

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

**In re: American Honda Motor Co., Inc.,
CR-V Vibration Marketing and Sales
Practices Litigation,**

**Case No. 2:15-md-2661
Judge Michael H. Watson
Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers**

This document relates to: ALL CASES.

**PRETRIAL ORDER NO. 12: ORDER CONTINUING STAY OF CASE
SCHEDULE DEADLINES**

In the Court's October 13, 2016 Order, the Court accepted the parties' joint proposal that the litigation deadlines be stayed for thirty days in an effort to facilitate an informal resolution of this action. ECF No. 77. The Court ordered the parties to file a written report on or before November 14, 2016, detailing (1) the degree to which the resolution discussions have been productive, and (2) what further modifications to the litigation schedule might be appropriate.

This matter is before the Court upon the parties' November 14, 2016 Joint Status Report. ECF No. 78. In their Joint Status Report, the parties represent that they have continued to make progress towards a resolution of this litigation. Specifically, the parties indicate that Plaintiffs have provided AHM with a formal settlement demand, AHM is collecting additional information and performing

additional data analysis in order to prepare a response to the demand, and AHM anticipates providing the additional data, analysis, and response to Plaintiffs by approximately November 23, 2016. The parties anticipate that by the end of November or early December, they will have agreed upon a mediator and will have scheduled an in-person mediation. They request an additional thirty-day stay of all current litigation deadlines so that they may continue to focus on negotiating an informal resolution of this action.

The Court finds the parties' proposal to be well taken. Accordingly, the current litigation deadlines are **STAYED for THIRTY (30) DAYS. ON OR BEFORE DECEMBER 14, 2016**, the parties are to file a written report detailing (1) the degree to which the resolution discussions have been productive, (2) the date and location of the scheduled mediation, (3) whether counsel from the newly transferred case is involved in the parties' ongoing discussions and approves of the mediation, and (3) what further modifications to the litigation schedule might be appropriate. Upon review of the parties' forthcoming report, if appropriate, the Court will notice this case for a status conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


MICHAEL H. WATSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT


ELIZABETH A. PRESTON DEAVERS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE