

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
SECURITY & EXCHANGE COMMISSION	:	15 CV 675 (JBA)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
IFTIKAR AHMED ET AL.	:	DATE: JULY 14, 2017
	:	
-----X		

ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANT AHMED’S MOTION SEEKING JUDICIAL REVIEW BY THIS ESTEEMED COURT OF THE TRANSCRIPT OF DEPOSITION BY OAK WITNESS MS. GRACE A. AMES ON JULY 15, 2015 AND ON DEFENDANT AHMED’S MOTION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AND ACCESS TO DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPTS OF OAK REPRESENTATIVE, MS. GRACE AMES FROM DEPOSITION CONDUCTED ON 4<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2017 IN NEW YORK (Dkts. ##539-40)

The factual and procedural history behind this complex litigation is set forth in considerable detail in the various published rulings of U.S. District Judge Janet Bond Arterton. See 123 F. Supp. 3d 301 (D. Conn. 2015), aff’d, 664 F. App’x 53 (2d Cir. 2016); 2016 WL 500436 (D. Conn. Jan. 11, 2016); 2016 WL 7197359 (D. Conn. Dec. 8, 2016); 2017 WL 1347668 (D. Conn. Apr. 7, 2017); 2017 WL 1391518 (D. Conn. Apr. 7, 2017); 2017 WL 2234174 (D. Conn. May 22, 2017).<sup>1</sup>

On May 4, 2017, defendant Ahmed, appearing pro se, filed his pending Motion Seeking Judicial Review by this Esteemed Court of the Transcript of Deposition by Oak Witness Ms. Grace A. Ames on July 15, 2015 (Dkt. #539),<sup>2</sup> followed four days later by his Motion for Judicial Review of and Access to Deposition Transcripts of Oak Representative,

---

<sup>1</sup>Judge Arterton has filed dozens and dozens of unpublished rulings and orders in this file as well.

<sup>2</sup>Attached as Exh. 1 is a copy of the deposition transcript, most of which has been redacted.

Ms. Grace Ames from Deposition Conducted on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2017 in New York (Dkt. #540).<sup>3</sup> Plaintiff filed its brief in opposition to both motions on May 25, 2017 (Dkt. #575); defendant Ahmed filed his reply briefs on May 26 and 29, 2017. (Dkts. ##576-77).

On July 13, 2017, Judge Arterton filed her Order, in which she granted Dkt. #539 and granted Dkt. #540 in part, such that defendant Ahmed "will not be permitted 'view only' access to the complete 5/4/17 deposition transcript [,]" and she ordered that this Magistrate Judge "perform an independent review of both transcripts to determine whether the portions marked by Oak as confidential are in fact confidential." (Dkt. #649). She further ordered that the parties make available to this Magistrate Judge both redacted and unredacted versions of the transcripts. (Id.; see also Dkts. ##638, 650).

Accordingly, **on or before July 24, 2017**, counsel shall forward redacted and unredacted versions of the July 2015 and May 2017 deposition transcripts to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers for her in camera review. In addition, by that same date, plaintiff SEC shall forward an ex parte letter to the Magistrate Judge's Chambers which sets forth in as much detail as necessary, the specific reasons why the portions that have been redacted are confidential and should not be disclosed to defendant Ahmed. In addition, by that same date, the Relief Defendants and non-party Oak may forward similar ex parte letters to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers if they so choose.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>The following two exhibits were attached: copy of Judge Arterton's Order on Defendant's Motion Seeking Permission to be Allowed to Participate in the Oak Deposition Scheduled for Thursday, May 4<sup>th</sup> 2017, filed May 3, 2017 (Dkt. #538)(Exh. 1)["May 2017 Ruling"]; and copies of emails, dated May 4-5, 2017 (Exh. 2).

<sup>4</sup>If they wish, any combination of plaintiff SEC, the Relief Defendants, or non-party Oak may forward a combined letter.

Dated this 14th day of July 2017, at New Haven, Connecticut.

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