

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. SA CV 22-00099-DOC-DFM

Date: February 24, 2022

Title: JOHN C. EASTMAN V. BENNIE G. THOMPSON ET AL.

PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE

Karlen Dubon
Courtroom Clerk

Not Present
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
PLAINTIFF:
None Present

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
DEFENDANT:
None Present

**PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER GRANTING IN PART
APPLICATION TO FILE BRIEFING
UNDER SEAL [130]**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Dr. John Eastman’s (“Plaintiff”) Application to file his briefing on privilege assertions under seal ([Dkt. 130](#)). Plaintiff argues that responding to many privilege assertions necessarily involves referencing third parties by name, and that publishing those names publicly would violate those third parties’ privacy. Application ¶ 3. Plaintiff requests that he be allowed to file his briefing under seal and file a redacted version of the briefing publicly. *Id.* ¶¶ 4-5.

The Court has previously noted its concern for the privacy of third parties not involved or represented in this litigation. However, the Court must prioritize maximizing transparency to the public while remaining conscientious about privacy. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Application is GRANTED IN PART as follows: Plaintiff may file his unredacted briefing under seal such that it is visible to the Court and the House Select Committee, and Plaintiff may redact personally identifiable information about third parties in the publicly-filed version of his briefing. The same procedure shall be followed by the House Select Committee if needed for their briefing.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. SA CV 22-00099-DOC-DFM

Date: February 24, 2022

Page 2

The information redacted must be limited to the minimum amount necessary to protect third parties' privacy by preventing identification of individuals. This information includes names, phone numbers, email addresses (but not email domains unless specifically personally identifiable), and specific job positions.

The Court provides the following hypothetical examples to demonstrate the limited extent of redaction it is allowing:

Original: John Doe was an attorney working with Tom Smith's team on Trump's legal cases. His email, john_doe@donaldtrump.com, reflects his affiliation with the Trump campaign. Ken Doe was an attorney who was working, at President Trump's behest, on anticipated election litigation as early as September 2020. He was also involved with post-election litigation efforts, primarily in Georgia, including *Trump v. Doe*, No. 2020CV100000 (Fulton Cnty, Ga. Super. Ct. Dec. 1, 2020), and *Trump v. Doe*, No. 1:20-cv-01000 (N.D. Ga. Dec. 1, 2020). Jane Doe was an attorney who served as General Counsel for the Central County Republican Party and Associate General Counsel for the Franklin Republican Party.

Redacted: [REDACTED] was an attorney working with [REDACTED]'s team on Trump's legal cases. His email, [REDACTED]@donaldtrump.com, reflects his affiliation with the Trump campaign. [REDACTED] was an attorney who was working, at President Trump's behest, on anticipated election litigation as early as September 2020. He was also involved with post-election litigation efforts, primarily in Georgia, including *Trump v. Doe*, No. 2020CV100000 (Fulton Cnty, Ga. Super. Ct. Dec. 1, 2020), and *Trump v. Doe*, No. 1:20-cv-01000 (N.D. Ga. Dec. 1, 2020). [REDACTED] was an attorney who served as [REDACTED] for the Central County Republican Party and [REDACTED] for the Franklin Republican Party.

Because Plaintiff's previously-filed public brief (Dkt. 132) does not conform to the limited redaction the Court is allowing, Plaintiff is ORDERED to file an amended public version of his briefing by 11:00 am PST on Friday, February 25, 2022.

The Clerk shall serve this minute order on the parties.

MINUTES FORM 11

Initials of Deputy Clerk: kdu

CIVIL-GEN