

United States District Court For the Northern District of California interlocutory review pursuant 28 U.S.C. 1292. Plaintiffs in the *Bloom* class action did not file a
petition for interlocutory review.

On September 7, 2016, an order related a fifth action, *Bloom II* (Case No. 16-cv-04883-WHA) to these actions.

This order requests responses from the parties regarding the following question: to what extent should the *Bloom* class action (Case No. C 16-02265 WHA) and the newly-related class action (Case No. 16-cv-04883-WHA), *Bloom II*, be stayed pending such time as our court of appeals acts upon the pending petitions for interlocutory review? **By SEPTEMBER 13, 2016 AT NOON**, the parties may submit briefs of no more than five pages responding to this question. The Court asks the parties to consolidate briefs where appropriate and avoid submitting duplicative briefs.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 9, 2016.

WILLIAM ALSUP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE