TIMOTHY L. JARQUIN NO. 2019-CA-0309

COURT OF APPEAL VERSUS

FOURTH CIRCUIT DANNY R. BLANKS,

INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HIS

CAPACITY AS A MEMBER STATE OF LOUISIANA

AND MANAGER OF **PONTCHARTRAIN** *****

PARTNERS, L.L.C.; BARLOW

AND IN HIS CAPACITY AS A

J. COOK, INDIVIDUALLY

MEMBER OF

PONTCHARTRAIN

PARTNERS, L.L.C.; JAMES R.

WASHINGTON, III,

INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HIS

CAPACITY AS A MEMBER OF

PONTCHARTRAIN

PARTNERS, L.L.C.; AND

MARY LEBLANC,

INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HER

CAPACITY AS DIRECTOR OF

HUMAN RESOURCES OF

PONTCHARTRAIN

PARTNERS, L.L.C.

APPEAL FROM CIVIL DISTRICT COURT, ORLEANS PARISH NO. 2017-10461, DIVISION "G-11" Honorable Robin M. Giarrusso, Judge * * * * * *

Judge Regina Bartholomew-Woods

* * * * * *

(Court composed of Judge Terri F. Love, Judge Regina Bartholomew-Woods, Judge Paula A. Brown)

ON APPLICATION FOR REHEARING

Stephen D. Marx P.J. Stakelum III CHEHARDY, SHERMAN. WILLIAMS, RECILE, STAKELUM & HAYES, One Galleria Boulevard, Suite 1100 Metairie, LA 70001

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF/APPELLEE

Jason R. Anders ANDERS LAW FIRM 650 Poydras Street, Suite 1400 New Orleans, LA 70130

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLANT

LIMITED REHEARING GRANTED SEPTEMBER 11, 2019

On application for rehearing, Timothy Jarquin, Appellee, seeks amendment of this Court's August 21, 2019 opinion. Appellant, Pontchartrain Partners, L.L.C, had appealed the district court's December 27, 2018 judgment denying its motion to quash, arguing that Appellee, who had filed a subpoena *duces tecum*, was seeking information protected by the attorney-client privilege. On appeal, this Court vacated the district court's judgment and remanded for additional analysis of the attorney-client privilege claim.

We grant Appellee's application for rehearing for the limited purpose of clarifying that our prior opinion vacating the judgment is directed only to that portion of the judgment denying the motion to quash despite an arguable claim of attorney-client privilege to the information sought. In all other respects, the original judgment shall stand, as Appellant did not raise any other claims on appeal apart from privilege.