1

Fahy v. Tarbox et al

2

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

22

24 25

26

27 28 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

No. C-09-1420 MMC

**SANCTIONS** 

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR

FRANK FAHY,

Plaintiff,

٧.

ORPHEOS TARBOX, et al.,

Defendants.

The Court is in receipt of plaintiff Frank Fahy's letter request, filed March 22, 2011, by which said plaintiff requests the Court "consider sua sponte imposition of Rule 11 Sanctions" against counsel for defendant City and County of San Francisco, Orpheos Tarbox, Timothy Buelow, Steven Stocker, and Michael Hennessey, based on said counsel's noticing a discovery-related motion before the undersigned rather than before the magistrate judge to whom discovery matters previously had been referred. According to plaintiff, defendants' counsel did so in order "to bias [the Court] and [its] staff against" plaintiff.

Plaintiff is hereby advised that the Court does not entertain requests for relief made by letter. Rather, such requests must be brought by noticed motion. See Civil L.R. 7-1(a). Further, even if the Court were to consider plaintiff's request, the Court would decline to

impose the requested sanctions and, accordingly, for all such reasons, said request is hereby DENIED.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 24, 2011

MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge