

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

LAWRENCE E. JAFFE PENSION)	
PLAN, ON BEHALF OF ITSELF)	
AND ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY)	
SITUATED,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	02 C 5893
)	
HOUSEHOLD INTERNATIONAL, INC.,)	
ET AL.,)	Judge Ronald A. Guzmán
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

At the status hearing held on April 7, 2011, lead plaintiffs, PACE Industry Union-Management Pension Fund, International Union of Operating Engineers Local No. 132 Pension Plan and Glickenhau & Co., notified the Court that several custodian banks have expressed concern regarding the difficulty of obtaining the investor clients' answers to a discovery inquiry on the claim form prior to the claim deadline of May 24, 2011.¹ This difficulty arises from the fact that although these custodian banks are authorized to file claims on behalf of their clients, they were not the decision-makers regarding the relevant investments as to those clients. Thus, to obtain an answer to the discovery inquiry, such custodian banks must identify, and transmit the discovery inquiry to, each


¹ The proof of claim form consists of the claimant's identification and schedule of transactions in Household common stock. In addition to the proof of claim, the Court included a discovery inquiry that speaks to the reliance issue. The inquiry reads: "If you had known at the time of your purchase of Household stock that defendants' false and misleading statements had the effect of inflating the price of Household stock and thereby caused you to pay more for Household stock than you should have paid, would you have still purchased the stock at the inflated price that you paid?" A claimant is asked to check either the "yes" or "no" box.

relevant decision-maker. This complication is further compounded by the sheer volume of class members for whom they would be submitting claims.² Plaintiffs' counsel, correctly so, informed such banks that May 24, 2011 is the deadline for the submission of claims, but they now seek guidance from the Court as to whether additional time may be granted in order for the custodian banks to obtain answers to the discovery inquiry after their investor clients' claims have been timely filed.

The Court holds that the facts before it at this juncture do not necessitate extending the claim deadline for filing the claimant's identification and schedule of transactions in Household common stock. However, given the nature of the difficulties facing the custodian banks (as well as others that may be in the same or similar situation as the custodian banks) in obtaining answers to the discovery inquiry, the Court grants plaintiffs leave to propose a plan by May 6, 2011 as to the most efficient way to proceed in order to obtain responses to the discovery inquiry, including but not limited to an estimate of the number of claims that would require an extension of time in which to respond to the discovery inquiry, the requisite time frame and the manner and scope of any notification of the extension.

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: April 11, 2011


RONALD A. GUZMAN
United States District Judge

² The representative of one custodian bank estimated that it may have 8,000 to 10,000 investor clients who engaged in transactions in Household common stock during the Damages Period. Similarly, a representative of another custodian bank estimated that 4,500 to 5,000 of its investor clients engaged in transactions in Household common stock during the same period.