

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
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

REGINALD C. HOWARD,
Plaintiff,
vs.
BRIAN CONNETT, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No.: 2:11-cv-01402-RFB-GWF

ORDER


This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Produce Inmate (#112), filed on July 27, 2015.

Plaintiff requests that he be allowed to attend the upcoming settlement conference in person. He argues that he cannot properly participate in the conference if he is forced to do so via video teleconference. Furthermore, his attorney would have to choose between traveling to the SDCC or attend the settlement conference without his client.

The Court finds that the settlement conference can be effectively conducted with the Plaintiff appearing via teleconference. The Court understands that counsel will have to choose between attending the conference in the presence of his client at the SDCC or attending the conference at court without the physical presence of his client. Whichever approach counsel takes, the Court will allow him to have private conversations with his client as needed. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Produce Inmate (#112) is **denied**.

DATED this 28th day of July, 2015.



GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
United States Magistrate Judge