

****E-filed 04/15/2010****

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9 SAN JOSE DIVISION
10

11 GREGORY NICHOLAS STESHENKO,

No. C 09-5543 RS

12 Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE FUTURE COURT
PROCEEDINGS**

13
14 v.

15
16 THOMAS MCKAY, et al.,

17 Defendants.
18
19 _____/

20
21 Plaintiff has submitted a letter requesting that this action be reassigned to a judge sitting in
22 the San Jose Division, in light of the burdens to him arising from traveling to San Francisco to
23 attend court proceedings. Reassignment does not appear to be warranted at this juncture. The
24 Case Management Conference, presently set for May 27, 2010, shall be telephonic. In the event
25 there are motions filed which the Court does not elect to take under submission without oral
26 argument pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), plaintiff will be permitted to appear by telephone.
27 Finally, plaintiff's declination of magistrate judge jurisdiction and request for reassignment to a
28 district judge appears to be based on a misunderstanding. This action is presently assigned to a

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 Judge, the undersigned. Only discovery disputes have been referred to a magistrate judge.

Dated: 04/15/2010



RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE