UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAFONZO R. TURNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

MONTANEZ, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-00078-KAW

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR ORDER OF UNMONITORED PHONE CALLS

Re: Dkt. No. 121

On January 2, 2018, the Court received a letter from Plaintiff Lafonzo R. Turner, requesting that the Court order Defendants to give Plaintiff and his counsel "ongoing access to their unmonitored phone area, so that Pl[aintiff] and counsel can confer " (Dkt. No. 121.) Plaintiff asserts that such relief is necessary because Defendants have informed Plaintiff's counsel that they lack facilities to accommodate unmonitored calls, yet have twice permitted such calls. Plaintiff also contends that they require unimpeded access.

The Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion. As an initial matter, Plaintiff is now represented by counsel, and should not be communicating with the Court pro se. See Reynolds v. Hologic, Inc., Case No. 11-cv-462-PJH, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 140776, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 28, 2012) ("it would be improper for the court to engage in ex parte communications with a represented party"). To the extent Plaintiff wishes to seek relief from the Court, Plaintiff should make such requests through his appointed counsel.

Moreover, there is no apparent basis for Plaintiff's request. Plaintiff does not assert that he is unable to make unmonitored calls, or that Defendants have ever refused to allow him to make such calls. While Plaintiff asserts that Defendants have wrongfully informed Plaintiff's counsel that they lack facilities to accommodate unmonitored calls, he admits that he has in fact been

United States District Court Northern District of California

allowed to make such calls. Thus, there is no showing that his access to unmonitored calls is unlawfully impeded, or that the relief sought is required.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 5, 2018

KANDIS A. WESTMORE United States Magistrate Judge