IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF COMANCHE COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

NEIL & LACY WEST,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CJ-2025-135
	)	
STATE FARM FIRE & CASUALTY COMPANY and NANCY HOLCOMB INS.AGENCY, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

FILED
DISTRICT COURT
COMANCHE COUNTY, OKLAHOMA
November 3, 2026 5:19 PM
ROBERT MORALES, COURT CLERK
Case Number CJ-2025-135

DEFENDANT STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY COMPANY'S EMERGENCY MOTION TO STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO ENFORCE THIS COURT'S AUGUST 14, 2026 ORDER DENYING STATE FARM'S MOTION TO QUASH JON FARNEY'S DEPOSITION

Defendant State Farm Fire and Casualty Company ("State Farm") moves on an emergency basis to strike Plaintiffs' October 27, 2026 Motion to Enforce This Court's August 14, 2026 Minute Order Denying State Farm's Motion to Quash Jon Farney's Deposition (herein, "Motion to Enforce" or "Plaintiffs' Motion"). On October 27, Plaintiffs filed their Motion on the public docket identical to a motion they filed in a separate case, *Hursh v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, No. CJ-2025-2626 (Okla. Cty.) (herein, "*Hursh*"), which attaches—as Exhibit 3—an internal State Farm Senior Executive Offsite ("SEO") memorandum (herein, the "Confidential Document") that was produced in *Hursh* and unambiguously designated "**Confidential Produced Pursuant to Protective Order**." Further, Plaintiffs' Motion quotes from and describes the content of this protected document without redaction.[1]

[1] This Motion is a façade for the filing of this Confidential SEO document of public record because there is no dispute as to the presentation of Mr. Farney for deposition. The parties were continuing to work on an agreed date when this motion was filed. However, that violation is not the point of this Motion.

The *Hursh* Court's Protective Order is unambiguous. A party ***may not*** publicly file a document produced in that case and designated as "Confidential" without permission of the producing party or the Court. Plaintiffs have permission from neither. Plaintiffs' Motion must thus be stricken and removed from the public docket to preserve the confidentiality of the Confidential Document.

BACKGROUND

The Confidential Document has been the subject of a month-long dispute in *Hursh* regarding attorney-client work product and privilege. The Confidential Document, produced in *Hursh* and Bates-numbered HUR00158701–19, is a draft, internal State Farm memorandum containing legal advice from two State Farm in-house attorneys (in Microsoft Word comment bubbles, track changes, and in-line comments). State Farm, in the course of producing hundreds of thousands of documents in this case and elsewhere, inadvertently produced two versions of that memorandum—one being the Confidential Document—with incomplete privilege redactions.

State Farm learned it had inadvertently produced the Confidential Document in the context of a September 17, 2026 deposition in this case, when Plaintiffs' counsel (also Plaintiffs' counsel in *Hursh*) marked a copy of the memorandum containing the incomplete redactions as Exhibit 133 to the deposition. (*See id.* at 4.) State Farm's counsel promptly notified Plaintiffs' counsel that Exhibit 133 might contain inadvertently disclosed privileged communications and information and that State Farm was investigating further. On September 22, 2026, State Farm's counsel sent Plaintiffs' counsel a clawback letter asserting privilege over the Confidential Document and requesting that Plaintiffs' counsel destroy and return all copies of it.

On September 23, 2026, Plaintiffs' counsel filed the Confidential Document in *Hursh* (under seal) as Exhibit 14 to Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority Regarding Plaintiffs'

Motion to De-Designate in regard to other documents (herein, "*Hursh* Notice"). In the *Hursh* Notice, Plaintiffs acknowledged that "despite disagreeing that . . . documents filed as Exhibits to this Motion meet the standard for filing under seal, Plaintiffs are currently forced to file under seal to cooperate with State Farm's overbroad designations of confidentiality on documents sought to be used in public pleadings." (9/23/2026 Pls.' Notice at 7.) Plaintiffs further asserted that because "this [*Hursh*] Court will be hearing Plaintiffs' Motion to De-Designate on Monday, September 28 . . . Plaintiffs explicitly request this Court [also] de-designate Exhibit 14." (*Id.* at 8; *see also id.* at 18 ("Plaintiffs respectfully request an Order de-designating Exhibits 14–16 as not confidential to prevent any argument about its use next week in key corporate representative depositions.").) Plaintiffs also argued that the Confidential Document was not protected by the attorney-client privilege. (*Id.* at 12.)

In this case, Plaintiffs ***did not request*** that the Court de-designate the Confidential Document. Despite filing a copy of the document—under seal—on September 18, 2026 as an exhibit to a filing wholly unrelated to it (*see* 9/18/2026 Pls.' Reply to Mot. to Compel), Plaintiffs did not move to de-designate the document.

The *Hursh* Court ***did not grant*** the *Hursh* Plaintiffs' request to de-designate the Confidential Document (Exhibit 14 to the *Hursh* Notice) or remove in any way its protections under the *Hursh* Protective Order.[2] Rather, on September 28, the *Hursh* Court entered a Minute Order de-designating "11 documents" comprised of "Exhibits 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 19 [to Plaintiffs' original Motion to De-Designate]; Exhibits 4–6 and 12 to Plaintiffs' Reply ISO De-Designation; and Exhibit 16 to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Authority Regarding Plaintiffs' Motion to

[2] Nor, in any event, was Plaintiffs' last-minute request, in a "Notice of Supplemental Authority" regarding the confidentiality of entirely different documents, procedurally proper under the *Hursh* Protective Order.

De-Designate." (*See* 9/28/2026 Minute Order, at 1.) At the September 28 hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion to De-Designate, the *Hursh* Court allowed State Farm one week (until October 5) to file a supplemental brief supporting its assertions of attorney-client and work product privilege regarding the document.

On October 5, 2026, in accordance with the *Hursh* Court's guidance at the September 28 and September 29 hearings, State Farm filed its Privilege Brief, describing the privileged nature of the Confidential Document. The *Hursh* Plaintiffs responded on October 23, 2026. (*See* 10/23/2026 Pls.' Resp. & Obj. (herein, "Privilege Objection").) In their Privilege Objection, the *Hursh* Plaintiffs did not renew their earlier request that the Court deem the Confidential document non-confidential. Instead, and as set forth in detail in the final paragraph of Plaintiffs' Privilege Objection, the *Hursh* Plaintiffs requested that the *Hursh* Court "sustain no redaction" to the Confidential Document, "order production of all business content, including all text that appears in the pre-review drafts [of the memorandum in question]," find that State Farm waived privilege, and "deny State Farm's requests to strike, compel destruction, and stay." (*See id.* at 20.)

On October 26, the *Hursh* Court held a hearing on the privilege question. At that hearing, the sole question before the *Hursh* Court was whether the Confidential Document was privileged—that Court did not rule on or even consider State Farm's designation of the document as Confidential pursuant to the Protective Order. The *Hursh* Court, over State Farm's objections, ruled that the Confidential Document "was not created in anticipation of litigation and is not protected work-product, nor attorney-client privileged." (*See* 10/26/2026 Minute Order at 1.) The *Hursh* Court further ruled that "State Farm is entitled to its appellate rights but the request for a stay pending appeal is denied." (*Id.*) The *Hursh* Court's Minute Order in no way addressed,

directly or indirectly, State Farm's designation of the document as Confidential pursuant to the *Hursh* Protective Order.

The next day, State Farm filed an application for a writ regarding the *Hursh* Court's Minute Order with the Oklahoma Supreme Court. On the same day, Plaintiffs filed their Motion to Enforce in this case, appending the Confidential Document and describing it in the body of the Motion. (*See* Pls.' Mot. at 2–3, Ex. 3.)

DISCOVERY CONFERENCE

Counsel for State Farm has conferred with counsel for Plaintiff but as of the date of this filing, the matter is not resolved.

ARGUMENT AND AUTHORITY

I. PLAINTIFFS' FILING OF THE CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT ON THE PUBLIC RECORD VIOLATES THE *HURSH* PROTECTIVE ORDER.

Plaintiffs' Motion to Enforce violates the *Hursh* Court's December 11, 2025 Protective Order by publicly filing, quoting, and describing the Confidential Document. The *Hursh* Protective Order unambiguously provides that a document designated as "Confidential" ***may not*** be filed publicly on a court's docket or otherwise publicly disseminated. Pursuant to the Orders, "[d]ocuments and/or deposition transcripts designated as 'Confidential' ***shall not be disseminated publicly***" and may be disclosed only to an enumerated list of persons "unless prior written consent to further disclosure has been obtained from counsel for the designating party or permission for such disclosure has been given by the Court." (Prot. Order ¶ 5 (emphasis added).) Further, when "any materials specifically designated as 'Confidential' under this Protective Order" are filed, they

must "be submitted in a sealed envelope or other container, and shall be prominently labeled on the first page: 'Contains Confidential Information – Subject to Court Order.'" (*Id.* ¶ 6.)[3]

Every page of the Confidential Document is clearly designated as "Confidential Produced Pursuant to the Protective Order." (*See* Pls.' Mot. at Ex. 3.) Plaintiffs are well aware of this designation—as demonstrated by their prior filing of the document under seal in this case on September 18, 2026, and their counsel's filing of the document under seal in *Hursh* on September 23, 2026. Plaintiffs' counsel are also well aware that they were not entitled to file or otherwise use the document publicly absent a ruling from the *Hursh* Court giving them permission to do so. Indeed, on September 23, Plaintiffs' counsel in *Hursh* "explicitly requested" that the *Hursh* Court de-designate the Confidential Document. (*Id.* at 8 ("Plaintiffs explicitly request this Court de-designate Exhibit 14"); *id.* at 18 ("Plaintiffs respectfully request an Order de-designating Exhibits 14–16 as not confidential to prevent any argument about its use next week in key corporate representative depositions.").)

Plaintiffs did not request that the Confidential Document be de-designated in this case. Further, the *Hursh* Court ***did not grant*** Plaintiffs' counsel's demand to de-designate the Confidential Document in that case. In response to the *Hursh* Plaintiffs' "explicit request[ ]" that the *Hursh* Court strip the confidentiality protection from the Confidential Document, that Court entered a Minute Order denying the request (albeit granting the *Hursh* Plaintiffs' requests as to

---

[3] The *Hursh* Protective Order further establishes a procedure to "challenge any other party's designation of a document or portion of a document as 'Confidential.'" (*Id.* ¶ 4.) Under Paragraph 4, the challenging party must first "provide to the producing party written notice of its disagreement with the designation." The producing party may then "respond, in writing, within twenty (20) days, by stating whether it agrees or disagrees that designation should be removed." The parties must "attempt to dispose of such dispute in good faith on an informal basis." Only after completing that process, "the producing party shall have thirty (30) days to submit a motion for relief from the Court." (*Id.*)

other State Farm documents). (*See Hursh* 9/28/26 Minute Order at 1.) There is nothing ambiguous about the *Hursh* Court's September 28, 2026 Minute Order in that regard. Indeed, while the *Hursh* Court specifically granted the *Hursh* Plaintiffs' request to de-designate Exhibit 16 to their Notice of Supplemental Authority, the *Hursh* Court did not do so for Exhibit 14 (the Confidential Document). (*See id.*)

The Confidential Document was designated "Confidential" pursuant to the *Hursh* Protective Order. It was never de-designated, neither Plaintiffs nor their counsel ever obtained an order overruling State Farm's designation. As such, Plaintiffs' Motion to Enforce violates the *Hursh* Court's Protective Order.

II. THE COURT MUST STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO ENFORCE AND IMMEDIATELY REMOVE IT FROM THE PUBLIC DOCKET.

The Court has the inherent authority to control its own docket and may therefore strike material from the record. *Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 44–45 (1991); *United States v. Miljus*, No. CIV-06-1832-PK, 2009 WL 2095981, at *1 (D. Or. Feb. 19, 2009), *report and recommendation adopted*, No. CIV. 06-1832-PK, 2009 WL 1211307 (D. Or. May 1, 2009). Further, Courts have long recognized that protective orders preventing the public filing of confidential business information and trade secrets play an important role in litigation. Indeed, Oklahoma law expressly empowers courts to enter protective orders regarding the use of confidential information produced during discovery. Section 3226(C) of the Discovery Code—which mirrors its federal counterpart in Rule 26(c)[4]—permits the Court to enter "any order which justice requires to protect a party from . . . annoyance, harassment, embarrassment, oppression or

[4] "Section[] 3226 . . . [has its] conceptual origins in [its] counterpart[] found in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26 . . . ." *State ex rel. Okla. State Bd. of Med. Licensure & Supervision v. Rivero*, 2021 OK 31, ¶ 79, 489 P.3d 36, 64.

undue delay, burden or expense including . . . *that a trade secret or other confidential research, development or commercial information not be disclosed or be disclosed only in a designated way*." 12 O.S. § 3226(C)(1)(g) (emphasis added).[5] Thus, courts across jurisdictions, including in cases involving State Farm, have extended protections to exactly the type of information at issue here—recognizing that disclosure of such information outside the instant litigation may result in competitive injury. *See, e.g., Ortez v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, No. 17-CV-01202, 2018 WL 11237901, at *2–3 (D. Colo. Oct. 29, 2018) (finding that internal manuals were entitled to protection because defendant "would lose its competitive advantage if these manuals were publicly available—its competitors could replicate UPS's methods and procedures, which it expended significant time and financial resources to develop."); *Jones v. Nationwide Ins. Co.*, No. 3:98-CV-2108, 2000 WL 1231402 (M.D. Pa. July 20, 2000) (ordering that "all [produced] documentation, including all company policies and all claims manuals, are to be kept confidential, for the eyes of plaintiff's counsel only"); *Toy v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, No. CV 23-4095, 2025 WL 1179459, at *4 (E.D. La. Apr. 23, 2025) (finding that "State Farm ha[d] established good cause for issuance of [a] protective order treating its claims handling policies, procedures and methodologies as confidential and limiting the[ir] use and disclosure . . . to purposes of this litigation").

Plaintiffs' Motion to Enforce was filed in violation of the *Hursh* Protective Order. As such, it should be stricken immediately. *See Lin v. CGIT Sys., Inc.*, No. CV 20-11051-JGD, 2023 WL

---

[5] *See also Farrimond v. State ex rel. Fisher*, 2000 OK 52, ¶ 21, 8 P.3d 872, 876–77 ("Section 3226(C) of the Discovery Code vests the court with discretion to enter appropriate protective orders to protect the confidentiality of discovered information in appropriate circumstances"); *YWCA of Oklahoma City v. Melson*, 1997 OK 81, ¶ 25 n.41, 944 P.2d 304, 310, 311 n.41; *Barnes v. United* States, No. 12-CV-282, 2013 WL 4507596, at *1 (N.D. Okla. Aug. 22, 2013) (indicating that protection under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) "may include protection of trade secret, or other confidential research, development, or commercial information"); *Integrated Dentistry, P.A. v. Integrative Dental Specialists, PLLC*, No. 5:19-CV-05090, 2020 WL 488286, at *1 (W.D. Ark. Jan. 30, 2020) ("Confidential commercial information falls squarely within the ambit" of Rule 26).

12023448, at *3 (D. Mass. Sept. 29, 2023) (where a party improperly filed a privileged document, "[the producing party] is entitled to have the email stricken from the record."); *Radiance Aluminum Fence, Inc. v. Marquis Metal Material, Inc.*, 335 F.R.D. 371, 377 (E.D. Mich. 2020).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Court should strike Plaintiffs' Motion to Enforce and its Exhibit 3 as in violation of the *Hursh* Protective Order.

Respectfully submitted,

Timila S. Rother, OBA #14310
Paige A. Masters, OBA #31142
Amanda M. Finch, OBA #34650
CROWE DUNLEVY
A Professional Corporation
Braniff Building
324 N. Robinson Ave.
Suite 100
Oklahoma City, OK 73102-8273
(405) 235-7700
(405) 239-6651 (Facsimile)
timila.rother@crowedunlevy.com
paige.masters@crowedunlevy.com
amanda.finch@crowedunlevy.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing was served by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, this 3rd day of November, 2026, to:

Reggie N. Whitten
Michael Burrage
Blake Sonne
Hannah Whitten
John S. Sanders
Jake Denne
WHITTEN BURRAGE
512 North Broadway Avenue, Suite 300
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

Brad W. Burgess
Colby A. Stephenson
BURGESS & HIGHTOWER LAW FIRM
21 NW 44th Street, Suite 201
Lawton, Oklahoma 73505

R. Ryan Deligans
DURBIN, LARIMORE & BIALICK
920 North Harvey
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

Timila S. Rother