	Case 3:19-cv-02881-WHA	Document 55	Filed 09/19/19	Page 1 of 5
1	Mark W. Bucher			
2	mark@calpolicycenter.org CA S.B.N. # 210474			
3	Law Office of Mark W. Bucher			
4	18002 Irvine Blvd., Suite 108 Tustin, CA 92780-3321			
5	Phone: 714-313-3706			
6	Fax: 714-573-2297			
7	Brian K. Kelsey (Pro Hac Vice)			
8	bkelsey@libertyjusticecenter.org Reilly Stephens (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) rstephens@libertyjusticecenter.org			
9				
10	Liberty Justice Center 190 South LaSalle Street, Suite 15	500		
11	Chicago, Illinois 60603			
12	Phone: 312-263-7668 Fax: 312-263-7702			
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff			
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
15	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
16	Isaac Wolf,			
17	Plaintiff,		ase No. 3:19-cv	02001 W/LIA
18	v.		ase 10.519 -cv	-02881-WHA
19	Thisses to Destructional & Techni	l		
20	University Professional & Technic Employees, Communications Wor		LAINTIFF'S R	EPSONSE TO THE
21	America Local 9119 et al.,	0	RDER TO SH	OW CAUSE
22	Defendants.			
23		<u> </u>		
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	Case No. 3:19-cv-02881-WHA	1		
	PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE			

Attorneys Brian K. Kelsey, Reilly Stephens, and Mark W. Bucher hereby file their
 response to this Court's Order of August 22, 2019 (Dkt. 44) to show cause why this case
 should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution due to their failure to appear for the Case
 Management Conference on August 22, 2019.

 On August 14, 2019, counsel for plaintiff met and conferred by phone with counsel for the Defendants, with the goal of submitting a Joint Case Management Statement by this Court's deadline of August 15, 2019.

5

6

7

8 2. Counsel for all parties agreed that the manner by which to proceed would be
9 to submit to this Court a stipulation and motion to continue the Case Management
10 Conference until after the adjudication of the Defendants' pending Motions to Dismiss.

3. Consistent with this agreement, on August 15, 2019, the parties submitted to
this Court their Stipulations and Motion to Continue the Case Management Conference
(Dkt. 41).

4. Because of the unanimous agreement of the parties, counsel for Plaintiff
assumed, in error, that the motion was likely to be granted and, therefore, did not make
advanced preparations for appearance at the Case Management Conference.

5. In particular, the entry made on counsel's internal deadlines calendar noted generally a possible hearing, not noting a particular time, and included a question mark, signifying uncertainty as to whether a hearing existed to attend to that day.

20 6. On August 16, 2019, this Court issued an Order denying the parties' Motion
21 to Continue (Dkt. 42).

7. In adherence to this Court's order denying the motion, on August 19, 2019
Plaintiff's counsel drafted and circulated to Defense counsel a Case Management
Statement, which the parties were able to come to agreement on and submit on August 20,
2019.

8. While Plaintiff's counsel, therefore, took steps to provide this Court with the
 necessary statement for its consideration at the Case Management Conference, counsel
 neglected to update the internal scheduling calendar to reflect the fact that the hearing was
 <u>Case No. 3:19-cv-02881-WHA</u> 2

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

going forward or to note at what time it was to be held and how to call in to the Court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

9. In addition, Plaintiff's counsel relied on the hired services of a California paralegal for backup of calendared events and to receive notices from the Court for Attorney Mark W. Bucher; however, the paralegal left employment with her law firm shortly before the Case Management Conference.

10. Due to this error in administration, Plaintiff's counsel failed to fulfill their responsibilities to the Court and failed to appear for the Case Management Conference.

11. Plaintiff's counsel are truly sorry for their error and are sorely ashamed that their mistake did not show this Court the due respect that it deserves.

10 12. Attorney Brian K. Kelsey has been admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court
11 of Tennessee since 2003 and has never before missed a conference or hearing set by any
12 court. In his sixteen years practicing law, he has never been subject to sanction or
13 discipline by the bar of any court. He apologizes profusely to the Court for his error.

14 13. Attorney Reilly Stephens has been admitted to the bar of the Court of
15 Appeals of Maryland since December, 2017, and has not in that time been subject to
16 sanction or discipline by the bar of any court. This is the first time he has failed to appear
17 at a conference for one of his clients. He apologizes profusely to the Court for his error.

18 14. Attorney Mark W. Bucher has been admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court
of California since 2000 and has not in that time been subject to sanction or discipline by
the bar of any court. This is the first time he has failed to appear at a conference for one of
his clients. He apologizes profusely to the Court for his error.

15. Plaintiff's counsel would like to inform the Court that they have taken
affirmative steps to ensure that such a grave error never again occurs in the future. First,
in California they have spoken with the California law firm that they had contracted with
and have received assurance that the replacement paralegal will monitor court dockets as a
backup for them.

27 16. Second, in the home office of counsel *Pro Hac Vice* in Chicago, they hired
 28 their first paralegal to monitor case calendars as a backup just yesterday, after an
 <u>Case No. 3:19-cv-02881-WHA</u> 3

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

extensive search in part as a result of this error. They humbly ask that their *Pro Hac Vice* status not be revoked.

17. Plaintiff's counsel, however, admit that it was their own conduct in this matter that did not meet the professional standards they strive for and that this Court expects. They humbly ask this Court's grace in forgiving their error and that they not be referred to the Court's Standing Committee on Professional Conduct.

7 18. Plaintiff's counsel wish to emphasize that the failures identified by this Court
8 in its order to show cause were the fault of counsel and in no way the fault of Plaintiff,
9 Isaac Wolf. Counsel beseeches this Court not to deprive Mr. Wolf of a ruling in his case
10 on the basis of counsel's error.

Respectfully submitted,

The undersigned counsel declare under oath that the above described facts and
circumstances are a true and correct description of events.

13 Dated: September 19, 2019

3

4

5

6

14

15 /s/ Mark W. Bucher 16 Mark W. Bucher mark@calpolicycenter.org 17 CA S.B.N. # 210474 18 Law Office of Mark W. Bucher 18002 Irvine Blvd., Suite 108 19 Tustin, CA 92780-3321 20 Phone: 714-313-3706 Fax: 714-573-2297 21 22 /s/ Brian K. Kelsey Brian K. Kelsey (Pro Hac Vice) 23 bkelsey@libertyjusticecenter.org 24 /s/ Reilly Stephens Reilly Stephens (Pro Hac Vice) 25 rstephens@libertyjusticecenter.org 26 Liberty Justice Center 190 South LaSalle Street 27 Suite 1500 28 Chicago, Illinois 60603 Case No. 3:19-cv-02881-WHA

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Phone: 312-263-7668 Fax: 312-263-7702

Attorneys for Plaintiff