

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

In re: WATTS COORDINATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS	) ) ) ) ) )	Master Docket Case No. 19-cv-01717  Judge Andrea R. Wood  Magistrate Judge Sheila M. Finnegan
--	----------------------------	---

**This document relates to all cases.**

**DEFENDANTS’ JOINT MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THEIR RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Defendants seek leave to supplement their response to Plaintiff’s Motion for a Protective Order, Dkt. 124, to provide this Court with certain FBI documents in support of arguments made in their response brief. In support thereof, Defendants state as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

Before this Court is the Loevy & Loevy Plaintiffs’ Motion a Protective Order (“Pltf’s. Mot.” or “Motion”) seeking to limit certain testimony of Plaintiffs. Dkt. 124. Briefing on the Motion is complete. Because Plaintiffs have questioned whether there are FBI documents that support certain arguments made by Defendants, Dkt. 140, Plaintiffs’ Reply; Dkt. 138, Defendants’ Joint Response, Defendants seek leave to file such documents for the Court’s review in deciding Plaintiff’s motion.

**ARGUMENT**

Plaintiffs’ Reply claims that Defendants’ redacted discussion about FBI documents is inaccurate and that no such documents exist to support Defendants’ claims. Dkt. 140, p. 12. This is not true. All parties have received documents produced by federal agencies, including the FBI,

in this case, and contrary to Plaintiffs' claim, the arguments made by Defendants are supported by reports memorializing interviews of certain individuals, both identified and unidentified.

During discovery in this matter, federal agencies, including the FBI, have provided documents generated during the course of their prior investigation. Defendants did not file any FBI documents with their response in light of the protective order in place, but now, because Plaintiffs are questioning whether such documents exist, the Court should have the documents that support Defendants' arguments. In particular, there are two pages that Defendants seek to file under seal:

FBI documents bates-stamped [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Thus, the substance of this interview supports

what Defendants argued in their brief. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

---

1 [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

Defendants are denied the opportunity to do so.

\_\_\_\_\_ The open question about who was interviewed \_\_\_\_\_ . If Defendants knew who that person was, they would be able to determine further areas of inquiry for that person at deposition; without that information, Defendants are deprived of that opportunity and to gather inculpatory evidence \_\_\_\_\_

## CONCLUSION

Defendants' arguments and reference to FBI reports in their response are supported by FBI documents [REDACTED]. Because Plaintiffs have challenged that assertion and because the Court would benefit from seeing the actual documents, Defendants respectfully request leave of Court to provide FBI [REDACTED] for its review and consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Anthony E. Zecchin

Special Assistant Corporation Counsel  
One of the attorneys for Defendant Officers

Andrew M. Hale  
Brian Stefanich  
William E. Bazarek  
Anthony E. Zecchin  
Allyson L. West  
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel  
Hale & Monico LLC  
53 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 337  
Chicago, IL 60604

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Anthony E. Zecchin, an attorney, hereby certify that, on **July 7, 2020**, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Court's CM/ECF system, which sent electronic notification of the filing on the same day to all counsel of record.

/s/ Anthony E. Zecchin