

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HENRY DAVIS, DOUGLAS COLEMAN,
AARON FILLMORE, JEROME JONES,)
DESHAWN GARDNER, and PERCELL)
DANSBERRY,)

Plaintiff,)

vs.)

JOHN BALDWIN,)

Defendants.)

Case No. 16-cv-600-SCW

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

WILLIAMS, Magistrate Judge:

The Court held a discovery dispute conference on April 25, 2018. The following summarizes the Court’s findings and rulings at that hearing.

A. Interrogatory Responses

Defendant seeks supplemental information from the questionnaires concerning segregation in response to Interrogatory #2 which sought the specific factual basis that supports each of Plaintiffs’ claims. The Court already determined that the questionnaires themselves are privileged. Defendant seeks to present additional case law and argument as to why they believe that communications from putative class members are discoverable. Defendant may submit a one-page letter brief to the Court by **April 30, 2018**. Plaintiffs’ response is due **May 7, 2018**.

B. Email Review and Production

Defendant's counsel indicate that they are in the process of reviewing approximately 85,000 documents for responsiveness and privilege issues. As of this date only 4,707 of those documents have been produced. The Court was under the initial understanding that Defendant would only be reviewing the documents for privilege issues, not responsiveness and relevance. To the extent that Defendant wants to undertake this additional review before producing the documents, they can, but the deadline for completing the production remains **May 11, 2018**.

C. Intelligence Information Contained in Emails

Defendant seeks to redact gang intelligence information that defense counsel believes goes beyond the rationale for administrative detention or segregation placement. Defendant believes this information is highly sensitive and could be dangerous to staff and other inmates if the information was released. The Court has previously ruled that such information is relevant to the case. The Court also previously recognized the highly sensitive nature of this information and, as such, ordered it produced for "Attorney's Eyes Only" (*See* Doc. 80). The example provided to the Court in Defendant's submission does not change the Court's opinion. Redacting such documents makes the content of the documents difficult to decipher. While the Court continues to recognize the sensitive nature of these documents and acknowledges the Defendant's assertion that the release of such documents could be detrimental and dangerous, the Court believes that the current guidelines in place for production provide

appropriate protections. Defendant's request to redact such information is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: April 25, 2018.

/s/ Stephen C. Williams _____
STEPHEN C. WILLIAMS
United States Magistrate Judge