

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

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WAYMO LLC,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-00939-WHA](#) (JSC)

**ORDER REGARDING WAYMO'S  
IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUMENTS  
FOR THE COURT'S IN CAMERA  
REVIEW**

This Court ordered Uber to provide the Court for its in camera review 50 pages Waymo identified as potentially improperly redacted on attorney-client or attorney work-product grounds. (Dkt. No. 2454.) The Special Master has now brought to the Court's attention a dispute among the parties as to whether the pages Waymo identifies must be from documents logged or produced as part of the supplemental post-November 2017 discovery. They must. Waymo's December 29, 2017 letter brief was focused exclusively on Uber's supplemental production and logs; Waymo did not make any argument as to why this Court should review in camera documents long ago produced in this lawsuit and this Court did not rule that it would review such documents.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: January 8, 2018

  
JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY  
United States Magistrate Judge