

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

**\* \* \***

ALEESHA JOHNSON, et al., )  
 )  
 Plaintiffs, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 GRACE CLAYTON, et al., )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

2:08-cv-01810-RCJ-LRL  
**ORDER**

Before the court are the request of the Clark County defendants for an exemption from attending the upcoming settlement conference (#96) and the request by the Clayton defendants for telephonic attendance at the settlement conference (#97). Plaintiffs do not oppose Clark County’s request because those defendants have settled. *See* plaintiffs’ Non-Opposition (#98). Plaintiffs do not oppose the Clayton defendants’ request to allow their carrier’s representative to participate in the settlement conference by telephone, but vigorously oppose the Clayton defendants’ request that they themselves be allowed to participate by telephone. *See* plaintiffs’ Partial Opposition (#99). The court agrees with plaintiffs that the Clayton defendants’ physical presence at the settlement conference is essential. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the Clark County defendants’ request for exemption from attending the upcoming settlement conference (#96) is granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the request by the Clayton defendants for telephonic attendance at the settlement conference (#97) is granted in part and denied in part. The representative of defendants’ carrier may participate in the settlement conference telephonically. Defendants Grace

1 Clayton and Stacey Clayton's request to participate in the settlement conference by telephone is denied.  
2 They are ordered to attend the settlement conference in person.

3 DATED this 23rd day of July, 2010.

4 

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 **LAWRENCE R. LEAVITT**  
7 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26