violate the protective order in this case or any other legal obligation or prohibition. As such, it may be that the posting of these videos is protected by the First Amendment. On the other hand, an order might be necessary to prevent adverse effect on jury selection.

Defendants have not filed a response to plaintiff's letter with the court. It appears, however, that these videos have already been removed, mooting this dispute. Without determining the legal rights of either party at this stage, the court requests as a courtesy that both sides take steps to ensure that neither these nor similar videos are reposted or otherwise made public pending trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 10, 2010.

SENIOR JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

 $^{^{1}}$ On June 9, 2010, the court attempted to visit the links provided by plaintiffs, and received messages indicating that the videos had been removed by the poster or were otherwise unavailable.