

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

A.O.A., et al.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 4:11 CV 44 CDP
	)	
IRA L. RENNERT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Certain Rule 30(b)(6) depositions of defendants’ corporate representatives are scheduled to begin next week. Meanwhile, pending before me is plaintiffs’ motion to compel defendants to produce 30(b)(6) witnesses on financial topics. Having fully considered the issues raised and the parties’ respective positions,<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Production of 30(b)(6) Witnesses on Financial Topics [732] is granted in part and denied in part as follows:

- Subsidiaries — Plaintiffs agreed to limit the terms “You” and “Your” defined in the Notices of Videotaped Deposition to not include subsidiary companies, and my earlier ruling on plaintiffs’ motion to compel 30(b)(6)

---

<sup>1</sup> Because the depositions are scheduled to begin December 14, and the parties have submitted sufficient information for me to rule the motion, I have determined to make my ruling before plaintiffs’ reply brief is due.

witnesses incorporated this agreement. I do not agree with defendants that this limitation of the terms “You” and “Your” removed all consideration of any subsidiary information. To the extent the Notices specifically request information relating to a subsidiary or subsidiaries, plaintiffs’ motion is granted. If defendants have knowledge responsive to a specific request relating to a subsidiary, they must produce a person or persons most familiar with the topics and prepared to testify.

- Production/Identification of Documents — This issue was discussed during the status conference held December 7, 2017. For the reasons stated at that conference, plaintiffs’ request that defendants produce documents prior to the deposition(s) and/or lists of documents reviewed by witnesses in preparation for deposition is denied, subject to defendants’ duty to supplement their previous production if new responsive documents are discovered during such preparation, including documents reviewed in preparation for Renco Topic 24 and Renco Topic 30 / Doe Run Resources Topic 27.
- La Oroya Complex — Defendants acknowledge plaintiffs’ entitlement to 30(b)(6) testimony on topics concerning financial transfers and involvement in loans related to the La Oroya Complex. Plaintiffs’ motion to compel 30(b)(6) testimony on Renco Topic 32 / Doe Run Resources Topic 29 is

granted. Defendants must produce a person or persons most familiar with the topic and prepared to testify.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Catherine D. Perry". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped "P" at the end.

---

CATHERINE D. PERRY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 8th day of December, 2017.