

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CURTIS CLIFFORD INGRAM,
Plaintiff,
v.
K. STERLING, ET AL.,
Defendant.

Case No.: 14-cv-02691-GPC(DHB)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S EX
PARTE MOTION FOR COURT-
ORDERED SETTLEMENT
CONFERENCE**

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff’s *ex parte* motion seeking a Court-ordered settlement conference pursuant to Rules 16(a), (c) and 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (ECF No. 20.) On April 15, 2016, Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) against defendants K. Sterling, K. Balakian, K.A. Seibel, and Warden Paramo (collectively, “Defendants”). (ECF No. 18.) Defendants have not yet responded to the SAC.

The Court will issue an order setting a Case Management Conference only after Defendants file an answer to the SAC. Shortly after the Case Management Conference,

1 the Court will issue a scheduling order. The scheduling order will set forth a date for a
2 Mandatory Settlement Conference before the magistrate judge.¹

3 If the parties wish to stipulate to an earlier settlement conference before the
4 magistrate judge, the parties may do so. However, as Defendants have not yet filed an
5 answer to the SAC, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's *ex parte* motion is DENIED.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: April 20, 2016



9
10 DAVID H. BARTICK
11 United States Magistrate Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ In accordance with Civil Local Rule 16.1(e), an Early Neutral Evaluation
27 Conference will not be set in this matter. *See* Civ. L.R. 16.1(e)(8). In addition, a Rule
28 26(f) conference is not required because Plaintiff, who is in state custody, is bringing this
action *pro se*. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(B), (f).