

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
HARTFORD ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESAN	:	3:12 CV 1641 (JBA)
CORP.	:	
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
INTERSTATE FIRE & CASUALTY CO.	:	DATE: JUNE 3, 2015
	:	
-----X		

RULING FOLLOWING SEVENTH IN CAMERA REVIEW

The factual and procedural history behind this litigation is set forth in this Magistrate Judge's Ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production, filed January 28, 2014 (Dkt. #39), 297 F.R.D. 22, and in U.S. District Judge Janet Bond Arterton's Ruling on Defendant's and Plaintiff's Partial Objections to Magistrate Judge's Rulings, filed January 13, 2015 (Dkt. #64), 2015 WL 164069. Familiarity is also presumed with this Magistrate Judge's Ruling on Defendant's Motion to Compel Production, filed February 19, 2014 (Dkt. #43), 2014 WL 652308, Ruling Following First In Camera Review, filed February 26, 2014 (Dkt. #49), Ruling Following Second In Camera Review, filed June 12, 2014 (Dkt. #63), 2014 WL 2615367, Ruling Following Third In Camera Review, filed March 25, 2015 (Dkt. #85), Ruling Following Fourth In Camera Review, filed March 31, 2015 (Dkt. #86), 2015 WL 1471920, and Ruling Following Fifth In Camera Review, filed May 6, 2015 (Dkt. #91), and Ruling Following Sixth In Camera Review, filed May 22, 2015 (Dkt. #92)["May 22, 2015 In Camera Review Ruling"].

This file has been referred to this Magistrate Judge for all discovery. (Dkt. #29). Under the latest scheduling order, filed by Judge Arterton on April 8, 2015, all discovery is to be completed by June 30, 2015, and, after a pre-filing conference, all dispositive motions are to be filed by August 31, 2015. (Dkt. #88). The procedural background has been fully

set forth in prior rulings.

In accordance with the May 22, 2015 In Camera Review Ruling (at 2-3), on May 28, 2015, defense counsel forwarded to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers redacted and unredacted versions of Interstate Bates Nos. 13969, 14603, 14726, 15560, 15987, 16022, 16568, 17591, and 18247. After a careful in camera review, the Magistrate Judge agrees with defendant that the portions that have been redacted are protected by the attorney-client privilege and hence need not be produced.

Because this ruling is subject to review, see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(**written objections to ruling must be filed within fourteen calendar days after service of same**); FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut; Small v. Secretary, H&HS, 892 F.2d. 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989)(**failure to file timely objection to Magistrate Judge's recommended ruling may preclude further appeal to Second Circuit**), the box of documents will remain in this Magistrate Judge's Chambers. If either party files an objection to this ruling, then the documents will be filed **under seal** and forwarded to Judge Arterton's Chambers for her in camera review. If no objection is filed, then the documents will be returned to defense counsel.

This is not a Recommended Ruling, but a ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the standard of review of which is specified in 28 U.S.C. § 636; FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; and Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges. As such, it is an order of the Court unless reversed or modified by the District Judge upon timely made objection.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 3rd day of June, 2015.

/s/ Joan G. Margolis, USMJ
Joan Glazer Margolis
United States Magistrate Judge