

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALLEN B. WILLIAMS,

Case No. 1:09-cv-00468 OWW JLT (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'  
REQUEST FOR VIDEO CONFERENCING

v.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

(Doc. 96)

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On October 14, 2011, Defendants requested, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(4), to be allowed to conduct the deposition of Plaintiff via video conference. Defendants explain that the trip from their office in Sacramento to Salinas Valley State Prison, the institution of Plaintiff's incarceration, would take three and one half hours.

Good cause appearing, Defendants' October 14, 2011, request for video conferencing (Doc. 96) is **GRANTED**. However, nothing in this order shall be interpreted as requiring the institution in which Plaintiff is housed to obtain video conferencing equipment if it is not already available.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 17, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE