## Case 1:15-cv-09796-JSR Document 82 Filed 06/09/16 Page 1 of 3

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK ----x SPENCER MEYER, individually and on : behalf of those similarly situated, : 15 Civ. 9796 Plaintiff, : ORDER -v-TRAVIS KALANICK, : : Defendant. JED S. RAKOFF, U.S.D.J.

On May 7, 2016, the Court received materials for its <u>in</u> <u>camera</u> review that were submitted, in accordance with the Court's orders, by Uber Technologies, Inc. ("Uber") and Global Precision Research, LLC d/b/a Ergo ("Ergo"). These materials, over which privilege and/or work-product protection are claimed, relate to plaintiff Spencer Meyer's contentions that Uber hired Ergo to conduct an investigation of plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel Andrew Schmidt, that Ergo, in order to obtain information about the subjects of the investigation, made misrepresentations to third parties, and that misrepresentations were also made to plaintiff's counsel about Uber's and/or defendant's role in ordering the investigation. <u>See</u> Memorandum Order dated June 7, 2016, Dkt. 76. In light of the forthcoming depositions relating to these matters, the Court has carefully

1

## Case 1:15-cv-09796-JSR Document 82 Filed 06/09/16 Page 2 of 3

reviewed <u>in camera</u> each and all of the submitted materials and, as a consequence of that review, makes the following rulings: (1) All claims of privilege and work-product protection as to materials submitted by Ergo are denied, and Ergo must produce to plaintiff's counsel by 5 p.m. on June 9, 2016 all of the materials that Ergo submitted for the Court's <u>in camera</u> review. (2) Uber's claims of privilege and work-product protection are affirmed as to certain materials and denied as to others. Specifically, Uber must produce to plaintiff's counsel by 5 p.m. on June 9, 2016 the following documents, identified by their Bates numbers in Uber's privilege log:

UBER-PRIV000001 UBER-PRIV0000022 UBER-PRIV0000024 UBER-PRIV0000039 UBER-PRIV0000040 UBER-PRIV0000043 UBER-PRIV0000055 UBER-PRIV0000056 UBER-PRIV0000059 UBER-PRIV0000077 UBER-PRIV0000083

(3) Plaintiff's application to take the deposition of Uber's General Counsel Salle Yoo regarding the Ergo matter is denied.

A Memorandum setting forth the reasons for the Court's three rulings will issue in due course.

2

Case 1:15-cv-09796-JSR Document 82 Filed 06/09/16 Page 3 of 3

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, NY June 🕤, 2016

RAKOFF, U.S.D.J. JE