

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAHINAH IBRAHIM,

No. C 06-00545 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**REQUEST FOR BRIEFING
MEMORANDA**

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, et al.,

Defendants.

A “Court Information Officer” from Washington D.C. has contacted the clerk’s office of this district court concerning this case and wishes to travel to San Francisco to show certain documents to the undersigned judge. Afterward, the officer intends to take the documents back to Washington, apparently without disclosure of the documents to plaintiff or plaintiff’s counsel, and without leaving copies for the record.

The Court is unfamiliar with such a procedure and requests a memorandum from each side concerning the purpose of any such in-camera disclosure as well as the extent to which counsel (on both sides) should be permitted to view the documents. The memoranda should quote from applicable statutes, regulations, and other legal authority. Be specific.


Government’s counsel should instruct the officer mentioned *not* to visit the undersigned judge until the Court has reviewed the memorandums and has settled on an appropriate procedure. The memoranda are due **TUESDAY AT NOON**, and must be served on the other side.

1 Five-page replies may be submitted within 24 hours. No ex parte memoranda will be allowed
2 for this limited purpose. In the meantime, it will not be possible for the officer to visit the
3 undersigned. The officer has submitted national security guidelines ex parte but this will not be
4 reviewed until a proper procedure has been decided.

5 A discussion on this issue will be held at the case management conference on Thursday.

6
7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 Dated: November 7, 2012.

10 
11 _____
12 WILLIAM ALSUP
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28