

**CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)**

<b>JULY 23, 2021 REQUEST</b>				
<b>Bates Nos.</b>	<b>Document</b>	<b>Information Redacted/Witness held</b>	<b>Privileges Claimed</b>	<b>Additional Detail</b>
4-10	08-20-18 (FACEBOOK & SUBPOENAS).P&A	Non-responsive records; Names, email address, and phone numbers of staff	Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	
11-22	09-21-15 (FACEBOOK & SUBPOENAS).P&A	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes; Names, email address, and phone numbers of staff	1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 7927.705; Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030) 2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	
23-33	2017-05-30 (Misconduct by Jurors During Voir Dire and Trial).P and A	Names, email address, and phone numbers of staff	1. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	
34	Weekly Report 8-11-17-P.2-REDACTED	Non-responsive records; names and phone numbers of staff	1. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	This is a Weekly Report on New Decisions dated August 11, 2017, published by the Criminal Law Division of the California Department of Justice. It is a 3-page document consisting of case

**CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)**

				summaries of court opinions from cases decided in the California Court of Appeal. Upon review, only a portion of 1 page of this document was responsive and that was redacted and disclosed. The remainder of the document was not responsive and contained names and phone numbers of staff and, therefore, was accordingly redacted and withheld.
35	Weekly Report 2018-08-10-P.4-REDACTED	Non-responsive records; names and phone numbers of staff	1. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	This is a Weekly Report on New Decisions dated August 10, 2018, published by the Criminal Law Division of the California Department of Justice. It is a 5-page document consisting of case summaries of court opinions from cases decided in the California Supreme Court and California Court of Appeal. Upon review, only a portion of 1 page of this document was responsive and that was redacted and disclosed. The remainder of the document was not responsive and contained names and phone numbers of staff and, therefore, was accordingly redacted and withheld.
36	Weekly Report 2019-11-15-P.2-REDACTED	Non-responsive records; names and phone	1. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure	This is a Weekly Report on New Decisions dated November 15, 2019, published by the Criminal Law Division of the California

# CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)

		numbers of staff	(Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	Department of Justice. It is a 4-page document consisting of case summaries of court opinions from cases decided in the California Court of Appeal. Upon review, only a portion of 1 page of this document was responsive and that was redacted and disclosed. The remainder of the document was not responsive and contained names and phone numbers of staff and, therefore, was accordingly redacted and withheld.
37	Weekly Report 7-31-15-P.2-REDACTED	Non-responsive records; names and phone numbers of staff	1. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	This is a Weekly Report on New Decisions dated July 31, 2015, published by the Criminal Law Division of the California Department of Justice. It is a 4-page document consisting of case summaries of court opinions from cases decided in the California Court of Appeal. Upon review, only a portion of 1 page of this document was responsive and that was redacted and disclosed. The remainder of the document was not responsive and contained names and phone numbers of staff and, therefore, was accordingly redacted and withheld.
38-39	Weekly Report 2020-12-18-PP.2-3-REDACTED	Non-responsive records; names and phone	1. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public	This is a Weekly Report on New Decisions dated December 18, 2020, published by the Criminal

# CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)

		numbers of staff	interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	Law Division of the California Department of Justice. It is a 4-page document consisting of case summaries of court opinions from cases decided in the U.S. Supreme Court and the California Court of Appeal. Upon review, only a portion of 2 pages of this document was responsive and those were redacted and disclosed. The remainder of the document was not responsive and contained names and phone numbers of staff and, therefore, was accordingly redacted and withheld.
40	IFP Training - Superior Court Etiquette & Effective Chambers Conferences (3-21-19)- REDACTED	Non-responsive records; Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 7927.705; Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</li> <li>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</li> </ol>	This is an Introduction to Felony Prosecutions (IFP) training presentation consisting of 25 PowerPoint slides prepared by attorneys from the OCDA for attorneys within the OCDA's office that provides information as well as legal directions, opinions, and recommendations regarding superior court etiquette and effective chambers conferences. Only 1 slide was identified as responsive. The remainder of the PowerPoint slides were not responsive. Upon review, the responsive slide also contained attorney opinions and recommendations on jury selection

# CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)

				and, therefore, that portion of the slide was redacted and disclosed while the remaining non-responsive slides were withheld.
41-103	AB 2542 Cal. Racial Justice Act by Ret. Judge Couzens	N/A	N/A	
104-112	Bill Text – AB 2542 Criminal procedure discrimination	N/A	N/A	
113	BULLETIN 15-002 (Documentary & Electronic Evidence)	Non-responsive records; Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes	1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 7927.705; Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030) 2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	
114-117	How to confront bias in the criminal justice system	N/A	N/A	
118-119	IFP Training - Voir Dire (3-20-19)-REDACTED	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes	1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 7927.705; Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030) 2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])	This is an Introduction to Felony Prosecutions (IFP) training presentation consisting of 76 PowerPoint slides authored by an attorney from the OCDA for attorneys within the OCDA's office that provides attorney opinions and recommendations on jury selection. 74 of the 76 slides contained attorney opinions and recommendations regarding jury selection, and, therefore, were accordingly withheld while the two

# CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)

				slides that did not have any privileged information were disclosed.
120-132	Implicit Bias – A Primer for Courts (Jerry Kang – August 2009)	N/A	N/A	
(Withheld)	Basic Brady, Statutory, and Ethical Discovery Obligations (December 2, 2015 Edition) by Jeff Rubin, Santa Clara District Attorney’s Office	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 6254(k); Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</li> <li>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</li> <li>3. Confidential disclosure made to governmental agency (Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5))</li> </ol>	This is a guide/outline authored by Jeff Rubin of the Santa Clara County DA’s office and Douglas Pipes (ret.) of the Contra Costa County DA’s office and was disclosed to us as a confidential record pursuant to Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5). This guide/outline is 307 pages in length and provides legal analysis, opinions, directions, and recommendations on how prosecutors should comply with their <i>Brady</i> , statutory, and ethical discovery obligations.
(Withheld)	2016-IPG#14 (Basic <i>Brady</i> , Statutory, and Ethical Discovery Obligations Outline) (January 12, 2016 Edition) – Santa Clara District Attorney’s Office	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes; Names and phone numbers of staff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 6254(k); Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</li> <li>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</li> <li>3. Confidential disclosure made to governmental</li> </ol>	This is an Inquisitive Prosecutor’s Guide/outline authored by Jeff Rubin of the Santa Clara County DA’s office and Douglas Pipes (ret.) of the Contra Costa County DA’s office and was disclosed to us as a confidential record pursuant to Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5). It is an updated version of the December 2, 2015 guide/outline. This updated guide/outline is 307 pages in length and provides legal analysis, opinions, directions, and

# CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)

			agency (Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5))	recommendations on how prosecutors should comply with their <i>Brady</i> , statutory, and ethical discovery obligations.
(Withheld)	2018-IPG#38 (Obtaining Cell Site Info: <i>Carpenter</i> ) (August 7, 2018) – Santa Clara District Attorney’s Office	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes; Names and phone numbers of staff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 6254(k); Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</li> <li>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</li> </ol>	
(Withheld)	IPG – The Basic <i>Brady</i> , Statutory, and Ethical Discovery Obligations Outline (March 15, 2019 Edition) – Santa Clara District Attorney’s Office	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 6254(k); Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</li> <li>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</li> <li>3. Confidential disclosure made to governmental agency (Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5))</li> </ol>	This is an updated version of the Inquisitive Prosecutor’s Guide/outline authored by Jeff Rubin of the Santa Clara County DA’s office and Douglas Pipes (ret.) of the Contra Costa County DA’s office and was disclosed to us as a confidential record pursuant to Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5). This updated guide/outline is 437 pages in length and provides legal analysis, opinions, directions, and recommendations on how prosecutors should comply with their <i>Brady</i> , statutory, and ethical discovery obligations.
(Withheld)	2017-IPG#31(The <i>Brady</i> -Statutory-and Ethical Discovery Outline (June 9, 2017 Edition)	Attorney impressions, opinions and	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 6254(k);</li> </ol>	This is an updated version of the Inquisitive Prosecutor’s Guide/outline authored by Jeff

# CHICANXS/ACLU PRA LITIGATION – PRIVILEGE LOG (10-13-23)

	– Santa Clara District Attorney’s Office	thought processes	<p>Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</p> <p>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</p> <p>3. Confidential disclosure made to governmental agency (Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5))</p>	Rubin of the Santa Clara County DA’s office and Douglas Pipes (ret.) of the Contra Costa County DA’s office and was disclosed to us as a confidential record pursuant to Gov. Code § 7921.505(c)(5). This updated guide/outline is 365 pages in length and provides legal analysis, opinions, directions, and recommendations on how prosecutors should comply with their <i>Brady</i> , statutory, and ethical discovery obligations.
(Withheld)	1/29/21 Email from H. Woesner to E. Vasquez, W. Fallon, C.Philippe, M. Bradbury, S. Caughlin, B. Micheil, M. Swensson, A. Bugman, M. Caress, M. Briante, M. Guirguis, K. Wiemann, M. Elliott, J. Kirk, N. Morcos, C. Harrington, S. Scoville, E. Garcia, L. Cotton, K. Bogardus re: “Racial Justice Act – AB2542”	Attorney impressions, opinions and thought processes	<p>1. Attorney work product (Gov. Code § 7927.705; Code Civ. Proc., § 2018.030)</p> <p>2. Public interest in nondisclosure clearly outweighs public interest in disclosure (Gov. Code, § 7922.000 [deliberative process])</p>	This is a one-page, intra-office email sent internally to various attorneys within the OCDA’s office to provide an introduction to the Racial Justice Act and provide legal direction on how they should comply with their obligations under the law.