

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI AT KANSAS CITY

JOHN DOE B.P.,)		
Plaintiff)	CASE NO 1	016-CV29995
v.	,)	CADE NO	010 (12)
)	DIVISION	7
FATHER MICHAEL TIERNEY, et al.,)		•
)		
)		-
Defendants)		

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTIONS TO QUASH DEPOSITION OF DAVID CLOHESSY

Pending before the Court are John Doe B.P.'s Motion to Quash Subpoena of David Clohessy filed November 14, 2011, and Motion to Quash and For Protective Order Regarding Defendant Father Michael Tierney's Subpoena Directed to David Clohessy, filed by counsel on behalf of David Clohessy filed November 14, 2011. Based on a review of the relevant motions, suggestions filed by counsel and the applicable legal authority, the Court enters the following findings and orders:

On August 2, 2011, this Court considered a motion filed by Fr. Tierney concerning pretrial publicity. In that order, significant issues were raised considering the potential that a court order would constitute a "gag" on SNAP in violation of the First Amendment. In response to the motions, the Court entered a narrowly written order. Nothing in that order prevented SNAP from speaking on issues pertaining to the litigation or the parties. The order does provide:

Counsel for the parties in this litigation shall not make, induce or assist any other person to make any extrajudicial statement that a reasonable person would expect to be disseminated by means of public communication if the lawyer knows or reasonably should know that it will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing the trial in this matter;

Counsel shall not make any statement for public dissemination that impugns or disparages the character, credibility, or reputation of a party or disclose any information that is likely to be inadmissible as evidence in trial but that, if disclosed, will create a substantial risk of interfering with an impartial trial.

Counsel shall not induce or assist another to make a statement prohibited by this order.

Counsel for Fr. Tierney has subpoened David Clohessy, Director of SNAP, to appear for deposition on December 8, 2011. Counsel also requests that Clohessy produce 8 categories of documents identified in that subpoena. The motions to quash raise significant issues concerning the breadth of the document requests, the potential violation of privacy interests of third-parties particularly pursuant to RSMo. §455.003, and claims they are punitive in nature, that they do not appear to seek any relevant evidence, and constitute an abuse of process. Additionally the motions claim counsel for Fr. Tierney violated the August 2, 2011, Order by revealing plaintiff's identity.

Discussion

Rule 56.01(b)(1) of the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure provides in pertinent part that "Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending action..." A review of the suggestions filed on behalf of Fr. Tierney certainly is sufficient to establish that the deposition itself is likely to include relevant information. There are, however, legitimate concerns raised about possible violations of RSMo. § 455.003, if SNAP is covered by that statute.

This litigation raises issues important to all parties. None should be permitted to avoid the responsibility to provide discovery necessary to provide for a full and fair trial on the merits of the case. Because the Court believes the deposition of Clohessy may reasonably be expected to reveal relevant information, but believes that there may well be sensitive issues addressed in such deposition, the Court enters the following orders:

WHEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff and Clohessy's motions to quash subpoena of Clohessy are DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that counsel are to cooperate to arrange for the deposition to be completed within 5 business days of the current scheduled date of December 2, 2011.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that either party may request that deposition, or portions thereof, be taken under seal.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Clohessy may prepare a privilege log identifying with particular detail any documents he believes to be privileged and the basis of the claim of privilege.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court will review in camera documents as requested by counsel except and to the extent precluded by RSMo. § 455.003.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that violations of the August 2, 2011 Order, and publication in any form of the identity of John Doe, will subject parties and/or counsel to possible imposition of sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date Nav 29,2011

The Honorable Ann Mesle

Circuit Court Judge

this	that copies wer of	, 20	to:
Rebecca	Randles, (816) 9	31-0134	
Jonathan	Haden, (816) 29	2-2001	
Brian Ma	dden, (816) 531-	-2372	
	•		

Jamie Maggard, Law Clerk, Division 7 /
Paula Gandara, Judicial Administrative Assistant