

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 ELLIOT SCOTT GRIZZLE,  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, et al.,  
15 Defendants.  
16  
17  
18

Case No.: 17-CV-813-JLS-WVG


**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S EX  
PARTE MOTION TO ALLOW  
PLAINTIFF’S ATTENDANCE  
VIRTUALLY VIA ZOOM OR  
TELEPHONE AT MANDATORY  
SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE**

19 On April 7, 2022, Plaintiff filed an Ex Parte Motion to Allow Plaintiff’s Attendance  
20 Virtually Via Zoom or Telephone at Mandatory Settlement Conference (“Ex Parte  
21 Application”). (Doc. No. 169.) On April 8, 2022, Defendants filed a Notice of Non-  
22 Opposition to Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application. (Doc. No. 171.) Plaintiff moves the Court  
23 to appear either telephonically or via videoconference for the Mandatory Settlement  
24 Conference (“MSC”) in this matter. Given Plaintiff’s ongoing incarceration and  
25 Defendants’ non-opposition to Plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application, the Court finds good cause  
26 exists to permit Plaintiff to appear remotely for the forthcoming MSC in this matter.  
27 Plaintiff, his attorney, and counsel for Defendants shall make all efforts to ensure Plaintiff  
28 timely appears for the MSC either via telephone or by Zoom. Thus, the Court GRANTS

1 Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application. Separately, the Court observes Plaintiff failed to provide  
2 advance notice of his instant filing to Chambers in violation of this Court's Civil Chambers  
3 Rules VI. Compliance with all applicable rules, including Chambers Rules, is mandatory.  
4 Future non-compliance may result in sanctions.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 DATED: April 11, 2022



7  
8 Hon. William V. Gallo  
9 United States Magistrate Judge

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28