

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  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
Northern District of California

CITY OF OAKLAND,

No. C 11-1446 YGR (MEJ)

Plaintiff,

**AMENDED ORDER RE:  
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

v.

SSA TERMINALS, LLC., et al.,

**Re: Docket No. 62**Defendants.  

---

On February 3, 2012, the parties filed a joint discovery dispute letter regarding the scope of a proposed stipulated protective order. Dkt. No. 62. In it, Defendants contend that certain counsel of record for Plaintiff, the Port of Oakland, should not be permitted to review material designated “Attorneys Eyes Only” because they are involved in lease negotiations and/or decision-making for the Port and that disclosure of certain materials to them would be extremely prejudicial. Plaintiff contends that all counsel of record in this action require access and that denial of access is tantamount to disqualifying those members of the Port’s trial team. Neither side prevents any legal authority in support of their arguments, but Defendants request the opportunity for full briefing. Good cause appearing, the Court shall permit each party to file a supplemental letter of no more than five pages. Defendants shall file their letter by February 13, 2012, and Plaintiff shall file a response by February 20. The parties should be mindful that the focus of their authority should be on the exclusion of counsel that is both counsel of record and in-house counsel, and not in the context of a trademark and/or patent case.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 6, 2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Maria-Elena James  
Chief United States Magistrate Judge