

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
 BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342  
 2 DAVID L. ANDERSON #149604  
 JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134  
 3 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855  
 BRIAN J. WONG #226940  
 4 50 Fremont Street  
 Post Office Box 7880  
 5 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880  
 Telephone: (415) 983-1000  
 6 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200  
 Email: [bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com)

7  
 8 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
 DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 9 DAVID L. LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 10 1501 K Street, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 11 Telephone: (202) 736-8010  
 Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

12 Attorneys for Defendants  
 13 AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17  
 18 TASH HEPTING, GREGORY HICKS,  
 CAROLYN JEWEL and ERIK KNUTZEN  
 19 on Behalf of Themselves and All Others  
 Similarly Situated,  
 20  
 Plaintiffs,  
 21  
 vs.  
 22 AT&T CORP., AT&T INC. and DOES 1-20,  
 23 inclusive,  
 24 Defendants.

No. C-06-0672-VRW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
 DEFENDANT AT&T INC.'S  
 MOTION TO DISMISS  
 PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED  
 COMPLAINT**

Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor  
 Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker

25  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 On April 28, 2006, defendant AT&T Inc. moved pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2) of the  
2 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to dismiss plaintiffs' Amended Complaint for Damages,  
3 Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (Dkt. 8) for lack of personal jurisdiction over AT&T Inc.

4 On June 8, 2006, the motion duly came on for hearing before the Court, the Hon.  
5 Vaughn R. Walker, United States District Chief Judge, presiding. Having considered  
6 AT&T Inc.'s motion, plaintiffs' opposition thereto, AT&T Inc.'s reply and the oral  
7 arguments presented by counsel for the parties, and good cause appearing,

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

9 1. The motion is hereby GRANTED on the ground that the Court has neither  
10 general nor specific jurisdiction over AT&T Inc. because AT&T Inc. lacks the requisite  
11 contacts with the State of California.

12 2. Accordingly, the Amended Complaint for Damages, Declaratory and  
13 Injunctive Relief, filed by plaintiffs Tash Hepting, Gregory Hicks, Carolyn Jewel and Erik  
14 Knutzen on February 22, 2006 (Dkt. 8), is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice as to  
15 defendant AT&T Inc.

16

17 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Vaughn R. Walker  
United States District Chief Judge

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28