

A true printed copy in 5 sheet(s)  
of the electronic record filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
in the United States District Court  
for the District of \_\_\_\_\_

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL**  
on  
**MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

CERTIFIED 4/3/14, 2014.

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

MDL No. 2522

**IN RE: TARGET CORPORATION CUSTOMER  
DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION**

**TRANSFER ORDER**

**Before the Panel:**\* In three separate motions, plaintiffs in three actions have moved, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings of this litigation in various districts, including the Middle District of Louisiana, the Eastern District of Louisiana, the Northern District of Illinois, the Central District of California, the Southern District of Florida, or the District of Minnesota. This litigation currently consists of 33 actions pending in eighteen districts as listed on Schedule A.<sup>1</sup>

All parties agree that centralization is warranted, but disagree about the most appropriate transferee district. Plaintiffs in more than 50 actions and potential tag-along actions have responded to the motions, and they variously argue in support of centralization in the Middle District of Louisiana, the Eastern District of Louisiana, the Northern District of Illinois, the Central District of California, the Southern District of Florida, the District of Minnesota, the Southern District of Illinois, the District of Colorado, the Southern District of California, the Northern District of California, or the Eastern District of New York. Common defendant Target Corp. (Target) supports centralization in the District of Minnesota.

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, we find that these actions involve common questions of fact, and that centralization in the District of Minnesota will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. These actions share factual questions arising from a data security breach at stores owned and operated by Target between November 27, 2013, and December 15, 2013. Centralization will eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, including with respect to class certification; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary.

---

\* Judge Marjorie O. Rendell and Judge Lewis A. Kaplan did not participate in the disposition of this matter. Certain Panel members who could be members of the putative classes in this docket have renounced their participation in these classes and have participated in the decision.

<sup>1</sup> An additional action was included in the motions for centralization, but has been dismissed without prejudice.


The Panel has been notified of 71 related actions pending in 35 district courts. These and any other related actions are potential tag-along actions. See Panel Rules 1.1(h), 7.1 and 7.2.

-2-

We are persuaded that the most appropriate location for this litigation is the District of Minnesota. Target is headquartered in that district, where 25 actions and potential tag-along actions are pending. All actions in the district are pending before Judge Paul A. Magnuson, a jurist with extensive experience in multidistrict litigation. Moreover, the District of Minnesota is easily accessible and relatively centrally located for the parties to this litigation, which is nationwide in scope.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the actions listed on Schedule A are transferred to the District of Minnesota and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Paul A. Magnuson for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings in that district.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



---

John G. Heyburn II  
Chairman

Charles R. Breyer  
Ellen Segal Huvelle

Sarah S. Vance

**IN RE: TARGET CORPORATION CUSTOMER  
DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2522

**SCHEDULE A**

Central District of California

KLEIN V. TARGET CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 8:13-01974 14cv933 PAM /

Northern District of California

KIRK V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 3:13-05885 14cv934 PAM /  
WREDBERG V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 3:13-05901 14cv935 PAM /  
GUZMAN, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 3:13-05953 14cv936 PAM /

Southern District of California

BOHANNON V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 3:13-03139 14cv937 PAM /

District of Colorado

COUNCIL V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-03479 14cv938 PAM /

Middle District of Florida

CRUZ V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 8:13-03200 14cv939 PAM /  
KWAN V. TARGET CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 8:13-03252 14cv940 PAM /

Southern District of Florida

GRAY V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 0:13-62769 14cv941 PAM /

Northern District of Illinois

IN RE: TARGET CORPORATION CUSTOMER SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION, C.A. No. 1:13-09070 14cv942 PAM /  
MCCARTER V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-09147 14cv943 PAM /  
NOVAK, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-09165 14cv944 PAM /  
MCPHERSON V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-09188 14cv945 PAM /  
ELLIS V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-09232 14cv946 PAM /  
VASQUEZ, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:13-09279 14cv947 /  
PAM

- A2 -

**MDL No. 2522 Schedule A (Continued)**

Southern District of Illinois

SWITZER, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 3:13-01319 14cv948 PAM'

Eastern District of Louisiana

HAWKINS V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 2:13-06770 14cv949 PAM'

Middle District of Louisiana

LAGARDE V. TARGET CORPORATION OF MINNESOTA, ET AL., C.A. 14cv950 PAM'  
No. 3:13-00821

District of Massachusetts

TIRADO V. TARGET CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:13-13212 14cv951 PAM'  
HELLER V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-13257 14cv954 PAM'  
DERBA V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-13267 14cv953 PAM'

District of Minnesota

HORTON V. TARGET CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 0:13-03583 N/A  
BURKSTRAND, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 0:13-03593 N/A  
ALONSO III V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 0:13-03601 N/A  
ASHENFARB, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 0:14-00010 N/A  
SAVEDOW V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 0:14-00054 N/A

Eastern District of Missouri

RANSOM, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:13-02591 14cv952 PAM'

Eastern District of New York

SHANLEY, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 2:13-07279 14cv955 PAM'

District of Oregon

PURCELL V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 3:13-02274 14cv956 PAM'

- A3 -

**MDL No. 2522 Schedule A (Continued)**

District of Rhode Island

KNOWLES, ET AL. V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 1:13-00793 14cv957 PAM'

District of Utah

ROTHSCHILD, ET AL. V. TARGET, C.A. No. 1:13-00178 14cv958 PAM'

Western District of Washington

SYLVESTER V. TARGET CORPORATION, C.A. No. 2:13-02286 14cv959 PAM'