

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
SAN JOSE DIVISION

DANIEL RAMIREZ, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

CASE NO. 5:10-cv-04374 EJD

**ORDER RE: AMENDED JOINT CASE
MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

Plaintiff(s),

v.

UNITED RENTALS, INC.,

Defendant(s).

_____ /

On June 14, 2013, the court ordered the parties to file a Joint Case Management Statement. See Docket Item No. 61. The parties did so on June 28, 2013. See Docket Item No. 62.

Having reviewed the statement, the court finds that it does not comply with the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California concerning the contents of a Joint Case Management Statement. Specifically, the parties did not sufficiently address alternative dispute resolution or provide a schedule as required.¹ Accordingly, the court orders the parties to file an Amended Joint Case Management Statement which complies with this District's Standing Order on or before **July 12, 2013**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 2, 2013


EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge

¹ As to ADR, the Standing Order requires the parties to address “[p]rospects for settlement, ADR efforts to date, and a specific ADR plan for the case, including compliance with ADR L.R. 3-5 and a description of key discovery or motions necessary to position the parties to negotiate a resolution.” With regard to scheduling, the Standing Order requires proposed dates “for designation of experts, discovery cutoff, hearing of dispositive motions, pretrial conference and trial.”