

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 SALLY STEINHART,

9 Plaintiff,

No. 11-03497 EDL

10 v.

**ORDER DENYING APPLICATION TO
APPEAR TELEPHONICALLY**

11 JOSEPH BARKELA,

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14 On September 19, 2012, Plaintiff filed a letter requesting, among other things, permission to
15 appear by telephone at the case management conference that was then set for September 25, 2012.

16 On September 20, 2012, the Court denied Plaintiff's request to appear by telephone at the case
17 management conference. See Docket No. 65. The Court, however, continued the case management
18 conference to October 2, 2012 in part based on Plaintiff's September 19, 2012 letter.

19 On September 24, 2012, Plaintiff requested a continuance of the October 2, 2012 case
20 management conference from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. or later on October 2, 2012. In that request,
21 Plaintiff stated:

22 I have a previously set motion on October 2, 2012 at 8:30 am in Sonoma Superior
23 Court. As there will be no tentative ruling, and a telephone appearance is not
24 permitted in that matter, I would respectfully request that the time of the Case
25 Management Conference in this matter be changed. I won't be able to appear in
26 person until 11:30 am at the earliest. Therefore I would respectfully request that it be
27 held at 12:00 noon, or sometime in the afternoon.

28 Docket No. 66. The Court rescheduled the case management conference from 10:00 a.m. on October
2, 2012 to 12:00 p.m. on October 2, 2012, solely at Plaintiff's request.

On September 28, 2012, Plaintiff filed another request to appear telephonically at the case
management conference set for October 2, 2012 at 12:00 p.m. Plaintiff states that she is regularly
employed as a school crossing guard from 2:20 p.m. until 3:10 p.m. on school days, including

1 October 2, 2012. In her renewed request, Plaintiff has failed to show good cause for a telephone
2 appearance. When Plaintiff requested a continuance to a time in the afternoon of October 2, 2012,
3 she did not mention her afternoon obligation as a crossing guard. Further, the Court has
4 accommodated Plaintiff's requests for continuances of the case management conference on two
5 occasions. Therefore, Plaintiff's request is denied.

6 Dated: September 28, 2012

Elizabeth D. Laporte

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28