

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Attilio Armeni v. SN Servicing Corporation

No. CV 24-9457 FMO (ASx), United States District Court for the Central District of California (July 15, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California issued an order to show cause regarding sanctions or dismissal. The court directed the parties to explain by July 22, 2025 why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to file a required settlement notice or status report after the court-ordered settlement conference.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Central District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Fernando M. Olguin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Central District of California
DECIDED	July 15, 2025
DOCKET	CV 24-9457 FMO (ASx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court issued an order to show cause why sanctions or dismissal should not be imposed for failure to comply with a prior order requiring completion of a settlement conference and the filing of a settlement notice or status report.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Attilio Armeni, et al. v. SN Servicing Corporation

TOPICS

- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- sanctions
- settlement procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties should be required to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to comply with the court's settlement-conference and filing order.
2. Whether failure to respond to the order to show cause could warrant sanctions or dismissal for lack of prosecution under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT, no later than July 22, 2025, the parties shall show cause in writing why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to comply with the Court's Order of January 2, 2025."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had required the parties to complete a settlement conference with a private mediator no later than June 30, 2025. The parties were also required to file either a notice of settlement or, if the case did not settle, a settlement status report within specified deadlines. Neither filing had been made as of the date of the order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 2, 2025, the court ordered the parties to complete a settlement conference by June 30, 2025. If the case settled, the parties had to file a notice of settlement within 24 hours; otherwise, they had to file a settlement status report within 48 hours after the conference. As of July 15, 2025, neither filing had been made, so the court ordered the parties to show cause in writing by July 22, 2025, why sanctions should not be imposed and warned that failure to respond could result in sanctions or dismissal for lack of prosecution.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S. Ct. 1386, 1388 (1962)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 538 U.S. 909 (2003)