11     JOHN DOES 1 through 11,     )     CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE       12     Defendants.     )	1	
4         5       IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT         6       FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA         7       8         9       PATRICK COLLINS, INC., a         9       Plaintiff,         10       V.         11       JOHN DOES 1 through 11,	2	
6 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 PATRICK COLLINS, INC., a ) 9 Plaintiff, ) 10 v. ) 11 JOHN DOES 1 through 11, ) 12 Defendants. ) 13 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 CONTINUE CONTINUE CONTINUE 15 CONTINUE CONTINUE 16 CONTINUE CONFERENCE	3	
6 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 PATRICK COLLINS, INC., a ) 9 Plaintiff, ) 10 v. ) 11 JOHN DOES 1 through 11, ) 12 Defendants. ) 13 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 CONTINUE CONTINUE CONTINUE 15 CONTINUE CONTINUE 16 CONTINUE CONFERENCE	4	
<pre>7 8 PATRICK COLLINS, INC., a California Corporationm 9 Plaintiff, 10 v. 11 JOHN DOES 1 through 11, 12 Defendants.</pre> 2:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 9 12:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 12:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 13:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 14:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 15:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 15	5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
<pre>6 California Corporationm ) 2:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 9 Plaintiff, ) 10 v. 0 11 JOHN DOES 1 through 11, 0 12 Defendants. 0</pre>	6	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
<pre>6 California Corporationm ) 2:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM 9 Plaintiff, ) 10 v. 0 11 JOHN DOES 1 through 11, 0 12 Defendants. 0</pre>	7	
Plaintiff,       )         10       v.         11       JOHN DOES 1 through 11,         12       Defendants.	8	
v.     CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL       11     JOHN DOES 1 through 11,     SCHEDULING) CONFERENCE       12     Defendants.	9	· · ·
JOHN DOES 1 through 11, ) 12 Defendants. )	10	v. ) <u>CONTINUING STATUS (PRETRIAL</u>
Defendants. )	11	
13 )	12	) Defendants. )
	13	)

The May 30, 2012 Order Setting Status (Pretrial Scheduling) Conference scheduled a status conference in this case on October 1, 2012, and required the parties to file a joint status report no later than fourteen (14) days prior to the scheduling conference. The May 30, 2012 Order further required that a status report be filed regardless of whether a joint report could be procured. No status report was filed as ordered.

Therefore, Plaintiff is Ordered to Show Cause ("OSC") in a writing to be filed no later than October 1, 2012, why sanctions should not be imposed against it and/or its counsel under Rule 16(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for failure to file a timely status report. The written response shall also state whether Plaintiff or its counsel is at fault, and whether a hearing is requested on the OSC.<sup>1</sup> If

27

• 11

28

1

<sup>&</sup>quot;If the fault lies with the attorney, that is where the impact (continued...)

## Case 2:12-cv-01458-GEB-JFM Document 11 Filed 09/21/12 Page 2 of 2

1	a hearing is requested, it will be held on October 15, 2012, at 9:00
2	a.m., just prior to the status conference, which is rescheduled to that
3	date and time. A status report shall be filed no later than fourteen
4	(14) days prior to the status conference.
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.
6	Dated: September 21, 2012
7	ANED MI
8	GARLAND E. BURREIL, JR.
9	Senier United States District Judge
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	<sup>1</sup> (continued)
26	of sanction should be lodged. If the fault lies with the clients, that is where the impact of the sanction should be lodged." <u>Matter of</u>
27	Sanction of Baker, 744 F.2d 1438, 1442 (10th Cir. 1984), <u>cert. denied</u> , 471 U.S. 1014 (1985). Sometimes the faults of attorneys, and their
20	concerning and wighted upon alignets. In no Hill 775 F 2d 1205 1207

<sup>28</sup> consequences, are visited upon clients. <u>In re Hill</u>, 775 F.2d 1385, 1387 (9th Cir. 1985).