

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

JAMIE ARNOLD and CLINTON)
 FEGER, individually and on behalf)
 of all others similarly situated,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
 vs.)
)
 DIRECTV, INC., d/b/a DIRECTV HOME)
 SERVICES; and DTV HOME SERVICES II,)
 LLC,)
)
 Defendants.)

Case No. 4:10CV00352 AGF

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This putative class action is before the Court on the named Plaintiffs’ motion (Doc. #56) to compel Defendants to respond more fully to Plaintiffs’ initial discovery requests. Oral argument was held on the motion on June 3, 2011. The motion to compel shall be granted in part and denied in part.


As more fully stated at the hearing, Defendants must respond, at this point in the proceedings, to Plaintiffs’ requests for production of documents to the extent that the documents relate to DIRECTV’s relationship with the HSPs that employed Plaintiffs (herein referred to as “Aerosat”), but not with respect to other HSPs, and to the extent that such documents relate to the named Plaintiffs and any individuals who may have opted in to date.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion to compel is denied without prejudice with respect to Plaintiffs' Interrogatory at issue.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendants shall produce all documents requested by Plaintiffs to the extent such documents relate to Aerosat. If Defendants have already done so, they shall so certify in writing to Plaintiffs. Defendants shall also certify in writing to Plaintiffs whether DIRECTV's relationship with the other HSPs in question differed, during the relevant time period, from its relationship with Aerosat, as reflected in the documents already produced or to be produced, and if so, how.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the parties may, by filing a motion with the Court, request an amendment to any deadlines now set in this case.



AUDREY G. FLEISSIG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 3rd day of June, 2011.