

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE	)	
COMMISSION,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:15-cv-00659-JMS-MJD
vs.	)	
	)	
MATTHEW HAAB,	)	
<i>et al.</i>	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MINUTE ENTRY FOR MAY 1, 2015  
STATUS CONFERENCE  
HON. MARK J. DINSMORE, MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The parties appeared by counsel in person for a Status Conference. The parties discussed issues relating to the hearing on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction scheduled for May 1, 2015 before the Honorable Judge Jane Magnus-Stinson.

This matter is scheduled for a telephonic initial pretrial conference on **Monday, June 22 2015, at 4:20 p.m.** Counsel shall attend the conference by calling the designated telephone number, to be provided by the court via email. The parties shall file a proposed Case Management Plan (“CMP”) no fewer than **seven days** before the pretrial conference. Unless the parties agree there are compelling reasons for a departure, the CMP shall be in the format set forth in the model CMP<sup>1</sup> found on the Court’s website ([www.insd.uscourts.gov](http://www.insd.uscourts.gov)).

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that the magistrate’s CMP summary is no longer required.

In advance of the initial pretrial conference, counsel shall plan for discovery and conduct the conference required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f). Represented parties shall attend the initial pretrial conference by counsel. Clients are not required (but are permitted) to attend this conference.

Counsel who attend the conference must have their appearance on file. At the conference, counsel should be prepared to discuss the issues addressed in the ESI Supplement to Case Management Plan found on the Court's website, in addition to:

1. How exhibits will be identified during the discovery process consistent with the Court's trial procedures;
2. The types and number of witnesses the parties anticipate may provide evidence under Federal Rule of Evidence 702, 703 or 705;
3. Any issues anticipated at the outset regarding the scope or nature of discovery anticipated in the case;
4. Any anticipated deviations from the established limitations on discovery;
5. Any anticipated need for the entry of a protective order in the matter; and
6. How soon the parties anticipate being in a position to discuss settlement of the matter and what specific items of discovery need to be completed prior thereto, and how that necessary discovery can be accomplished as quickly and efficiently as possible.

So ORDERED.

Dated: 05/01/2015

  
Mark J. Dinsmore  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

All Electronically Registered Counsel via the Court's ECF system.