

United States District Court
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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

BLADEROOM GROUP LIMITED, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
FACEBOOK, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [5:15-cv-01370-EJD](#) (HRL)

**ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE
JOINT REPORT NO. 16**

Re: Dkt. No. 311

In discovery, plaintiffs clawed back certain documents, claiming that they are protected by the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product doctrine. At issue in Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) No. 16: whether the subject documents (entries 28-33 and 2595-2599 on plaintiffs' privilege log) truly are protected from discovery. Facebook says that the privilege/work product protections either don't apply or were waived. It seeks an order (1) requiring plaintiffs to produce documents and (2) re-opening the depositions of Andy Godden and Paul Rogers.

With respect to privilege log entries 28-33, the court is underwhelmed by Facebook's showing. Nevertheless, it will conduct an in camera review of the withheld documents and produced documents BRG00007423-7426, solely because the court finds that it needs more context to better evaluate the parties' positions. By **5:00 p.m. on Friday, October 27**, plaintiffs

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

shall lodge these documents with the undersigned's chambers. The court defers ruling on Facebook's request to re-open depositions, pending completion of its in camera review.

As for privilege log entries 2595-2599, based on the papers presented, this court is satisfied that the documents properly have been withheld from production. Facebook has not convincingly demonstrated that an in camera review is warranted. Facebook's request for production of these documents is denied.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 26, 2017



HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge