

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Carlos Pucheta v. Nissan North America, Inc.

Pucheta v. Nissan North America, Inc. · No. CV 25-3582 FMO (RAOx) · Decided October 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Central District of California ordered the parties to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to comply with a prior order requiring a settlement conference and a related settlement filing. The court warned that failure to respond by October 9, 2025, could result in sanctions and/or dismissal for lack of prosecution.

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	October 2, 2025
DOCKET	CV 25-3582 FMO (RAOx)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued an order to show cause regarding the parties' failure to comply with a prior order requiring completion of a settlement conference and filing of a settlement notice or status report.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; civil minutes order and order to show cause

TOPICS

sanctions civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure settlement enforcement judicial sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the parties should be required to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for failing to comply with the court's May 27, 2025 order.

2. Whether failure to respond to the order to show cause could result in sanctions or dismissal for lack of prosecution.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had ordered the parties to complete a settlement conference before a private mediator no later than September 29, 2025. If the case settled, the parties were required to file a notice of settlement within 24 hours; otherwise, they were required to file a settlement status report within 48 hours after the conference. As of October 2, 2025, neither filing had been submitted.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court's May 27, 2025 order required the parties to complete a settlement conference by September 29, 2025, and to file either a notice of settlement or a settlement status report after the conference. Neither filing had been made by October 2, 2025. The court ordered the parties to show cause in writing by October 9, 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), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 909 (2003)

OPINION

Carlos Pucheta v. Nissan North America, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. CV 25-3582 FMO (RAOx) Date October 2, 2025 Title Carlos Pucheta v. Nissan North America, Inc. Present: The Honorable Fernando M. Olguin, United States District Judge Vanessa Figueroa None Present Deputy Clerk Court Reporter / Recorder Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs: Attorneys Present for Defendants: None Present None Present Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order to Show Cause Re: Sanctions or Dismissal Pursuant to the Court's Order of May 27, 2025, the parties were required to complete a settlement conference before a private mediator no later than September 29, 2025. (See Dkt. 15, Court's Order of May 27, 2025, at 17). If the case settled, the parties were required to file a Notice of Settlement no later than 24 hours after settlement. (See id.). Otherwise, the parties were required to file a Status Report Re: Settlement no later than 48 hours after the settlement conference was complete. (See id.). As of the filing date of this Order,

neither a Notice of Settlement nor a Status Report Re: Settlement has been filed. (See, generally, Dkt.). Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT, no later than October 9, 2025, the parties shall show cause in writing why sanctions should not be imposed for failure to comply with the Court's Order of May 27, 2025. Failure to submit a response to this Order by the deadline set forth above may result in the imposition of sanctions and/or dismissal of this action for lack of prosecution. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *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), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 909 (2003). 00 : 00
Initials of Preparer vdr