UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

LEORA RILEY, et al.,)	
Individually and on behalf of all others)	
similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.) Case No. 18-cv-2337	'-KHV-TJJ
)	
PK MANAGEMENT, LLC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants	j.)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Production or, in the Alternative, for *In Camera* Review (ECF No. 79). On February 11, 2019, the Court ordered Defendant Aspen Companies Management, LLC to submit an unredacted copy of the document in question for *in camera* review.¹ Aspen has done so and the Court has reviewed the document and is ready to rule.

ORDER

As Aspen explained in its response to the motion, the email contains a message from its employee Mr. Levenbrown "communicating a message from the company's attorney to another employee down the chain of command." Mr. Levenbrown is the regional manager for Central Park Towers and direct supervisor to the other employee in the email chain, Margaret Mejia. Ms. Mejia is the on-site property manager for Central Park Towers.

After reviewing the contents of the emails provided to Plaintiffs in redacted form, the Court finds they are subject to attorney-client privilege. The contents are as Aspen explained

¹ ECF No. 112.

² November 27, 2018 letter from counsel (ECF No. 110-1 at 7).

them, i.e. communication from a supervisor to an employee with legal advice from the company's lawyer for the employee to follow concerning a KCPT film inquiry. "[T]he attorney-client privilege extends to communications made within a corporation if those communications are made for the purpose of securing legal advice."

The Court therefore denies Plaintiffs' motion insofar as it seeks to compel Aspen to produce an unredacted version of Bates no. Aspen007901 to Plaintiffs.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 15th day of February, 2019, at Kansas City, Kansas.

Teresa J. James

U. S. Magistrate Judge

³ Williams v. Sprint/United Mgmt. Co. 238 F.R.D. 633, 638 (D. Kan. 2006).