IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

KRISTOPHER CHURCHILL & LUIS ROLANDO *On behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated*	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	No. 10-6911
v.	:	
CIGNA CORPORATION, et al.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 21st day of August, 2012, it is ORDERED:

- Plaintiffs' Motion to Amend/Expand Class Definition (Document 90) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The motion is GRANTED insofar as the following subclass shall be certified pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3):

  > All individuals who, on or after November 24, 2006, (1) were enrolled in a plan administered by a CIGNA Defendant, or insured under health insurance coverage offered by a CIGNA Defendant in connection with a plan, and (2) are currently enrolled in a CIGNA-affiliated plan, and (3) who, on or after November 24, 2006, made a claim or make a claim for Applied Behavior Analysis and/or Early Intensive Behavioral Treatment for Autism Spectrum Disorder which was denied on the grounds that such treatment is deemed by a CIGNA Defendant to be investigative or experimental.
  >
  > Excluded from the class are Defendants, any parent, subsidiary, affiliate, or controlled person of Defendants, as well as officers, directors, agents, servants or employees of Defendants, and the immediate family member of any such person. Also excluded is any judge who may preside over this case or any person who has already settled a claim for either of these therapies with a Defendant.

  The motion is DENIED insofar as Plaintiffs' proposed Subclass shall be modified as set forth above.

- Defendant's Motion for Partial Dismissal of Second Amended Class Action Complaint (Document 88) is DENIED without prejudice to reassertion after notice

has been issued to the previously certified class;

- Plaintiffs' Motion to Amend Class Definition Entered by Court and Subclass Definition Sought by Plaintiffs (Document 92) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, consistent with this Order;
- Defendant's Motion to Stay and Joint Stipulation (Document 97) is DENIED as moot;
- Defendant's Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Exhibit in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Amend the Class Definition (Document 112) is GRANTED; and
- Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion to Amend Class Definition (Document 118) is GRANTED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Juan R. Sánchez
Juan R. Sánchez, J.