

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

RICKEY ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

J. YATES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:10-cv-00671 AWI-MJS (PC)
**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’
REQUEST TO CONDUCT PLAINTIFF’S
DEPOSITION VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE
(ECF No. 42)**

Plaintiff Rickey Adams (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Plaintiff initiated this action on August 13, 2009 in Fresno County Superior Court. (ECF No. 1.) Defendants removed the action to this Court on April 15, 2010. (Id.) The Court screened Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 33) and found that it stated a cognizable claim (ECF No. 34). Plaintiff is currently proceeding on an Eighth Amendment claim against Defendants Erickson, Rumbles, and Brumbaugh. (ECF No. 34.)

On April 12, 2013, Defendants Brumbaugh, Erickson, and Rumbles filed a request to conduct Plaintiff’s deposition via videoconference. (ECF No. 42.) Pursuant to Fed. R.

1 Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(B), if the proposed deponent is confined in prison, a party must obtain
2 leave of court and the court must grant leave to the extent consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P.
3 26(b)(2). This request is necessary because Plaintiff is currently confined in Lancaster
4 State Prison in Lancaster, California.

5 Accordingly, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(a)(2)(B), the Court hereby GRANTS
6 Defendants Erickson, Rumbles, and Brumbaugh's request to conduct Plaintiff's
7 deposition via videoconference.
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: May 4, 2013

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE