

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. C 11-04175 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

STEVE ANDRE,

Defendant.

**ORDER RESCHEDULING
PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND
NOTICE REGARDING JURY
TRIAL**

The final pretrial conference is **RESCHEDULED** for the morning of the trial in this matter: **FEBRUARY 11 AT 7:30 A.M.** The parties have failed to timely submit their joint proposed final pretrial order, which was due on January 28 (*see* Dkt. No. 33 ¶¶ 10, 15). The parties shall file this final pretrial order by **FEBRUARY 1 AT NOON**. Further un-excused delays may result in appropriate sanctions.

For the February 14 trial, both sides should be aware that the Court will have to summons a sufficient number of venire persons from around our district to properly compose a jury to decide this case. These individuals will have to travel to the courthouse and be available for jury selection. The expense of doing this will ordinarily constitute court costs taxable as such. More importantly, both sides should ask themselves whether it is right to insist on inconveniencing so many good citizens of our district in order to decide a case where approximately \$15,000 is at stake? Both sides should consider whether this action should be tried to the bench. But, absent a

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

stipulation filed by **FEBRUARY 6 AT NOON**, the Court will have no choice but to summons the required number of venire persons.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 29, 2013.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE