

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LONNIE TRIPP,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-2876 GEB GGH P

vs.

M.S. EVANS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 11, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion requesting the aid of another prisoner for future video conferences with defense counsel.¹ Though, plaintiff is incarcerated at San Quentin and the other prisoner is incarcerated at Folsom.

Pursuant to Local Rules 183(a), “Any individual who is representing himself or herself without an attorney must appear personally or by courtesy appearance by an attorney admitted to the Bar of this Court and may not delegate that duty to any other individual, including husband or wife, or any other party on the same side appearing without an attorney.” If plaintiff is not requesting the presence of the other inmate for legal advice, the court would, in

¹ It appears that defendants may be conducting a deposition via video-conference.

1 any event, deny the request. Therefore, the court has no authority to order that this other person
2 be made available to aid plaintiff.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's August 11, 2010 motion,
4 (Doc. 54) is denied.

5 DATED: August 30, 2010

6
7 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows

8 _____
9 GREGORY G. HOLLOWS
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 GGH:ab
12 trip2876.ord2
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26