

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division**

SEALED PLAINTIFF 1, *et al*

Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-670-MHL

PATRIOT FRONT, *et al*

Defendants.

ORDER

The above-captioned case is set for an Initial Pretrial Conference on September 19, 2024 at 11:00 a.m. Upon examination of the file and consideration of the Court's docket, and it appearing that this action would be sooner resolved if the parties consent to referral of the case in its entirety to a Magistrate Judge as the presiding judicial officer (of course, preserving the right to trial by jury if such has been demanded), it is hereby ORDERED that counsel shall confer with their respective clients and with each other to determine whether all parties will consent to assignment of the case to a Magistrate Judge as the presiding officer.

See 28 U.S.C. § 636.¹

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 636 states, in pertinent part:

Upon the consent of the parties, a full-time United States magistrate judge or a part-time United States magistrate judge who serves as a full-time judicial officer may conduct any or all proceedings in a jury or nonjury civil matter and order the entry of judgment in the case, when specially designated to exercise such jurisdiction by the district court or courts he [or she] serves.

28 U.S.C. § 636(c)(1).

To that end, counsel for the defendant shall ensure that the foregoing conferences occur not later than September 5, 2024, and that the Court is informed not later than 5:00 p.m. on September 5, 2024, whether such consents (by all parties) have been given. Counsel for **each party** shall file not later than 5:00 p.m. on September 5, 2024, a Statement Regarding Consent clearly articulating whether or not the party will consent to Magistrate Judge jurisdiction.

The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and to pro se Plaintiff.

It is SO ORDERED.

/s/
M. Hannah Lauck
United States District Judge

Date: August 15, 2024
Richmond, Virginia

