

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

VICTOR VELASQUEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SANTA CLARA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 5:11-cv-03588-PSG

ORDER RE: MEET-AND-CONFER
(Re: Docket Nos. 77, 87, 108, and 114)

Before the court is a filing¹ from Plaintiff Victor Velasquez that provides a status report on the parties' meet-and-confer responsive to the court's prior order "to discuss possible limiting instructions or whether other witnesses, particularly percipient witnesses, should also appear by videoconference in lieu of making a physical appearance in court."² Defendants, too, have offered their take on the meet-and-confer.³ The court agrees with Defendants that, absent an explicit motion for reconsideration, the court will not revisit its prior decision.⁴ The court is, however,

¹ See Docket No. 121.

² Docket No. 119 at 8.

³ See Docket No. 122.

⁴ Motions for reconsideration must comply with Civil L.R. 7-9. See Civil L.R. 7-9(a) ("No party may notice a motion for reconsideration without first obtaining leave of Court to file the motion."); Civil L.R. 7-9(c) ("No motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration may repeat any oral or written argument made by the applying party in support of or in opposition to the interlocutory

1 willing to assist the parties move past their impasse in meet-and-confer. To that end, the parties
2 shall appear for a status conference this Wednesday, February 5, 2014, at 4:30 pm. Telephonic
3 appearances may be made without leave of the court.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: January 31, 2014

6 
7 PAUL S. GREWAL
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 order which the party now seeks to have reconsidered. Any party who violates this restriction shall
be subject to appropriate sanctions.”).