



**(PS) Gifford v. Hornbrook Fire Protection District et al**

2019 | Cited 0 times | E.D. California | March 1, 2019

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROGER GIFFORD,

Plaintiff, v. HORN BROOK FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:16-CV-0596-JAM-DMC

ORDER

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, brings this civil action. No defendants have appeared. 1

The matter is currently set for an initial scheduling conference on March 6, 2019, at 10:00 a.m. before the undersigned in Redding, California. Because, however, plaintiff has not completed service on all defendants and has not filed a scheduling conference statement within Plaintiff will nonetheless be required to appear on March 6, 2019, at 10:00 a.m., in Redding,

////////

1 Of the six defendants named in the complaint, only defendant Joseph Hott has been served. See Doc. 10. Defendant Hott failed to respond to the complaint within the required time and the Clerk of the Court has entered his default. See Doc. 12.

California, to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders. See Local Rule 110. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 28, 2019

\_\_\_\_\_ DENNIS M. COTA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE

