

1 ARTHUR A. HARTINGER (SBN 121521)
 ahartinger@meyersnave.com
 2 GEOFFREY SPELLBERG (SBN 121079)
 gspellberg@meyersnave.com
 3 CAMILLE HAMILTON PATING (SBN 122890)
 cpating@meyersnave.com
 4 MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON
 555 12th Street, Suite 1500
 5 Oakland, California 94607
 Telephone: (510) 808-2000
 6 Facsimile: (510) 444-1108

7 Attorneys for Defendant

8
 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12
 13 JAMES JENKINS, SHAWN PICKETT,
 CLEVELAND BROWN, AND ARNOLD
 14 THREETS,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 CITY OF RICHMOND, a California
 Governmental Entity,

18 Defendant.

CASE NO. C 08-03401 MHP

**ORDER AFTER HEARING RE:
 REQUEST TO CONDUCT
 INVESTIGATIONS INVOLVING
 PLAINTIFF PICKETT**

19
 20 The Defendant City of Richmond has moved this Court for an order permitting the City to
 21 conduct two separate investigations of Plaintiff Lt. Shawn Pickett.

22 The first investigation relates to emails sent from an individual identified in this order by
 23 the initial "S" for privacy reasons. One of the recipients of these emails was a Richmond citizen
 24 who complained to the City that she believed Lt. Pickett (and not "S") was the true sender of the
 25 emails at issue. The City moved the Court for leave to investigate this issue. The second
 26 investigation relates to the Richmond Police Department's concern regarding the manner in which
 27 Lt. Pickett responded to his receipt of information in August of 2010 regarding an alleged crime.
 28

1577790

1
 ORDER AFTER HEARING

C 08-03401 MHP

1 The City moved the Court for leave to investigate that incident.

2 The motion by Richmond came on for hearing in this Court on January 18, 2011. Counsel
3 for all parties appeared and argued. Based upon the evidence and argument submitted, the Court
4 orders as follows:

5 1. With regard to the complaint regarding the emails, the Court ~~appoints Dr. A.J. Philips~~ has appointed Lynell
6 ~~Nichols (or other forensic examiner recommended by Dr. Nichols) to review the emails at issue~~
7 and all other relevant information including metadata allegedly obtained by the recipient(s) of
8 these emails, to determine whether there is forensic evidence demonstrating that Lt. Pickett is the
9 true sender of these emails. In order to make this determination as to whether Lt. Pickett's was the
10 sender of these emails, Dr. A.J. Nichols (or other forensic examiner recommended by Dr. Nichols)
11 ~~may inspect, if necessary, the relevant computers or cell phones used by Lt. Pickett.~~

12 2. Until further order from this Court, Lt. Pickett is not to delete, modify, alter,
13 transfer or make any changes which conceal, destroy, remove or change any data (including
14 images) which currently exists on any and every computer and cell phone used by or owned by Lt.
15 Pickett, including any personal computers (laptop or desktop) and any personal cell phones,
16 including any and all iPhones owned or used. There is no other limitation to Lt. Pickett's use of
17 any computer or cell phone.

18 3. With respect to the Richmond Police Department concern regarding the manner in
19 which Lt. Pickett responded to his receipt of information in August of 2010 regarding an alleged
20 crime, the Special Master, Ms. Yanni shall select an independent investigator to take statements of
21 all "external" witnesses (ie, non-police department personnel) to the incident. (Alternatively, the
22 parties can agree on the investigator who will be used.) Upon receipt of the audio tapes and
23 statements from those interviews, defendant shall provide copies of the statements and audio tapes
24 to plaintiffs.

25 4. If after the above actions are completed, Richmond wishes to continue pursuing its
26 request to open investigations against Lt. Pickett, Richmond shall file that request, along with the
27 supporting evidence, with the Court on February 17, 2011. Plaintiffs shall file their opposition on
28 February 24, 2011. The matter will be heard on March 3, 2011 at 3:00 p.m.

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

5. The costs for these investigations shall be paid by defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 24, 2011

By: ~~Hon. Marilyn H. Patel~~
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
IT IS SO ORDERED
MHP
Judge Marilyn H. Patel

Approved as to Form

AC

Anne Costin, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiffs