

## Ohio Supreme Court Clarifies Long-Debated Discovery Question, by

Andrew L. Smith, Esq.



In December, the Ohio Supreme Court in *Burnham v. Cleveland Clinic*, Case No. 2015-112, 2016-Ohio-8000, ¶3 (Dec. 7, 2016), issued a ruling, holding court orders

requiring a party to disclose discovery information “plausibly alleged” as protected by the attorney-client privilege are immediately appealable. The Court reasoned as follows:

An order requiring the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege causes harm and prejudice that inherently cannot be meaningfully or effectively remedied by a later appeal. Thus, a discovery order that is alleged to breach the confidentiality guaranteed by the attorney-client privilege satisfies R.C. 2505.02(B) (4)(b) and is a final, appealable order that is potentially subject to immediate review.

*Id.* at ¶2.

### Background of Dispute

In *Burnham*, Darlene Burnham brought a personal-injury suit against the Cleveland Clinic and Cleveland Clinic Health System. She allegedly slipped and fell in her sister’s hospital room at the Clinic after an employee poured liquid on the floor.

During discovery, Ms. Burnham requested production of an incident report she learned had been created. However, the Clinic alleged the report was not discoverable because it was shielded by various protections, including the attorney-client privilege.

Ms. Burnham filed a motion to compel discovery of the report. The trial court ordered the Clinic to provide Ms. Burnham with a privilege log and directed the parties to brief the issue of privilege. Included with the Clinic’s privilege log, filed under seal, was a copy of the report and an affidavit from the Clinic’s deputy chief legal officer claiming the report was generated as part of its protocol to notify the Clinic’s legal department of events that might be the basis for legal action. After

reviewing the parties’ briefs and the privilege log, the court ordered the Clinic to produce the incident report. The Clinic then filed an immediate appeal.



The appellate court dismissed the action, finding there was no final, appealable order to review. The appellate court determined the Clinic failed to

affirmatively establish there would be prejudice resulting from disclosure of the incident report sufficient to justify an interlocutory appeal before the underlying personal-injury suit was fully resolved.

### Ohio Supreme Court Ruling

The Ohio Supreme Court ultimately concluded “[b]ecause the Clinic raised a colorable claim that its report was protected by the attorney-client privilege, the court’s order compelling disclosure of that report was a final, appealable order.” *Id.* at ¶29.

The Court was clear to point out information claimed as protected by the work-product privilege may be treated differently. Indeed, “[t]he attorney-client privilege and the attorney-work-product doctrine provide different levels of protection over distinct interests, meaning that orders forcing disclosure in these two types of discovery disputes do not necessarily have the same result that allows an immediate appeal.” *Id.* at ¶15. However, under certain limited circumstances an order mandating disclosure of information arguably protected by the work-product privilege may still be immediately appealable.

But the same guarantee of confidentiality is not at risk with an attorney’s work product. Any harm from disclosure would likely relate to the case being litigated, meaning that appellate review would more likely provide appropriate relief. This is not to say that compelling the disclosure of an attorney’s work product pursuant to

(Continued on page 21)



**Ohio Supreme Court Clarifies** (cont'd.)

(Continued from page 20)

Civ.R. 26(B)(3) would never satisfy R.C. 2505.02(B)(4)(b) and require an interlocutory appeal. But it does not necessarily involve the inherent, extrajudicial harm involved with a breach of the attorney-client privilege.

*Id.* at ¶26.

**Importance for the Insurance Defense Industry**

This decision is extremely beneficial in the realm of insurance defense and bad faith litigation, including the often-disputed disclosure of materials, including, among other things, claims files, claim log notes, reserve information, claim handling policies and manuals, underwriting materials, and pre-suit internal reports and investigation reports. Defendants now have the opportunity to immediately appeal adverse discovery court orders concerning these matters.

**Conclusion**



In *Burnham*, the Ohio Supreme Court clarified a much-disputed discovery issue. Court orders requiring a party to disclose discovery information “plausibly alleged” to be protected by the attorney-client privilege are in fact immediately

appealable. Indeed, once “the genie is out of the bottle,” the harm is done justifying an appeal and a second opinion as to such a key privilege determina-

tion. This discovery bell “cannot be unrung.”

However, a number of questions are still unanswered after the *Burnham* decision:

1. *What degree of showing will be necessary to allege protection by the attorney-client privilege to justify the immediate appeal?* The opinion references the terms of art “colorable claim” and “plausibly alleged.” However, the Court summarily concluded the report in question was potentially privileged without detailing this determination.
2. *Although there is an automatic right to appeal an order mandating production of discovery information arguably protected by the attorney-client privilege, what degree of prejudice or harm will be necessary to justify an interlocutory appeal when the attorney-client privilege is not involved?* What if the appeal is solely based on the work-product privilege, statutory immunity, or even a general confidentiality, proprietary, or trade secret argument? The Court did not rule out these possibilities, but did hint it will be extremely difficult to justify an immediate appeal when the attorney-client privilege is not in question. Exactly how difficult remains to be determined.

*Andrew L. Smith is a Partner in the Cincinnati, Ohio office of Smith, Rolfes & Skavdahl Company, LPA who concentrates his practice in the areas of construction law, insurance defense, and bad faith litigation defense. He is the creator of the AGC of Ohio construction law blog, Between the Law and a Hard Hat, and the co-host of the University of Cincinnati athletics media platform, [BearcatsSportsRadio.com](http://BearcatsSportsRadio.com).*



Under the **Members Only** section, each member has the opportunity to provide a **800 character bio**. If you have provided us with your picture, it will automatically show now when you open your member listing. To the right of the picture is where the bio will be displayed.

If you would like to take advantage of this, you just need to e-mail Mary Beth Robinson at [nspii@nspii.com](mailto:nspii@nspii.com) your 800 character or less bio. If you would also like to add your picture, e-mail her a high resolution (between 80-100 KB in size) .jpeg formatted picture.