

materials, and written instructions used in connection with the processing of defendant's Med Pay claim to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers for her in camera review." Id. at *2. Similarly, the February 2015 Discovery Ruling granted defendant's motion in part with respect to Request for Production No. 11, "to the extent that plaintiff shall forward to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers for her in camera review the personnel files of plaintiff's employees who were substantially involved in the evaluation of defendant's Med Pay claim." Id. at *3. The ruling further speculated regarding the personnel files that "It is unlikely that any of these materials will be relevant to defendant's claims here." Id. at *3, n.7.

On April 15, 2015, plaintiff forwarded to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers approximately 0.5 inches of documents from its internal Intranet, responsive to Requests for Production Nos. 7, 14 and 18. Plaintiff also forwarded copies of the personnel records of two employees, approximately 1.5 inches thick, responsive to Request for Production No. 11.

After a careful in camera review of these documents, the Magistrate Judge concludes that none of them are relevant to any issues in this lawsuit and thus need not be produced to defendant.

Because this ruling is subject to review, 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**), these documents will remain in this Magistrate Judge's Chambers. If either party files an objection to this ruling, then the documents will be filed under seal and forwarded to Judge Arterton's

Chambers for her in camera review. If no objection is filed, then the documents will be returned to plaintiff's counsel.

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.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 20th day of April, 2015.

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