

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 CHASSIDY F. LUCAS, et al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 JOE CAMACHO, et al.,

12 Defendants.

CASE NO. C11-5350BHS

13
14 ORDER DENYING
15 DEFENDANTS' MOTION
16 FOR A STATUS
17 CONFERENCE

18 This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Joe Camacho, Deborah
19 Camacho and Angela Stephenson's ("Camacho Defendants") motion for a status
20 conference (Dkt. 45). The Court has reviewed the brief filed in support of the motion and
21 the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion for the reasons stated herein.

22 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

23 On May 5, 2011, Plaintiffs Chassidy Lucas, Bianca Lucas, and CB Stormwater
24 ("Plaintiffs") filed a complaint against Defendants Joe Camacho, Deborah Camacho,
25 Angela Stephenson, George Parker, and Ali Parker. Dkt. 1. On May 16, 2011, the Court
26 issued an order establishing certain deadlines as follows: Joint Status Report due by
27 9/13/2011, FRCP 26f Conference Deadline is 8/23/2011, Initial Disclosure Deadline is
28 9/6/2011. Dkt. 3.

On August 3, 2011, the Camacho Defendants filed a motion for a status
conference. Dkt. 45. Although Plaintiffs have filed various documents, it is unclear

1 whether Plaintiffs filed a document that was responsive to the Camacho Defendants'
2 motion. On August 19, 2011, the Camacho Defendants replied. Dkt. 53.

3 II. DISCUSSION

4 In their motion, the Camacho Defendants request a judicial status conference "to
5 resolve various decorum, procedural, factual, and jurisdictional issues which for reasons
6 stated below cannot be resolved without strict judicial oversight." Dkt. 45 at 1-2. The
7 Camacho Defendants list several issues that it seeks to discuss with the Court. *Id.* at 4.
8 Only three of these issues actually relate to this civil action: the Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)
9 conference, the propriety of a stay, and a protective order.


10 With regard to the discovery conference, all parties must attempt in good faith to
11 hold a discovery conference. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(2). It is Plaintiffs' responsibility to
12 initiate the communications necessary to comply with the Court ordered conference. Dkt.
13 3 at 4-5. If any party fails to participate in framing a discovery plan, the party may be
14 subject to sanctions by the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(f). Failure to comply with this Court
15 order may result in dismissal of the action. Fed. R. Civ. P. (b)(2). With these rules in
16 mind, the Court does not find that there is a need for a judicial conference at this time.

17 With regard to a stay and/or a protective order, the proper method of requesting
18 relief from the Court is by filing a motion. Local Rule 7.
19

20 III. ORDER

21 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Camacho Defendants' motion for a
22 status conference (Dkt. 45) is **DENIED**.

23 DATED this 8th day of September, 2011.

24
25 
26 _____
27 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
28 United States District Judge