

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

PAULA TURNER, )  
 )  
 Plaintiff, )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 AIG DOMESTIC CLAIMS, INC., )  
 AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL )  
 SPECIALTY LINES INSURANCE )  
 COMPANY, and SARETSKY, )  
 HART, MICHAELS & GOULD, PC, )  
 )  
 Defendants. )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

4:10CV3159

**MEMORANDUM  
AND ORDER**

This matter comes before the court on both parties’ motions (filings [45](#), [52](#)) to file evidence regarding Plaintiff’s Statement of Objections (filing [47](#)) to the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Order (filing [44](#)) Disqualifying Plaintiff’s Counsel. Further, defendant Saretsky, Hart, Michaels & Gould, P.C., has filed a Motion for Permission to Restrict Documents (filing [55](#)) pursuant to NECivR 5.3(c) and the E-Government Act of 2002. The parties’ motions shall be granted. Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED:**

1. The parties’ motions (filings [45](#), [52](#)) to file evidence regarding Plaintiff’s Statement of Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum and Order Disqualifying Plaintiff’s Counsel are granted;
2. The Motion for Permission to Restrict Documents (filing [55](#)) is granted, and Defendant’s Supplemental Index of Evidence in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Statement of Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Memorandum

and Order Disqualifying Plaintiff's Counsel (with Attachment F referenced in the Affidavit of Renee Eveland) and in Support of Companion Brief (filing [56](#)) is hereby placed under restricted access, and access is restricted to the court and the parties to this action, including counsel of record.

DATED this 8<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

*Richard G. Kopf*

United States District Judge

---

\*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.