



# Litigation Review Committee

February 2016

February 11, 2016

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

East Committee Room, McNamara Alumni Center

## LIT - FEB 2016

### 1. Resolution to Conduct Non-Public Meeting of the Litigation Review Committee to Discuss Attorney-Client Privileged Matters - Review/Action

Docket Item Summary - Page 3

Resolution - Page 4



# BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

---

**Litigation Review**

**February 11, 2016**

**AGENDA ITEM:** Resolution to Conduct Non-Public Meeting of the Litigation Review Committee to Discuss Attorney-Client Privileged Matters

Review     Review + Action     Action     Discussion

*This is a report required by Board policy.*

**PRESENTERS:** William Donohue, General Counsel

## **PURPOSE & KEY POINTS**

To consider a resolution to conduct a non-public meeting of the Litigation Review Committee to discuss attorney-client privileged matters.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Litigation Review Committee reviews litigation matters and obtains legal advice regarding specific University actions and their legal consequences.



## REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

### RESOLUTION RELATED TO

#### **Conduct Non-Public Meeting of the Litigation Review Committee to Discuss Attorney-Client Privileged Matters**

**WHEREAS**, based on advice of the General Counsel, the Board of Regents Litigation Review Committee has balanced the purposes served by the Open Meeting Law and by the attorney-client privilege, and determined that there is a need for absolute confidentiality to discuss litigation strategy in particular matters involving the University of Minnesota.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that in accordance with Minn. Stat. § 13D.01, Subd. 3 and 13D.05 Subd. 3(b), a non-public meeting of Litigation Review Committee be held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in the East Committee Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center, for the purpose of discussing attorney-client privileged matters including the following:

- I. *Preeti Kaur Rajpal v. Regents of the university of Minnesota, Aaron L. Friedman*
- II. *University of Minnesota v. AT&T, et al.*
- III. *University of Minnesota v. MD Anderson*
- IV. *Miller, Banford and Wiles v. University of Minnesota*
- V. *Minnesota Alpha Chapter of Sigma Alpha Epsilon, on its own behalf and in its representative capacity for its members v. University of Minnesota*