



Litigation Review Committee

June 2021

June 10, 2021

8:00 a.m.

Hail! Minnesota Conference Room

LIT - JUN 2021

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

Docket Item Summary - 3

Resolution - 4



BOARD OF REGENTS DOCKET ITEM SUMMARY

Litigation Review

June 10, 2021

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: Douglas Peterson, 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 committee reviews litigation matters and obtains legal advice regarding specific University actions and their legal consequences.



REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

RESOLUTION 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, June 10, 2021 at 8:00 a.m. in the Hail! Minnesota Conference Room, 600 McNamara Alumni Center, for the purpose of discussing attorney-client privileged matters including the following:

- I. *Regents of the University of Minnesota v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*
- II. *Becker, et al. v. Regents of the University of Minnesota and UMP*
- III. *Does 1-2, et al. v. Regents of the University of Minnesota*
- IV. *Michael Sacks, et al. v. University of Minnesota, et al.*