

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
For the Northern District of California

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 DIVISION

MAROUANE OUZIZ,

No. C 12-02378 KAW (LB)

Plaintiff(s),

**ORDER REGARDING SETTLEMENT  
CONFERENCE**

v.

ATM OPERATING, INC., ET AL.,

Defendant(s).

The court has reviewed the parties' helpful settlement papers. There is one issue, and that is that there is no clear demand-response now (just a recounting of the past course of demand-response and a new position by Plaintiffs). *See, e.g.*, Plaintiffs' Statement at 10, Eclipse's Statement at 9. Given the relatively short time available on Monday and the fact that people are flying in for the settlement process, the court suggests that it makes sense for counsel to talk by telephone no later than Friday morning to see if they can provide a negotiating bracket that is closer to where they were (as opposed to the clean slate that exists now). The court understands what Eclipse said in its statement, and it is also true that not a lot of time has passed. In any event, the parties must send an informal email to the court's orders box at [lbpo@cand.uscourts.gov](mailto:lbpo@cand.uscourts.gov) by Friday, December 14, 2012, at 3 p.m. with the current demand and the defendants' current response.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 13, 2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LAUREL BEELER  
United States Magistrate Judge