

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
MARIE L. GARDNER, ET AL.	:	3:13 CV 1918 (JBA)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY	:	DATE: MARCH 16, 2016
-----X	:	

INITIAL RULING FOLLOWING IN CAMERA REVIEW

Under the latest Scheduling Order, filed March 1, 2016 (Dkt. #167), all fact discovery is to be completed on or before May 6, 2016, all expert discovery is to be completed on or before July 29, 2016, and after a pre-filing conference has been held, all dispositive motions are to be filed on or before August 29, 2016.

Familiarity is presumed with this Magistrate Judge's Ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, filed January 13, 2016. (Dkt. #151). Pursuant to this ruling, on February 12, 2016, the parties filed a Joint Statement (Dkt. #163), with respect to their agreement concerning the 38,000 documents at issue. Also pursuant to this ruling (at 5), on January 15, 2016, defendant submitted to this Magistrate Judge's Chambers for her in camera review a small binder with the redacted versions of Exhs. 6, 8, 9 and 10, and a large binder with the unredacted versions of these four exhibits.

After a careful review of the redacted and unredacted versions, the Magistrate Judge agrees that no further production is necessary regarding Exhs. 6, 8, and 10. However, the Magistrate Judge requires further information from defendant regarding Exh. 9. Specifically, **on or before March 28, 2016**, defendant shall provide an ex parte letter to this Magistrate Judge explaining why, for Exh. 9, only one page of a multi-page document (CCC08644) was produced and not the other pages (and in particular, why the preceding page was not

produced).

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 16th day of March, 2016.

/s/ Joan G. Margolis, USMJ
Joan Glazer Margolis
U.S. Magistrate Judge