EXHIBIT 2

Littler
Employment & Labor Law Solutions Worldwide

Littler Mendelson, PC
1150 17th Street N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20036

Jason M. Branciforte
202.414.6867 direct
202.842.3400 main
202.842.0011 fax
jbranciforte@littler.com

October 28, 2015

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Honorable Larry S. Merck
Office of Administrative Law Judges
800 K Street, N.W., Suite 400-N
Washington, D.C. 20001-8002

Chief Docket Clerk
Office of Administrative Law Judges
800 K Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001-8002

Re: Maria-Fe M. Jordan v. DynCorp International LLC
Case No. 2015-LD-00030
OWCP No. 02-233683

Dear Judge Merck:

As you know, we represent DynCorp International LLC ("DI" or "Company") in connection with the above-referenced matter, and are writing in response to the Administrative Law Judge's October 19, 2015 Order, which requires DI to provide an unredacted copy of the privileged communication, DIJORDAN 002499 – DIJORDAN 002502, for *in camera* inspection. DI maintains that the redacted portions of the at-issue email thread are privileged and, therefore, respectfully requests that the Administrative Law Judge deny Claimant's Motion to Compel Production of Emails and for Sanctions ("Motion").

In response to Claimant's needless Motion, DI explained the basis for asserting attorney-client privilege, viz., the at-issue communications concerned the status of operations issues in connection with the Worldwide Protective Services ("WPS") Program contract, which were transmitted to Christopher Bellomy, Esq. – an in-house lawyer for DI – in order to apprise him (and other DI employees with responsibility for the administration and management of the WPS Program contract) of developments potentially impacting the contract. (See Email from Darin Powers to Brian Cox, Robert Huber and Christopher Bellomy dated July 30, 2013 with notation "Subject to Attorney Client Privilege," and response thereto, at pp. 1-3, Exhibit A hereto.) These communications were intended to be, and should remain, privileged among the select group of employees who received the at-issue communication. See, e.g., Hercules, Inc. v. Exxon Corp., 434 F. Supp. 136, 144 (D. Del. 1977) ("It is not essential, however, that the request for advice be express. Client communications intended to keep the attorney apprised of continuing business developments, with an implied request for legal advice thereon, or self-

initiated attorney communications intended to keep the client posted on legal developments and implications may also be protected.") Certainly, Mr. Powers' email to Mr. Bellomy, among others, was to keep DI's in-house contracts lawyer apprised of developments impacting the WPS Program contract. Thus, the Administrative Law Judge should keep DIJORDAN 002499 – DIJORDAN 002502 privileged.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Should you have any further questions, or require further briefing on the privilege issue, please let us know.

Respectfully submitted,

LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.

Jason M. Branciforte

cc: Jack Jordan, Esq. (via certified mail without attachment)