

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9
10 TIE-JIN SHEN, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 LUCY'S ASIA BISTRO, et al.

14 Defendants.
15 _____/

No. C 06-07706 TEH (WDB)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST TO CONTINUE
RULING**

16
17 On July 8, 2009, the Undersigned held a telephonic hearing on Plaintiffs'
18 Motion to Compel Attendance at Deposition. The Clerk's Notice setting the hearing
19 instructed counsel for the moving party to initiate the conference call and then
20 telephone the Court at the appointed time. After a ten-minute delay, counsel for
21 Defendants appeared by telephone, with no appearance for Plaintiffs. Counsel for
22 Plaintiffs had not informed the Court or opposing counsel of any reason for his
23 inability to appear at the hearing. The Court denied Plaintiffs' motion to compel
24 without prejudice to re-noticing the motion.

25 After the conclusion of the hearing and the Court's ruling on the motion,
26 Plaintiffs' counsel called the Undersigned's law clerk to state he had been delayed and
27 inquired about the motion. He thereafter filed a Request to Continue the Ruling on
28 Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Depositions. Doc. no. 103.

1 Plaintiffs' Request to Continue the Ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel is
2 DENIED as moot. Plaintiffs may re-notice the motion to compel following the three-
3 week period they propose "to see if any bankruptcy petitions would be filed by
4 Defendants Lucia Liao and Margarette Ting."

5
6 Dated: July 9, 2009

7 
8 _____
9 WAYNE D. BRAZIL
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28