

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

Northern District of California

San Francisco

DANIEL SPALDING, et al.,

No. C 11-02867 TEH (LB)

Plaintiffs,

**ORDER RE FURTHER
SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE**

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,

Defendants.

The court held a further settlement conference on July 3, 2012 and orders the following.

As discussed, the parties will ask the district court to continue the case management conference until mid-September 2012. The parties will stay further discovery and any litigation until after the next settlement conference.

The parties shall meet and confer as discussed and thereafter contact courtroom deputy Lashanda Scott on or before July 16, 2012 to set a further settlement conference at their earliest convenience (and as the court's schedule allows). The defendants shall meet and confer separately on the matters discussed and shall update the court by July 16, 2012 with their plan for moving forward. That update may be informal by email to the court's orders box at lbpo@cand.uscourts.gov, or the parties may arrange a separate or joint telephone call through Ms. Scott.

Also, as discussed, the court's intent is that before the next settlement conference, the defendants (either collectively or individually) shall comply with paragraph D(1)(c) of the court's settlement conference order. *See* 12/14/11 Order, ECF No. 28, at 4. The defendants also shall ensure that

1 persons with policy making authority are at the next settlement conference. The court is willing to
2 accommodate the schedules of those policymakers by conducting the settlement conference in
3 Oakland (likely in the lawyers' lounge) and by setting a time certain for their participation. The
4 defendants shall include this information in their updated settlement statement to the court. The
5 parties' updated settlement conference statements shall be lodged with the court at least two
6 business days before the next settlement conference. They should contain only new information
7 (such as the defendants' compliance with paragraph D(1)(c) and who will be attending the
8 conference) and may be emailed to the court's orders box.

9 If any of these time frames are too ambitious given the scheduling issues discussed, the parties
10 are free to modify them by agreement.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: July 3, 2012



13 LAUREL BEELER
14 United States Magistrate Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28