

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

HOLLY LOUIS, an individual, )
Plaintiff, )
vs. ) Case Number CIV-14-1358-C
MERCY HEALTH, a foreign )
corporation, )
Defendant. )

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff filed the present action asserting claims for negligence related to medical treatment she received at Mercy Hospital in Oklahoma City. As part of her discovery in this case, Plaintiff issued a number of subpoenas to Mercy-affiliated hospitals throughout Oklahoma. The subpoenas sought policies related to patient rights and responsibilities, emergency department policies and procedures, and obstetrics and gynecology policies and procedures. Each of the Mercy entities objected to the subpoenas and now each seeks an Order from the Court quashing the subpoenas. In support of their Motions, each of the Mercy entities argues that the information sought by the subpoenas lacks relevancy to the claims in the lawsuit.

In response to the Mercy entities' Motions to Quash, Plaintiff argues that the information sought is relevant to her claims for piercing the corporate veil and attaching liability to Mercy Health as the parent entity of Mercy OKC, the location where the alleged injury occurred. According to Plaintiff, the policies sought by the subpoenas may offer some evidence demonstrating control by Mercy Health over Mercy OKC and the other Mercy entities. That

evidence would then be relevant to the issue of piercing the corporate veil of Mercy OKC and attaching liability to Mercy Health.

After consideration of the parties' arguments, the Court finds that the Mercy entities' Motions will be denied. The only argument raised by the Mercy entities is relevancy, and Plaintiff has offered arguments demonstrating that the information sought has at least some tendency to lead to admissible evidence. Therefore, the information sought by the subpoenas is relevant and properly discoverable. Therefore, Mercy Hospital Ada, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 22); Mercy Hospital Ardmore, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 23); Mercy Hospital El Reno, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 24); Mercy Hospital Healdton, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 25); Mercy Hospital Kingfisher, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 26); Mercy Hospital Logan County, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 27); and Mercy Hospital Watonga, Inc's Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents (Dkt. No. 28) are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of June, 2015.



---

ROBIN J. CAUTHRON  
United States District Judge