

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
JOSEPH STRAUCH, ET AL	:	3:14 CV 956 (JBA)
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
COMPUTER SCIENCES CORP.	:	DATE: MAY 8, 2015
	:	
-----X		

SUPPLEMENTAL RULING FOLLOWING IN CAMERA REVIEW

Familiarity is presumed with this Magistrate Judge's Ruling on Defendant's Motion to Compel, filed February 10, 2015 (Dkt. #138), in which this Magistrate Judge ordered an in camera review of the "handful of documents" to which plaintiffs asserted a privilege (at 8), as well the Ruling Following In Camera Review, filed February 26, 2015 (Dkt. #146), which held that the redacted portions were all protected from disclosure.

On May 7, 2015, plaintiff submitted six additional pages to the Magistrate Judge's Chambers. After a careful review of these six pages, the Magistrate Judge agrees that the redacted portions are all protected from disclosure, under either the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine.

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.

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).

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 8th day of May, 2015.

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