

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Sheila Gluesing v. PrudentRx LLC and Caremark Rx, LLC

Gluesing · No. No. 24-cv-549-JJM-AEM · Decided February 24, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island sustains Sheila Gluesing’s objection to a magistrate judge’s denial of her motion to compel discovery. The court clarifies that discovery concerning economic duress related to an arbitration provision may include systemic and structural aspects of the PrudentRx program, not only evidence of duress personally experienced by Gluesing. The court vacates the magistrate judge’s order, grants the motion to compel, and directs defendants to respond to specified requests for production.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John J. McConnell, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island
DECIDED	February 24, 2026
DOCKET	No. 24-cv-549-JJM-AEM
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff objected under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) to a magistrate judge's non-dispositive order denying her motion to compel discovery concerning economic duress and arbitration.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), a district court may modify or set aside a magistrate judge's order on a non-dispositive matter if the order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Discovery-management decisions are reviewed for abuse of discretion, and factual findings are accepted unless the court forms a strong and unyielding belief that a mistake has been made.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum and order
PARTIES	Sheila Gluesing v. PrudentRx LLC, Caremark Rx, LLC

TOPICS

discovery dispute

arbitration

civil procedure

contracts

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

arbitration

ERISA

health law

contracts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the magistrate judge's denial of Gluesing's motion to compel discovery was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
2. Whether discovery authorized to develop Gluesing's economic-duress opposition to arbitration may include evidence concerning structural or systemic features of the PrudentRx program and the experiences of other targeted patients.

HOLDINGS

1. Discovery authorized to develop Gluesing's opposition to arbitration was not limited to economic duress personally felt by Gluesing. It properly included relevant discovery concerning whether CVS Specialty's Terms of Use were structured to coerce arbitration through economic duress, including structural aspects of the PrudentRx program and whether other individuals may have been subjected to similar economic pressure.
2. The magistrate judge's order denying the motion to compel was vacated because it construed the district court's prior discovery order too narrowly and was contrary to the scope of discovery authorized by that order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Rather, the purpose of the limited discovery order was to allow Ms. Gluesing to fully develop a record that would allow her to properly oppose Defendants' request for arbitration." (Discussion)

"The Court finds that discovery limited to Ms. Gluesing's claim that CVS Specialty's Terms of Use are structured to coerce arbitration of claims through economic duress is appropriate." (Discussion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Gluesing alleged that PrudentRx, Caremark, and CVS Specialty Pharmacy engaged in a scheme to overcharge individuals for prescription medications. Defendants sought to compel arbitration under CVS Specialty Pharmacy's Terms of Use, and Gluesing argued that she entered the agreement under economic duress because of structural and financial pressures associated with the pharmacy program. The district court authorized limited discovery concerning economic duress, but the magistrate judge interpreted that order as restricting discovery to facts unique to Gluesing and her specific health plan.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Gluesing sued PrudentRx LLC and Caremark Rx, LLC under ERISA and RICO, alleging a scheme involving overcharges for prescription medications. Defendants moved to compel arbitration based on CVS Specialty

Pharmacy's Terms of Use. The district court denied the motion without prejudice and authorized limited discovery concerning whether Gluesing was subjected to economic duress when agreeing to the arbitration provision. After the magistrate judge denied Gluesing's motion to compel discovery, the district court sustained her objection, vacated the magistrate judge's order, and granted the motion to compel.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. Defendants must fully respond to RFP Nos. 1, 3, and 6 within 20 days. Defendants may file a renewed motion to compel arbitration within 30 days after producing the documents.

CASES CITED

- 333 F.3d 38, 41 (1st Cir. 2003)
- 2025 WL 2723554, at *5 (D. Me. Sept. 24, 2025)
- 279 F.R.D. 62, 64 (D. Mass. 2012)
- 160 F. Supp. 3d 431, 433 (D. Mass. 2016)
- 199 F.3d 1, 4 (1st Cir. 1999)