

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

SUSAN BROOKS and CLAUDIA HUTTO,

Plaintiffs,

Case Number: 12-CV-12880
Honorable Denise Page Hood

v.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON, a
Michigan municipal corporation, and GEORGE
FITZGERALD, an individual, sued in his official
and personal capacity.

Defendants.

**ORDER ALLOWING FOR VIDEO CONFERENCE DEPOSITION OF
NON-PARTY JULIE FITZGERALD**

On September 20, 2013, a telephonic status conference was held on Defendants' Motion to Amend the Court's Scheduling Order [**Docket No. 91, Filed September 11, 2013**]. During the conference, the parties agreed non-party Julie Fitzgerald will complete her deposition by videoconference. The Court notes that it believes that videoconferencing falls within the category of "other remote means" allowed for depositions pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(4). *See Schoenherr v. Smith*, .12-CV-14276, 2013 WL 2239304 (E.D. Mich. May 21, 2013). The court also notes that "[p]arties routinely conduct depositions via videoconference, and courts encourage the same because doing so minimizes travel costs." *Gee v. Suntrust Mortg.*,

Inc., 10-CV-01509 RS (NC), 2011 WL 5597124, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2011).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Julie Fitzgerald's deposition be completed by videoconference at a date and time amenable to both parties.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Mrs. Fitzgerald's attorney is unable to produce her for deposition, he should notify Plaintiffs' counsel for purposes of effectuating service.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Denise Page Hood
Denise Page Hood
United States District Judge

Dated: September 26, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on September 26, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/LaShawn R. Saulsberry
Case Manager