

² *Turner*, Case No. 01-2324-KHV-JPO, 205 F.R.D. at 595.

Seafood Trader, Inc. v. RF Int'l, Ltd., where he opined, “The purpose of mediation is to engage the parties, not only the attorneys, in the mediation process. . . . The value of the mediation is for the mediator to engage the parties and counsel directly.”³

More authoritative to this dispute is the Memorandum Order entered by Chief District Judge J. Thomas Marten on December 24, 2014 (Doc. 11). That order specifies unequivocally that “a person having actual settlement authority will be present at the conference. Only in the most compelling circumstances will the court forego the personal presence of the person with actual settlement authority.” Here, defendant has offered only the travel costs and lost work attributable to his attendance at mediation as burdensome. The court finds those to be the necessary costs of litigation and not the “most compelling circumstances” which might support remote attendance.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant’s motion for leave for its corporate representative to appear telephonically at mediation (**Doc. 12**) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated at Wichita, Kansas this 30th day of January 2015.

s/ Karen M. Humphreys
KAREN M. HUMPHREYS
United States Magistrate Judge

³ *Inter-Ocean Seafood Trader, Inc.*, Case No. 12-2268-KGG, 2013 WL 441065, at *2.