

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

SHARON NESS, individually,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAW ENFORCEMENT SUPPORT  
AGENCY (LESA); PIERCE COUNTY;  
CITY OF TACOMA; et al,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C10-5111 KLS

ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S  
DEPOSITION

The Defendants scheduled the discovery deposition of the Plaintiff for July 27, 2012.

The undersigned was attending a conference the week of July 23<sup>rd</sup> and therefore unable to rule on the Plaintiff's motion for a protective order as it pertained to her discovery deposition. ECF No. 40. Upon reviewing the pleadings, the Court notes that the Defendants agreed not to conduct the deposition on the scheduled date if there was no ruling from this Court regarding the Plaintiff's motion.

First, the Defendant notes that the Plaintiff failed to file a certification required under Local Rule CR 26(c)(2) regarding a meet and confer. The chain of email provided to the Court

1 shows the parties were discussing the issue and, therefore, for purposes of this motion only, the  
2 Court will infer a conference of the parties. The undersigned will make no such further  
3 inferences regarding discovery in this case.

4 The issue regarding the deposition is whether the Plaintiff's deposition should start at  
5 9:00, which the plaintiff opposes, or whether it should start at 1:00 but then continue for 7 hours  
6 into the evening, which the defendants oppose.

7 A reasonable solution to this stand off is that the deposition be scheduled for two days  
8 starting at 1:00 p.m. each date, with the total deposition time not to exceed seven hours. That is  
9 the Court's ruling.

10 Dated this 3rd day of August, 2012.

11  
12   
13 Karen L. Strombom  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24