| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 8 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 9 | SAM BESS, |
| 10 | Plaintiff, No. 2:07-cv-1989 JAM JFM |
| 11 | VS. |
| 12 | MATTHEW CATE, et al., |
| 13 | Defendants. <u>ORDER</u> |
| 14 | / |
| 15 | On December 17, 2009, plaintiff filed a letter requesting a conference call to |
| 16 | resolve a discovery dispute. Tracking records for the United Parcel Service reflect that this |
| 17 | request and accompanying declaration were delivered to the clerk's office mail room at 10:43 |
| 18 | a.m. on December 18, 2009. However, the UPS envelope with the enclosures were not |
| 19 | discovered by the undersigned until Wednesday, December 30, 2009. The envelope had been |
| 20 | placed in a staff attorney box on the 16th floor by some unknown person on an unknown date. It |
| 21 | does not appear that counsel for either party called either the courtroom deputy or chambers to |
| 22 | notify the court of the filing or to inquire as to its status. |
| 23 | Because the undersigned was not aware of this filing until December 30, 2009, the |
| 24 | discovery deadline passed on December 22, 2009, and the undersigned has no authority to |
| 25 | accommodate the request. The undersigned has taken steps to inquire why chambers was not |

26 informed of the UPS delivery on December 18, 2009. However, in any event, further action by

| 1 | the undersigned regarding discovery may not take place unless one or both parties obtain relief |
|----|---|
| 2 | from the district judge assigned to this case. |
| 3 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's December 17, 2009 |
| 4 | request is denied. |
| 5 | DATED: January 12, 2010. |
| 6 | |
| 7 | al I Martel. |
| 8 | UNFIED STATES MAGISTRATE JJDGE |
| 9 | • |
| 10 | /001; bess.den |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| | 2 |
| | |

I

I