

1 Richard G. Grotch, Esq. - SBN 127713
CODDINGTON, HICKS & DANFORTH
 2 **A Professional Corporation, Lawyers**
 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 300
 3 Redwood City, California 94065-2133
 Tel. (650) 592-5400
 4 Fax. (650) 592-5027
 E-mail: rgrotch@chdlawyers.com

5 **ATTORNEYS FOR** Defendants/Cross-Claimants
 6 UNITED AIR LINES, INC. and
 UAL CORPORATION

7
 8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10
 11 J.C., an individual, and as Guardian Ad
 Litem for her child, S.C., a minor,

12
 13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15 UAL CORPORATION, a Delaware
 corporation; UNITED AIR LINES, INC.,
 16 a subsidiary of UAL CORPORATION and
 a Delaware corporation; JACKSON
 SENYONGA, an individual; and DOES 1
 17 through 25, inclusive,

18 Defendants.

No. C 09-0747 SBA (JL) (MEJ)

MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
 RELIEF: REQUEST FOR
 CONTINUANCE OF STATUS
 CONFERENCE AND CLARIFICATION
 OF ORDER

Honorable Maria-Elena James
 Chief United States Magistrate Judge

19
 20 AND RELATED CROSS-CLAIM

21 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, defendants and cross-complainants UNITED AIR LINES,
 22 INC. and UAL CORPORATION (hereinafter referred to collectively as "United") respectfully
 23 submit this motion for administrative relief seeking (1) a continuance of the Status Conference re
 24 Settlement, from June 10, 2010 to **June 17, 2010 at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom B** and (2)
 25 clarification of the Court's April 29, 2010 order (Doc. 83) with respect to who is required to attend
 26 the Status Conference re Settlement. *Counsel for the all of the parties agree to the requested*
 27 *continuance and to the June 17, 2010 date; plaintiff, herself, has neither agreed nor disagreed.*

28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I.

PROCEDURAL POSTURE

On April 29, 2010, upon receipt of the parties’ status conference statements regarding the settlement of this action, the Court scheduled a status conference for May 13, 2010. (Doc. 83). The day before the scheduled conference, a request to continue the Status Conference was submitted on behalf of plaintiff “J.C.” (Doc. 84). Although plaintiffs’ counsel advised that he was available to attend the conference, the plaintiff, herself, apparently was unable to do so. (*Id.*)

On May 13, 2010, the Court granted the requested continuance and continued the Status Conference to June 10, 2010. (Doc. 86). Because of a calendar conflict posed by a long-scheduled mediation in another case in this Court, involving parties and principals traveling from across the country, United’s counsel immediately contacted counsel for the other parties to ask if they would agree to have the Status Conference continued further by one week, to June 17, 2010. Both counsel for plaintiffs and for defendant Jackson Senyonga *agreed* to that request.

Because the Status Conference was continued in the first instance because of plaintiff “J.C.’s” personal inability to attend on the initially scheduled date, United’s counsel has asked plaintiffs’ counsel, repeatedly, to advise whether the plaintiff would also agree to the one week postponement. Since making that request, plaintiffs’ counsel has confirmed his own availability and agreement to the continuance, but has indicated that he is unable to confirm whether or not his client will agree.

In order to raise this issue with the Court in a reasonably timely manner, and with no information apparently forthcoming from the plaintiff herself, United feels compelled to submit this request at this time.

II.

REQUEST FOR ONE WEEK CONTINUANCE

With the agreement of counsel – if not the plaintiff herself – United respectfully requests that the Status Conference re Settlement be continued from June 10, 2010 to June 17, 2010, at 10:00 a.m., in Courtroom B of this Court.

///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

III.

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION

In the Court’s April 29, 2010 order (Doc. 83), the Court ordered “the *parties* to appear for a status conference.” (Emphasis added). Counsel for all the defendants interpreted that as requiring the parties to appear through their counsel of record. It appears plaintiff “J.C.” *may have* interpreted the Order as requiring the real parties, themselves, to attend. While it is understandable that the plaintiff may wish to attend the status conference with her attorney, United simply seeks clarification as to whether its understanding – that only counsel are required to attend the Status Conference (as is customary) – is correct.

Dated: May 20, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
CODDINGTON, HICKS & DANFORTH

/s/ Richard G. Grotch

Richard G. Grotch
Attorneys for Defendants/Cross-Claimants
United Air Lines, Inc. and UAL Corporation

TO ALL COUNSEL AND PARTIES OF RECORD, this hearing shall be rescheduled for Thursday, June 24, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.. All parties who have the authority to settle this matter must attend.

DATED: May 25, 2010

