

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 D. MIX,

1:13-cv-00823-AWI-MJS

Plaintiff,

**ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO
MEET AND CONFER BY PHONE**

v.

**AUDREY KING, Executive Director,
CSH; LINDSEY CUNNINGHAM,
Psychologist, CSH; DR. SALOUM,
Psychiatrist, CHS,**

Defendants.

_____ /

The Court's pretrial order required the parties to meet and confer regarding exhibits. Defendants' counsel has informed the Court that Plaintiff insists upon meeting in person. He has expressed his opinion that the obligation to premark exhibits can be accomplished over the telephone. To meet in person would involve driving three and one-half hours each way from Sacramento to Coalinga and billing the client agency \$170 per hour. Defendants' counsel argues that meeting in person would be unduly burdensome and unnecessarily costly given the task can be easily accomplished over the telephone. In this instance, the Court agrees.

Plaintiff is ordered to meet and confer with Defendants' counsel by telephone "to ensure against duplication of exhibits by offering joint exhibits where possible." Doc. 96 at 10. Defendants' counsel is directed to use best efforts to ensure that Plaintiff is provided a copy of this order as quickly and to make all necessary arrangement to confer telephonically as soon as possible.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 30, 2016



SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE