

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PLANET AID, INC., et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
REVEAL, CENTER FOR
INVESTIGATIVE REPORTING, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-03695-MMC](#)

**ORDER DEFERRING RULING ON
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
RETRANSFER; GRANTING
JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY**

Re: Dkt. No. 32

Before the Court is plaintiffs' motion to retransfer or, in the alternative, to take jurisdictional discovery, filed July 11, 2017, by which plaintiffs challenge an order of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, granting defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction and Improper Venue, and transferring the above-titled action to the Northern District of California. Defendants have filed opposition, to which plaintiffs have replied. The matter came on regularly for hearing on October 27, 2017. Samuel Rosenthal, Matthew F. Miller, and Tania L. Rice of Squire Patton Boggs (US) LLP appeared on behalf of plaintiffs. Thomans R. Burke of Davis Wright Tremaine LLP appeared on behalf of defendants.

The Court having considered the parties' respective written submissions and the arguments of counsel at the hearing, finds plaintiffs have not shown the challenged order was "clearly erroneous," see Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp., 486 U.S. 800, 819 (1988), or that the evidence recently discovered by plaintiffs "would have been critical to the Maryland court's jurisdiction . . . determination" (see Reply at 3:3). With regard to jurisdictional discovery, to the extent plaintiffs' request encompasses the deposition of Deborah George, the request is hereby GRANTED, see Harris Rutsky &


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

Co. Ins. Services, Inc. v. Bell & Clements Ltd., 328 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)
(finding jurisdictional discovery warranted where such discovery “might well demonstrate
facts sufficient to constitute a basis for jurisdiction”), and in all other respects the request
is hereby DENIED.

Accordingly, for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, the Court hereby
DEFERS ruling on the plaintiffs’ motion to retransfer, pending the deposition of Deborah
George, and the parties are hereby DIRECTED to file, no later than November 6, 2017, a
joint proposed schedule for supplemental briefing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 30, 2017


MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge