

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
JAMES THOMPSON ET AL.	:	3:14 CV 259 (WWE)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
NATIONAL UNION FIRE INSURANCE	:	
COMPANY OF PITTSBURGH, PA	:	JULY 22, 2016
-----X		

RULING FOLLOWING IN CAMERA REVIEW

Familiarity is presumed with the prior discovery rulings and orders entered in this lawsuit by U.S. Magistrate Judge Holly B. Fitzsimmons or this Magistrate Judge, namely Dkts. ##44, 62, 66. On June 20, 2016, plaintiffs filed their Motion for In Camera Review (Dkt. #72 & Exh. A), with respect to a limited number of documents as to which defendant asserted the attorney-client privilege; Senior U.S. District Judge Warren W. Eginton referred this motion to this Magistrate Judge the next day. (Dkt. #73). Six days later, on June 27, 2016, this Magistrate Judge filed an electronic order granting such motion to the limited extent that copies of the disputed documents were to be forwarded to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers for her in camera review, and if any of the documents were provided in whole or in part to opposing counsel, then copies of both the unredacted and redacted versions were to be provided. (Dkt. #74).

On July 20, 2016, defense counsel forwarded a letter to this Magistrate Judge, with a copy to plaintiffs' counsel, with copies of the following documents which were only provided to the Magistrate Judge: copies of the redacted versions of the seven documents, which already were provided to plaintiffs' counsel (Exh. A); copies of the unredacted versions of these seven documents (Exh. B); and another copy of defendant's privilege log (Exh. C).

After a careful in camera review, the Magistrate Judge agrees that the redacted

portions of these seven documents all contain privileged attorney-client communications and thus need not be disclosed to plaintiffs' counsel.

As set forth in Judge Eginton's Scheduling Order, filed June 28, 2016 (Dkt. #75), status reports and a proposed case management schedule shall be filed **on or before July 29, 2016**.¹

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) & 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.

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) & 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).

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 22nd day of July, 2016.

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

¹If any counsel believes that a settlement conference before this Magistrate Judge would be productive, he should contact this Magistrate Judge's Chambers accordingly.