1	R. Joseph Barton, CA Bar No. 212340		
2	Email: jbarton@cohenmilstein.com Bruce F. Rinaldi, CA Bar No. 55133		
3	Email: <u>brinaldi@cohenmilstein.com</u> COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLI	LPLLC	
	1100 New York Avenue, N.W.		
4	West Tower, STE 500 Washington, DC 20005		
5	Telephone: (202) 408-4600 Facsimile: (202) 408-4699		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff & the Class		
7	Patrick W. Shea, Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> , N	JY Bar No. 4587176	
8	Email: patrickshea@paulhastings.com PAUL HASTINGS LLP		
9	75 East 55th Street		
10	New York, NY 10022 Telephone: (212) 318-6000		
11	Facsimile: (212) 319-4090		
12	Attorneys for Defendant [Additional counsel listed on the next page]		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
16			
17	QUILLER BARNES,	Case No. 08-04058 EMC	
18	Plaintiff,	SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT CASE	
19	V.	MANAGEMENT STATEMENT	
20	AT&T PENSION BENEFIT PLAN -	ORDER SETTING TELEPHONIC CMC	
21	NONBARGAINED PROGRAM,	FOR 11/2/12 at 11:30 a.m.	
22	Defendant.		
23		Judge Edward M. Chen	
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
COHEN, MILSTEIN, SELLERS & TOLL P.L.L.C. ATTORNEYS AT LAW WASHINGTON		SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT BARNES V. AT&T, CASE NO. 08-04058 EMC	

1	Michelle L. Roberts, CA Bar No. 239092 Email: mlr@ssrlawgroup.com		
2	SPRINGER-SULLIVAN & ROBERTS LLP  410 – 12th Street, Suite 325		
3	Oakland, CA 94607		
4	Telephone: (510) 992-6130 Facsimile: (510) 280-7564		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff & the Class QUILLER BARNES		
6	Stephen H. Harris, CA Bar No. 184608		
7	Email: stephenharris@paulhastings.com M'Alyssa C. Mecenas, CA Bar No. 272075		
8	Email: malyssamecenas@paulhastings.com PAUL HASTINGS LLP		
9	515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071		
10	Telephone: (213) 683- 6000 Facsimile: (213) 627-0705		
11	Regan A.W. Herald, CA Bar No. 251879		
12	Email: reganherald@paulhastings.com PAUL HASTINGS LLP		
13	55 Second Street, 24th Floor San Francisco, CA 94105		
14	Telephone: (415) 856- 7000 Facsimile: (415) 856-7100		
15	Attorneys for Defendant		
16	AT&T PENSION BENEFIT PLAN – NONBARGAINED PROGRAM		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

COHEN, MILSTEIN, SELLERS & TOLL P.L.L.C ATTORNEYS AT LAW WASHINGTON

28

SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT BARNES V. AT&T, CASE NO. 08-04058 EMC 1

2

Pursuant to the Court's instruction during the Parties' June 22, 2012 case management conference that the Parties report to the court within 60 days regarding outstanding issues, the Parties to the above-entitled action jointly submit this case management statement addressing the issues of class certification, class notice, discovery, and ADR.

# 1. <u>Class Certification</u>:

### a. Plaintiff's Position

Prior to time that Count III was added to the Complaint in this case (alleging violations of ERISA's anti-forfeiture, and actuarial equivalence requirements), Plaintiff had sought and the Court granted class certification as to Count II and IV. See Barnes v. AT&T Pension Benefit Plan - Nonbargained Program, 270 F.R.D. 488 (N.D. Cal. 2010). Based on information obtained in discovery and positions taken by Defendant, Plaintiff sought to amend the complaint to add Count III. See Barnes v. AT&T Pension Benefit Plan-Nonbargained Program, 273 F.R.D. 562 (N.D. Cal. 2011). At the time that the Court granted Plaintiff's motion to amend the Complaint to add Count III, the Court advised that Plaintiff would need to separately seek class certification for new counts brought on behalf of the Class. See Barnes, 273 F.R.D. at 570 at n.6. At the time that the class was originally certified, Defendant had averred that the class consisted of 285 participants (plus their beneficiaries). See Barnes, 270 F.R.D. at 499 at n. 2. After the Court certified the class, Defendant then averred in interrogatories that the Class consisted only of 10 participants (plus their beneficiaries), including 7 participants who elected to take lump sums at first retirement and 3 participants who have or would receive deferred annuities. See Def's MSJ, Dkt. No. 295 at p. 8. For those who elected to receive deferred annuities, Defendant has now agreed to pay the benefits in Section 3.4(d)(3). See Dkt. No. 312 at 1. Based on Defendant's statement under oath that the number of participants in the Class who took lump sums at first termination is 7 participants (plus their beneficiaries) and Plaintiff's belief that any decision on the legality of plan terms will, as a practical matter, affect any of the other similarly situated participants, Plaintiff does not intend to file a motion to certify Count III on behalf of the Class.

///

28

COHEN, MILSTEIN,

#### b. Parties' Joint Statement

In light of Plaintiff's decision not to move for class certification on Count III, the Parties agree to resolve the remaining claims and defenses with respect to Plaintiff only, pursuant to the current Scheduling Order.

# 2. Class Notice

In light of the Court's Order on the parties cross-motions for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 309), and Plaintiff's decision not to seek class certification of Count III, Class Counsel believed that it would be appropriate pursuant to Rule 23(d)(1)(B) to send notice to the Class members advising them of Plaintiff's decision to not pursue Count III as a class claim, and that absentee class members may need to take some action to protect their rights, such as seeking to intervene and/or filing a separate individual claim. Class Counsel proposed submitting a form of supplemental notice for the Court's approval.

The Parties have conferred regarding this issue. Defendant has stated that it will agree that any time-based defense that Defendant could assert against the absentee class members with respect to the claims asserted in Count III shall be tolled from the date of this joint case management statement up through the date the Court rules on Count III with respect to Plaintiff. The Parties intend to enter a formal agreement to this respect. In light of Defendant's agreement, the Parties agree that it is not necessary to send supplemental class notice to the Class at this time, but Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe it may be necessary to do so after a ruling on Count III.

### 3. <u>Discovery</u>:

Fact discovery in this case closes on September 10, 2012. On April 27, 2011, Plaintiff served a fourth set of interrogatories on Defendant regarding its affirmative defenses. Defendant never responded to these interrogatories. In light of the parties' agreement to address issues of plan interpretation first, Plaintiff agreed that discovery regarding Defendant's affirmative defenses could be deferred until after the Court's decision on the cross-motions for summary judgment. *See* Dkt. No. 258 at 8. Defendant has agreed to respond to Plaintiff's interrogatories regarding Defendant's affirmative defenses with respect to Plaintiff only and expects to provide responses to Plaintiff's Fourth Set of Interrogatories before the current fact discovery cut-off date,

COHEN, MILSTEIN, SELLERS & TOLL P.L.L.C ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Edward M. Chen

U.S. District Judge

MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

BARNES V. AT&T, CASE NO. 08-04058 EMC