

1  
2 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
3 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
4

5 PATRICIA A MCCOLM,

No. C 09-04132 SI

6 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
LETTER MOTION AS MOOT AND  
DIRECTING PLAINTIFF NOT TO FAX  
LETTERS OR FILINGS TO THE COURT**

7 v.

8 FOREMOST INSURANCE CO,

9 Defendant.  
10 \_\_\_\_\_/

11 Plaintiff faxed a letter to the court on September 27, 2010 requesting certain relief with regard  
12 to a deposition that was scheduled for September 28, 2010. The Court does not have direct access to  
13 faxes sent to the number used by plaintiff and therefore did not receive the fax until the request made  
14 in the letter was already moot. Therefore, plaintiff's requests are DENIED as moot.

15 Fax is not the appropriate method of communicating with the Court. Plaintiff is directed to  
16 communicate with the court by mail, by delivering filings directly to the courthouse, or by electronic  
17 filing.

18 Additionally, it has come to the Court's attention that plaintiff has attempted to contact the court  
19 directly by telephone. Plaintiff is required to contact the court in writing in order that defendant can be  
20 provided with a copy of any communication between plaintiff and the Court. This provides defendant  
21 with the opportunity to be aware of what requests have been made to the Court.

22 If plaintiff remains concerned about who can access deposition recordings and transcripts, or  
23 documents produced during discovery, plaintiff may file a motion for a protective order outlining her  
24 specific concerns.

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26  
27 Dated: September 28, 2010

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge