

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

**IN RE: CHANGE HEALTHCARE, INC.
CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH
LITIGATION**

Case No. 24-md-3108 (DWF/DJF)

PRETRIAL ORDER NO. 11

This Order Applies to All Actions

This matter is before the Court on the Plaintiffs’ Motion to Lift the Stay of Discovery for the Limited Purpose of Conducting Discovery Related to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (“Motion”) (ECF No. 296) and the parties’¹ Joint Stipulation Regarding Lift of The Discovery Stay for the Limited Purpose of Plaintiffs Serving Discovery Related to Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss For Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (“Joint Stipulation”) (ECF No. 306). Plaintiffs filed their Motion on April 4, 2025 (ECF No. 296). They asked the Court to lift the stay of discovery the Court issued as part of its August 14, 2024 Pretrial Order No. 1 (ECF No. 54), and its February 19, 2025 Text-Only order (ECF No. 216), for the limited purpose of serving discovery related to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (ECF No. 250). In lieu of a response to the Motion, the parties’ filed the Joint Stipulation. Based on the parties’ agreement and for good cause shown, the Court approves the Joint Stipulation and denies Plaintiffs’ Motion as moot as follows:

1. The current stay of discovery shall be lifted for the limited purpose of permitting Plaintiffs to serve personal jurisdiction discovery on those Defendants asserting personal

¹ Plaintiffs and Defendants include all those named in the Consolidated Complaints filed on January 15, 2025. *Total Care Dental and Orthodontics, et al. v. UnitedHealth Group Inc., et al.*, 25-cv-179 (D. Minn.) (ECF No. 1); *Christenson, et al. v. UnitedHealth Group Inc., et al.*, 25-cv-183 (D. Minn.) (ECF No. 1).

jurisdiction defenses, namely, Change Healthcare Inc. and Change Healthcare Operations (the “Personal Jurisdiction Defendants”).

2. Because Plaintiffs have agreed to limit the Defendants subject to this personal jurisdiction discovery, the Personal Jurisdiction Defendants agree not to take the position that the personal jurisdiction discovery Plaintiffs request is outside of the Personal Jurisdiction Defendants’ possession, custody, and control, provided that such discovery is in the possession, custody, and control of other Defendants in the above-captioned matter. The Personal Jurisdiction Defendants may still raise other objections as to burden and scope objections.

3. This stipulation relates only to lifting the stay and limiting the specific Defendants subject to the discovery and does not constitute an agreement that Plaintiffs’ request for personal jurisdiction discovery is proper. The Personal Jurisdiction Defendants expressly reserve all rights to object to Plaintiffs’ personal jurisdiction discovery requests on any and all grounds.

4. The stay of discovery shall otherwise remain in full force and effect

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 14, 2025

s/ Dulce J. Foster

DULCE J. FOSTER

United States Magistrate Judge