

1 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
 David W. Carpenter\*  
 2 Bradford A. Berenson\*  
 David L. Lawson\*  
 3 Edward R. McNicholas\*  
 Eric A. Shumsky #206164  
 4 1501 K Street, N.W.  
 Washington, DC 20005  
 5 Tel: (202) 736-8000  
 Fax: (202) 736-8711  
 6 bberenson@sidley.com

BRUCE I. AFRAN, Esq.  
 10 Braeburn Drive  
 Princeton, NJ 08540  
 Telephone: (609) 924-2075

MAYER LAW GROUP, LLC  
 Carl J. Mayer  
 66 Witherspoon Street, Suite 414  
 Princeton, NJ 08542  
 Telephone: (609) 921-8025  
 Facsimile: (609) 921-6964

7 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP  
 Bruce A. Ericson #76342  
 8 Jacob R. Sorensen #209134  
 Marc H. Axelbaum #209855  
 9 50 Fremont Street  
 Post Office Box 7880  
 10 San Francisco, CA 94120  
 Tel.: (415) 983-1000  
 11 Fax: (415) 983-1200  
 bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

THE LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN E.  
 SCHWARZ, ESQ., LLC  
 Steven E. Schwarz, Esq.  
 2461 W. Foster Ave., #1W  
 Chicago, IL 60625  
 Telephone: (773) 837-6134  
 Facsimile: (773) 837-6134  
 Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

12 Attorneys for Specially Appearing Defendants  
 AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation

\* admitted pro hac vice

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

16 In re:

17 NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY  
 18 TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS  
 LITIGATION

MDL Dkt. No. 06-1791-VRW

**JOINT STIPULATION REGARDING  
 AT&T INC. & BELLSOUTH CORP.'S  
 MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF  
 PERSONAL JURISDICTION;  
 [PROPOSED] ORDER**

Date: June 3, 2009  
 Time: 10:30 a.m.  
 Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor  
 Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker

23 This Document Relates To:

24 *McMurray v. Verizon Communications, Inc., et*  
 25 *al.*, No. 09-cv-0131-VRW

26  
 27  
 28

1 **RECITALS**

2 A. AT&T Defendants have filed two motions to dismiss plaintiffs' Complaint  
3 (Dkt. 1), both of which currently are pending.

4 B. On March 16, 2009, telecommunication carrier defendants, including AT&T  
5 Inc. and BellSouth Corporation, moved to dismiss the plaintiffs' Complaint for failure to  
6 state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* Mot. to Dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P.  
7 12(b)(6) (Dkt. 588). That same day, Specially Appearing Defendants AT&T Inc. and Bell-  
8 South Corporation moved to dismiss the plaintiffs' Complaint for lack of personal jurisdic-  
9 tion. *See* Mot. to Dismiss Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2) (Dkt. 584).

10 C. Both motions are currently scheduled to be heard on June 3, 2009. This  
11 stipulation concerns the latter motion, Docket Item No. 584.

12 D. On May 7, 2009, plaintiffs filed a "Response to AT&T Inc. and BellSouth  
13 Corporations' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction" (Dkt. 613). In it, they princi-  
14 pally argued that, just as this Court "administratively terminated" without prejudice other  
15 motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction that previously were filed in this MDL  
16 (Dkt. 379), the Court should take similar action here.

17 **STIPULATION**

18 Plaintiffs and Specially Appearing Defendants hereby stipulate as follows:

19 A. In order to promote the efficient handling of this matter, the parties have  
20 agreed they do not object to the Court taking the pending motion to dismiss for lack of per-  
21 sonal jurisdiction (Dkt. 584) off of the Court's argument calendar and deferring a decision  
22 on it.

23 B. The parties further agree that by reaching this agreement AT&T Inc. and  
24 BellSouth Corporation have not waived their personal jurisdiction objections, that any delay  
25 in deciding the personal jurisdiction motion as a result of this agreement shall not be as-  
26 serted or held to prejudice those objections, and that by reaching this agreement no party  
27 has waived any argument presented in the briefing in connection with the pending motion

28

1 to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. In addition, because of the filing of this stipula-  
2 tion AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation have not filed their reply brief in support of  
3 their motion to dismiss, and the parties agree that AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation  
4 retain their right to do so when the motion is restored to this Court's argument calendar.

5 D. The parties further agree that by reaching this agreement, plaintiffs have not  
6 waived whatever rights to amend their complaints to add additional or substitute parties in  
7 the future that they otherwise would have, and that delay in deciding the personal jurisdic-  
8 tional motion as a result of this agreement shall not be asserted or held to prejudice any  
9 such amendments.

10 E. The parties undertake that, if any party subsequently concludes that it is no  
11 longer appropriate to defer resolution of the motion to dismiss, that party will promptly no-  
12 tify the other parties and then the Court.

13 Respectfully submitted,

14 Dated: May 13, 2009

15 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
16 David W. Carpenter (pro hac vice)  
17 Bradford A. Berenson (pro hac vice)  
18 David L. Lawson (pro hac vice)  
19 Edward R. McNicholas (pro hac vice)  
20 Eric A. Shumsky #206164  
21 1501 K Street, N.W.  
22 Washington, DC 20005  
23 Tel: (202) 736-8010  
24 Fax: (202) 736-8711  
25 bberenson@sidley.com

26 By: /s/ Bradford A. Berenson  
27 Bradford A. Berenson

28 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW  
PITTMAN LLP

29 Bruce A. Ericson #76342  
30 Jacob R. Sorensen #209134  
31 Marc H. Axelbaum #209855  
32 50 Fremont Street  
33 Post Office Box 7880  
34 San Francisco, CA 94120  
35 Tel.: (415) 983-1000  
36 Fax: (415) 983-1200  
37 bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

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

Attorneys for Specially Appearing Defendants  
AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation

THE LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN E.  
SCHWARZ, ESQ., LLC  
Steven E. Schwarz, Esq.  
2461 W. Foster Ave., #1W  
Chicago, IL 60625  
Telephone: (773) 837-6134  
Facsimile: (773) 837-6134  
By: /s/ Steven E. Schwarz  
Steven E. Schwarz

BRUCE I. AFRAN, Esq.  
10 Braeburn Drive  
Princeton, NJ 08540  
Telephone: (609) 924-2075

MAYER LAW GROUP, LLC  
Carl J. Mayer  
66 Witherspoon Street, Suite 414  
Princeton, NJ 08542  
Telephone: (609) 921-8025  
Facsimile: (609) 921-6964

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

**DECLARATION PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 45, § X.B**

I, Marc H. Axelbaum, hereby declare pursuant to General Order 45, § X.B, that I have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document from the signatories listed above.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing declaration is true and correct.

Executed on May 13, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

By: /s/ Marc H. Axelbaum  
Marc H. Axelbaum

Attorney for Specially Appearing Defendants AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation

**PROPOSED 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

Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation, and good cause appearing, the Court  
ORDERS the following:

A. The motion of Specially Appearing Defendants AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction (Dkt. 584) is hereby taken off of the Court's June 3, 2009 argument calendar.

B. If any party subsequently concludes that it is no longer appropriate to defer resolution of the motion to dismiss, that party will promptly notify the other parties and then the Court.

C. By reaching the foregoing Stipulation:

(1) Specially Appearing Defendants AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation have not waived their personal jurisdiction objections;

(2) any delay in deciding the personal jurisdiction motion as a result of the foregoing Stipulation shall not be asserted or held to prejudice those objections;

(3) no party has waived any argument presented in the briefing in connection with the pending motion;

(4) Specially Appearing Defendants AT&T Inc. and BellSouth Corporation retain their right to file a reply brief in support of the motion if and when it is restored to this Court's argument calendar;

(5) Plaintiffs have not waived whatever rights to amend their complaints to add additional or substitute parties in the future that they otherwise would have; and

//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//  
//

1 (6) any delay in deciding the personal jurisdictional motion as a result of the  
2 foregoing Stipulation shall not be asserted or held to prejudice any such amend-  
3 ments.

4 **PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: May 15, 2009.

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

Hon. Vaughn R. Walker  
United States District Court

