

¹⁸ September 17, 2011. After carefully considering the parties' positions, the Court rules as set
¹⁹ forth below.

20

A. <u>September 15, 2011 Joint Letter</u>

21 Defendants have withheld from production on attorney-client privilege grounds an 22 email chain relating to a third party's complaint regarding the promotion of Natrecor. At the 23 parties' request the Court has reviewed the withheld emails in their entirety in camera and 24 finds that they do not involve communications seeking legal advice and thus must be 25 produced. See United States v. Graf, 610 F.3d 1148, 1156 (9th Cir. 2010). The copying of 26 the email to in-house counsel does not mean the email necessarily involved the seeking of 27 legal advice. See United States v. ChevronTexaco Corp., 241 F.Supp.2d 1065, 1075 (N.D. 28 Cal. 2002).

Upon production of the email chain the parties shall meet and confer regarding whether any depositions need to be reopened in light of the production. The depositions, if any, may take place after the September 23, 2011 discovery cut-off.

September 17, 2011 Letter **B**.

Plaintiff's motion to quash Defendants' deposition subpoena on Dr. Peacock is denied. Since Plaintiff contends it cannot reasonably be ready for Dr. Peacock's deposition on September 23, 2011, the parties shall meet and confer as to a mutually convenient date in October. The parties shall reach agreement as to the date of Dr. Peacock's deposition on or before September 23, 2011.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 19, 2011

a he leive S.(JACOU RLEY UNITED STATE S MAGISTRATE JUDGE