

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Judy West, et al. v. Ford Motor Company, et al.

West · No. 1:25-cv-01266-KES-CDB · Decided January 8, 2026

OPINION

West

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 10 JUDY WEST, et al., Case No. 1:25-cv-01266-KES-CDB 11 Plaintiffs, ORDER
REQUIRING COUNSEL FOR

PLAINTIFFS TO SHOW CAUSE IN

12

v. WRITING WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD

13 NOT BE IMPOSED FOR FAILURE TO

FORD MOTOR COMPANY, et al., TIMELY APPEAR AT SCHEDULING

14 CONFERENCE

Defendants, 15 (Doc. 2) 16 January 12, 2026, Deadline 17 18 Background 19 Plaintiffs Judy West
and Paula West-Moore (“Plaintiffs”) initiated this action with the 20 filing of a complaint on
September 11, 2023, in the County of Kern Superior Court, Case No. 21 BCV-23-103052, against
Defendants Ford Motor Company (“Ford”) and Jim Burke Ford 22 (collectively, “Defendants”),
before Defendant Ford removed the case to this Court on September 23 23, 2025. (Doc. 1; Doc. 1-
1 Exhibit A). On September 24, 2025, the Court entered an order setting 24 the initial scheduling
conference for January 8, 2026, at 9:00 AM. (Doc. 2). In the order, the 25 parties were provided
the email address for the undersigned’s courtroom deputy for the parties to 26 request and obtain
Zoom teleconference connection details. Id. at 2. Further, the courtroom deputy 27 forwarded the
Zoom connection details via email to counsel for the parties in advance of the scheduling
conference. 1 On January 8, 2026, the Court convened via Zoom videoconference for the
scheduling 2 conference. Cait Crable appeared on behalf of Defendants. Plaintiffs did not timely
appear either 3 personally or through counsel. After the Court and Ms. Crable waited for five
minutes from the 4 start of the conference for Plaintiffs’ appearance, Nina Sanaia joined the Zoom
teleconference but 5 was unprepared to enter an appearance when the case was called due to her
experiencing 6 audio/technical difficulties. After troubleshooting that issue, Ms. Sanaia, an un-

noticed attorney, 7 entered her appearance on behalf of Plaintiffs, and after the Court questioned why she is not a 8 noticed attorney on the docket, Ms. Sanaia explained that she would file a notice of appearance 9 shortly after the conference. When the Court asked Ms. Sanaia to explain the circumstances of 10 her late appearance, she stated that she was covering for noticed counsel who were busy with trial 11 in an unrelated matter, was only recently provided a link to access the conference, and provided 12 no further details. The Court deemed these explanations unsatisfactory and the undersigned 13 recessed the scheduling conference and notified counsel that a show cause order would follow. 14 Local Rule 110 provides that “[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with these Rules 15 or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all 16 sanctions . . . within the inherent power of the Court.” The Court has the inherent power to control 17 its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate. *Bautista v. 18 Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000). 19 Conclusion and Order 20 In light of counsel for Plaintiffs’ failure to timely appear at the mandatory scheduling 21 conference on January 8, 2026, it is HEREBY ORDERED, counsel for Plaintiffs shall show cause 22 in writing no later than January 12, 2026, why sanctions should not be imposed for Plaintiffs’ 23 failure to obey this Court’s orders. 24 25 Remainder of This Page Intentionally Left Blank 26 27 1 And it is FURTHER ORDERED that counsel for Plaintiffs initiate meet and confer efforts 2 | with counsel for Defendant and identify in counsel’s response to this show cause order at least two 3 | proposed dates of mutual availability to reconvene for scheduling conference no earlier than 14 4 | days from the date of this order. 5 Failure to comply with this order to show cause may result in the imposition of 6 | sanctions, up to and including a recommendation to dismiss the case. 7 IT ISSO ORDERED. 5! Dated: _ January 8, 2026 | br Pr 9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28