1	James M. Finberg (State Bar No. 114850)			
2	Barry R. Himmelstein (State Bar No. 157736) Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857)			
3	Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260) LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339			
4				
5	Telephone: (415) 956-1000 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008 jfinberg@lchb.com bhimmelstein@lchb.com			
6				
7	msobol@lchb.com efastiff@lchb.com			
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class			
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
11	(San Francisco Division)			
12				
13	TASH HEPTING, et al., ,	Case No. C-06-0672-VRW		
14	Plaintiffs,	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD		
15	v.	BE RELATED		
16	AT&T CORP., et al.,			
17	Defendants.	The Honorable Vaughn R. Walker		
18	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	The Honorable Vaugilli R. Walker		
19	Roe, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al.,			
20	case no. C-06-03467 MMC			
21				
22	TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:			
23	Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12, plaintiffs Benson B. Roe and Paul Goltz respectfully			
24	submit this administrative motion to consider whether a case filed in this District, <i>Roe</i> , et al. v.			
25	AT&T Corp., et al., case no. C-06-03467-MMC (filed May 30, 2006) ("Roe"), should be related			
26	to another case filed in this District, Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp. et al., case no. C-06-0672-			
27	VRW ("Hepting").			
28				
	540902.1	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED CASE NO. C-06-0672-VRW		

1	Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(d)(2), plaintiffs state that Roe names the same		
2	defendants as named in Hepting (i.e., AT&T Corp. and AT&T Inc.) and that both Roe and		
3	Hepting allege that these defendants violated federal communications statutes and the California		
4	Unfair Competition Law by illegally providing the federal government with AT&T's customers'		
5	telecommunications records. (Roe names additional AT&T corporate entities.) Plaintiffs in Roe		
6	and <i>Hepting</i> raise causes of actions for violations of 28 U.S.C. § 2702, 47 U.S.C. § 605, and		
7	California Bus. & Prof. Code §§17200, et seq. (Hepting includes additional causes of action that		
8	Roe does not include.)		
9	Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(a)(2), it appears likely that there will be an unduly		
10	burdensome duplication of labor and expense or the possibility of conflicting results if the cases		
11	are conducted before different Judges.		
12	Dated: June 5, 2006	Respectfully submitted,	
13			
14		By: /s/Eric B. Fastiff	
15		Eric B. Fastiff	
16		James M. Finberg Barry R. Himmelstein	
17		Michael W. Sobol Eric B. Fastiff	
18		LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor	
19		San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: (415) 956-1000 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008	
20		` '	
21		Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Benson B. Roe and Paul Goltz	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

PROOF OF SERVICE BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

2	I am a citizen of the United States and employed in San Francisco County,		
3	California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My		
4	business address is Embarcadero Center West, 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor, San Francisco,		
5	California 94111-3339. On June 5, 2006, I caused to be deposited with Federal Express, a true		
6	and correct copy of the within documents:		
7	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED		
8	in a sealed envelope, addressed to the parties in Roe, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., case no. C 06-		
9	03467 MMC as follows:		
10			
11	AT&T CORP. c/o CT Corporation System	PACIFIC BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY c/o CT Corporation System	
12	818 West Seventh St. Los Angeles, CA 90017	818 West Seventh St. Los Angeles, CA 90017	
13	AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF	AT&T INC.	
14	CALIFORNIA, INC. c/o CT Corporation System	c/o CT Corporation System 350 N. St. Paul	
15	818 West Seventh St. Los Angeles, CA 90017	Dallas, TX 75201	
16	SBC LONG DISTANCE, LLC		
17	c/o CT Corporation System 818 West Seventh St.		
18	Los Angeles, CA 90017		
19	Following ordinary business pra	ctices, the envelope was sealed and placed for	

20 21

22

23

was made.

24

25

26

27

28

collection by Federal Express on this date, and would, in the ordinary course of business, be retrieved by Federal Express for overnight delivery on this date.

I declare that I am a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service

Service on the parties to Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp. et al., case no. C-06-0672-VRW was made by electronic filing using the Court's CM/ECF system.

Executed on June 5, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

\s\ Barry R. Himmelstein Barry R. Himmelstein