

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

vs.

AMG SERVICES, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

2:12-cv -00536-GMN-VCF

ORDER

(Motion For Protective Order #343 and Motion to Compel #345)

Before the Court is the Federal Trade Commission's (hereinafter "FTC") Motion For Protective Order. (#343). Defendant AMG Services, Inc. (hereinafter "AMG") filed an Opposition (#347), and the FTC filed a Reply (#364).

Also before the court is AMG's Motion to Compel FTC's Production of a Privilege Log and Accompanying Affidavit. (#345). The FTC filed an Opposition (#366), and AMG filed a Reply (#376).

Motion for Protective Order

The FTC asks this court to issue a protective order "regarding 19 document subpoenas served by defendant AMG...to consumers who have previously provided declarations in this case." (#343). The FTC asserts that the "subpoenas are objectionable because they call for production of virtually all of the consumers' financial information for the past six years, without any restriction for documents pertaining only to transactions with the defendants." *Id.* AMG argues in its opposition that the motion (#343) should be denied, because "FTC has not met its burden to show that AMG's subpoenas seek irrelevant information or impose any undue burden on witnesses the FTC itself brought into the case." (#347).

1
2 The FTC argues in its reply that it “does not oppose the subpoenas to the extent they call for documents
3 related to these consumers’ declarations, and, accordingly, the FTC does not oppose approximately half
4 of the specifications in those subpoenas.” (#364). A hearing on the motion for protective order is
5 scheduled for May 20, 2013, at 10:00 a.m.

6 **Motion To Compel**

7
8 AMG asks this court in its motion to compel to issue an “order compelling the FTC to produce a
9 detailed privilege log and accompanying affidavit for documents and other information the FTC
10 withholds pursuant to the deliberative privilege.” (#345). AMG asserts that the FTC is withholding a
11 number of responsive documents under the “deliberate process privilege,” and that the FTC refuses to
12 provide much detail about its basis for asserting this privilege. *Id.* AMG seeks an order requiring FTC
13 to produce: “(1) a detailed document-by-document log for documents withheld pursuant to the
14 deliberative process privilege; and (2) an affidavit from the head of the agency or another senior official
15 that describes with particularity the bases for asserting the deliberative process privilege.” *Id.*

16 The FTC asserts in its opposition that the court should deny the “motion to compel a privilege
17 log and affidavit for the deliberative process privilege because the motion is premature and AMG
18 misstates the requirements for those submissions.” (#366). FTC states that it “is in the process of
19 assembling its privilege log and accompanying declaration asserting the deliberative process privilege
20 over a narrow sliver [of] pre-complaint internal documents generated by FTC attorneys while
21 determining whether to recommend enforcement action,” and that “AMG has nonetheless filed a
22 [m]otion to [c]ompel, challenging the sufficiency of the privilege log and declaration, which do not yet
23 exist.” *Id.* The FTC argues that the “[c]ourt cannot assess the adequacy of the FTC’s privilege log and
24 declaration until they are submitted to AMG and the parties first have an opportunity to discuss and
25 resolve any of AMG’s specific concerns.” *Id.*

1
2 The court finds that AMG's request for the court to deem the privilege log insufficient and to
3 require the FTC to include specific information in the privilege log (#345) is premature, as the court
4 cannot determine whether the privilege log and affidavit are sufficient until the FTC has provided AMG
5 and the court with its privilege log. On or before April 29, 2013, the FTC must provide the court and
6 AMG with the privilege log for responsive documents withheld as privileged. On or before May 6,
7 2013, AMG may file a supplement to its motion to compel (#345). Any reply is due on or before May
8 13, 2013. A hearing on the motion to compel (#345) is scheduled for May 20, 2013, at 10:00 a.m.

9
10 Accordingly and for good cause shown,

11 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a hearing on the FTC's Motion For Protective Order (#343)
12 and AMG's Motion to Compel FTC's Production of a Privilege Log and Accompanying Affidavit
13 (#345) is scheduled for May 20, 2013, at 10:00 a.m.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before April 29, 2013, the FTC must provide the court
15 and AMG with the privilege log for responsive documents withheld as privileged. On or before May 6,
16 2013, AMG may file a supplement to its motion to compel (#345). Any reply is due on or before May
17 13, 2013.

18 DATED this 16th day in April, 2013.

19
20 

21
22 _____
23 CAM FERENBACH
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
25