

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAJOHN BROSNAN,
Plaintiff,

v.

EXPERIAN HOLDINGS, INC., et al.,
Defendants.Case No. [16-cv-06508-SI](#)**AMENDED ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
WHY CASE SHOULD NOT BE
TRANSFERRED**

On December 23, 2016, defendants Experian Holdings, Inc. and Experian Information Solutions, Inc. (“Experian Defendants”) filed a motion to transfer venue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404. Docket No. 16. Experian Defendants ask that this case be transferred to the Central District of California, where over 40 class action lawsuits have been consolidated before the Honorable Andrew J. Guilford in *In re Experian Data Breach Litigation*. *Id.* at 1.

Plaintiff seems to be in agreement with Experian Defendants. Plaintiff, who appears pro se, sought permission to file this lawsuit from the Honorable William Alsup of this district. Case No. 15-mc-80297, Docket No. 1. Following Judge Alsup’s grant of the request, plaintiff filed a notice of related case on May 5, 2016. Plaintiff informed the Court of the related case of *Bhuta v. Experian*, No. 8:15-cv-01592-AG-DFM, in the Central District of California, and asked the Court to transfer plaintiff’s case “to the same judge assigned to the *Bhuta v. Experian* case.” Case No. 15-mc-80297, Docket No. 5.

Defendant T-Mobile USA, Inc. has answered plaintiff’s complaint and as yet has taken no position on the requests to transfer venue. *See* Docket Nos. 9, 12.

Accordingly, the parties are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing no later than January 12, 2017, why this case should not be transferred. If the parties do not respond by

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

January 12, 2017, this action will be transferred to the Central District of California for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 4, 2017



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge