

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
JOHN DOE ET AL.	:	
	:	3:11 CV 1581 (JBA)
v.	:	
	:	
DARIEN BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL.	:	DECEMBER 5, 2012
-----X	:	

RULING FOLLOWING IN CAMERA REVIEW

The factual and procedural history behind this litigation has been set forth in considerable detail in U.S. District Judge Janet Bond Arterton's Ruling on Defendants' Motions to Dismiss, filed September 17, 2012 (Dkt. #132), 12 WL 4092662, as well as the multiple discovery rulings issued by this Magistrate Judge,<sup>1</sup> namely the Ruling on Plaintiff's Motion for Order and Protective Order Relating to Discovery, filed May 30, 2012 (Dkt. #83), Ruling Following In Camera Review, filed June 20, 2012 (Dkt. #85), Supplemental Ruling Following In Camera Review, filed July 10, 2012 (Dkt. #89),<sup>2</sup> Ruling on Too Many Pending Discovery Motions, filed September 14, 2012 (Dkt. #130) ["September 2012 Ruling"], 2012 WL 4056737, and Ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, filed November 19, 2012 (Dkt. #152) ["November 2012 Ruling"], 2012 WL 5845756. (See also Dkts. ##135-36). Under the September 2012 Ruling, all discovery is to be completed by September 20, 2013, and a pre-filing conference must be held before Judge Arterton in October 2013 with respect to all dispositive motions. (See also Dkts. ##36, 81, 84).

The November 2012 Ruling ordered, with respect to defendants' redactions of Exh.

---

<sup>1</sup>On May 17, 2012, Judge Arterton referred this file to this Magistrate Judge for all discovery matters. (Dkt. #80).

<sup>2</sup>Plaintiffs have filed Objections to the June and July 2012 discovery rulings. (Dkts. ##87, 91, 95).

G, that defense counsel forward to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers unredacted copies of pages 15, 17, 19-23, 25-28, 30, 32-34, 36, 38-42, 44-47, 49, 51-56, 58-61, 63, 65, 67, 69-70, 72, 74 and 77 for the Magistrate Judge's in camera review. (Dkt. #152, at 9-10). Defense counsel forwarded these unredacted pages on December 3, 2012, which were received the next day. After a careful comparison of the unredacted and redacted versions of these forty-four pages, many of which were duplicative, the Magistrate Judge finds that plaintiffs are not entitled to any unredacted copies. The redactions relate to employees' addresses, telephone numbers, dates of birth, and Social Security numbers, as expected, but also to employees' specific body parts that sustained injuries, medical ailments, and description of personal property, as well as detailed descriptions of the Defendant Darien Board of Education's computer system. None of these items, which are of a personal or propriety interest to defendants, have any effect on any of the issues in this lawsuit.

This is not a Recommended Ruling, but a ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the standard of review of which is specified in 28 U.S.C. § 636; FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; and Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges. As such, it is an order of the Court unless reversed or modified by the District Judge upon timely made objection.

See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(**written objections to ruling must be filed within fourteen calendar days after service of same**); FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut; Small v. Secretary, H&HS, 892 F.2d. 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989)(failure to file timely objection to Magistrate Judge's recommended ruling may preclude further appeal to Second Circuit).

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 5th day of December, 2012.

/s/ Joan G. Margolis, USMJ  
Joan Glazer Margolis  
United States Magistrate Judge