

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

ROBERT E BARRETT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:09-cv-01741 LJO JLT (PC)

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
REQUEST FOR DEPOSITION BY VIDEO
CONFERENCING

(Doc. 33)

_____ /

On May 19, 2011, Defendants filed a request seeking permission to conduct the deposition of Plaintiff by videoconferencing pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(4). Defendants explain that the institution of Plaintiff's incarceration is approximately 359.95 miles away from the office of Defendants' counsel and that videoconferencing would thus eliminate unnecessary travel expenses.

Good cause appearing, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' May 19, 2011 request for deposition by videoconferencing (Doc. 33) is **GRANTED**. Nothing in this order, however, shall be construed as requiring the institution of Plaintiff's incarceration to obtain video conferencing equipment if it is not already available for this purpose.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 20, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE