1	**E-filed 7/14/10**
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
9	TANIA GARCIA-LOPEZ, et al., No. C 09-2592 RS
10	Plaintiff, ORDER RE PREVIOUSLY GRANTED
11	v. CONTINUANCE
12	MICHAEL YATES, et al.,
13	
14	/ Defendants.
15	The Court previously granted Plaintiff's motion to continue the hearing on the cross-motions
16 17	for summary judgment from July 15, 2010 to July 29, 2010, by executing Plaintiff's proposed order,
17	which erroneously stated that the motion was "unopposed." The Court is aware from the body of
10	plaintiff's motion that defendants in fact opposed the motion on grounds that counsel had already
20	purchased airfare and had arranged a vacation. Although the Court strongly discourages telephonic
20	appearances at law and motion, should defense counsel wish to appear by telephone at the continued
22	hearing, the Court will accommodate a written request to do so, although it may require both sides
23	to appear by telephone in that event.
24	Dated: 7/14/10 RibitSection
25	Dated: 7/14/10
26	RICHARD SEEBORG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27	
28	

United States District Court For the Northern District of California