



**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF OHIO COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA**

**IN RE: MARCELLUS SHALE LITIGATION**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 14-C-3000**

**THIS DOCUMENT APPLIES TO:**

Doug Bunch v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-176 KAN
Robert Davis v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-262 KAN
Amber B. Gaines v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-289 KAN
J. Doug Geelhaar v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-225 KAN
James R. Griffith, et al. v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 14-C-668 MON
Joshua M. Knight v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-277 KAN
Judith K. Metheny v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 14-C-1548 KAN
Vickie Nutter v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 14-C-1529 KAN
Diane Pitcock, et al. v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 14-C-45 DOD
Chelsea Powell v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-232 KAN
Chad Richards, et al. v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-179 KAN
Guy William Sheely, Jr. v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-202 KAN
Robert E. Shields v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-201 KAN
William Jeb Stewart, et al. v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-181 KAN
John D. Wilhide v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-200 KAN
David E. Wright v. Antero Resources, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-C-182 KAN

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

The Court has reviewed Plaintiffs' *Motion for Protective Order* filed in the above-referenced cases on May 28, 2015 (Transaction ID 57306499) and *Antero Resources Corporation's Response in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Protective Order* filed on June 9, 2015 (Transaction ID 57379039).

Having conferred with one another to insure uniformity of their decisions, as contemplated by Trial Court Rule 26.07(a), the Presiding Judges assigned to the Marcellus Shale Litigation unanimously **FIND** that the 15 depositions noticed by Defendant Antero Resources Corporation (Antero) on May 26, 2015, are not unduly burdensome and, therefore, Plaintiffs' motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiffs' objection to the additional depositions on the ground that the cases have yet to be set for trial is without merit. The August 26, 27 and 28, 2015 mediation applies to all cases in

the Marcellus Shale Litigation, not just the Harrison County Cherry Camp Trial Group. The *Order Governing Mediation and Mediation Statements* (Transaction ID 57113741), which applied to the Harrison County Cherry Camp Trial Group, was amended to apply to all cases in the Marcellus Shale Litigation. See *Amended Order Governing Mediation and Mediation Statements* (Transaction ID 57121505). Accordingly, Antero may complete such discovery as is reasonably necessary to fairly evaluate Marcellus Shale Litigation cases between now and commencement of mediation on August 26, 2015.

The Panel notes and preserves the objections of any party aggrieved by this Order.

It is so **ORDERED**.

**ENTER:** June 11, 2015.

/s/ Alan D. Moats  
Lead Presiding Judge  
Marcellus Shale Litigation