



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1711</b>		DATE: <b>3/4/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Judiciary</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>ARNIE C. "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCAT</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>In-Person</b>		SUBMIT DATE: <b>3/6/2026 11:27 PM</b>

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

**I am in Support of this Bill and Issuing Summons to Out-Of-State Parties for Depositions and Production of Discovery Information and Documents.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1711</b>		DATE: <b>3/4/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Judiciary</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>GREGORY M. GOODWIN</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>573-751-7017</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>MISSOURI ATTORNEY GENERAL's OFFICE</b>		TITLE: <b>ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>PO BOX 899</b>			
CITY: <b>JEFFERSON CITY</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>65101</b>
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: <b>3/4/2026 12:00 AM</b>	
<b>THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.</b>			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1711</b>		DATE: <b>3/4/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Judiciary</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>STEVEN CRICK</b>		PHONE NUMBER: <b>816-836-5050</b>	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: <b>HUMPHREY, FARRINGTON &amp; MCCLAIN</b>		TITLE: <b>SHAREHOLDER</b>	
ADDRESS: <b>221 W LEXINGTON AVE STE 400</b>			
CITY: <b>INDEPENDENCE</b>		STATE: <b>MO</b>	ZIP: <b>64050</b>
EMAIL: <b>sec@hfmlegal.com</b>	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>3/3/2026 8:22 PM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

My name is Steven Crick. I am an attorney in Independence with Humphrey, Farrington & McClain, P.C. I have been practicing since 1984.

It is very common in any lawsuit that some witnesses are not in Missouri. To obtain documents, other evidence or testimony from out-of-state witnesses, we must go to the state where the witness is located and request that they issue a subpoena.

Most states have adopted the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act. Here is a link to the Uniform Law Commission's webpage on this Act:  
<https://www.uniformlaws.org/committees/community-home?CommunityKey=181202a2-172d-46a1-8dcc-cdb495621d35>

Using Missouri as the example, under the Act, a Missouri attorney in need of a subpoena from another state, would obtain a completed Missouri subpoena, submit that Missouri subpoena to the clerk of the court in the jurisdiction where the witness is located, and that clerk would use that Missouri subpoena as authority for issuance of a subpoena from that court. Requesting a subpoena does not constitute an entry of appearance as an attorney in that state, which otherwise would be construed as practicing law without a license. The Act allows the attorney to obtain the subpoena and to serve it and obtain the documents or testimony or other evidence requested.

Without that Act, a party or attorney to a Missouri lawsuit would have to file an independent action in that state, retain a local attorney, and formally seek a court order allowing issuance of a subpoena through that State. This takes time and money.

Missouri requires this additional procedures for a party in a foreign action to obtain a Missouri subpoena.

While most states have enacted the UIDDD Act, some states only allow its use if the jurisdiction where the action is pending has also adopted the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act because they want their citizens to receive the same courtesy that they give.

I had this experience in Virginia. The Virginia statute states:

§ 8.01-412.14. Uniformity of application and construction; reciprocal privileges.

**In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration shall be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it. The privilege extended to persons in other states for discovery under this article shall only apply if the jurisdiction where the action is pending has extended a similar privilege to persons in the Commonwealth, by that jurisdiction's enactment of the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act, a predecessor uniform act, or another comparable law or rule of court providing substantially similar mechanisms for use by out-of-state parties.**

**Alabama, Georgia and Utah have similar requirements of reciprocity.**

**AL Code §12-21-406 (2017). It states:(b) The privilege extended to persons in other states for discovery under this article shall only apply if the jurisdiction where the action is pending has extended a similar privilege to persons in this state. Georgia has a similar requirement of reciprocity.**

**GA Code § 24-13-112(d) states: d) This Code section shall only apply to a subpoena to be issued in this state if the foreign jurisdiction that issued the foreign subpoena has adopted a version of the "Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act."**

**Utah 78B-17-103 states:( 3 ) Parties resident in another state may use the provisions of this chapter for issuance, service, or enforcement of subpoenas only if the other state has enacted this uniform act or enacted provisions substantially similar to this uniform act.**

**The UIDD Act promotes judicial economy, lessens the burdens of litigation and promotes cooperation among states.**

**On behalf of my clients, I would ask that the Missouri Legislature enact the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act.**



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
**WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM**

BILL NUMBER: <b>HB 1711</b>		DATE: <b>3/4/2026</b>	
COMMITTEE: <b>Judiciary</b>			
<b>TESTIFYING:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
<b>WITNESS NAME</b>			
<b>INDIVIDUAL:</b>			
WITNESS NAME: <b>SARAH BERRY</b>		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: <b>Written</b>	SUBMIT DATE: <b>3/4/2026 7:39 AM</b>	

**THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.**

HB 1711 adopts the Uniform Interstate Depositions and Discovery Act, allowing subpoenas issued in litigation from another state to be domesticated and enforced in Missouri through a simplified clerical process.

While interstate discovery cooperation can serve legitimate judicial efficiency goals, the structure proposed in this bill raises important procedural and due process concerns.

Under the bill, a party may submit a foreign subpoena directly to a Missouri circuit clerk, and the clerk must promptly issue a Missouri subpoena incorporating the terms of the foreign subpoena. This process occurs without prior judicial review by a Missouri judge, effectively allowing discovery demands originating in another jurisdiction to be converted into enforceable Missouri subpoenas through an administrative process.

Although parties retain the ability to move to quash or modify the subpoena after issuance, the burden is placed on the Missouri resident or entity receiving the subpoena to initiate court action to protect their rights. This framework risks subjecting Missouri individuals and businesses to discovery demands issued in out-of-state litigation before any Missouri court has evaluated the scope, relevance, or burden of the requested discovery.

Interstate discovery cooperation should not come at the expense of procedural safeguards that protect Missouri residents from improper or overly burdensome discovery demands originating outside this state.

For these reasons, HB 1711 warrants careful review to ensure that adequate judicial oversight and due process protections remain in place when foreign subpoenas are enforced within Missouri.

**Legislative Notice:**

HB 1711 authorizes the issuance of Missouri subpoenas based on foreign subpoenas through a ministerial process performed by a circuit clerk rather than through prior judicial review.

Because such subpoenas may compel testimony, document production, or inspection of property within Missouri, statutes implementing interstate discovery procedures should ensure sufficient procedural safeguards to protect Missouri residents from unduly burdensome or improper discovery demands originating from litigation outside this state.