

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----X	:	
NICHOLAS HADJIPATERAS	:	3:14 CV 82 (JAM)
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
STARFUELS, INC.	:	DATE: JULY 7, 2015
-----X	:	

RULING FOLLOWING SUPPLEMENTAL IN CAMERA REVIEW

The factual and procedural history behind this litigation has been set forth in considerable detail in this Magistrate Judge's Ruling Following In Camera Review, filed June 11, 2015 (Dkt. #66). Eight days later, the one outstanding discovery motion was denied without prejudice as moot, as all of the underlying discovery issues therein either had been decided by this Magistrate Judge or had been resolved between counsel. (Dkt. #68). Immediately thereafter, the Magistrate Judge was notified of one remaining discovery issue (see Dkts. ##69-70), for which she agreed to conduct this in camera review.

On July 2, 2015, this Magistrate Judge received from counsel for now non-party Odin Marine a cover letter, dated June 29, 2015, with copies of a series of e-mail chains between Odin's principals regarding plaintiff's expense reports and his potential termination. In this letter, Odin argues that these internal e-mails are "cumulative and do not bear any relation [t]o the claims set forth in . . . plaintiff's Complaint against Starfuels [his latest employer]." After a careful in camera review of these documents, some of which are duplicative (as e-mail chains often are), the Magistrate Judge agrees that none of them need to be produced, except for plaintiff's e-mail to Dave Young, dated June 10, 2013 (which appears three times), unless plaintiff already has a copy of it.

Because this ruling is subject to review, see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(**written objections to ruling must be filed within fourteen calendar days after service of same**); FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut; Small v. Secretary, H&HS, 892 F.2d. 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989)(**failure to file timely objection to Magistrate Judge's recommended ruling may preclude further appeal to Second Circuit**), these documents will remain in this Magistrate Judge's Chambers. If either party files an objection to this ruling, then the documents will be filed under seal and forwarded to Judge Meyer's Chambers for his in camera review. If no objection is filed, then the documents will be returned to counsel for Odin.

This is not a Recommended Ruling, but a ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the standard of review of which is specified in 28 U.S.C. § 636; FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; and Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges. As such, it is an order of the Court unless reversed or modified by the District Judge upon timely made objection.¹

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 7th day of July, 2015.

/s/ Joan G. Margolis, USMJ
Joan Glazer Margolis
United States Magistrate Judge

¹If either counsel believes that a settlement conference before this Magistrate Judge would be productive, he should contact Chambers accordingly.