1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 7 MARK LETELL ADAMS No. C 10-4787 WHA (MEJ) ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR 8 Plaintiff. TELEPHONIC CONFERENCE v. 9 RONALD ALBERTSON, et al., 10 Defendants. 11 12 13 The Court is in receipt of a letter from Plaintiff Mark Adams requesting a telephonic 14 conference on or before Friday, October 28, 2011, for the purpose of resolving a discovery dispute. 15 Dkt. No. 117. In his letter, Mr. Adams states that the parties met and conferred by telephone prior to 16 the filing of his letter, and that time is of the essence because the subpoenas at issue have a 17 production deadline of October 31, 2011. As the parties have not complied with the undersigned's 18 Discovery Standing Order, which requires them to meet and confer in person and thereafter file a 19 joint letter, the request is DENIED. However, given that the dispute remains unresolved, the non-20 parties need not comply with the production deadline of October 31, 2011. Instead, the parties shall 21 meet and confer, file a joint letter if unable to resolve the dispute, and, if the Court then denies 22 Plaintiff's request to quash the subpoenas, the Court shall set a production deadline. 23 IT IS SO ORDERED 24 25 Dated: October 26, 2011 26 Maria-Elena James Chief United States Magistrate Judge 27 28