BRAYTON&PURCELL LLI
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
222 RUSH LANDING ROAD

5

6

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

to initiate the transfer process.

("JPML") pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407; said notice to the JPML from counsel being necessary

On July 29, 1991, the JPML entered an order transferring all asbestos personal injury cases pending in the federal courts to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, for coordinated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. (In re Asbestos Products Liability Litigation (no. VI). MDL No. 875., 771 F.Supp. 415 (1991)). That order also applies to "tag-along actions," or actions involving common questions of fact filed after January 17, 1991. Such actions are to be transferred to the eastern District of Pennsylvania as part of MDL 875, for coordinated pretrial proceedings.

The JPML has held that a district court has the authority to stay pending a transfer order. *In re Asbestos Products Liability Litigation*, 170 F. Supp. 2d 1348, 1349 n.1 (J.P.M.L. 2001) ("[T]hose courts concluding that such issues should be addressed by the transferee judge need not rule on them, and the process of 1407 transfer in MDL-875 can continue without any unnecessary interruption or delay.")

The parties agree that it is likely that the JPML will transfer this matter to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. The Clerk of the JPML has not entered a Conditional Transfer Order pursuant to JPML Rule 12(a) or filed an order to show cause why the action should not be transferred, pursuant to JPML Rule 13(b). It is likely the dates set forth in the Case Management Scheduling Order including the deadlines imposed by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26, will pass before the Clerk of the JPML acts.

The parties make this Motion on the grounds that a stay of this action would (a) promote judicial efficiency, (b) allow consistency in pretrial rulings, and (c) be most convenient to the parties.

For the reasons above, the parties hereby STIPULATE to and respectfully request the Court VACATE its Case Management Scheduling Order filed December 3, 2008 (Document 2) and the Order Setting Case Management Conference and Requiring Joint Case Management Conference Statement filed January 15, 2009 (Document 15), and that the Court issue an Order STAYING this action pending the outcome of the MDL Panel's decision on the merits of the

## [PROPOSED] ORDER TO STAY

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing date and deadlines specified in the *Case Management Scheduling Order* filed December 3, 2008 (Document 2) and the *Order Setting Case Management Conference and Requiring Joint Case Management Conference Statement* filed January 15, 2009 (Document 15), are hereby VACATED and that this action is STAYED pending the outcome of the JPML's decision to transfer.

Dated: February 9, 2009

8

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## [PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE] ORDER TO CONTINUE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the hearing date and deadlines specified in the Case Management Scheduling Order filed December 3, 2008 (Document 2) and the Order Setting Case Management Conference and Requiring Joint Case Management Conference Statement filed January 15, 2009 (Document 15), are hereby VACATED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the following case management deadlines are continued as follows:

- 2. Last day to meet and confer re initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection, and discovery plan is 21 days before the Case Management Conference in paragraph 1, above.
- 3. Last day to file Joint ADR Certification with Stipulation to ADR process or

  Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference is 21 days before the Case Management Conference in paragraph 1, above.

26 ////

27 ////

28 //

Injured\106862\Fed (wd)\Stip stay or cont (Holliday WD).wpd