

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SHAUNTAE TAYLOR,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
C/O J. GREGORY,  
  
Defendant.

Case No.: 1:16-cv-00698-LJO-SAB (PC)  
  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST  
TO ATTEND SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE  
BY VIDEO  
  
(ECF No. 27)

Plaintiff Shauntae Taylor is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This case is currently set for settlement conference before the undersigned on September 18, 2017, at 8:30 a.m., at California State Prison, Corcoran (“CSP-Corcoran”).

On August 17, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting that the Court revoke its order transporting him to CSP-Corcoran for the settlement conference, and ordering him to instead appear at the settlement conference by video conferencing. (ECF No. 27.) Plaintiff asserts that he was formerly housed at CSP-Corcoran, and he fears for his safety should he come into contact with certain staff there.

Generally, the Court allows inmates to appear telephonically for pretrial proceedings; however, the Court finds that settlement conferences are not productive without the ability to have face to face

1 contact with the participants. Therefore, the Court requires the parties to personally appear for  
2 settlement conferences. The Court's past experience has demonstrated that the California Department  
3 of Corrections video conferencing system can be unreliable; and therefore it is insufficient for the  
4 purposes of conducting a settlement conference. Thus, the Court finds that it is not practicable to allow  
5 an inmate to appear by video at a settlement conference.

6 Plaintiff is advised that unless he chooses to dismiss his lawsuit, he is obligated to litigate this  
7 action which may necessitate, among other things, transportation from his institution to the court or  
8 other locations for proceedings. Nevertheless, matters of safety are of the utmost concern. If Plaintiff  
9 wishes to forgo the settlement conference entirely on the grounds of safety considerations, Plaintiff  
10 must file a motion to do so immediately.

11 Accordingly, Plaintiff's request to attend the settlement conference by video conference (ECF  
12 No. 27), is DENIED.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: August 30, 2017

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE