

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT HACKWORTH,	CASE NO. 1:06-cv-850-AWI-MJS (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
v.	REQUEST TO TAKE DEPOSITION BY
P. RANGEL,	VIDEOCONFERENCE
Defendant.	(Doc. 55)

Defendant Rangel has filed a Request¹ to Conduct Plaintiff Robert Hackworth's Deposition via Videoconference [Doc. 55]. Defendant asks for this relief in an attempt to minimize the expense associated with taking the deposition of a prisoner housed a significant distance from counsel for Defendant. Plaintiff has not opposed the Request.

For good cause shown, Defendant's Request to Conduct Plaintiff Robert Hackworth's Deposition via Videoconference [Doc. 55] is GRANTED. Nothing in this Order shall be interpreted as requiring the institution in which Plaintiff is housed to obtain ///

///

///

¹ The Court notes that Rule 30(b)(4) provides that the Court may "on motion" authorize a deposition to be conducted remotely. Defendants are advised that any future request to take a deposition via video conference should be filed as a motion in accordance with the rules.

1 videoconferencing equipment if it is not already available.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 22, 2010

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE