



1 stated that he did not believe ADR would be effective until after completion of discovery, at  
2 which time, he would prefer ENE. In its brief and at the case management conference, Defendant  
3 stated that it believed a judicial settlement conference would be more useful than ENE. As the  
4 parties do not agree on an ADR process selection at this time,

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the case is no longer referred to ENE. If it becomes  
6 apparent that ADR would be useful, the court, on its own initiative or at the request of one or  
7 more parties, may refer the case to one of the court's ADR programs or to a judicially hosted  
8 settlement conference. Civ. L.R. 16-8(a).

9

10 Dated: January 7, 2011

11

  
PAUL S. GREWAL  
United States Magistrate Judge

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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

*Counsel automatically notified of this filing via the court's Electronic Case Filing system.*

copies mailed on 1/7/11 to:

James Price Salsman  
1324 Carlton Ave  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

/s/ Kelly Lowenberg for  
OSCAR RIVERA  
Courtroom Deputy