

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Smith v. Diaz

Smith · No. 20-cv-04335-HSG · Decided June 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California vacated an evidentiary hearing and directed that pending factual issues be resolved by jury trial following the Supreme Court's decision in *Perttu v. Richards*. The Court scheduled a case management conference for July 1, 2025, and provided proposed dates for a pretrial conference and a two-week trial, which it directed the parties to discuss and accommodate.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
DECIDED	June 25, 2025
DOCKET	20-cv-04335-HSG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Case-management order addressing the effect of a recent Supreme Court decision and scheduling further proceedings for a jury trial.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; procedural case-management order
PARTIES	C. Jay Smith v. Ralph Diaz, et al.

TOPICS

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the scheduled evidentiary hearing should be vacated and pending factual issues proceed to a jury trial in light of *Perttu v. Richards*.
- How the case should be scheduled to allow trial to occur by the end of 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case had an evidentiary hearing scheduled, but the parties stipulated that the hearing should be vacated and that pending factual issues should instead be resolved by a jury trial. The court noted the age and current posture of the case and directed the parties to prepare for a case-management conference concerning a pretrial conference and trial later in 2025.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The parties stipulated that the evidentiary hearing should be vacated and that pending factual issues should be decided by a jury trial in light of *Perttu v. Richards*. The court vacated the evidentiary hearing and set an in-person case-management conference to discuss pretrial and trial scheduling.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Perttu v. Richards*, No. 23-1324, 605 U.S. --, 2025 WL 1698783, at *3 (U.S. June 18, 2025)

OPINION

Smith v. Diaz

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 C. JAY SMITH, Case No. 20-cv-04335-HSG 8 Plaintiff, ORDER RE CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE AND CASE

9 v. SCHEDULE

10 RALPH DIAZ, et al., 11 Defendants. 12 13 The parties stipulated, and the Court agreed, that
the evidentiary hearing should be vacated 14 and all pending factual issues should be decided by
jury trial in light of the Supreme Court’s 15 recent opinion in *Perttu v. Richards*, No. 23-1324, 605
U.S. --, 2025 WL 1698783, at *3 (U.S.

16 June 18, 2025). See Dkt. No. 176. The Court accordingly set an in-person case management
17 conference on July 1, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. to discuss how to proceed. The parties should be 18
prepared to discuss their availability for a pretrial conference and trial. Given the age of this case
19 and its current posture, the trial needs to occur by the end of this year. 20 The Court provides
the following dates for discussion. Before the case management 21 conference, the parties must
meet and confer to determine which of the following windows will 22 work for them. The Court
expects the parties to collectively clear their calendars to enable a trial 23 in at least one of these
windows. 24 // 25 // 26 // 27 // I Pretrial Conference 2-Week Trial! Option 1 | September 23, 2025,

at 3:00 p.m. October 20, 2025, at 8:30 a.m.

2 September 30, 2025, at 3:00 p.m. _| October 27, 2025, at 8:30 a.m.

November 4, 2025, at 3:00 p.m. December 1, 2025, at 8:30 a.m. 3 4 IT IS SO ORDERED. 5

Dated: 6/25/2025 7 iatwobe S. GILLIAM, JR. □□ 3 United States District Judge 9 10 11 12 © 15

16 = 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 IP 28 ' This is the maximum trial length: the Court will

set stringent time limits that likely will result in a substantially shorter trial than this.