

1
2
3
4 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 TIM SCHIEBERL,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 NANCY A. BERRYHILL,
11 Defendant.

Case No. [17-cv-02433-MMC](#)

**ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO
INFORM COURT WHETHER HE
CONSENTS TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE
FOR ALL PURPOSES**

12
13 In cases initially assigned to a district judge, the parties may consent at any time to
14 reassignment of the case to a magistrate judge for all purposes, including entry of final
15 judgment. See Civil L.R. 73-1(b).

16 On June 21, 2017, defendant consented to have a magistrate judge conduct all
17 further proceedings in the instant action. Accordingly, plaintiff is hereby DIRECTED to
18 advise the Court, no later than July 12, 2017, as to whether he consents to have a
19 magistrate judge conduct all further proceedings in the instant action.¹ For plaintiff's
20 convenience, a consent form is attached hereto; forms are also available at
21 <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov>, in the "Forms" section.

22 The parties are further advised that they may jointly request assignment to a
23 specific magistrate judge. Because defendant has previously filed a general consent,
24 any such joint request must be made in a separate document filed concurrently with
25


26
27 ¹ Normally, the Court would direct the parties to so inform the Court in their Joint
28 Case Management Statement filed in connection with a case management conference. Because the instant action involves a review of an administrative record, however, a case management conference has not been scheduled.

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

plaintiff's consent.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 21, 2017


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge