

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

JOSE ROE, and others,
 Plaintiffs,
 v.
THOMAS F. WHITE, and others,
 Defendants.


Case No. 03-cv-04035 CRB (NC)
ORDER REGARDING OBJECTION
Re: Dkt. No. 1247

Defendant White today objected to the Court’s order following in camera review, requesting that the Court “modify the Order by requiring that the entire chat without redactions be produced for in camera review.” Dkt. No. 1247 at 1. The Court now clarifies that it did review in camera an *unredacted* chat, titled “Roe v. White 00322.” The Court’s order found that the document as a whole was not privileged as claimed, but that there were references to a privileged communication with counsel that should be redacted. The Court therefore ordered that a redacted version of the document be produced, subject to the Court’s review to ensure the redactions are sufficiently narrow.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: July 16, 2014



Nathanael M. Cousins
United States Magistrate Judge