SUPPLEMENTAL JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE STATEMENT - CASE NO. 14-CV-05200-EMC

In Re Uber FCRA Litigation

Doc. 124

1	John C. Fish, Jr. (SBN 160620)
	jfish@littler.com
2	Rod M. Fliegel (SBN 168289)
3	rfliegel@littler.com
3	Andrew M. Spurchise (SBN 245998) aspurchise@littler.com
4	LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
7	650 California Street, 20th Floor
5	San Francisco, CA 94108.2693
	Tel: (415) 433-1940
6	Fax: (415) 399-8490
7	Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr. (SBN 132099)
	tboutrous@gibsondunn.com
8	Debra Wong Yang (SBN 123289)
9	dwongyang@gibsondunn.com
9	Marcellus A. Mcrae (SBN 140308) mmcrae@gibsondunn.com
10	Theane D. Evangelis (SBN 243570)
	tevangelis@gibsondunn.com
11	Dhananjay S. Manthripragada (SBN 254433)
	dmanthripragada@gibsondunn.com
12	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
	333 South Grand Avenue
13	Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197
	Tel: (213) 229-7000
14	Fax: (213) 229-7520
15	Joshua S. Lipshut (SBN 242557)
	jlipshutz@gibsondunn.com
16	Kevin Ring-Dowell (SBN 278289)
	kringdowell@gibsondunn.com
17	GIBŠON, DUŇN & CRUTCHER LLP
	555 Mission Street, Suite 3000
18	San Francisco, CA 94105-0921
	Tel: (415) 393-8200
19	Fax: (415) 393-8306
20	Attorneys for Defendants
ا 2	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND RASIER, LLC
21	OBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. THO RESERVE ELEC
	Pamela Devata (pro hac pending)
22	pdevata@seyfarth.com
	SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
23	131 South Dearborn Street, Suite 2400
	Chicago, IL 60603
24	Tel: (312) 460-5000
25	Fax: (312) 460-7000
ا د	Timothy L. Hix (CSB 184372)
26	thix@seyfarth.com
-	SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
27	333 South Hope Street, Suite 3900
	Los Angeles, CA 90071
28	Tel: (213) 270-9600
	Fax: (213) 270-9601

1	
2	Nicholas R. Clements (CSB 267314) rclements@seyfarth.com SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
3	SEYFARTH SHAW LLP 560 Mission Street, Suite 3100
4	560 Mission Street, Suite 3100 San Francisco, CA 94105 Tel: (415) 397-2823 Fax: (415) 397-8549
5	
6	Attorneys for Defendant HIREASE, LLC
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
11	
$_{26}$	
26 27	

The parties, pursuant to the Court's oral order of November 4, 2015 (Civil Minutes at ECF No. 117), hereby stipulate and agree to the following schedule in anticipation of their selected alternative dispute resolution option, private mediation.

The parties met and conferred and after extensive discussions, selected Mark Rudy as a mutually-agreeable mediator for this matter. The parties inquired into Mr. Rudy's availability (including if any Saturday dates were available) and the first date Mr. Rudy is available for the mediation is March 30, 2016. The parties immediately reserved the March 30, 2016 date with Mr. Rudy's office to ensure the earliest practicable mediation with a mutually-agreeable qualified mediator. As such, they propose the following schedule:

- Mediation Completion Date: March 31, 2016
- Deadline for Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier, LLC to file responsive pleading to Plaintiffs' Consolidated Complaint: If mediation is unsuccessful in reaching resolution, <u>15 days after the Mediation Completion Date</u>.
- Deadline for Defendant Hirease, LLC to file responsive pleading to Plaintiffs' Consolidated Complaint: If mediation is unsuccessful in reaching resolution, <u>15 days</u> after the Ninth Circuit resolves the pending appeal of this Court's denial of Defendants' motion to compel arbitration.¹
- Deadline for opposition to any motions filed as responsive pleadings to Plaintiffs' Consolidated Complaint: 30 days after the filing of the motions.
- Deadline to file replies in further support of any motions filed as responsive pleadings to Plaintiffs' Consolidated Complaint: 14 days after the filing of the oppositions to such motions.
- Deadline to file motions under Rule 23 related to class certification: If mediation is unsuccessful in reaching resolution, 225 days after the Mediation Completion Deadline,

23

24

25

26

27

28

Hirease is a defendant in only one count of the Consolidated Complaint, the Eleventh Cause of Action, which is brought only by Named Plaintiff Mohamed, whose claims are stayed with the exception of his individual claims. Therefore the parties have agreed to a different deadline for Hirease to respond to the Consolidated Complaint.

180

or 225 days after the Court's resolution of any dispositive motion filed in response to Plaintiffs' Consolidated Complaint, whichever is later.

- Deadline to file opposition to motions under Rule 23 related to class certification: 60 days after the filing of the underlying motions (*Plaintiffs' proposal*) or 75 days after the filing of the underlying motions (Defendants' proposal).²
- Deadline to file replies in further support of motions under Rule 23 related to class certification: 30 days after the filing of the underlying motions.
- Class certification hearing: Next hearing date that is at least 21 days after filing of reply to motion.
- All other deadlines: TBD after decision on motions under Rule 23 related to class certification.

The parties agree that nothing contained herein waives any party's rights, objections, or defenses of any kind, including but not limited to Defendants' standing objections to this Court's jurisdiction and Defendants' assertions that certain named plaintiffs and putative class members are bound to assert their claims, if at all, in individual arbitration.

In light of the parties' agreements stated herein, the parties respectfully request that the deadline to submit a further case management conference statement on December 3, 2015 and the case management conference scheduled for December 10, 2015 be vacated. The deadlines stated above would have formed the only relevant modifications to the parties' previously submitted case management conference statements in a December 3rd filing.

IT IS SO ORDERED as STIPULATED this day of 2015:



² The parties disagree on the relevant timing for just this deadline and have agreed to request that the Court simply circle the deadline which it accepts and delete the date it rejects. Defendants note that the Court ordered a deadline for filing opposition to class certification in the O'Connor case that was at least 75 days after the filing of that class certification motion. Plaintiffs believe that deadline was specific to O'Connor and should not apply here. Rather, Plaintiffs believe that the opposition and reply schedule should continue to be the one Defendants previously agreed to in the parties' joint case management conference statements of May 7, 2015 and July 31, 2015. See Gillette ECF Nos. 34, 76.

24

25

26

27

28

1	Dated: November 24, 2015	Respectfully submitted,
2		GOLDSTEIN, BORGEN, DARDARIAN & HO
3		/s/ Andrew P. Lee
4		Laura L. Ho
		Andrew P. Lee
5		300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000
6		Oakland, CA 94612
6		Tel: (510) 763-9800
7		Fax: (510) 835-1417
8		Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Putative Class
9		LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.
10		/s/ Rod M. Fliegel
11		John C. Fish, Jr.
		Rod M. Fliegel
12		Andrew M. Spurchise
13		650 California Street, 20th Floor
13		San Francisco, CA 94108.2693 Tel: 415.433.1940
14		Fax: 415.399.8490
ا ۽ ا		Attorneys for Defendants
15		UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. AND RASIER, LLC
16		SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
17		/s/ Timothy Hix
18		Timothy Hix
19		333 South Hope Street, Suite 3900
		Los Angeles, CA 90071
20		Tel: (213) 270-9600 Fax: (213) 270-9601
21		1 ax. (213) 270-7001
22	Ar	PPECTATION OF EILED
22	A.	ITESTATION OF FILER
23	I, Andrew P. Lee, attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from	
24	each of the other Signatories, which shall serve in lieu of their signatures on the document. Signed the	
25	24th day of November, 2015.	
26		/s/ Andrew P. Lee
27		Andrew P. Lee
28		
20		