

**United States District Court**  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION

BRIAN HUDDLESTON,	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 4:20-cv-447
	§	Judge Mazzant
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION	§	
and UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF	§	
JUSTICE.	§	

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Brian Huddleston’s Motion for In Camera Review (Dkt. #28). After considering the Motion, Defendants’ response (Dkt. #30), and Plaintiff’s reply (Dkt. #31), the Court finds that the Motion should be **DENIED without prejudice**.

Plaintiff requests that the Court conduct an *in camera* review of “all responsive documents” in unredacted form (Dkt. #28 at p. 16). But as Defendants point out in response, “the production phase is ongoing, and the briefing phase of the case has not begun or even been scheduled” (Dkt. #30 at p. 2). *See Juarez v. Dep’t of Justice*, 518 F.3d 54, 60 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (finding *in camera* review “unnecessary” when the agency’s affidavits “sufficiently describe the documents and set forth proper reasons for invoking an exemption”). As such, Plaintiff’s request is premature. Upon completion of Defendants’ production, the parties may meet and confer to discuss the details of a scheduling order for the briefing phase of the litigation, if necessary. But until then, Plaintiff’s request for *in camera* review is improper at this time.

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion for In Camera Review (Dkt. #28) is hereby **DENIED without prejudice**.

**SIGNED this 6th day of July, 2021.**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Amos Mazzant". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath it.

AMOS L. MAZZANT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE