

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PATRICK COTTER, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
LYFT, INC.,  
Defendant.

Case No. [13-cv-04065-VC](#)

**ORDER REQUESTING FURTHER  
BRIEFING**

The parties and the proposed intervenors, Alex Zamora and Rayshon Clark, are directed to file supplemental briefs, not to exceed 10 pages, addressing the following questions:

- Assuming that Lyft is correct that it stopped calling its Prime Time premiums "Prime Time Tips" and began instead calling them "Prime Time" in August 2014, not August 2015, such that there was no "Phase Two" as described in the complaint in *Zamora v. Lyft, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-02558-VC, analyze the strength of the *Zamora* plaintiffs' claim for restitution of gratuities under Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 and Cal. Labor Code § 351.
- Again assuming that there was no "Phase Two," but assuming the *Zamora* plaintiffs were nonetheless to prevail on their claim for restitution of gratuities under the UCL and section 351, how should the value of this claim be measured? What is its maximum potential value?
- Is Lyft correct as a factual matter that there was, essentially, no "Phase Two"?
- What effect would the proposed release have on the common law claims in the *Zamora* case?

The supplemental letter briefs are due no later than Monday, June 13, 2016.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 6, 2016

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'V. Chhabria', written over a horizontal line.

---

VINCE CHHABRIA  
United States District Judge