

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.	§	
	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:11-CV-244-Y
	§	
TRAVELPORT LIMITED, et al.	§	

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR RULE  
16(a) CONFERENCE, DENYING MOTION TO  
STAY, AND DENYING AS MOOT MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

Before the Court are the Request for Rule 16(a) Conference (doc. 33) filed by plaintiff American Airlines, Inc. ("American"); the Motion to Stay Discovery (doc. 88) filed by defendants Travelport Limited and Travelport, LP (collectively, "Travelport"); and the Motion to Consolidate (doc. 103) filed by defendants Sabre Inc., Sabre Holdings Corporation, and Sabre Travel International Limited (collectively, "Sabre").<sup>1</sup>

By its motion, American asks the Court to convene a conference under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(a) "so that American may apprise the Court of anticipated preliminary injunction proceedings this summer and the need for discovery to proceed expeditiously." (Pl.'s Mot. 1 (doc. 33).) Travelport, on the other hand, along with co-defendants Sabre and Orbitz Worldwide, LLC ("Orbitz"),<sup>2</sup> ask

---

<sup>1</sup> Travelport's Motion to Stay (doc. 88) supercedes an earlier-filed motion to stay (doc. 49). Accordingly, the earlier-filed stay motion is DENIED AS MOOT.

<sup>2</sup> Sabre has filed a Notice of Joinder (doc. 101) announcing its intention to join Travelport's motion to stay. Similarly, Orbitz has filed a Motion to Join Travelport's Motion to Stay (doc. 92), and the Court now GRANTS this motion.

the Court to stay discovery in this case pending the Court's ruling on the defendants' motions to dismiss. Thus, while it is American's position that discovery in this case should be expedited, each of the defendants is of the opinion that discovery should be halted.

The Court, having reviewed the parties' arguments and the relevant authorities, concludes that neither expedited discovery nor a stay is appropriate in this case. First of all, American's request for expedited discovery, which is based largely on its speculation as to how the defendants will respond to the expiration of certain contract amendments later this summer, is premature. Should the events of the upcoming months unfold as American anticipates, then American may renew its request for relief at that time. Meanwhile, however, the Court is of the opinion that an order expediting discovery is not merited. And in light of the Court's disinclination to expedite discovery at this time, a Rule 16(a) conference seems unnecessary.

At the same time, however, the defendants have not established a sufficiently compelling reason to stay discovery in this case. The primary reason that Travelport advances for granting a stay is cost-prevention. Travelport also points out that it is common to grant this type of stay in anti-trust cases. But given the Court's

---

Accordingly, all defendants are on record as having requested a stay of discovery pending the Court's ruling on the motions to dismiss.

decision not to expedite discovery, the Court is satisfied that discovery will not prove overly burdensome for the defendants, particularly given that they will have to produce many of the same documents in a related lawsuit in Illinois.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, the Court DENIES American's request for a Rule 16(a) conference and, likewise, DENIES Travelport's motion to stay. Additionally, the Court DENIES AS MOOT Sabre's motion to consolidate, as the companion case, No. 4:11-CV-0488-A, has been remanded back to state court.

SIGNED July 26, 2011.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRY R. MEANS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE