

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
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> FRY’S ELECTRONICS, INC., <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>	}
--	---

No. C10-1562RSL

ORDER GRANTING SECOND
MOTION TO COMPEL
ARBITRATION

This matter comes before the Court on “Defendant Fry’s Electronics Inc.’s Second Motion to Compel Arbitration.” (Dkt. # 103). Having considered the arguments made by the parties and reviewed all pleadings and evidence in support of and in opposition to the motion,¹ the Court finds as follows:

Plaintiff Ka Lam previously represented to the Court that he would submit his

¹ The Court has not considered the letters from counsel, dated February 7, 2012, and February 15, 2012. Mr. Blankenship’s efforts to communicate with the Court regarding pending motions outside the normal briefing process is improper. Counsel could have and should have presented whatever “procedural issues” are bothering him in response to defendant’s motion to compel arbitration or, if necessary, in a separate motion. Requests for Court action shall be made by motion, not through phone calls or correspondence. The “telephonic motions” discussed in Local Civil Rule 7(i) will be considered only when the parties have reached an impasse at a deposition and need an immediate resolution to a discrete and concrete issue. The parties are, of course, free to contact my judicial assistant regarding scheduling matters, but informal communications with the law clerk or the Court are to be avoided.

ORDER GRANTING SECOND MOTION
TO COMPEL ARBITRATION

