

1 Delano, where Plaintiff is incarcerated, to take Plaintiff's deposition. Defendants also assert that the
2 California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation is operating under severe financial
3 constraints, which limit its travel expenditures.

4 Defendants have presented good cause to take Plaintiff's deposition by videoconference.
5 Plaintiff is presently incarcerated at Kern Valley State Prison, in Delano, California, and is unable
6 to easily travel for a deposition. Counsel for Defendants are located in Sacramento, California, and
7 would incur travel expenses to conduct Plaintiff's deposition in Delano. Therefore, Defendants'
8 request shall be granted with respect to Plaintiff's deposition. However, the Court declines to grant
9 blanket permission to conduct all depositions of witnesses in this case by videoconference.
10 Depositions by remote means may not be acceptable under all circumstances, and Defendants have
11 not addressed the circumstances of individual witnesses, besides Plaintiff, they seek to depose.

12 **III. CONCLUSION**

13 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' request to conduct
14 depositions by videoconference is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART, as follows:

- 15 1. Good cause appearing, Defendants' request for leave to conduct Plaintiff's deposition
16 by videoconference pursuant to Rule 30(b)(4) is GRANTED; and
- 17 2. Defendants' request for leave to conduct depositions of other witnesses in this case
18 by videoconference is DENIED, without prejudice.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 **Dated: August 10, 2011**

22 /s/ Gary S. Austin
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28