 4 12. Sgt. M. Lopez (Badge No. 179)
- 5 13. Deputy Mattoon (Badge No. 1095)
- 6 14. Officer S. Roby (Badge No. 529)
- 7 15. Emily Christine Santamaria
- 8 16. Maritza Ramirez
- 9 17. Erica Garren
- 10 18. Jessica McClain
- 11 19. Pablo Robles
- 12 20. Adult Division of Parole Supervisor who on April 6, 2016,
- 13 interviewed Plaintiff
- 14 21. Parole Officer Garcia
- 15 22. The Custodian of Records of the California Department of
- 16 Records or the Person Most Knowledgeable with the California
- 17 Department of Corrections
- 18 23. Taylor Brophy
- 19 24. Dan Nguyen
- 20 Defendant anticipates calling the following witnesses:
- 21 1. Kelly Sullivan
- 22 2. Devenna Wright
- 23 3. Rachael Chandler, Sheriff's Records Officer
- 24 4. Colleen Swartz, Sheriff's Records Officer
- 25 5. Alexander McCamy, or the Person Most Knowledgeable from
- 26 Defendant County of Sacramento
- 27 6. Pablo Robles
- 28 7. Maria Cristina Andrade

1 Each party may call a witness designated by the other.

2 A. No other witnesses will be permitted to testify unless:

3 (1) The party offering the witness demonstrates that the
4 witness is for the purpose of rebutting evidence which could not be
5 reasonably anticipated at the Pretrial Conference, or

6 (2) The witness was discovered after the Pretrial
7 Conference and the proffering party makes the showing required in
8 "B" below.

9 B. Upon the post-Pretrial discovery of witnesses, the
10 attorney shall promptly inform the court and opposing parties of
11 the existence of the unlisted witnesses so that the court may
12 consider at trial whether the witnesses shall be permitted to
13 testify. The evidence will not be permitted unless:

14 (1) The witnesses could not reasonably have been
15 discovered prior to Pretrial;

16 (2) The court and opposing counsel were promptly
17 notified upon discovery of the witnesses;

18 (3) If time permitted, counsel proffered the witnesses
19 for deposition;

20 (4) If time did not permit, a reasonable summary of the
21 witnesses' testimony was provided opposing counsel.

22 XI. EXHIBITS, SCHEDULES AND SUMMARIES

23 Plaintiff intends to introduce the following exhibits:

24 1. Pablo Robles conviction records for a violation of Health
25 and Safety Code §11377 on July 20, 2011, in Sacramento County
26 Superior Court Case No. 08F05507.

27 2. December 30, 2014, Pablo Robles motion to reduce his
28 sentence pursuant to California Proposition 47, the Sacramento

1 Superior Court reduced his sentence to a misdemeanor pursuant to
2 Penal Code §1170.18 reducing his sentence to eight months. A true
3 and correct copy of the signed order by Judge Marjorie Koller on
4 12/30/14 is attached to the First Amended Complaint as "Exhibit 2".

5 3. 12/20/14 Sacramento County Minute Orders of Judge Koller
6 (County Response to Request for Production of Documents 00027-
7 00029).

8 4. Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Operations Order
9 Arrest Types and Booking (County Response to Request for Production
10 of Documents 00040-00049).

11 5. Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Operations Order
12 Sentence Computation (County Response to Request for Production of
13 Documents 0005000).

14 6. Pablo Robles' May 2015 Plaintiff Pablo Robles motion to
15 reduce charges on which he was also serving time in California
16 State Prison-Solano redesignated as to misdemeanors pursuant to
17 Proposition 47. Santa Clara County Superior Court order granted
18 his motion indicating that he had been time served dated May 27,
19 2015, and the cover letter from County of Santa Clara's Public
20 Defender's Office is attached to the First Amended Complaint as
21 "Exhibit 3."

22 7. Documents contained within the Parole Office for which
23 Plaintiff will be subpoenaing for Trial.

24 8. Documents within the Possession, Custody, and Control of
25 the California Department of Correction for which Plaintiff will be
26 issuing a subpoena.

27 9. Arrest Records of April 3, 2016, DUI arrest of Plaintiff
28 Pablo Robles.

1 10. Court records of the April 5, 2016, Plaintiff PABLO
2 ROBLES was scheduled to appear in court on his DUI charge and the
3 decision to not charge him at the time.

4 11. The computer records of Sacramento County Superior Court
5 showing that on April 7, 2016, the Sacramento County Main Jail
6 website no longer indicated that he was being held on the DUI
7 charge, but now was being held on a count of Health and Safety Code
8 § 11357 with an Early Prison Release Date of 7/29/16.

9 12. April 11, 2016, County Jail Message Request from
10 Plaintiff PABLO ROBLES to Classification in the Sacramento Main
11 Jail to obtain copies of all documentation pertaining to his
12 incarceration i.e. charges, holds, etc. which is within the
13 possession custody and control of Defendant County of Sacramento.

14 13. April 17, 2016, grievance form from Plaintiff PABLO
15 ROBLES regarding him being falsely imprisoned on his prior criminal
16 case for which he served all this time. With a response by Sgt.
17 Lopez instead of attempting to determine if Plaintiff had served
18 his time stated as follows: "Mr. Robles if you feel that you are
19 not being held legally based on the previous court Rulings and
20 motion of your case I would encourage you to contact your attorney
21 so that everything can be cleared up and explained." A true and
22 accurate copy of this document was attached as "Exhibit 4 " to the
23 First Amended Complaint.

24 14. April 19, 2016, County Jail Message Request sent by
25 Plaintiff PABLO ROBLES to the Warden (Jail Commander) indicating
26 that he had been held since April 3, 2016 without having been taken
27 before a judge. A true and correct copy of that document is
28 attached hereto as "Exhibit 5" to the First Amended Complaint.

1 15. April 23, 2016, County Jail Message Request from
2 Plaintiff PABLO ROBLES to Floor Staff regarding whether he had a
3 "Parole Hold" which is within the possession, custody, and control
4 of Defendant County of Sacramento.

5 16. Documentation concerning the April 26, 2016, incident
6 where Plaintiff was scheduled for court which was cancelled which
7 is being subpoenaed for trial from the Sacramento County Superior
8 Court;;

9 17. April 26, 2016, Message Request form from Plaintiff Pablo
10 Robles to Records requesting his Central File, a copy of which was
11 attached as Exhibit "6" to his First Amended Complaint.

12 18. April 26, 2016, Message Request form from Plaintiff Pablo
13 Robles to Floor Staff Requesting to be notified of any holds,
14 pending charges, or next Court date a copy of which is attached as
15 Exhibit "7" of his First Amended Complaint.

16 19. April 28, 2016, Grievance form from Plaintiff PABLO
17 ROBLES regarding False Imprisonment. A true and correct copy of
18 that document is attached as Exhibit "8 " to the First Amended
19 Complaint.

20 20. May 2, 2016, Grievance form from Plaintiff PABLO ROBLES
21 regarding Violation of his Human Rights as a Prisoner. A true and
22 correct copy of that document is attached as Exhibit "9" to the
23 First Amended Complaint.

24 21. May 3, 2016, Message Request form from Plaintiff PABLO
25 ROBLES to Floor Staff regarding any holds and his next court date.
26 The Officer informed him over the intercom in his cell that his
27 next court date would be May 9, 2016. A true and correct copy of
28 those documents are attached hereto as Exhibit "10" to the First

1 Amended Complaint.

2 22. May 3, 2016 Superior Court of California County of
3 Sacramento Calendaring change which is Exhibit 5 to Pablo Robles
4 Deposition.

5 23. May 6, 2016, Sacramento Superior Court Judge Koller court
6 minute order attached as "Exhibit 11 " to the First Amended
7 Complaint which states "Per CDCR, Defendant time served and to be
8 released F/W."

9 24. May 6, 2016 Sacramento County Sheriff's Office
10 Transaction Receipt showing Plaintiff Pablo Robles was released on
11 May 6, 2016 (County 00001 in Response to Plaintiff's Request for
12 Production of Documents).

13 25. September 29, 2016, Claim Against Public Entity filed by
14 Pablo Robles with the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, a
15 true and correct copy of which is attached as "Exhibit 12" to the
16 First Amended Complaint.

17 26. January 30, 2017, notice of rejection of claim, a true
18 and correct copy of which is attached as "Exhibit 13" to the First
19 Amended Complaint.

20 27. 5/20/16 Letter from Emily Christine Sanatamaria with
21 attached text messages regarding Pablo Robles missing child's
22 birthday due to unlawful incarceration by County of Sacramento.

23 28. Birthday Card sent by Plaintiff to son when he was being
24 imprisoned.

25 29. Expenses incurred due to Pablo Robles' unlawful
26 incarceration by Martiza Ramirez on his behalf attached as "Exhibit
27 B" to the Rule 26 Disclosures

28 30. Expenses incurred due to Pablo Robles' unlawful

1 incarceration by his sister Erica on his behalf attached to the
2 Rule 26 Disclosures as "Exhibit C."

3 31. Expenses incurred due to Pablo Robles' unlawful
4 incarceration by Jessica McClain on his behalf attached to the Rule
5 26 Disclosures as "Exhibit D."

6 32. Expenses incurred by Pablo Robles directly due to
7 unlawful incarceration attached to the Rule 26 Disclosures as
8 "Exhibit E.;"

9 33. Documents related to Interruption of Business and Injury
10 of Reputation in his business due to the unlawful incarceration
11 attached as "Exhibit F" to the Rule 26 Disclosures.

12 34. Documents related to Pablo Robles Employment Search after
13 unlawful incarceration attached to the Rule 26 Disclosures as
14 "Exhibit G."

15 35. Pablo Robles 1099 for 2019.

16 36. Pablo Robles 1099 for 2020.

17 37. Checks from Old Sac Tattoo for 2021 work by Pablo Robles.

18 38. Old Sac Tatto Consent Forms showing income received.

19 39. Declaration of Rachel Chandler in Support of Defendant
20 Motion for Summary Judgement (potential impeachment).

21 40. Declaration of Alexander McCamy in Support of Defendant
22 Motion for Summary Judgement (potential impeachment).

23 41. Declaration of Devenna Wright in Support of Defendant
24 Motion for Summary Judgment (potential impeachment).

25 42. Declaration of Maria Cristina Andrade in Opposition to
26 Motion for Summary Judgement (potential recollection).

27 Defendant intends to introduce the following exhibits:

28 A. Order for Re-Designation of Sentence dated December 30,

1 2014, People v. Robles, Sacramento County Case No. 08F05507.

2 B. Minute order dated December 30, 2014, People v. Robles,
3 Sacramento County Case No. 08F05507.

4 C. Criminal Complaint filed on June 6, 2016, People v.
5 Robles, Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 16MI010841.

6 D. April 19, 2016, grievance; and April 22, 2016, response.

7 E. Request for Calendaring Change dated May 3, 2016, People
8 v. Robles, Sacramento County Case No. 08F05507.

9 F. Minute Order dated May 6, 2016, People v. Robles,
10 Sacramento County Case No. 08F05507.

11 Each party may use an exhibit designated by the other.

12 A. No other exhibits will be permitted to be introduced
13 unless:

14 (1) The party proffering the exhibit demonstrates that
15 the exhibit is for the purpose of rebutting evidence which could
16 not be reasonably anticipated at the Pretrial Conference, or

17 (2) The exhibit was discovered after the Pretrial
18 Conference and the proffering party makes the showing required in
19 paragraph "B," below.

20 B. Upon the post-Pretrial discovery of exhibits, the
21 attorneys shall promptly inform the court and opposing counsel of
22 the existence of such exhibits so that the court may consider at
23 trial their admissibility. The exhibits will not be received
24 unless the proffering party demonstrates:

25 (1) The exhibits could not reasonably have been
26 discovered prior to Pretrial;

27 (2) The court and counsel were promptly informed of
28 their existence;

1 (3) Counsel forwarded a copy of the exhibit(s) (if
2 physically possible) to opposing counsel. If the exhibit(s) may
3 not be copied, the proffering counsel must show that he has made
4 the exhibit(s) reasonably available for inspection by opposing
5 counsel.

6 As to each exhibit, each party is ordered to exchange copies
7 of the exhibit not later than fourteen (14) days before trial.
8 Each party is then granted five (5) days to file and serve
9 objections to any of the exhibits. In making the objection, the
10 party is to set forth the grounds for the objection. The parties
11 shall pre-mark their respective exhibits in accord with the Court's
12 Pretrial Order. Exhibit stickers may be obtained through the
13 Clerk's Office. An original and one (1) copy of the exhibits shall
14 be presented to Gabriel Michel, Deputy Courtroom Clerk, at 8:30
15 a.m. on the date set for trial or at such earlier time as may be
16 agreed upon. Mr. Michel can be contacted at (916) 930-4091 or via
17 e-mail at: gmichel@caed.uscourts.gov. As to each exhibit which is
18 not objected to, it shall be marked and may be received into
19 evidence on motion and will require no further foundation. Each
20 exhibit which is objected to will be marked for identification
21 only.

22 XII. DISCOVERY DOCUMENTS

23 A. Plaintiff's List

24 Plaintiff may offer the following discovery responses:

- 25 1. Defendant County of Sacramento's Rule 26 Disclosures;
- 26 2. Defendant County of Sacramento's Responses to Plaintiff
27 Pablo Robles' First Set of Interrogatories;
- 28 3. Defendant County of Sacramento's Responses to Plaintiff

1 Pablo Robles' First Set of Request for Production of Documents;

2 4. Plaintiff Pablo Robles' Notice of Deposition of Person(s)
3 Most Knowledgeable of Defendant County of Sacramento;

4 5. Deposition of Defendant County of Sacramento's PMK
5 Alexander McCamy;

6 6. Deposition of Pablo Robles; and

7 7. Plaintiff's Rule 26 Disclosures.

8 **B. Defendant's List**

9 Defendant may offer the following discovery responses:

10 A. Plaintiff's Responses to Interrogatories propounded by
11 Defendant;

12 B. Plaintiff's Responses to Requests for the Production of
13 Documents Propounded by Defendant;

14 C. Plaintiff's Responses to Requests for the Production of
15 Documents Propounded by Defendant; and

16 D. Defendant may offer the deposition testimony from
17 Plaintiff.

18 XIII. FURTHER DISCOVERY OR MOTIONS

19 Pursuant to the court's Status Conference Order, all discovery
20 and law and motion was to have been conducted so as to be completed
21 as of the date of the Pretrial Conference. That order is
22 confirmed. The parties are free to do anything they desire
23 pursuant to informal agreement. However, any such agreement will
24 not be enforceable in this court.

25 XIV. STIPULATIONS

26 To the extent possible, the Parties anticipate stipulating to
27 the admissibility of certain documents.

28 ///

1 XV. AMENDMENTS/DISMISSALS

2 The Parties do not anticipate requesting any amendments to
3 pleadings, dismissals, or additions or substitutions of parties.

4 XVI. FURTHER TRIAL PREPARATION

5 A. Counsel are directed to Local Rule 285 regarding the
6 contents of trial briefs. Such briefs may be E-filed on or before
7 March 14, 2022.

8 B. Counsel are further directed to confer and to attempt to
9 agree upon a joint set of jury instructions. The joint set of
10 instructions shall be lodged via ECF with the court clerk on or
11 before March 14, 2022 and shall be identified as the "Jury
12 Instructions Without Objection." As to instructions as to which
13 there is dispute the parties shall submit the instruction(s) via
14 ECF as its package of proposed jury instructions also on or before
15 March 18, 2022. This package of proposed instructions should not
16 include the "Jury Instructions Without Objection" and should be
17 clearly identified as "Disputed Jury Instructions" on the proposed
18 instructions.

19 The parties shall e-mail a set of all proposed jury
20 instructions in word format to the Court's Judicial Assistant, Jane
21 Klingelhoets, at: jklingelhoets@caed.uscourts.gov.

22 C. It is the duty of counsel to ensure that a hard copy of
23 any deposition which is to be used at trial has been lodged with
24 the Clerk of the Court pursuant to Local Rule 133(j). The
25 depositions shall be lodged with the court clerk no later than
26 March 14, 2022. Counsel are cautioned that a failure to discharge
27 this duty may result in the court precluding use of the deposition
28 or imposition of such other sanctions as the court deems

1 appropriate.

2 D. The parties are ordered to E-file with the court and
3 exchange between themselves no later than March 14, 2022, a
4 statement designating portions of depositions intended to be
5 offered or read into evidence (except for portions to be used only
6 for impeachment or rebuttal).

7 E. The parties are ordered to E-file with the court and
8 exchange between themselves no later than March 14, 2022, the
9 portions of Answers to Interrogatories and/or Requests for
10 Admission which the respective parties intend to offer or read into
11 evidence at the trial (except portions to be used only for
12 impeachment or rebuttal).

13 F. Each party may submit proposed voir dire questions the
14 party would like the court to put to prospective jurors during jury
15 selection. Proposed voir dire should be submitted via ECF no later
16 than March 14, 2022.

17 G. Each party may submit a proposed verdict form that the
18 party would like the Court to use in this case. Proposed verdict
19 forms should be submitted via ECF no later than March 14, 2022.

20 H. In limine motions shall be E-filed separately on or
21 before March 11, 2022 Opposition briefs shall be E-filed on or
22 before March 16, 2022 No reply briefs may be filed.

23 XVII. SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS

24 No further formal Settlement Conference will be set in this
25 case at this time.

26 XVIII. AGREED STATEMENTS

27 See paragraph III, *supra*.

28 ///

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

XIX. SEPARATE TRIAL OF ISSUES

None requested.

XX. IMPARTIAL EXPERTS/LIMITATION OF EXPERTS

Not applicable.

XXI. ATTORNEYS' FEES

The matter of the award of attorneys' fees to prevailing parties pursuant to statute will be handled by motion in accordance with Local Rule 293.

XXII. MISCELLANEOUS

No other issues have been identified.

XXIII. ESTIMATE OF TRIAL TIME/TRIAL DATE

The parties estimate three (3) to five (5) court days for trial. Trial will commence on or about March 21, 2022 at 9:00 a.m.

Counsel are to call Gabriel Michel, Deputy Courtroom Clerk, at (916) 930-4091, ten (10) days prior to trial to ascertain the status of the trial date.

XXIV. OBJECTIONS TO PRETRIAL ORDER

Each party is granted seven (7) days from the date of this Pretrial Order to object or respond to it via ECF.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 21, 2022

/s/ John A. Mendez

THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE