Jill E. Clark

From:

Jill E. Clark

Sent:

Wednesday, May 20, 2009 6:39 AM

To: Subject: Lathrop, Sara J RE: PROBLEM!!!

There is always a point in discussing prior to a court motion.

Are you really suggesting that we need to bring a motion to get an unredacted police report? And/or the identity of D.E.?

Also, tell me whether there are interview notes, any docs on Ritschel's computer (word docs), audiotapes of interviews, etc. It is good to know what is out there before making a motion, if that is really going to be required.

Tx.

From: Lathrop, Sara J [mailto:Sara.Lathrop@ci.minneapolis.mn.us]

Sent: Wednesday, May 20, 2009 6:36 AM

To: Jill E. Clark

Subject: RE: PROBLEM!!!

Jill, I have no way of knowing what you were told, or not told, at any point in time by people other than myself. More importantly, it is not productive to keep going back and forth over email on this issue. If you want to bring some kind of motion about evidence, you are able to do that. There is no point in us going round and round every day over email.

From: Jill E. Clark [mailto:jill@jillclarkpa.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 6:53 PM

To: Lathrop, Sara J

Subject: RE: PROBLEM!!!

(b)

Well, why wasn't I told that? Why do I have to learn that after getting a report that it was examined, and after sending a number of emails?

Jill Clark, Esq. Jill Clark, P.A.

Telephone: 763/417-9102

Fax: 763/417-9112 jill@jillclarkpa.com

This email may contain confidential or privileged communications. If you are not the proper recipient of this email, please destroy it and let us know that you have done so. If you are a client and want to discuss the risks associated with emails, or if you do not wish to have us communicate via email, please let us know.

From: Lathrop, Sara J [mailto:Sara.Lathrop@ci.minneapolis.mn.us]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 8:39 AM

To: Jill E. Clark

Subject: RE: PROBLEM!!!

(c)

Judge Porter reviewed the hard drive in camera, then gave approval to have it examined by the forensic examiner. Judge Porter was reviewing to see if there was any privileged information before releasing it to be examined.

From: Jill E. Clark [mailto:jill@jillclarkpa.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2009 6:13 AM



To: Lathrop, Sara J

Subject: RE: PROBLEM!!!

Sara, why did Ritschel tell the crime lab that they could examine the disks?

And you don't see any problem with police reading emails between me and my client?

Please respond in detail to each issue that I raise, rather than just "do what you have to do."

From: Lathrop, Sara J [mailto:Sara.Lathrop@ci.minneapolis.mn.us]

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2009 11:22 AM

To: Jill E. Clark

Subject: RE: PROBLEM!!!

(d)

Jill, I am not sure what you are upset about. I do not see any abuses or problems. Do what you think you need to do.

Sara J. Lathrop
Assistant Minneapolis City Attorney
333 South Seventh Street, Suite 300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612-673-2072 (direct)
612-673-3362 (fax)
sara.lathrop@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

From: Jill E. Clark [mailto:jill@jillclarkpa.com]

Sent: Sunday, May 17, 2009 1:04 PM

To: Lathrop, Sara J Subject: PROBLEM!!! Importance: High (e)

After this lawsuit was filed an objection was made to the state court judge about police reviewing attorney-client privileged information on Stepnes' computers, in December 2008 (according to police report), MPD read emails between Jill Clark and Paul Stepnes.

Unless we can work this out, I am going to file a motion to prevent your clients from using ***any*** evidence from those computer in this civil case.

There was no pending criminal investigation in 12/08 – you know full well that this civil case was in process. No examination of those computers/disks should have been done without plaintiffs' involvement, and I had already raised this issue to you by that time.

What do you propose to deal with these flagrant abuses?

Jill Clark

Jill Clark, P.A.

(0) 763 417-9102

From home computer