

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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

**\*E-Filed 02/11/2010\***

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

RICHARD B. FOX,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
GOOD SAMARITAN L.P., et al,  
Defendants.

**No. C 04-00874 RS**  
**ORDER RE IN CAMERA REVIEW**

Pursuant to the order entered February 4, 2010, the Court has reviewed *in camera* materials related to the two non-pediatric patients. There is no indication defendants engaged in any intentional or reckless over-redaction or unwarranted withholding of information. Indeed, in most instances, defendants appear to have applied a liberal standard in evaluating how much material to produce unredacted to provide context for any references to plaintiff therein. Nevertheless, there are a few instances where further production is appropriate:

1. Doc. GSH41231. In the first paragraph by speaker "JD," it is not entirely certain that the sentence beginning "He made a bald faced statement . . ." is a reference to plaintiff, but the statement described is similar enough to comments made by plaintiff earlier in the meeting that it

1 may be. As such, the redaction running from that paragraph down to the presently unredacted  
2 paragraph containing the comments of speaker “MA” should be removed.

3 2. Doc. GSH41232-GSH41233. The final paragraph on page 15 (speaker “BS”) through the  
4 first full paragraph on page 16 (speaker “JD”) should be unredacted.

5 3. Document GSH41263 is a letter that was addressed to plaintiff, among others. Although  
6 it does not appear particularly pertinent to the issues in this action, neither does it appear to  
7 implicate any substantial privacy concerns. In any event, to comply with the prior order requiring  
8 production of materials referring to plaintiff, it should be produced. While it may be difficult to  
9 analyze how much of a letter addressed to plaintiff is a “reference” *to* plaintiff, in this instance it is  
10 appropriate to produce the letter in full.

11  
12 Defendants may contact the Courtroom deputy, Martha Parker-Brown at (408) 535-5346 to  
13 make arrangements to pick up the materials reviewed *in camera*.

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: 02/11/2010

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD SEEBORG  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE