

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

SAMUEL SALDANA,
Plaintiff,
v.
M.E. SPEARMAN, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-0319 AC P

ORDER

After plaintiff requested that the court set this case for a second settlement conference, ECF No. 34, defendant was ordered to advise the court whether he believed a settlement conference would be beneficial at this time, ECF No. 37. Defendant has now responded that he does not believe a second settlement conference would be beneficial at this time. ECF No. 40. The request for a settlement conference will therefore be denied. Plaintiff is still free to discuss possible settlement with defendant’s counsel without a settlement conference. However, any such communications should not be filed with the court.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s request for a second settlement conference, ECF No. 34, is denied.

DATED: April 10, 2020


ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE