

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

KENNETH W. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORECIVIC, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-CV-2310-HLT-GLR

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

The Court held a telephone status conference on August 23, 2018, at the request of Defendants. The parties disagree as to whether Plaintiff, who now lives in Texas, must appear in Kansas for his deposition.

Plaintiff offers no acceptable reason other than the cost of traveling to Kansas City as a justification for why he cannot appear here. “As a general rule, plaintiffs must make themselves available for examination in the district in which they brought suit.”¹ Therefore, Plaintiff’s deposition shall take place in the District of Kansas on or before September 24, 2018, or on any other date on which the parties agree. The Court will consider whether or not Defendants should incur any part of Plaintiff’s travel costs upon written motion by any party.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated August 23, 2018, at Kansas City, Kansas.

S/ Gerald L. Rushfelt
Gerald L. Rushfelt
U.S. Magistrate Judge

¹ *Clayton v. Velociti, Inc.*, No. 08-2298-CM-GLR, 2009 WL 1033738, at *2 (D. Kan. Apr. 17, 2009) (citing *Williams v. Sprint/United Mgmt. Co.*, No. 03-2200-JWL, 2006 WL 1867471, at *3 (D. Kan. June 30, 2006). *See also Stubbs v. McDonald’s Corp.*, No 04-2164-GTV-DJW, 2005 WL 375662, at *1 (D. Kan. Jan. 26, 2005) (“Since plaintiff has selected the forum, he or she will not be heard to complain about having to appear there for a deposition.”).