

Magistrate Judge Jennifer C. Boal: ELECTRONIC ORDER entered. The parties have engaged in over two months of negotiations regarding search terms in connection with the Defendants' review of electronically stored information in this case. At the September 14, 2026, case management conference, the Court directed the parties to continue to confer and, if they were unable to resolve their disputes, then each side should provide proposed search terms to the Court. Given the complexity of the case, and as explained by the Court at the conference, the Court indicated that it would pick one side's proposal in total rather than engage in a term-by-term resolution of the disputes. The Plaintiffs and all Defendants with the exception of Zelis and Aetna have resolved their disputes. Because Judge Murphy granted Aetna's motion to dismiss on September 30, 2026, disputes as to search terms for Aetna are now moot. After careful review of the parties' proffered terms and arguments, this Court finds that Zelis' proposal is more reasonable and aligns more closely with the guidelines of Rules 1 and 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Zelis shall use those search terms. Notwithstanding that decision, this Court notes Zelis' offer that it remains open to conferring with Plaintiffs about gaps in Zelis' production following its application of the search terms "including through targeted 'go-get' searches." Docket No. 343 at 4. Zelis should do so. (AHH) (Entered: 10/05/2026)