

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

PHILIPPE BUHANNIC and  
PATRICK BUHANNIC,

Defendants Below,  
Appellants,

v.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT &  
TUNNELL LLP,

Non-party Below,  
Appellee.

§  
§  
§ No. 433, 2018  
§  
§ Court Below—Court of Chancery  
§ of the State of Delaware  
§  
§ C.A. No. 10164  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Submitted: December 14, 2018

Decided: February 15, 2019

Before **STRINE**, Chief Justice; **VALIHURA** and **TRAYNOR**, Justices.

**ORDER**

After careful consideration of the parties' briefs and the record on appeal, we conclude that the judgment below should be affirmed. In this appeal, the appellants, Philippe Buhannic and Patrick Buhannic, argue that the Court of Chancery failed to give them access to certain documents that were in the files of their former law firm, appellee Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP. On appeal, Morris Nichols does not challenge the production ordered by the Court of Chancery. Thus, the only issue on appeal is whether the Buhannics are correct in contending that the Court of Chancery erred by excluding certain documents from the production it ordered. Because this is the only issue on appeal, we do not address whether the Court of Chancery was correct

to order production as broad as it did and to reject Morris Nichols' arguments in favor of the end-product approach, which excludes a lawyer's internal work product from the documents that must be produced to a former client upon request. Instead, we address the only issue presented to us and find that for the reasons the Court of Chancery gave, it was proper to deny access to the documents the Buhannics seek on appeal.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the judgment of the Court of Chancery is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Karen L. Valihura  
Justice