

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**
10

11 JOSE ROE, and others,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 THOMAS F. WHITE, and others,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. 03-cv-04035 CRB (NC)

**ORDER RE: POST-JUDGMENT
REVIEW OF REPLOGLE FILES**

Re: Dkt. No. 1086

17 This Court has completed its review of twenty-three boxes of David Replogle's
18 documents that were formerly in the possession of the State Bar. The Court identified
19 approximately 1500 pages of documents and two CDs that are responsive to paragraph two
20 of Judge Breyer's November 15, 2011 Order. Dkt. No. 1043. Many, if not all, of these
21 responsive documents appear to be privileged.

22 The boxes contained mostly loose papers, without any sort of indexing or
23 organization system to identify each document. The Court has separated and catalogued the
24 responsive documents, but additional organization is needed. The process of identifying
25 and copying each responsive document will be time consuming, and the Court has already
26 spent many hours sifting through these materials.

27 By July 24, 2013 at 5:00 p.m., defendants must provide a vendor to Bates Number,
28 scan, and photocopy the responsive documents in order that copies may be provided to the


Case No. 03-cv-04035 CRB (NC)
ORDER RE: POST-JUDGMENT
REVIEW

1 Guardian Ad Litem and plaintiffs' counsel in accordance with Judge Breyer's order. *See*
2 Dkt. Nos. 1043, 1086. Once defendants have hired a vendor, the vendor must collect the
3 responsive documents from chambers. The Court will hold a hearing on July 31, 2013 at
4 1:00 p.m. to discuss the next step of the review process.

5 Any party may object to this order within fourteen days. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Date: July 22, 2013


Nathanael M. Cousins
United States Magistrate Judge

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28