

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  
TZVEE WOOD and ANDREA MALESTER,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

MUTUAL REDEVELOPMENT HOUSES, INC., et  
al.,

Defendants.

TZVEE WOOD and ANDREA MALESTER,

Plaintiffs,

-against-

MUTUAL REDEVELOPMENT HOUSES, INC., et  
al.,

Defendants.

ANALISA TORRES, District Judge:

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #: \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE FILED: 6/30/2022

14 Civ. 7535 (AT)

18 Civ. 726 (AT)

**ORDER**

The Court has reviewed the Plaintiffs' *ex parte* and in camera letter dated June 7, 2022, received via email on June 22, 2022. The Court has determined that the letter does not describe interactions between Plaintiffs and their former counsel in such detail that attorney client privilege concerns are implicated. Therefore, the Court has determined that the letter should not have been filed *ex parte* and in camera.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Court shall file the letter on the public docket.

Turning to the substance of the letter, the Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' request to seal a portion of the September 6, 2018 conference before the Honorable Debra C. Freeman. The Court has reviewed the audio file and finds that Judge Freeman excused opposing counsel and ordered that, should a transcript of the conference be made, the *ex parte* portion should be placed under seal. The portion of the recording that was *ex parte* begins at 36:40 and ends at 55:15. Therefore, the Court orders two transcripts be created: (1) a transcript with the specified portion redacted, which shall be filed on the public docket; and (2) a transcript with the specified portion unredacted, which shall be filed under seal and have restricted party view limited to the Court and Plaintiffs. The parties are directed to attach this order to any request to transcribe the conference.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 30, 2022  
New York, New York



ANALISA TORRES  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs noted that they do not oppose the letter being "unsealed after the matter is fully resolved." See, e.g., No. 14 Civ. 7535, ECF No. 368 at 5. This order fully resolved the matter at issue in the letter.