	Case 2:21-cv-02338-KJM-CKD Document 14	10 Filed 05/22/23 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	THE BETTER MEAT CO.,	No. 2:21-cv-02338-KJM-CKD
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER
13	v.	
14	EMERGY, Inc. d/b/a MEATI FOODS, PAUL VRONSKY, and BOND CAPITAL	
15	MANAGEMENT LP.,	
16	Defendants.	
17 18	EMERGY, INC. d/b/a MEATI FOODS,	
19	Counter Claimant,	
20	v.	
21	THE BETTER MEAT CO. and AUGUSTUS	
22	PATTILLO,	
23	Counter Defendants.	
24		
25	On April 17, 2023 this court granted defendant/counter claimant Emergy's motion to	
26	strike under California's anti-SLAPP statute. Prior Order (Apr. 17, 2023), ECF No. 134. Emergy	
27	then moved for attorneys' fees and costs related to this motion. Mot. for Fees, ECF No. 136. In	
28	response, plaintiff/counter defendant Better Meat filed a motion for administrative relief, asking	

## 

the court to stay the briefing and hearing of Emergy's motion "until after entry of a final judgment." Mot. for Admin. Relief at 2, ECF No. 137.

This court's standing order requires attorneys to meet and confer with one another before they file motions. *See* Standing Order at 3, ECF No. 4-1. However, the parties' counsel have not met and conferred prior to the filing of this motion for administrative relief. Mot. for Admin. Relief. In email correspondence between the parties, Better Meat's counsel suggests this requirement would be futile here. Ex. 1 at 2, ECF No.137–1. However, the correspondence indicates Emergy's counsel was willing to schedule a time to meet and confer and had "several questions about the scope and basis of [the] motion." *Id.* at 3. Instead, after one failed scheduling attempt, Better Meat's counsel proposed speaking with opposing counsel the day after filing the motion; if the parties came to any agreement after the motion was filed, Better Meat would remove the motion from the calendar "with no one worse for wear." *Id.* at 2.

As discussed in detail in *Mollica v. County of Sacramento*, this court is "unwilling to excuse non-compliance with its standing order." No. 2:19-02017, 2022 WL 15053335, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 26, 2022). The meet and confer requirement saves time and resources for the court, counsel, clients and other litigants before the court. *See id.* Counsel's ill-fated strategy to file the present motion and then remove the motion only if/when the parties reached an agreement, would, in fact, not leave "no one worse for wear." Counsel has wasted its client's money, its own time and resources and the time and resources of this court.

The **court denies Better Meat's motion for administrative relief without prejudice.** If Better Meat wishes to refile this motion, it must comply with the court's standing order before doing so.

This order resolves ECF No. 137.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 22, 2023.

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE