1	Anthony T. Caso (Cal. Bar #88561)	
2	Email: atcaso@ccg1776.com Constitutional Counsel Group	
3	174 W Lincoln Ave # 620	
	Anaheim, CA 92805-2901	
4	Phone: 916-601-1916 Fax: 916-307-5164	
5		
6	Charles Burnham (D.C. Bar# 1003464)* Email: charles@burnhamgorokhov.com	
7	BURNHAM & GOROKHOV PLLC	
8	1424 K Street NW, Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20005	
	Telephone: (202) 386-6920	
9	* admitted pro hac vice	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
11		
12	IINITED CTA	TEC DISTRICT COURT
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALLEDDNIA SOUTHERN DIVISION	
13	CENTED AL DICTEDICT OF	
13	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF	CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION
13 14	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF O	CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION Case No.: 8:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM
14	JOHN C. EASTMAN,	
14 15	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff,	
14 15 16	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs.	
14 15 16 17	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al.	
14 15 16 17 18	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al.	
14 15 16 17 18 19	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al. Defendants BRIEF IN SUPPORT	Case No.: 8:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM OF PRIVILEGE ASSERTIONS AS TO
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al. Defendants BRIEF IN SUPPORT	Case No.: 8:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al. Defendants BRIEF IN SUPPORT DOCUMENT	Case No.: 8:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM OF PRIVILEGE ASSERTIONS AS TO S HELD IN ABEYANCE
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al. Defendants BRIEF IN SUPPORT DOCUMENT	Case No.: 8:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM OF PRIVILEGE ASSERTIONS AS TO
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JOHN C. EASTMAN, Plaintiff, vs. BENNIE G. THOMPSON, et al. Defendants BRIEF IN SUPPORT DOCUMENT	Case No.: 8:22-cv-00099-DOC-DFM OF PRIVILEGE ASSERTIONS AS TO S HELD IN ABEYANCE

In May of this year the congressional defendants withdrew their objections to 721 documents, continued to object to 721 documents, and held their objections to 576 documents in "abeyance." Over the 721 documents to which the congressional defendants objected, Plaintiff withdrew his claim of privilege over two documents, identified five as copies, and produced 115 documents pursuant to this Court's rulings on comparable materials.

Of the remaining 599 documents submitted to this Court for *in camera* review, the Court held that 20 were protected by the First Amendment (25 pages), 8 by the Attorney-Client privilege (25 pages), 373 by the Work Product doctrine (1402 pages), and 39 by both Attorney-Client and Work Product (103 pages). Another 14 (23 pages) were ordered produced with A/C or W/P material redacted. In other words, the overwhelming majority of the disputed documents (454 of 599, totaling 1578 pages) were held to be protected. 144 documents were ordered to be produced as not protected under either Attorney-Client privilege or Work Product doctrine. The Court ordered a single document (not authored by Dr. Eastman) produced pursuant to the crime-fraud exception.

On September 15, 2022 at the congressional defendants' request, this Court set the current briefing schedule to resolve objections to the remaining documents. ECF 367.

THE DOCUMENTS HELD IN ABEYANCE

Of the 576 documents (3236 pages) the congressional defendants previously held in abeyance, Plaintiff has withdrawn his objections pursuant to this Court's prior rulings as to 18 documents.¹ Plaintiff will produce these documents to the congressional defendants.

Of the remaining documents the vast majority are either part of an email chain this Court has previously held to be protected or very similar to material this Court has previously held to be protected. The few documents not falling in either of these categories are mostly clear cases of work product, *e.g.* a draft filing transmitted with attorney edits.

As it would be unwieldy to address all five hundred some documents in this filing, Plaintiff has prepared a spreadsheet along the lines of privilege logs previously submitted to the Court in this litigation. The last column of the spreadsheet (column M) directs the Court to the applicable prior rulings relevant to the various abeyance documents. Pursuant to this Court's prior orders, the log will be submitted to this Court under seal and served upon opposing counsel. ²

¹ Plaintiff maintains his objections to this Court's prior rulings as stated on the record at the time.

² Plaintiff will confer with opposing counsel as to whether the information in the spreadsheet will lessen the need for this Court's *in camera* review.

Respectfully submitted, /s/ Charles Burnham Charles Burnham (D.C. Bar# 1003464)* Email: charles@burnhamgorokhov.com BURNHAM & GOROKHOV PLLC 1424 K Street NW, Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 386-6920 * admitted pro hac vice

1 2 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 3 I have served this filing on all counsel through the Court's ECF system. 4 Respectfully submitted, 5 /s/Anthony T. Caso 6 Anthony T. Caso (Cal. Bar #88561) CONSTITUTIONAL COUNSEL GROUP 7 174 W Lincoln Ave # 620 8 Anaheim, CA 92805-2901 Phone: 916-601-1916 9 Fax: 916-307-5164 Email: atcaso@ccg1776.com 10 11 Charles Burnham (D.C. Bar# 1003464)* 12 Email: charles@burnhamgorokhov.com **BURNHAM & GOROKHOV PLLC** 13 1424 K Street NW, Suite 500 Washington, D.C. 20005 14 Telephone: (202) 386-6920 15 * admitted pro hac vice 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25