

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,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY, et al.,

Defendants.

---

No. C 06-00545 WHA

**ORDER ON DEFENDANTS'  
REQUEST FOR  
CLARIFICATION**

Defendants assert in their request for clarification (Dkt. No. 408) that they should not be required to produce a privilege log identifying classified documents because doing so would reveal classified information. Defendants further assert that they cannot even “reveal the volume of classified documents responsive to plaintiff’s discovery requests without revealing classified information.” The sole decision cited by defendants is not on point. Both sides are therefore **ORDERED** to submit additional briefing by **5:00 P.M. ON FEBRUARY 14** identifying the regulations, statutes, and or case law that support or contradict these propositions.

Defendants’ request for a status conference for the purpose of narrowing discovery is **DENIED**.


Defendants have been on notice of the pending discovery requests for several months, and for some requests, years. Defendants’ opportunity to move for a protective order has long since passed. The request for a modification of the briefing schedule is **DENIED**. Defendants

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

may lodge their objections to plaintiff's 30(b)(6) deposition notices in their opposition due on  
March 14.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 13, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE