

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**MELISSA CONKLIN,**  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
**EQUIFAX INC., ET AL.,**  
Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-04315-YGR

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
TELEPHONIC APPEARANCE; CONTINUING  
CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE;  
SETTING COMPLIANCE HEARING**

Re: Dkt. No. 20, 22

Defendant has filed a request and a motion to appear by telephone at the initial Case Management Conference (“CMC”) set for December 21, 2015. (Dkt. Nos. 20, 22.) The basis for the motion is essentially one of convenience and the view that the underlying action does not warrant a personal appearance. (Id. at 1.) As this Court has advised through its standing order:

These conferences are intended to be substantive and productive. Accordingly, each party shall be represented at case management conferences by counsel with authority to enter into stipulations and make admissions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(a) and (c), as well as fully prepared to address all of the matters in the CAND CMC Order and Civil L.R. 16-10(b). Failure to do so shall be considered grounds for sanctions. Because of the substantive quality of the initial case management conference, telephonic appearances are disfavored. The Court will grant requests to appear by telephone only upon a compelling showing of good cause. The routine inconveniences of travel do not constitute good cause.

Standing Order in Civil Cases § 6. Accordingly, the request is **DENIED**.

Additionally, the Court has reviewed the pleadings in this action and hereby **CONTINUES** the Case Management Conference to **January 11, 2016** so that the parties can determine whether consent to a magistrate judge of their choice and for all purposes is warranted. The Northern District’s use of magistrate judges for all purposes has been hailed as the model for the United States.

In this regard, counsel **shall personally** review each magistrate judge’s profile and discuss

1 the option with both opposing counsel and their clients. Profiles of each magistrate judge and  
2 their respective locations can be found at: <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/judges>. The Court  
3 hereby **SETS** a compliance hearing on **January 15, 2016** at **9:01 a.m.** in the Federal Courthouse,  
4 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California, Courtroom 1. Counsel shall confirm compliance as  
5 follows: by **January 6, 2016**, the parties shall file either (1) a joint stipulation to a magistrate  
6 judge for all purposes, or (2) a joint statement verifying counsel have personally reviewed each  
7 magistrate judge's profile and have discussed the options as directed but have been unable to reach  
8 consensus. If compliance is complete, the parties need not appear and the compliance hearing will  
9 be taken off calendar. Failure to file the required joint filing may result in sanctions. If the parties  
10 have not stipulated to a magistrate judge, the CMC will proceed before the undersigned as  
11 scheduled herein.

12 This Order terminates Docket Numbers 20, 22.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: December 9, 2015

15   
16 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**  
17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**