

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY GRISMORE et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 1:17-CV-00413- JLT
ORDER AFTER IN CAMERA REVIEW

The Court has conducted the in camera review of records produced by the Bakersfield Police Department (Doc. 37). The Court finds that there are few records that could bear on the issues raised in this litigation. Though the Court will order some of the records produced, it makes no comment whether they may, ultimately, be admitted at trial. The Court

ORDERS:

1. The documents identified as files 2, 3, 8, 9, 12, 14 and 16 on the thumb drive provided to the Court, **SHALL** be produced. The identities and personal identifiers of all officers, except those named in this litigation, may be redacted. In addition, the names and personal identifiers of witnesses and complainants may be redacted;

///
///
///

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

2. The documents **SHALL** be produced as soon as possible but **no later than April 9, 2018;**

3. At the option of the defendants, the documents produced **SHALL** be returned by the plaintiffs to the defendants at the conclusion of this litigation or destroyed. The documents are confidential and any information in the documents **SHALL NOT** be disseminated beyond those who absolutely must know it and all who learn of the information contained in the documents **SHALL** keep the information confidential;

4. Objections to this order may be filed within five days. In the event there are objections, the production date may be extended by the Court as needed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 26, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE