CADWALADER

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP New York London Charlotte Washington Beijing

700 Sixth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20001 Tel +1 202 862 2200 Fax +1 202 862 2400 www.cadwalader.com

January 24, 2011

BY CM/ECF

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe Clerk of the Court United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007

Re: <u>TradeComet.com LLC v. Google Inc., No.: 10-0911 - Letter under Rule 28(j)</u>

Dear Ms. Wolfe,

Plaintiff-Appellant TradeComet.com LLC ("TradeComet") submits this letter pursuant to Rule 28(j) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure to advise this Court of the most recent decision by a district court in the Southern District of New York relating to the issues raised by TradeComet in this appeal.

In Chiste v. Hotels.com LP, Nos. 08 Civ. 10676, 08 Civ. 10744, 08 Civ. 10746, 10 Civ. 07522, 2010 WL 4630317 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 15, 2010), Judge Colleen McMahon was presented with a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(3) or, in the alternative, to transfer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), based upon a forum provision that selected state and federal forums in Texas as the only permissible fora. Id. at *1.

With regard to a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(1), the court held "[a] forumselection clause does not divest a federal court of subject matter jurisdiction, so it would not be appropriate to dismiss the case pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1)." *Id.* at *5.

With regard to Rule 12(b)(3), the court held that "[v]enue is governed by statute, and the parties' agreement to litigate elsewhere does not change the fact that venue is statutorily proper here. It is therefore misleading to dismiss [the] suit for improper venue under Rule 12(b)(3)." *Id.*

CADWALADER

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe January 24, 2011

Ultimately, the court concluded that "[s]ince the case cannot be dismissed for lack of either subject-matter jurisdiction or venue, the only mechanism for enforcing the forum-selection clause is a transfer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)." Id. at *6 (emphasis supplied).

As Google admits in its letter dated January 19, 2011, the supplemental authorities it has brought to the Court's attention "do not address[] specifically the argument advanced in TradeComet's briefs that transfer under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) is the only means of enforcing a forum selection clause when transfer to a domestic federal forum is possible." *Chiste*, by contrast, addresses precisely those arguments, *see* TradeComet Br. 17-21; TradeComet Reply Br. 5-9, and concludes that § 1404(a) is the only proper procedural vehicle by which to consider whether to enforce such a provision.

Sincerely.

Charles F. Rule

cc: All Counsel (by CM/ECF)