

## COUGHLIN DUFFY LLP

CASE ALERT. NO. 35

NOVEMBER 4. 2008

## Ninth Circuit Refuses Return of Inadvertently Produced Document



Adam M. Smith, Esq. Member

P.O. Box 1917 350 Mount Kemble Avenue Morristown, New Jersey 07962 Tel (973) 631-6050 Fax (973) 267-6442

asmith@coughlinduffy.com



Amanda K. Coats, Esq. Associate

P.O. Box 1917 350 Mount Kemble Avenue Morristown, New Jersey 07962 Tel (973) 631-6066 Fax (973) 267-6442

a coats@coughlinduffy.com

www.coughlinduffy.com

On October 28, 2008, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, in Truckstop.net, LLC v. Sprint Corp., Docket No. 07-35123 (9th Cir. Oct. 28, 2008), refused Sprint's request to return an email message that Sprint claimed contained attorney-client privileged communications, despite the fact that Sprint had inadvertently produced the document in connection with a multi-phase document production. Notwithstanding the fact that a thorough "privilege review" may require a significant dedication of resources, this decision underscores the necessity of a careful review of documents, in particular email messages, before production in litigation.

This lawsuit arose out of a dispute between Truckstop.net ("Truckstop") and Sprint Communications Company L.P. ("Sprint") regarding Sprint's agreement to design, install, and test standardized wireless local area networks. In connection with its discovery obligations, Sprint produced over 470,000 electronic images to Truckstop. As part of Sprint's sixteenth supplemental production of documents, Sprint inadvertently produced an allegedly privileged, September 2004 e-mail message between Sprint employees that included impressions and recollections of a meeting with Sprint's legal department and various statements of

fact from other sources.

After realizing that the email was inadvertently produced, Sprint filed a motion seeking the return of the document. The district court held that most of the communication did not contain privileged information and was discoverable. Sprint filed an interlocutory appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

The issue on appeal was whether the allegedly privileged email message should be returned to Sprint. Even though the disclosure was inadvertent and Sprint sought to reverse its error, the Court found that no such remedy existed; Sprint was not allowed to "unring the bell." Instead, because the irreparable harm associated with the disclosure could not be undone and Sprint would sustain no additional harm if the email message remained disclosed, the Court refused to reverse the district court's decision.

The <u>Truckstop</u> decision highlights the importance of a thorough "privilege review." So much information is passed via email messages today that a "privilege review" can be a massive undertaking in the context of litigation. Failure to perform a "privilege review," however, can have serious negative consequences on a party's

## **About Coughlin Duffy LLP**

Coughlin Duffy LLP is one of the fastest growing law firms in the northeastern United States, servicing a sophisticated national and international clientele. We provide a full range of legal services including all types of litigation, arbitration and transactional work on behalf of corporate, institutional, governmental and individual clients. We have one of the largest groups of attorneys dedicated to representing insurers and reinsurers throughout the United States and internationally, and specialize in the representation of multi-national organizations faced with international disputes.

The materials presented herein are for information purposes only and are not offered as legal advice. No reader should act on the basis of these materials without seeking appropriate professional advice as to the particular facts and applicable law involved. Opinions presented herein are the opinions of the individual authors, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the firm of Coughlin Duffy LLP, or any of its attorneys or clients.

litigation position. One inadvertently produced document with sensitive, privileged information that was never intended to be disclosed can wreak havoc on a party's litigation strategy and the potential settlement value of a matter.

The <u>Truckstop</u> decision serves as yet another warning of the perils faced by litigants in the complex world of electronic discovery. Litigants must be vigilant with their "privilege review" of documents, particularly email messages, to avoid the pitfall illustrated in <u>Truckstop</u>.

Should you have any questions about this decision, please do not hesitate to contact us.