

**United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois**

<b>Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge</b>	Ronald A. Guzman	<b>Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge</b>	Nan R. Nolan
<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	02 C 5893	<b>DATE</b>	01/30/07
<b>CASE TITLE</b>	Jaffe vs. Household Intl Inc, et al		

**DOCKET ENTRY TEXT**

On January 10, 2007, the court ordered Defendants to produce calendars for three individuals, including David A. Schoenholz. (Minute Order of 1/10/07, Doc. 910.) At the January 24, 2007 status hearing, Plaintiffs objected that the Schoenholz calendar had been heavily redacted, often with entire pages blocked out. Defendants stated that they redacted all entries they deemed non-responsive to the following document request: **(See order below)**

■ [ For further details see text below.]

Notices mailed by Judicial staff.

**STATEMENT**

Calendars for any Household officers or employees sufficient to identify the dates of any meeting during the Class Period on the subject of predatory lending and/or Household’s lending practices with one or more of the following: a federal or state representative or official; a consumer group, such as ACORN or NAACP or AARP; any analyst, investor, stock broker or member of the financial industry; an officer or employee of a rating agency; or one or more representatives of the press, including a reporter or editorial boards.

(Plaintiffs’ Fourth Request for Production of Documents, No. 19.)

It is true that Plaintiffs’ request is quite limited in scope. Redacted documents, however, are problematic in that there is a concern that the redacted information is truly responsive, or that the redactions “delete meaningful context for the information that is provided.” *Nauman v. Abbott Labs.*, No. 04 C 7199, 2006 WL 1005959, at \*8 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 12, 2006). *See also In re Medeva Sec. Litig.*, No. 93-4376-KN AJWX, 1995 WL 943468, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. May 30, 1995) (“The Court does not welcome unilateral editing of documents by the producing party.”); *Seafirst Corp. v. Jenkins*, 644 F. Supp. 1160, 1165 (W.D. Wash. 1986) (“[D]isclosure of some possibly irrelevant material will cause no harm. In contrast, partial disclosure may tend to distort the tenor of the reports.”) The court has reviewed the calendars at issue here and holds that Defendants may redact any purely personal entries, such as doctor’s appointments and personal travel, meeting, and entertainment events, but may not redact any other information. Defendants are to produce new calendars consistent with this ruling by February 5, 2007.