1	1	
2		
3		
4	4	
5	5	
6	6	
7	7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	Northern District of California	
10	Oakland Division	
11	1 ANDREW H. MEISEL, et al., No. C 10-01786 LB	
12	2 Plaintiffs, ORDER CONTINUING CASE v. MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE	
13		
14		
15		
16	At the parties' request (ECF No. 72 at 3), the court continued the case management conference	
17	scheduled for April 7, 2011 to May 5, 2011 at 10:30 a.m. ECF No. 74. In the parties' joint case	
18	management statement, they stated that they had executed a written "Contingent Settlement	
19	Agreement." ECF No. 72 at 2. The parties anticipated executing a final settlement agreement by	
20	April 24, 2011. <i>Id.</i> at 3. The parties further stated that they would notify the court of the state	us of
21	the settlement on or before April 30, 2011. Id. While the case's docket includes a minute order	
22	from Judge Spero that indicates that the parties have reached a settlement (ECF No. 74), the p	arties
23	have not notified the court of the settlement or otherwise provided any updates as of today's d	late.
24	24 ///	
25	25 ///	
26	26 ///	
27		
28	28 ///	
	ORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE C 10-01786 LB	
	Decket	e luctio c

Accordingly, the court CONTINUES the case management conference scheduled for May 5,
2011 to May 26, 2011 at 10:30 a.m. and ORDERS the parties to file an updated joint case
management statement by May 19, 2011. In the joint case management statement – and in light of
the trial currently scheduled to begin on July 23, 2011 – the parties shall address any remaining
timing issues, including the date by which they will file a dismissal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 3, 2011

LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE C 10-01786 LB