



defense" and "reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence."

How the letter was drafted, who participated in the drafting or provided input, and what input was given, are all relevant issues. Having reviewed the documents in question (none of which bear Bates numbers), the Court concludes that each of them satisfies the criteria listed in Rule 26(b)(1). They document the initial concept of a customer letter (which was first discussed almost two months before Judge Watson's ruling), the drafting process of the letter which forms the basis of the tortious interference counterclaim, the input provided by various individuals, the stated purpose of sending the letter, and how the final version was decided upon. Because all of these documents are relevant, and because this Court has ruled that none of them are protected by the attorney-client privilege, Defendants are entitled to them. Safety Today is therefore ordered to produce to Defendants, within seven days, copies of the same documents which it submitted for *in camera* inspection.

Any party may, within fourteen days after this Order is filed, file and serve on the opposing party a motion for reconsideration by a District Judge. 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(A), Rule 72(a), Fed. R. Civ. P.; Eastern Division Order No. 91-3, pt. I., F., 5. The motion must specifically designate the order or part in question and the basis for any objection. Responses to objections are due fourteen days after objections are filed and replies by the objecting party are due seven days thereafter. The District Judge, upon consideration of the motion, shall set aside any part of this Order found to be clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

This order is in full force and effect, notwithstanding the filing of any objections, unless stayed by the Magistrate Judge or District Judge. S.D. Ohio L.R. 72.3.

/s/ Terence P. Kemp  
United States Magistrate Judge