Case 8	:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM Document 17 F	Filed 01/21/22 F	Page 1 of 5	Page ID #:107
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	FRED M. PLEVIN (SBN 126185) fplevin@paulplevin.com PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON LLP 101 West Broadway, Ninth Floor San Diego, California 92101-8285 Telephone: 619-237-5200 Facsimile: 619-615-0700 Attorneys for Defendant Chapman University			
8	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT	COURT	
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CAI	LIFORNIA, SO	OUTHERN	DIVISION
10				
11	JOHN C. EASTMAN,	Case No. 8:	:22-cv-0009	9-DOC-DFM
12	c/o Burnham & Gorokhov, PLLC 1424 K Street NW, Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20005,	DEFENDA UNIVERS		MAN SPONSE TO
13	Plaintiff,	PLAINTIF	FF'S APPL	ICATION FOR TRAINING
14		ORDER	AKI KESI	KAIMINO
15	v. BENNIE G THOMPSON in his	Date: Time:	Janu 2:00	uary 24, 2022) p.m.
16	BENNIE G. THOMPSON, in his official capacity as Chairman of the House Select Committee to Investigate	Judge:		. David O. Carter
17	the January 6 Attack on the United States Capitol; Rayburn House Office	Magistrate . McCormick	Judge: Hon	. Douglas F.
18	Building, 2466, Washington, DC 20515		9D not s	set
19	SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH			
20	ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL			
21	CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY, 1			
22	University Dr. Orange, CA 92866,			
23	Defendants.			
24				
25				
26				
27 28				
PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON LLP	DEFENDANT CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY'S RESPO RESTRA	NSE TO PLAINTIFF AINING ORDER	⁷ 'S APPLICATI	ON FOR TEMPORARY

Defendant Chapman University ("Chapman" or "the University") files this
 response to Plaintiff John C. Eastman's application for a temporary restraining order
 ("TRO") enjoining Chapman from producing documents and communications
 (together, "Documents") in response to the Subpoena to Produce Documents
 ("Subpoena") issued January 18, 2022 on Chapman by the House Select Committee
 to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol ("Select
 Committee").

8

I. INTRODUCTION

9 Chapman neither supports nor opposes the TRO application. The dispute
10 over the legitimacy and appropriate scope of the Select Committee's Subpoena is
11 between Eastman and the Select Committee. Chapman takes no position on the
12 legitimacy of the Select Committee or its Subpoena.

Chapman is an interested party in that it is the custodian of Documents
Eastman sent, received or created during the period of his employment with
Chapman covered by the Subpoena (November 3, 2020 to January 20, 2021).

16 With respect to the privilege issues asserted by Eastman, as explained below, 17 any legal work done by Eastman using Chapman's resources that supported a 18 political campaign or candidate for elective office was unauthorized and contrary to Chapman's policies. As such, any such work was not performed on behalf of the 19 20 University and it therefore has no interest in determining whether responsive 21 Documents related to such work are subject to the attorney-client privilege or attorney work product doctrine. Eastman is best suited to evaluate those documents 22 23 for potential privilege. For this reason, Chapman had offered (unsuccessfully) to 24 comply with the Select Committee's request for the Documents by producing them to Eastman, so he could identify privileged Documents and provide the Select 25 Committee with a privilege log. 26

- 27 || / / /
- 28 ////

II. FACTS

The Subpoena is limited in scope to Documents "that are related in any way
to the 2020 election or the January 6, 2021 Joint Session of Congress." Chapman
has identified responsive Documents and was prepared to produce them to the Select
Committee prior to receiving this Court's January 20, 2022 Order enjoining the
production of the Documents. (Docket No. 12.)

7 Chapman is a qualified 501(c)(3) tax exempt not-for-profit institution of 8 higher education. (Declaration of Janine P. DuMontelle, filed herewith, at ¶ 3 9 ["DuMontelle ¶ "].) IRS rules governing 501(c)(3) organizations strictly prohibit 10 the use of the organization's resources, including its computer network, in a political campaign or on behalf of a candidate. IRS guidance states: "Under the Internal 11 12 Revenue Code, all section 501(c)(3) organizations are absolutely prohibited from 13 directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office."¹ 14

Consistent with these IRS rules, Chapman's website contains the following 15 statement: "As a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization (Internal Revenue Service Code), 16 17 Chapman is ... organized and operated exclusively for exempt purposes set forth in 18 section 501(c)(3), and none of its earnings may inure to any private shareholder or individual. In addition, it may not be an action organization, i.e., it may not attempt 19 to influence legislation as a substantial part of its activities and it may not participate 20 in any campaign activity for or against political candidates."² (DuMontelle \P 3.) 21 22 During Eastman's employment, Chapman maintained a Computer and

23 Acceptable Use Policy, which stated, in pertinent part:

Although Chapman University does not make a practice of monitoring
 e-mail, the University reserves the right to retrieve the contents of

26 ¹ <u>https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/the-restriction-of-political-campaign-intervention-by-section-501c3-tax-exempt-organizations.</u>

28 ² <u>https://www.chapman.edu/about/our-family/leadership/evp-coo/governance.aspx</u>.

1

DEFENDANT CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

University-owned computers or e-mail messages for legitimate reasons, 1 such as to find lost messages, to comply with investigations of wrongful 2 acts, to respond to subpoenas, or to recover from system failure. 3 Except as authorized, in writing or by e-mail, by the University, users 4 are not to use Chapman Information Resources for compensated 5 outside work, the benefit of organizations not related to the University (except in connection with scholarly, creative or community service 6 activities), or commercial or personal advertising.³ 7 8 (DuMontelle ¶ 5.) 9 Whenever Dr. Eastman logged on to Chapman's network, he received the 10 following "splash screen" message: System for authorized users only 11 12 Use of this computer system constitutes your consent that your activities on, or information you store in, any part of the system is 13 subject to monitoring and recording by Chapman University or its agents, consistent with the Computer and Acceptable Use Policy 14 without further notice. You are responsible for being familiar with the 15 University policies related to the use of this computer system. If 16 monitoring of the system reveals a violation of University policy, appropriate action will be taken. Any evidence of criminal activity 17 will be provided to law enforcement. 18 (DuMontelle ¶ 6.) 19 **III. RESPONSE TO THE TRO APPLICATION** 20 Based on the IRS rules and Chapman's policies, any work done by Eastman 21 for clients that directly or indirectly supported any political campaign on behalf of 22 (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office was an unauthorized 23 and an improper use of Chapman's resources (e.g., its computer network). 24 Accordingly, Chapman has informed Eastman (through his counsel) that it is not 25 26 27 ³ The full policy is available here: <u>https://www.chapman.edu/campus-</u> services/information-systems/policies-and-procedures/acceptable-use-policy.aspx. 28 PAUL, PLEVIN, DEFENDANT CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY SULLIVAN & **RESTRAINING ORDER** CONNAUGHTON LLP

required to, nor does it have any interest in, withholding documents that are not
 related to legitimate and permissible University activities.

-	related to regitimate and permissione emversity activities.		
3	Further, it is Eastman, not Chapman, that is best suited to identify Documents		
4	that are responsive to the Subpoena that may fall under an attorney-client privilege		
5	between Eastman and any clients he represented, or be protected by the attorney		
6	work product doctrine. This is a potentially substantial task, as Chapman has		
7	identified nearly 19,000 items as potentially responsive to the Subpoena.		
8	(DuMontelle \P 8.) Chapman understands that in discussions that occurred for many		
9	weeks prior to the issuance of the Subpoena on January 18, 2022, Eastman and the		
10	Select Committee considered whether Chapman could produce the documents		
11	sought by the Select Committee to Eastman so he could identify privileged		
12	information and provide the Select Committee with a privilege log. Apparently, this		
13	process was not agreed to, and this resulted in the issuance of the Subpoena on		
14	January 18, 2022.		
15	Chapman's only interest in this dispute is to comply with the obligations		
16	imposed on it by the Select Committee's Subpoena. Chapman will await a final		
17	order of this Court defining its obligations with respect to the Subpoena.		
18			
19	Dated: January 21, 2022 PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN &		
20	CONNAUGHTON LLP		
21	By: /s/ Fred M. Plevin		
22	FRED M. PLEVIN		
23	Attorneys for Defendant Chapman		
24	University		
25			
26			
27			
28	5		
PAUL, PLEVIN, SULLIVAN & CONNAUGHTON LLP	5 DEFENDANT CHAPMAN UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER		