

Hupy PDR – Certain PAO Communication with Judges / Court during March 1, 2015 – April 6, 2015
– Exemption Codes for redacted e-mails

| CODE | WHAT CODE STANDS FOR | SUBJECT | | EXEMPTION | BRIEF EXPLANATION OF HOW EXEMPTION APPLIES |
|------|----------------------|---------|--|-----------|--|
|------|----------------------|---------|--|-----------|--|

DOCUMENTS WITH REDACTIONS

*For the e-mails in the file marked
refer to this sub-table to match the code on the redacted e-mail to the applicable exemption.
Redactions without codes pre-existed in the e-mail.*

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| A/C | Attorney Client communication | Attorney-Client communications redacted | | RCW 42.56.070(1) and RCW 5.60.060(2)(a) | Reflects communication and advice between attorney and clients. |
| WP | Work Product | PAO mental impressions, thoughts, and legal analysis redacted | | RCW 42.56.290 and <i>Limstrom v. Ladenburg</i> , 136 Wn.2d 595 (1998) | Attorney work product is exempt from disclosure. PAO mental impressions, thoughts, and legal analysis redacted |

DOCUMENTS WITHHELD IN THEIR ENTIRETY

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| A/C | Attorney Client communication | Attorney-Client communications redacted | 2 voicemails withheld in their entirety | RCW 42.56.070(1) and RCW 5.60.060(2)(a) | Reflects communication and advice between attorney and clients. |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|