STANDING ORDER IN CIVIL CASES REFERRED TO OR PENDING BEFORE HON. JONATHAN E. HAWLEY, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Table of Contents

I.	Rule 16 scheduling conference	2
II.	Discovery plan	2
III.	Waiver of the Rule 16 scheduling conference	3
IV.	Failure of counsel to attend a scheduled telephone hearing	3
V.	Joint or agreed motions to move deadlines which do not affect the dispositive motion deadline	3
VI.	Joint or agreed motions to move a deadline which will affect the dispositive motion deadline	4
VII.	Discovery disputes	4
VIII.	Discovery disputes brought to the Court's attention after the discovery deadline has already passed	5
IX.	Failure to respond to a motion	5
X.	Emergency motions	6
XI.	Courtesy copies and attachments or exhibits	6
XII.	Filing documents under seal and protective orders	6
XIII.	Role of the magistrate judge and consent authority	7
XIV.	Settlement conferences and mediation	7
XV.	Settled cases	8
XVI.	Contacting chambers	9

I. Rule 16 scheduling conference

The Court will set a Rule 16 scheduling conference approximately thirty days after the answer or other responsive pleading is filed. The conference will generally be conducted by telephone.

II. Discovery plan

The discovery plan shall be filed with the Court at least three calendar days before the Rule 16 scheduling conference. Although the Court does not require that this plan be in any particular format, the sample plan set forth in "Attachment A" is sufficient.

The dispositive motion deadline should generally be no more than one year after the date of the Rule 16 scheduling conference. If the parties request a dispositive motion deadline that is more than one year after the date of the Rule 16 scheduling conference, then the parties shall set forth with specificity in the discovery plan the reasons for the extended schedule.

If the parties do not agree on one or more of the deadlines contained in the discovery plan, or any other provisions contained therein, a single plan should set forth each party's respective deadline(s) or provision(s) and their supporting arguments. In no case may the parties file separate plans.

The parties should not request dates for the final pretrial conference or trial in their plan; the Court will select these dates and provide them to the parties at the Rule 16 scheduling conference.

III. Waiver of the Rule 16 scheduling conference

If the parties agree on all matters contained in the discovery plan and all counsel have previously participated in a Rule 16 scheduling conference in another case with Judge Hawley, then the parties may waive the Rule 16 scheduling conference. To do so, the parties shall file simultaneously with the filing of the discovery plan a "Motion to waive Rule 16 scheduling conference" which includes statement that 1) the parties agree upon all maters contained within the discovery plan, 2) all counsel have previously participated in a Rule 16 scheduling conference with Judge Hawley, and 3) they request that the Rule 16 scheduling conference be cancelled.

Where the parties waive a Rule 16 scheduling conference, the Court will provide the parties with dates for the final pretrial conference, trial date, and any other deadlines or hearings not contained in the discovery plan in the text order granting the motion to waive the scheduling conference.

IV. Failure of counsel to attend a scheduled telephone hearing

For the convenience of counsel, the Court conducts most hearings by telephone when possible. Counsel's failure to appear for a telephone hearing will be treated as a failure of counsel to appear for an in-person hearing.

If counsel unexpectedly cannot attend a scheduled telephone hearing and cannot file a motion to move the hearing, then counsel may call Judge Hawley's chambers to inform him of same in advance of the hearing. The Court will attempt to reschedule the hearing in such a circumstance.

Failure to attend a telephone conference call without advance notice to the Court of unavailability will result in that counsel being required to appear in person for all future hearings, even if all other counsel appear by telephone.

V. Joint or agreed motions to move deadlines which do not affect the dispositive motion deadline

Where the parties by agreement wish to move a deadline which does not affect the dispositive motion deadline, the parties shall do so by filing an agreed or joint motion which:

- 1. Sets forth the deadline the parties seek to move;
- 2. Sets forth the new deadline requested; and
- 3. States that the request to move the deadline does not affect the dispositive motion deadline.

The Court will ordinarily grant such motions by text order and without a hearing within approximately 24 hours of the filing of said motion.

VI. Joint or agreed motions to move a deadline which will affect the dispositive motion deadline

Where the parties by agreement wish to move a deadline which will affect the dispositive motion deadline, the parties should do so by filing an agreed or joint motion which:

- 1. Sets forth the deadline the parties seek to move;
- 2. Sets forth the new deadline requested;
- 3. States that the request will affect the dispositive motion deadline;
- 4. States with specificity the discovery that has been completed prior to the filing of the motion;
- 5. States with specificity the discovery that needs to be completed; and
- 6. States why the parties were unable to meet the deadline originally set by the Court.

Parties may not both request to move a deadline which will affect the dispositive motion deadline and keep the same final pretrial conference and trial settings; if the Court moves the dispositive motion deadline, it must also move the final pretrial conference and trial setting.

VII. Discovery disputes

Before filing a motion related to a discovery dispute, the parties shall follow the procedure set forth below:

Counsel for the parties shall confer pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. Such
conferral shall occur promptly after counsel becomes aware of the dispute.
Failure to confer within a reasonable period of time after learning of the
dispute may be deemed by the Court to constitute a waiver. The Court will
not consider counsel to have conferred unless counsel have had at least

- one telephone call addressing the dispute, in addition to any written exchanges concerning the dispute.
- 2. If counsel cannot resolve the dispute through conferral, then counsel for the party first raising the dispute shall file a "Motion for Hearing Concerning Discovery Dispute." The motion must contain a certification by counsel that the parties have conferred as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. The motion should not contain any argument or the nature of the discovery dispute. Any motion which does not certify that the parties have conferred prior to the filing of the motion will be stricken for failure to comply with this Standing Order.
- 3. When possible, the Court will resolve the dispute during a telephone call without written submissions by the parties.
- 4. If, after hearing the positions of the parties concerning the discovery dispute, the Court deems it necessary that a written motion and response be filed, the Court will give the parties permission to do so and set deadlines for said filings.
- 5. The Court will generally set written discovery motions for oral argument and rule from the bench after such argument. Where the Court deems a written order is necessary, the Court will generally issue such an order within two weeks of oral argument on the motion.

The Court will strike any discovery motion filed before the procedure outlined above has been followed.

VIII. Discovery disputes brought to the Court's attention after the discovery deadline has already passed

The parties may not raise a discovery dispute with the Court after the relevant discovery deadline has passed; all discovery disputes must be brought to the Court's attention before the relevant discovery deadline passes. Any discovery disputes raised with the Court after the expiration of the relevant discovery deadline shall be deemed waived by the Court, even if the parties agreed to conduct discovery after the relevant discovery deadline has passed.

IX. Failure to respond to a motion

Local Rule 7.1(B)(2) provides that a response to a motion must be filed within 14 days after service of the motion. The Rule also provides that if no response is timely filed, the Court "will presume there is no opposition to the motion and may rule without further notice to the parties."

The Court routinely grants motions pursuant to this Rule the day after the responsive deadline has passed. Motions to reconsider the grant of a motion to which no response was filed are disfavored by the Court.

X. Emergency motions

Where a party files an emergency motion or a motion which seeks a ruling on the same day as it is filed, counsel filing the motion shall send an email to hawley@ilcd.uscourts.gov and counsel for all parties in the case alerting same to the filing of said motion.

XI. Courtesy copies and attachments or exhibits

Local Rule 49.7 requires courtesy copies of attachments or exhibits longer than 30 pages. Judge Hawley does not require courtesy copies of any filing and relieves counsel of compliance with this Rule for cases pending before him.

Counsel should limit attachments and exhibits to matters directly relevant to the issue before the Court. Counsel shall not attach as exhibits documents already filed with the Court, such as the complaint, opposing counsel's motions, etc. Instead, counsel should simply refer to the docket number of the relevant filing and the CM/ECF page number.

For scanned documents, counsel should, whenever possible, perform an optical character recognition (OCR) on the document prior to its filing, thereby making the document searchable.

XII. Filing documents under seal and protective orders

Parties should be mindful that whether a document may be filed under seal must be balanced with the "[] common law right of public access to judicial records." *U.S. v. Corbitt*, 879 F.2d 224, 228 (7th Cir. 1989), citing *Nixon v. Warner Communications, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589 (1978). The Seventh Circuit has found that judicial records should be "open to public inspection unless they meet the definition of trade secrets or other categories of bona fide long-term confidentiality." *Baxter International, Inc. v. Abbott Labs*, 297 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2002). The Seventh Circuit has noted that "[i]nformation that affects the disposition of litigation belongs in the public record *unless a statute or privilege*

justifies nondisclosure." USA v. Maurice Foster, 564 F.3d 852 (7th Cir. 2009)(emphasis added), citing *Baxter International Inc.*, 297 F.3d at 545-46.

Accordingly, when seeking to file a document under seal, parties shall state with specificity the legal basis which allows the Court to seal the document. When possible, parties should seek to seal only those portions of a document which may properly be sealed by way of redaction.

The parties cannot agree in a protective order to file under seal documents which otherwise do not meet the legal standards for filing a document under seal. The Court will strike any provision in a proposed protective order which seeks to limit the Court's authority to determine whether a document should be filed under seal.

XIII. Role of the magistrate judge and consent authority

In cases referred to Judge Hawley, he will generally decide all non-dispositive issues until the dispositive motion deadline. Any dispositive motion, or motion which may have a dispositive effect on all or part of the case, will generally be un-referred and ruled upon by the presiding district judge without a Report and Recommendation. Accordingly, Judge Hawley will typically manage all non-dispositive aspects of a case until the dispositive motion deadline, at which time the district judge will generally take over all aspects of the case.

The parties can consent to a magistrate judge presiding over the entirety of the case. In order for the magistrate judge to preside by consent, all parties must consent thereto, and the form set forth in "Attachment B" must be executed and filed with the Court.

Counsel for all parties should confer with their clients and each other about consent to a magistrate judge prior to the Rule 16 scheduling conference, although the parties may consent at any time.

XIV. Settlement conferences and mediation

The parties are encouraged to seek a settlement conference or mediation with a magistrate judge. Where parties request a settlement conference or mediation in a case referred to Judge Hawley, Judge Hawley will conduct said conference or mediation. In cases where Judge Hawley presides by consent, a settlement

conference or mediation will be assigned to another magistrate judge in the Central District of Illinois.

Unless ordered to participate in a settlement conference by the presiding judge, the Court will conduct a settlement conference or mediation only upon the agreement of all parties.

When the parties all agree that they would like a settlement conference or mediation with a magistrate judge, they should file a joint or agreed motion requesting a settlement conference. The Court will then set a telephone hearing to set a deadline for submission of confidential pre-settlement statements, if any, and to select a date for the settlement conference.

Settlement conferences are generally in-person, begin at 10:00 am, and end by 1:00 pm. Each party must have someone present in-person at the settlement conference with final settlement authority, unless the Court grants an exception prior to the settlement conference.

XV. Settled cases

Pursuant to Local Rule 16.1(C), whenever a party reports a case as settled, the presiding judge will enter an order dismissing the case without prejudice as settled, with leave to reopen within 35 days if the settlement is not finalized. The time to reopen may be extended by order of the presiding judge upon a showing of good cause.

As an alternative to the procedure set forth in Rule 16.1(C), the parties can file a notice or stipulation of dismissal. The parties should not file the settlement agreement with the Court nor seek "approval" of the settlement from the Court, unless the nature of the action is one that specifically requires approval by the Court. Likewise, the Court cannot retain jurisdiction to enforce a settlement agreement unless the case is dismissed without prejudice. The court cannot and will not retain jurisdiction to enforce a settlement agreement in cases dismissed with prejudice unless the parties seek a consent decree in compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d).

Prior to filing a notice of dismissal pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(i), a joint stipulation to dismiss pursuant to Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii), or a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 41(a)(2) which seeks to dismiss only some of the parties or some claims, counsel should review *Taylor v. Brown*, 787 F.3d 851 (7th Cir. 2015). In

Taylor, the Seventh Circuit held that "Rule 41(a) should be limited to dismissal of an entire action." *Id.* at 857 (emphasizing Rule 41(a)'s reference to "an action"). The Seventh Circuit suggests construing a motion to voluntarily dismiss one claim as a motion to amend the complaint under Rule 15(a)(2). Id. at 858. Leave to amend under Rule 15(a)(2) will be "freely give[n] . . . when justice so requires."

XVI. Contacting chambers

It is never appropriate to email chambers or Judge Hawley without prior permission of the Court or as set forth in this Standing Order. With the exception of emailing a confidential pre-settlement statement to the Court as part of a settlement conference set before Judge Hawley, any email communication between Judge Hawley's chambers and an attorney must have all parties in the case as recipients.

Counsel should ordinarily not telephone chambers for any reason. Should an extraordinary circumstance require a telephone call to chambers, counsel for all parties should be on the telephone call to chambers when the call is placed. *Ex parte* telephone calls to chambers on case-related matters should never occur except for extraordinary circumstances and it is impossible or impracticable to have all counsel for all parties on the call. In instances where counsel or their agents call chambers *ex parte* absent an extraordinary circumstance, chambers staff have been instructed to inform the person calling that case related matters may not be discussed *ex parte* by telephone. Anything that counsel or their agents should not say *ex parte* directly to the judge cannot be said to his chambers staff.

In the extraordinary circumstance where it is necessary to communicate with chambers by telephone, those calling chambers should conduct themselves in the same manner as if they were speaking directly to the judge.

It is so ordered.

Entered on December 6, 2018

<u>s/Jonathan E. Hawley</u> U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE