1

2

3

4

23

24

25

26

27

28

disputed documents.

Dated: September 29, 2008

IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 BEVERLY KANAWI, et al., 9 Plaintiffs, C 06-05566 CRB (EDL) No. 10 ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' SEPTEMBER 25, v. 11 **2008 LETTER** 12 BECHTEL CORP., et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 On September 25, 2008, Plaintiffs filed a letter regarding a discovery dispute relating to 16 documents that were allegedly inadvertently produced by Defendant Fremont. Fremont filed a responsive letter on September 26, 2008. The Court has carefully reviewed the parties' filings, and 17 18 hereby denies without prejudice Plaintiffs' request that the Court rule that no attorney-client 19 privilege exists as to the documents at issue. Instead, no later than October 1, 2008, Fremont shall 20 lodge the documents for <u>in camera</u> review. In addition, Fremont states that the documents are 21 "similar to those currently being placed before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals pursuant to FIA's 22 and the Bechtel Defendants' appeals of the order requiring production pursuant to the fiduciary

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge

exception." Sept. 26, 2008 letter at 2. Therefore, with its in camera submission, Fremont shall state,

by Bates number if possible, which previously submitted documents are similar to which currently