

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOUGLAS O’CONNOR, *et al.*,

No. C-13-3826 EMC

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ORAL ARGUMENT PREPARATION
ORDER**

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

On August 6, 2015, this Court will hear oral argument on Plaintiffs’ pending motion for class certification. Docket No. 276. In their briefs (and particularly across numerous footnotes), counsel for Plaintiffs suggests that this Court could certify subclasses if it decides not to certify the broader class Plaintiffs seek. Counsel also suggests (as an alternative to total certification) that the Court could certify a liability-only class (or, possibly, various liability-only subclasses), leaving damages determinations to be made at some later date.

Plaintiffs shall be prepared to discuss in detail specifically what subclasses it believes are certifiable and why.¹ Relatedly, Plaintiffs shall be prepared to discuss in detail specifically how they propose any class (or subclass) action could be tried. Finally, Plaintiffs shall be prepared to discuss

///

///

///

//

¹ Plaintiffs’ counsel are advised to prepare a demonstrative for the Court showing all the various alternative proposals contemplated.

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

their proposed common damages methodologies for any and all proposed class actions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 29, 2015



EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge