

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**

WILLIAM GRANVILLE SMITH,
Plaintiff,
v.
B. AUBUCHON, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:14-CV-0775-KJM-DMC-P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is plaintiff’s “Motion for a Video Telecommunication” (ECF No. 124).

In his motion, plaintiff states that he has “no objections” to a video teleconference “to address too [sic] the Judge what discovery, interrogatories, admissions, production of documents that are of any questions, that Plaintiff is requesting to be fully prepared and capable to prosecute at trial.” To the extent plaintiff’s motion concerns further responses to discovery requests, discovery is closed and no relief is necessary. Based on this fact, and the absence of any indication in plaintiff’s motion that specific relief is needed now, or that relief cannot be decided on written motion without oral argument, the motion is denied at this time. The motion is denied without prejudice to renewal of the motion at such time as there exists a request for specific relief, or other showing of good cause why telecommunication is warranted.

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 124) is denied, without prejudice.

Dated: October 1, 2019



DENNIS M. COTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE