

1 ORRY P. KORB, County Counsel (S.B. #114399)
 MELISSA R. KINIYALOCTS, Deputy County Counsel (S.B. #215814)
 2 OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL
 70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, Ninth Floor
 3 San Jose, California 95110-1770
 Telephone: (408) 299-5900

4 Attorneys for Defendant
 5 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

6 DAVID J. STOCK, ESQ. (S.B. #85655)
 RANKIN, STOCK & HEABERLIN
 7 96 N. Third Street, Suite 500
 San Jose, California 95112
 8 Telephone: (408) 293-0463

9 Attorneys for Defendant
 10 OFFICER PHILLIP ABECENDARIO

11 DAVID S. ROSENBAUM, ESQ. (S.B. #151506)
 McDOWALL COTTER
 2070 Pioneer Court
 12 San Mateo, California 94403
 Telephone: (650) 572-0834

13 Attorneys for Defendant
 14 OFFICER TUAN LE

15 ROBERT R. POWELL, ESQ. (S.B. #159747)
 SARAH E. MARINHO, ESQ. (SB #293690)
 16 LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT R. POWELL
 925 West Hedding Street
 17 San Jose, California 95126
 Telephone: (408) 553-0200

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 19 RUBEN GARCIA

20
 21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

22 RUBEN GARCIA,
 23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA et al.,
 26 Defendants.

No. 16-CV-00012-RMW

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
 STATEMENT AND ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

Date: April 29, 2016
 Time: 10:30 a.m.
 Crtrm.: 6, 4th Floor
 Judge: Ronald M. Whyte

1 The parties to the above-entitled action submit this Joint Case Management Statement and
2 Proposed Order pursuant to the Standing Order for All Judges of the Northern District of California
3 and Civil Local Rule 16-9.

4 1. Jurisdiction and Service

5 This action arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Jurisdiction is conferred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§
6 1331 and 1343. The County of Santa Clara has been served and filed an Answer. Defendants
7 Phillip Abecendario and Tuan Le have filed waivers of service of summons, and their deadline to
8 respond to the Complaint is May 2, 2016.

9 2. Plaintiff's Allegations and Pending Criminal Investigation

10 Plaintiff Ruben Garcia alleges that while he was an inmate at the County's Main Jail,
11 Defendants Abecendario and Le, who are correctional officers, violated his constitutional rights by
12 allegedly using excessive force and denying him medical care in July 2015. Plaintiff alleges that the
13 County was on notice of a pattern of unconstitutional conduct by correctional officers and
14 demonstrated deliberate indifference to this alleged pattern and also allegedly failed to provide
15 adequate training to correctional officers. Defendants deny Plaintiffs' allegations.

16 The parties believe that the Office of the District Attorney has an open criminal investigation
17 pertaining to the incidents alleged in the Complaint but has not brought charges.

18 3. Legal Issues

19 Plaintiff brings claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for alleged violations of the Fourth,
20 Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments against the correctional-officer defendants and a *Monell*
21 claim against the County. Plaintiff also brings state-law claims for intentional infliction of
22 emotional distress, alleged violations of California Civil Code section 52.1, and breach of mandatory
23 duty.

24 4. Motions

25 There are no pending motions. Given the early posture of the case, the parties are unable to
26 identify anticipated motions at this time.

27 //

28 //

1 5. Amendment of Pleadings

2 Plaintiffs anticipate amending the complaint to correctly spell the full and complete name of
3 Mr. Phillip Abecendario, and include the first name of correctional officer Le.

4 6. Evidence Preservation

5 The parties have reviewed the Guidelines for the Discovery of Electronically Stored
6 Information (ESI), which were revised on December 1, 2015. The parties are aware of their
7 obligations to cooperate on issues relating to the preservation, collection, search, review, and
8 production of ESI and that the proportionality standard set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
9 26(b)(1) applies to discovery in this case. The parties agree to meet and confer as necessary to
10 address any issues regarding ESI.

11 7. Disclosures

12 The parties agree to serve their initial disclosures pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
13 26 by May 27, 2016.

14 8. Discovery

15 Discovery has not yet begun. The parties agree that discovery may be impacted by the
16 pending criminal investigation pertaining to the incidents alleged in the Complaint. It is premature
17 at this time to set a discovery schedule given the uncertainty of the timing and outcome of the
18 criminal investigation.

19 9. Class Action

20 This case is not a class action.

21 10. Related Cases

22 There are no related cases.

23 11. Relief

24 Plaintiff will be seeking emotional distress damages, compensation for pain and suffering,
25 past and future medical expenses associated with injuries sustained to his jaw/teeth with anticipated
26 future surgeries, and punitive damages in an amount to be determined at trial according to proof.

27 12. Settlement and ADR

28 The parties have agreed to mediation and that the case will not be in a posture to effectively

1 mediate the case until after the pending criminal matter is complete.

2 13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes

3 The County has not consented to proceed before a Magistrate Judge.

4 14. Other References

5 The parties agree that this case is not suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special
6 master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

7 15. Narrowing of Issues

8 At this time the parties are not aware of any issues that can be narrowed by agreement or
9 motion.

10 16. Expedited Trial Procedure

11 The parties agree that this case is not suitable for the Expedited Trial Procedure of General
12 Order No. 64.

13 17. Scheduling

14 Given the pending criminal investigation and the uncertainty at this time of the timing and
15 outcome of that matter, the parties agree that it is premature to schedule dates for designation of
16 experts, discovery cutoff, hearing of dispositive motions, pretrial conference, and trial.

17 18. Trial

18 This case will be tried to a jury, and the estimated length of trial at this time is two weeks.

19 19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons

20 The County is exempt from filing a Certification of Interested Entities or Persons.

21 20. Professional Conduct

22 All attorneys of record for the parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct
23 for the Northern District of California.

24 21. Other

25 Given the pending criminal investigation and the parties' inability at this time to set a
26 discovery schedule and trial date, the parties respectfully request that the Court continue the Case
27 Management Conference for 60 days.

28 //

1 I hereby attest that I have on file all holographic signatures corresponding to any signatures
2 indicated by a conformed signature /S/ within this e-filed document.

3
4 ORRY P. KORB
County Counsel

5
6 Dated: April 14, 2016

By: _____ /S/
MELISSA R. KINIYALOCTS
Deputy County Counsel

7
8 Attorneys for Defendant
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

9
10 RANKIN, STOCK & HEABERLIN

11
12 Dated: April 14, 2016

By: _____ /S/
DAVID J. STOCK, ESQ.

13
14 Attorneys for Defendant
OFFICER PHILLIP ABECENDARIO

15
16 McDOWALL COTTER

17 Dated: April 14, 2016

By: _____ /S/
DAVID S. ROSENBAUM, ESQ

18
19 Attorneys for Defendant
OFFICER TUAN LE

20
21 LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT R. POWELL

22 Dated: April 14, 2016

By: _____ /S/
ROBERT R. POWELL, ESQ.

23
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff
RUBEN GARCIA

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

ORDER

The Court continues the Initial Case Management Conference to July 1, 2016, at
10:30 a.m.

Dated: 4/19/2016


RONALD M. WHYTE
Senior District Judge

1298854