

1 orders. Docket No. 55.¹

2 Plaintiff has now submitted, *ex parte*, a belated confidential settlement conference statement
3 and a document that appears to relate to the Court’s order to show cause at Docket No. 55.
4 Regarding the latter, with certain exceptions not applicable here, neither party nor an attorney for any
5 party may make an *ex parte* communication with the Court. Local Rule IA 7-2(b). Additionally, it
6 is impossible for Defendants to respond to a filing they have not seen. *See* Docket No. 55 at 1-2
7 (stating that “Defendants may respond” to Plaintiff’s response to the order to show cause “no later
8 than April 10, 2017”).

9 The Court will not consider this improper *ex parte* communication and will destroy it.
10 Plaintiff shall comply with the Local Rules, and the Court’s order at Docket No. 55, by filing a
11 response to the Court’s order to show cause on the docket, no later than April 3, 2017. Failure to
12 comply with this order may result in sanctions.

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: March 31, 2017.

15
16 
17 NANCY J. KOPPE
18 United States Magistrate Judge
19
20
21
22

23 ¹ On March 29, 2017, this case was closed. Docket Nos. 56, 57. Nonetheless, the fact that
24 a case has been dismissed does not impact a court’s ability to rule on an earlier-issued order to show
25 cause. “It is well established that a federal court may consider collateral issues after an action is no
26 longer pending.” *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 395 (1990). Even after judgment
27 is entered, courts retain jurisdiction to impose sanctions for previous misconduct in the case pursuant
to Rule 16(f) and Local Rule IA 4-1. *See, e.g., Maui One Excavating*, 2013 WL 1908328, at *2 (D.
Nev. May 7, 2013) (citing *United Energy Owners Comm. v. U.S. Energy Mgmt. Sys., Inc.*, 837 F.2d
356, 358 (9th Cir. 1988)).