

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

D-J ENGINEERING, INC.,)	CONSOLIDATED CASES
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 14-1033-JAR
)	
818 AVIATION, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
)	
818 AVIATION, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 14-1126-JAR
)	
D-J ENGINEERING, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On November 24, 2015, the undersigned U.S. Magistrate Judge, James P. O’Hara, conducted a status conference in these consolidated cases. D-J Engineering, Inc., appeared through counsel Terry L. Mann. 818 Aviation, Inc., appeared through counsel Carlos E. Needham. This order memorializes discussions and rulings made at the conference.

The parties reported that a final settlement agreement memorializing the partial settlement reached in these cases has been executed as required by the September 2, 2015 order of the presiding U.S. District Judge, Julie A. Robinson (see ECF doc. 39). A copy of

the executed settlement agreement is attached to this order.¹

As set forth in the settlement agreement, the parties preserved certain claims for adjudication by the court. Specifically, in paragraph 6.4, D-J preserved a claim for an unpaid invoice. In paragraph 6.3, 818 preserved “its cause of action . . . for all claims for damages to those parts owned by 818, caused or occasioned by D-J, to wit: excessive pitting, axle nut thread damage, or improper overhaul.” Mr. Needham explained that the parts at issue are two pistons and two axles in the landing gear. The court ordered the parties to file by **November 30, 2015**, a joint statement itemizing the parts that remain at issue.

The parties stated that the settlement agreement calls for approximately a twenty-week time period for completion of the obligations set forth therein. With this time period in mind, the court set a deadline of **May 2, 2016**, for the parties to file motions to amend their pleadings.² The court also set a **May 2, 2016** deadline for the parties to file a joint status report setting forth the status of the cases and proposing a schedule for discovery and resolution of the remaining claims.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated November 24, 2015, at Kansas City, Kansas.

¹Although the settlement agreement is labeled “confidential,” the parties indicated that there is nothing particularly confidential therein, and agreed that it need not be filed under seal.

²The court contemplates that amended pleadings would omit settled claims and set out a cleaner record on which the cases could proceed.

s/ James P. O'Hara
James P. O'Hara
U. S. Magistrate Judge