

1 LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAHER & JACKSON, P.C.
 JEFFREY LEWIS, SBN 066587
 2 jlewis@lewisfeinberg.com
 ANDREW LAH, SBN 234580
 3 alah@lewisfeinberg.com
 NINA WASOW, SBN 242047
 4 nwasow@lewisfeinberg.com
 DARIN RANAHAHAN, SBN 273532
 5 dranahan@lewisfeinberg.com
 476 9th Street
 6 Oakland, CA 94607
 Telephone: (510) 839-6824
 7 Facsimile: (510) 839-7839

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 9 RETIREE SUPPORT GROUP OF CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

10 HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
 RAYMOND F. LYNCH, SBN 119065
 rlynch@hansonbridgett.com
 11 STEPHEN B. PECK, SBN 72214
 speck@hansonbridgett.com
 12 JANE M. FEDDES, SBN 282117
 jfeddes@hansonbridgett.com
 13 425 Market Street, 26th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94105
 14 Telephone: (415) 777-3200
 Facsimile: (415) 541-9366

15 Attorneys for Defendant
 16 CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 RETIREE SUPPORT GROUP OF CONTRA
 COSTA COUNTY,
 21
 Plaintiff,
 22
 v.
 23
 CONTRA COSTA COUNTY,
 24
 Defendant.
 25

CASE NO. C 12-00944 JST

**STIPULATION RE PRODUCTION OF
 CLOSED SESSION RECORDS
 WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO CLAIMS OF
 PRIVILEGE AND [~~PROPOSED~~] ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar

27 WHEREAS, Defendant has withheld from production documents on grounds including
 28 that the records from closed sessions of the Defendant's Board of Supervisors are exempt from

1 disclosure under Federal and State law under the deliberative process privilege and State law
2 pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code section 54950 et. seq, including section
3 54957.6. (“Privilege Claims”);

4 WHEREAS, Plaintiff and Defendant dispute the applicability and extent of these privileges
5 in this case, including the Brown Act, but wish to narrow the parties' disputes to the extent
6 possible;

7 WHEREAS, Defendant is willing to produce some closed session and other materials
8 under the parties’ Protective Order upon the conditions that Defendant's productions do not
9 constitute a waiver of any kind and are without prejudice to its Privilege Claims and applicability
10 of the Brown Act and that County retains the right to object to any use of the records in and during
11 a deposition, motion or at trial on the grounds of its Privilege Claims;

12 WHEREAS, so long as Plaintiff retains the claims and arguments it has before production,
13 Plaintiff is willing to agree that County's production of closed session and other records is made
14 without prejudice to the County’s Privilege Claims concerning the disclosed record and that
15 County retains the right to object to any use of the record in and during a deposition, motion or at
16 trial on the grounds of privilege, and that Plaintiff may not use the disclosed record or its content
17 to argue that additional undisclosed closed session records or testimony about deliberations in
18 closed session are discoverable or not privileged.

19 NOW, THEREFORE, in order to narrow the scope of the parties’ discovery disputes,
20 expedite discovery, and prepare for trial, the parties, through their respective attorneys, agree as
21 follows:

22 1. The documents produced pursuant to this Stipulation will be governed by the terms
23 of this Stipulation and Order and the Protective Order entered in this case on August 22, 2014
24 (Docket Number 80);

25 2. To the extent Defendant produces closed session or other records under the
26 Protective Order, Defendant’s production of such records does not waive its Privilege Claims or
27 confidentiality as to the document or the confidentiality of any such proceeding and its disclosures
28 are without prejudice to Defendant's Privilege Claims which it may assert later in or during

1 depositions, motions, and at trial;

2 3. Plaintiff does not waive and preserves any claim it has that closed session records
3 are discoverable. However, Plaintiff may not use the disclosed closed session records or their
4 content to argue that additional undisclosed closed session records or testimony about
5 deliberations in closed session are discoverable.

6 SO STIPULATED:

8 DATED: July 14, 2014

LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER &
JACKSON, P.C.

11 By: _____ /s/
NINA WASOW


13 DATED: July 14, 2014

HANSON BRIDGETT LLP

15 By: _____ /s/
RAYMOND F. LYNCH

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

20 Dated: July 16, 2014



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

SIGNATURES UNDER GENERAL ORDER NO. 45

Pursuant to General Order No. 45 of the United States District Court, Northern District of California, I, Raymond Lynch—the ECF User whose User ID and Password are used in the filing of this document—hereby attest that the concurrence to the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the other signatories to this document.

/s/ _____
Raymond Lynch