

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.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 13-cv-03826-EMC


**ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFFS'  
EMERGENCY MOTION AND UBER'S  
REQUEST FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES  
AND COSTS**

Docket No. 840, 846, 847, 848

Plaintiffs have withdrawn their Emergency Motion for Authorization to Communicate with Class Members. *See* Docket Nos. 840, 846. It is therefore moot. In its opposition to the motion, Uber separately requests that the Court “amend its sanctions order to grant monetary sanctions in an amount sufficient to compensate Uber for the fees it has incurred defending against these numerous filings.” Docket No. 847 at 3. Uber’s request for sanctions appears to be based on conduct following the Court’s sanction’s order, namely, Plaintiffs’ emergency motions for relief from that order. *See* Docket Nos. 830, 836, 840. Subsequent conduct is not a basis for the Court to amend its earlier sanctions order. To the extent Uber seeks sanctions for that later conduct, it must file a separate, properly-noticed motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated:

  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge