

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT,
a public corporation; and CITY OF SAN
DIEGO, a municipal corporation,
Plaintiffs,
v.
MONSANTO COMPANY, SOLUTIA
INC., and PHARMACIA
CORPORATION,
Defendants.

Case No.: 15-cv-0578-WQH-AGS
**ORDER re DEFENDANTS' IN
CAMERA SUBMISSION**

The Court has concluded the *in camera* review of Defendants' revised privilege log and the underlying documents referenced in the privilege log. This review was made to determine whether Defendants had met their burden to show that the documents were protected from disclosure by the attorney client privilege and/or the work product doctrine. In doing so, the Court was guided by the standards established in the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *In re Grand Jury Investigations*, 974 F.3d 1068 (9th Cir. 1992), both in conducting the review and determining those documents deserving of protection.

1 After reviewing the documents, the Court finds that Defendants have met their
2 burden to demonstrate that a portion of the documents are protected from disclosure by
3 the existence of the attorney client privilege or under the work product doctrine.
4 However, the Court finds that the following documents, identified by the tabs in the
5 binder provided to the Court, are not protected and must be provided to Plaintiffs within
6 14 days of this date:

7
8 1769; 2485; 2487; 2990; 3101; 3221; 3397; 3398; 3399; 3400; 3401; 3402; 3403; 3730;
9 3805; 3897; 3987; 4081; 4522; 5030; 5031; 5032; 5373; 5452; 5581; 5800; 5802; 5803;
10 5844; 5846; 5879; 6163; 6317; 6475; 6476; 6562; 6572; 6573; 6574; 6576; 6579; 6580;
11 6584; 6664; 6665; 6667; 6669; 6675; 6677; 6706; 6729; 6803; 7064; 7102; and 8617.

12
13 Dated November 13, 2018

14
15
16 

17 Magistrate Judge Marc L. Goldman
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28