

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: No. C 08-01510 WHA
CHARLES SCHWAB CORPORATION
SECURITIES LITIGATION.

This Document Relates
To All Cases.

**QUESTIONS FOR
ORAL ARGUMENT**

No new briefs, please, but be prepared on the following at oral argument:


1. During the class period, was there any statement by defendants that failed to disclose the full amount invested in MBS?
2. Before the change, was MBS affirmatively represented to be an “industry”?
3. What is the law whether fine print can cure otherwise misleading large print?
4. If shareholders should have been allowed to vote on the change in industry definitions, why would *subsequent* purchasers be entitled to recover for not holding an earlier vote?
5. Since the change was disclosed, why didn’t plaintiffs sue to insist on a vote back then? Why did they wait to see how the market would turn on MBS?
6. Given the large volume of the submissions, will counsel bring to the hearing an agreed-on set of documents limited to the key prospectuses, with all references to the MBS issue highlighted and tagged, the stack to be in chronological order.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Please, no more than six or seven key prospectuses (or the like). Time may be precious at the hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 23, 2010.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE