1 2 3 4	
5 6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION
11	
12	HENRY JIMENEZ, et al.,) Case No.: C 10-5177 PSG
13 14	Plaintiffs, ORDER CONTINUING CASE NANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND v. SETTING DEADLINE FOR PARTIES
14	v.) SETTING DEADLINE FOR TARTIES) EITHER TO FILE WRITTEN INSTATE LATH & PLASTER, INC.,) CONSENT TO THE JURISDICTION
16) OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE OR Defendant.)) TO REQUEST REASSIGNMENT TO A) DISTRICT JUDGE
17	The initial case management conference in this case is set for January 25, 2011, and the
18 19	deadline for filing a case management statement was January 18, 2011. See ADR Scheduling Order.
20	As a result, the parties were required either to file written consent to the jurisdiction of the
21	magistrate judge or to request reassignment to a district judge, no later than January 18, 2011. See
22	Civ. L. R. 73-1(a)(1). The parties have neither consented nor requested reassignment.
23	Plaintiff filed a short Case Management Conference Statement on January 18, 2011 requesting the case management conference be continued to March 29, 2011 because the case is in
24	the process of settling. Plaintiff, however, provides no explanation as to why setting a trial schedule
25	should be postponed for two months.
26	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that no later than January 25, 2011, the parties shall either file
27 28	written consent to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge or request reassignment to a district
28	judge.

Order

1	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the case management conference is continued to
2	February 1, 2011 at 2 p.m.
3	
4	Dated: January 20, 2011
5	Parl S. Anne PAUL S. GREWAL
6	United States Magistrate Judge
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	Order