

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

LAUSTEVEION JOHNSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
GENTRY, et al.
Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01671-APG-EJY

ORDER

Presently before the Court is *pro se* Plaintiff Lausteveion Johnson's Requests for Settlement Conference Via Video. ECF Nos. 81 and 87. The Court has considered Plaintiff's Requests and Defendants' Opposition (ECF No. 91).

Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Requests plainly states that Defendants have "do not have a settlement offer and do not intend to provide a monetary offer." ECF No. 91 at 1. Defendants further state that at the last jury trial involving Plaintiff, the jury returned a defense verdict. *Id.* at 2. Given these representations, and understanding the numerous cases Plaintiff has filed (including, without limitation, *Johnson v. NDOC et al*, 2:11-cv-00675-PMP-LRL; *Johnson v. Kraft Foods et al*, 2:16-cv-00042-MMD-GWF; *Johnson v. Dr. Lee, et al*, 3:13-cv-00273-RCJ-VPC; *Johnson v. Smith et al*, 3:16-cv-00556-RCJ-VPC; and *Johnson v. Covid-19 et al.*, 2:21-cv-00247-APG-EJY), the Court finds that a settlement conference in this case is not a reasonable use of the Court's resources.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Lausteveion Johnson's Requests for Settlement Conference Via Video (ECF Nos. 81 and 87) are DENIED.

DATED THIS 22nd day of June, 2021.


ELAYNA J. YOUCHAK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE