

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

JAMISON STIRILING, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
)
)
vs.)
)
)
ST. LOUIS COUNTY POLICE)
DEPARTMENT, et al.,)
Defendants,)

Case No. 4:11CV01932 AGF

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on several pretrial motions filed by Plaintiff Jamison Stirling,

Upon review of the record,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Stirling’s motion (Doc. No. 371) to withdraw the motion (Doc. No. 370) for issuance of a subpoena to the Ferguson Police Department is **GRANTED**, and the motion for issuance of the subpoena (Doc. No. 370) is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Plaintiff Stirling’s unopposed motion (Doc. No. 372) filed on August 18, 2004, for issuance of a subpoena directed to the City of Berkeley, Missouri, Police Department to produce copies of documents related to any citizen complaints filed against Defendant Robert Rinck while he was a Berkeley police officer is **GRANTED** to the extent that any such complaints involve the alleged violations of individuals’ civil rights.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Stirling’s motion (Doc. No. 400) to exclude Defendants’ use at trial of his deposition is **GRANTED** insofar as any deposition testimony related to or based upon the National Crime Information Center

report in question, and **DENIED** in all other regards.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Stiriling's motion (Doc. No. 401) for a hearing on discovery issues is **DENIED** at this point.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Stiriling's motion (Doc. No. 402) for sanctions against Defendants and their counsel for counsel's failure to provide Plaintiffs with copies of subpoenas served on two nonparties for the production of records is **DENIED**. Counsel for Defendants represents that the omission was unintentional and that he has provided Plaintiff with copies of the records that were obtained pursuant to the subpoenas. Counsel for Defendants is reminded of his obligation to provide Plaintiffs with notice of subpoenas before they are served.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff Stiriling's motion (Doc. No. 398) to compel production of copies of the above-reference subpoenas is **GRANTED**. Counsel for Defendants represents that he asked the nonparties for copies of the subpoenas and will provide Plaintiffs with copies of the subpoenas "that come into their possession." The Court is hardpressed to understand why counsel for Defendants cannot immediately provide Plaintiffs with copies of the subpoenas, and orders counsel to do so, and to file notice of compliance with the Court within seven (7) days of the date of this Order.


AUDREY G. FLEISSIG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 17th day of October, 2014.