Confidentiality request, response and hearing conclusion

Stevenson v. Stevenson, No. 56-CV-20-2928
Doc. 421: Summary-judgment hearing transcript
March 15, 2023

Selected passages transcribed from the identified court record. Formatting and line breaks are simplified. Each labeled block stands separately; material between blocks may be omitted. Original page numbers refer to the source, not this excerpt PDF.

Counsel's request and the court's response are presented separately, followed by the hearing's closing exchange. Speaker labels and original page/line locators are retained.

Selected transcript passages only. Unrelated argument and personal allegations are omitted. Speaker names and original page/line locators are retained.

Mr. Schaap - original pages 32:18-25 and 33:1-14

MR. SCHAAP: I would note too before I get into the meat of the argument, we raised this to the defendants on February 28th, but in their principal memorandum, they made reference, repeated reference, to information that was subject to the protective order in this case. It's private information. It's confidential information. It was included on page four, six, seven, and twenty-four, and twenty-five respectively. These were -- these are facts that came from deposition testimony that was designated as confidential. This is not the first time this has happened. And this is not a minor issue. When a protective order issues in a case, parties believe that it will be followed. They expect it to be followed. And here we asked the defendants to re-file the memorandum as confidential so that this information was not publicly available. And I received no response. So, it -- I'm looking for permission from the Court to file a motion in connection with this because I don't know what else to do. At this point, you know, there's -- there's ignoring of letters relating to violations of a protective order and that is clearly a problem. I -- and it's not the first time that this has happened.

The court - original page 33:15-19

THE COURT: All right. I'll come back to that Mr. Schaap after inquiring of the other side on that also. So, if you want to -- I'm making a note of it. Don't let me forget this, please, Mr. Schaap. There's a lot going on, so. I made a note of that.

Original pages 69:17-25 and 70:1-17

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Schaap, anything further?

MR. SCHAAP: We'll address the 1006 discussion --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. SCHAAP: -- in writing.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, what I'm going to do is, I'm going to hold the record open until March 22nd for Mr. Schaap to get his written reply back on the issue of the declarations. Then, the Court will take this under advisement at that point and issue a decision within the statutory guidelines. And with that -- ope. Ms. Hansen?

MS. HANSEN: No, I was just going to say thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh. All right.

MS. HANSEN: I was -- I was --

THE COURT: I wasn't sure when I see mutes come off now, I automatically think someone's gonna be interjecting.

So, with that, anything further from any of the parties.

MS. HANSEN: None for me, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That will conclude our hearing here today. Thank you, everyone.

(Proceedings concluded.)