

DEC 15 2006

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE

DOCKET NO. 1791

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

**IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS
RECORDS LITIGATION**

Mink v. AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc., et al., E.D. Missouri,

C.A. No. 4:06-cv-01113

Shubert, et al. v. Bush, et al., E.D. New York,

C.A. No. 1:06-cv-02282

Center for Constitutional Rights, et al. v. Bush, et al., S.D. New York,

C.A. No. 1:06-cv-00313

Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc., et al. v. Bush, et al., D. Oregon,

C.A. No. 3:06-cv-00274

**BEFORE WM. TERRELL HODGES, CHAIRMAN, D. LOWELL JENSEN, J.
FREDERICK MOTZ, ROBERT L. MILLER, JR., KATHRYN H. VRATIL,
DAVID R. HANSEN AND ANTHONY J. SCIRICA, JUDGES OF THE PANEL**

TRANSFER ORDER

Before the Panel are motions brought, pursuant to Rule 7.4, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001), by plaintiffs in these four actions to vacate the portion of a Panel order conditionally transferring the actions to the Northern District of California for inclusion in the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings occurring there in this docket. Federal Government defendants in the actions pending in the Eastern District of New York, Southern District of New York, and District of Oregon oppose the motions filed with respect to those actions, and telecommunication company defendants¹ in the Eastern District of Missouri action oppose the motion filed with respect to that action.² Plaintiffs in fourteen of the sixteen initially centralized actions have submitted a brief in support of the motions submitted by the Eastern District of New York, Southern District of New York, and District of Oregon plaintiffs.

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held (without oral argument), the Panel finds that these four actions involve common questions of fact with the actions in this litigation previously centralized in the Northern District of California, and that transfer of the four actions to the Northern District of California for inclusion in the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings in that district will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of

¹ AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P., and SBC Long Distance, L.L.C.

² Plaintiff Claudia Mink's motion to strike the telecommunication company defendants' response to her motion to vacate the conditional transfer order in the Missouri action is denied.

FILED 06 DEC 20 15:22 USDC ORP

the litigation. Transfer of these actions is appropriate for reasons expressed by the Panel in its original order directing centralization in this docket. In that order, the Panel held that the Northern District of California was a proper Section 1407 forum for actions sharing factual and legal questions regarding alleged Government surveillance of telecommunications activity and the participation in (or cooperation with) that surveillance by individual telecommunications companies. The Panel stated that centralization under Section 1407 was necessary in order to eliminate duplicative discovery, prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings (particularly with respect to matters involving national security), and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary. *See In re National Security Agency Telecommunications Records Litigation*, 444 F.Supp.2d 1332, 1334 (J.P.M.L. 2006). Like the actions already centralized in this docket, the four actions currently before the Panel arise from the Government's alleged telecommunications surveillance program, and necessarily implicate common and delicate questions of national security, including the applicability and scope of the state secrets privilege and related authorities.

Plaintiffs in the action pending in the District of Oregon argue that the existence of a top-secret sealed document renders their action unique, in that the document purportedly proves that plaintiffs were actually subject to surveillance, a key contested element of the other MDL-1791 actions. Even if plaintiffs' recollections of that document's contents are correct, however, the document would only show that surveillance was being conducted at some time prior to August 2004, when the document was inadvertently disclosed to plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' complaint, by contrast, raises allegations encompassing the allegedly ongoing surveillance program in its entirety, including events occurring subsequent to August 2004.

In the Southern District of New York action, plaintiffs attempt to distinguish their action on the theory that their status as civil rights attorneys for suspected terrorists will allow them to prevail in their pending summary judgment motion by attesting merely to a well-founded fear of surveillance (based on what has been publicly disclosed about the surveillance program), without having to show actual surveillance and without the need for any discovery. The pendency of that motion and the Government's competing motion to dismiss is not an impediment to transfer, inasmuch as the transferee judge can resolve them. Moreover, the contention that certain individuals or groups have legitimate and especial reasons to fear surveillance which are not shared by the average citizen is one that is likely to arise in some form in other actions centralized in this docket. Centralization avoids the possibility of inconsistent rulings on this important issue. The Panel finds the remaining arguments in opposition to transfer also unpersuasive.

As the Panel stated in its original order of transfer, the evolution of Section 1407 proceedings in the transferee district may prompt a plaintiff to contend that the continued inclusion of an action or claim in MDL-1791 is no longer advisable. At that juncture, the affected plaintiff can seek a suggestion of remand from the transferee judge. If the transferee judge deems remand of any claims or actions appropriate, procedures are available whereby this may be accomplished with a minimum of delay. *See* Rule 7.6, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. at 436-38.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, these four actions are transferred to the Northern District of California and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the

Honorable Vaughn R. Walker for inclusion in the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings occurring there in this docket.

FOR THE PANEL:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wm. Terrell Hodges". The signature is written in a cursive style with some loops and flourishes.

Wm. Terrell Hodges
Chairman

INVOLVED COUNSEL LIST

DOCKET NO. 1791

IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION

Jessica Ashlee Albies
P.O. Box 42604
Portland, OR 97242

Michael Avery
National Lawyer's Guide
Suffolk Law School
120 Tremont Street
Boston, MA 92108

Peter T. Barbur
Cravath, Swaine & Moore, LLP
Worldwide Plaza
825 8th Avenue
New York, NY 10019

David Cole
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

Ronald Marc Daignault
Jenner & Block LLC
919 Third Avenue, 37th Floor
New York, NY 10022

Joseph R. Dulle
Stone, Leyton & Gershan
7733 Forsyth Blvd., Suite 500
Clayton, MO 63105

Jon B. Eisenberg
Attorney at Law
1970 Broadway, Suite 1200
Oakland, CA 94612

Andrea Marie Gacki
US Dept of Justice/Civil Division/Fed.
Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Room 7334
Washington, DC 20001

Steven Goldberg
Goldberg, Mechanic, Suart
& Gibson, LLP
American Bank Building
621 S.W. Morrison Street
Suite 1450
Portland, OR 97205

David U. Gourevitch
Law Office of David U. Gourevitch, P.C.
228 East 45th Street
17th Floor
New York, NY 10017

Alexander K. Haas
United States Department of Justice
Federal Programs Branch
P.O. Box 883
Washington, DC 20044-0883

Jonathan L. Hafetz
Brennan Center for Justice
161 Avenue of the Americas
12th floor
New York, NY 10013

Amanda J. Hettinger
Thompson Coburn LLP
One US Bank Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63101-1693

Charles F. Hinkle
Stoel & Rives L.L.P.
900 S.W. 5th Avenue, Suite 2600
Portland, OR 97204

Lisa R. Jaskol
Attorney at Law
15760 Ventura Blvd., 18th Floor
Encino, CA 91436

Shayana Kadidal
Center for Constitutional Rights
666 Broadway, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10012-2317

Jennifer Alison Klear
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
140 Broadway, 39th Floor
New York, NY 10005

Ilann M. Maazel
Emery, Celli, Brinckerhoff &
Abady, LLP
545 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

Thomas H. Nelson
Thomas H. Nelson & Associates
825 NE Multnomah, Suite 925
Portland, OR 97232-2150

Vera Mary Scanlon
Beldock, Levine & Hoffman, LLP
99 Park Avenue
16th Floor
New York, NY 10016

Andrew H. Tannenbaum
U.S. Department of Justice
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW
P.O. Box 883
Washington, DC 20044

Timothy Alfred Valliere
Bushell & Valliere, LLP
Lincoln Building
60 East 42nd Street
Ste. 2925
New York, NY 10165