UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL ANTHONY THOMAS, Plaintiff, v. WARE, et al., Defendants.	No. 2:22-cv-00177-TLN-EFB (PC) ORDER REQUESTING CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT STATEMENTS FOR PRISONER SETTLEMENT PROGRAM

The parties to this action shall each, no later than thirty (30) days from the date of the order, submit confidential statements as described below. The confidential statements shall not be served on the opposing party or filed with the court, but instead, delivered by mail, fax, email or personal delivery to the court's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) division at the address, fax number or email address below and marked "Confidential." Such statements shall be limited to five (5) pages and shall include the following:

1. The party's assessment of whether the instant action is of the type that would benefit from a settlement proceeding;
2. The party's assessment of what factors, if any, will prevent settlement of this matter prior to trial; and
3. Any additional information the court may find useful in determining whether to set this matter for a settlement conference.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Should the court determine that this action is appropriate for referral to the Prisoner Settlement Program, it will set this matter for settlement conference before a magistrate judge or district judge. If not, the court will direct the parties to file pretrial statements. This order resolves plaintiff's December 1, 2025 request for settlement conference (ECF No. 78).[1]

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 2, 2026

cc: ADR Division, Attention: Sujean Park
US District Court
501 I Street, Suite 4-200
Sacramento, CA 95814
Fax: (916) 491-3912
email: spark@caed.uscourts.gov

EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

[1] Defendants filed an opposition to plaintiff's request for a settlement conference. ECF No. 79. That opposition was based primarily on the then-pendency of defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 68). Defendants requested that any settlement conference be deferred until the motion was resolved. The court has denied the motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 84. Accordingly, the court finds it appropriate for the parties to explore the possibility of settlement at this time.