

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

ProAssurance Specialty Insurance Company v. Najeeb K. Ansari

Ansari · No. 1:25-cv-01207-SAB · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders the parties to show cause why monetary sanctions should not be imposed for failing to file a required joint scheduling report. The court continues the initial scheduling conference to January 20, 2026, and requires a written response by January 9, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01207-SAB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court sua sponte ordered the parties to show cause why monetary sanctions should not issue after they failed to file a required joint scheduling report, and continued the initial scheduling conference.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

sanctions civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure judicial sanctions scheduling and case management

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the parties should be required to show cause why monetary sanctions should not issue for failing to comply with the court's order requiring a joint scheduling report.

2. Whether the initial scheduling conference should be continued because the required joint report was not filed.

HOLDINGS

1. A federal district court may exercise its inherent docket-control power and impose appropriate sanctions, including potentially dismissal, for failure to comply with court orders or applicable local rules; here, the failure to file the required joint scheduling report warranted an order requiring the parties to show cause why monetary sanctions should not issue.
2. The initial scheduling conference should be continued when the parties failed to file the required joint scheduling report, and the parties must file a new joint statement one week before the continued conference.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court has the inherent power to control its docket and may, in the exercise of that power, impose sanctions where appropriate, including dismissal of the action.” (at 1)

“The Court shall require the parties to show cause why monetary sanctions should not issue for the failure to file a joint report in compliance with order setting the mandatory scheduling conference.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties were ordered to file a joint scheduling report one full week before a mandatory initial scheduling conference. They failed to file the report before the scheduled conference.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously ordered the parties to file a joint scheduling report one week before the January 6, 2026, initial scheduling conference. No joint report was filed, prompting the court to issue an order to show cause, continue the conference to January 20, 2026, and require a new joint statement.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Bautista v. Los Angeles County*, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000)