

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 DENYING PLAINTIFFS’  
MOTION TO RETRANSFER OR, IN  
THE ALTERNATIVE, TO TAKE  
JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY**

Re: Dkt. No. 32

Before the Court is plaintiffs Planet Aid, Inc. and Lisbeth Thompsen’s 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 Reveal, Center for Investigative Reporting (“Reveal”), Matt Smith (“Smith”), and Amy Walters’ (“Walters”) Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction and Improper Venue, and transferring, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a), the above-titled action to the Northern District of California. Defendants filed opposition, to which plaintiffs replied, and a hearing was held on October 27, 2017.

By Order filed October 30, 2017, the Court found plaintiffs had not shown the challenged order was “clearly erroneous” (see Order, filed Oct. 30, 2017, at 1:24-25 (quoting Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp., 486 U.S. 800, 819 (1988)), or that the evidence developed by plaintiffs subsequent to the issuance of that order “would have been critical to the Maryland court’s jurisdiction . . . determination” (see id. at 1:25-26 (quoting Reply at 3:3)). The Court did, however, grant plaintiffs’ request to depose George and afforded the parties leave to file supplemental briefing, which briefing has been filed.



1 contacts with the forum state form the basis of the suit.” See id. at 278-79.

2 **2. Deborah George**

3 In determining whether a defendant has “purposefully directed his activities” at the  
4 forum, the Fourth Circuit considers eight factors, one of which is “whether the defendant  
5 maintains offices or agents in the forum state.” See id. at 278. Here, in support of their  
6 motion, plaintiffs initially submitted evidence that George was a Maryland resident and  
7 Revele employee during all times relevant to the instant action. As set forth above,  
8 however, for purposes of determining minimum contacts, the relevant “activities” are  
9 those out of which the plaintiff’s claims arise. See id. at 278-79.

10 In that regard, defendants, in response to plaintiffs’ initial showing, submitted a  
11 declaration from George, in which she stated she provided occasional technical and  
12 logistical advice of a general nature and that she neither wrote nor edited any of the  
13 scripts or audio for the podcasts here at issue. (See George Decl., filed Aug. 2, 2017,  
14 ¶¶ 5-7.) By its order filed October 30, 2017, the Court found such involvement insufficient  
15 to alter the determination made by the Maryland court.

16 The evidence now presented by plaintiffs, although providing additional detail, is  
17 consistent with George’s initial description of her role, and likewise is unavailing. In  
18 particular, although Walters, on one occasion, described George as the “radio editor” on  
19 the stories (see George Dep. Ex. 14),<sup>1</sup> George’s only involvement reflected in the record  
20 is (1) her attendance at a single, early meeting in California, during which she suggested  
21 Walters and Smith “start the story from the beginning” (see Rosenthal Decl., filed Jan. 5,  
22 2018, Ex. G); (2) her scheduled participation in a phone call concerning the cost of  
23 Walters’ proposal to interview a potential source in Africa (see id. Ex. F); and (3) her  
24 concern “about the story being written before the actual reporting [was] done” (see  
25 George Dep. Ex. 10).

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> In her deposition, George testified that she “was not the radio editor on the  
28 Planet Aid stories.” (See Rosenthal Decl., filed Jan. 5, 2018, Ex. A (George Dep.) at  
374:18-19.)

1 None of the proffered new evidence contradicts George’s earlier declaration that  
 2 she had no role in the writing or editing of the scripts or podcasts. Nor have plaintiffs  
 3 offered any evidence to show George had approval, let alone final approval, over the  
 4 content of the stories; indeed, the new evidence is to the contrary. (See Burke Decl.,  
 5 filed Jan. 24, 2018, Ex. D (George Dep.) at 259:12-18 (stating she first listened to  
 6 podcast when “it aired” and never heard any “[e]arly versions”).)

7 In sum, the newly presented evidence, in combination with the evidence previously  
 8 considered, is insufficient to show plaintiffs’ claims “arise out of” any of Georges activities,  
 9 and thus is insufficient to show the District of Maryland has personal jurisdiction over  
 10 defendants. See Consulting Engineers Corp., 561 F.3d at 278-79.

11 **3. Susanne Reber**

12 Subsequent to their initial showing, plaintiffs learned that Reber currently resides  
 13 in Maryland, was the “Executive Editor” for all of Reveal’s podcasts, including the  
 14 podcasts challenged here (see George Dep. Ex. 16), and, as such, was responsible for  
 15 “help[ing] forge many of the collaborations” between Reveal and newspapers, radio  
 16 stations, and television stations (see Rosenthal Decl., filed Jan. 5, 2018, Ex. A (George  
 17 Dep.) at 251:21-252:4).

18 Assuming, arguendo, such responsibilities, if carried out by a Maryland resident,  
 19 would be, as plaintiffs contend, “highly relevant to ‘minimum contacts’” analysis (see  
 20 Supplemental Memorandum (“Supp. Memo”) at 3:10-11), plaintiffs fail to show Reber  
 21 resided in Maryland at a time relevant to the instant claims. In particular, Reber has  
 22 submitted a declaration in which she states that, “[u]p until May 2016,” she worked in  
 23 Reveal’s California office, and that she did not move to Maryland until “June, 2016.” (See  
 24 Reber Decl., filed Jan. 24, 2018, ¶¶ 5-6).<sup>2</sup> Although the record does not reflect whether

---

25  
 26 <sup>2</sup> To the extent plaintiffs, by their citation to a Montgomery County Assessment  
 27 Record (see Rosenthal Decl., filed Jan. 5, 2018, Ex. L) and a page from the Montgomery  
 28 County website (see Rosenthal Decl., filed Feb. 5, 2018, Ex. C), suggest that Reber  
 moved to Maryland six months earlier, the Court is not persuaded, as plaintiffs have  
 submitted no evidence to support a finding that those two documents should be read  
 together in such manner.

1 Reber moved before or after the June 2 re-broadcast, any work she would have done in  
2 connection with that podcast would, as a practical matter, have occurred prior to such  
3 move, i.e., while Reber was a California resident.

4 To the extent plaintiffs contend Reber played a role in Reveal’s response to the  
5 “retraction demand” Planet Aid sent on August 19, 2016 (see Supplemental Reply  
6 (“Supp. Reply”) at 3:16-17), and that such role has some bearing on the minimum  
7 contacts analysis, the Court likewise is not persuaded, as plaintiffs’ claims arise out of  
8 defendants’ publication of the allegedly false and defamatory statements, not out of  
9 defendants’ failure to retract them.

10 Consequently, plaintiffs’ reliance on Reber’s Maryland residence is unavailing.

11 **B. Adverse Inference/Further Jurisdictional Discovery**

12 In their supplemental briefing, plaintiffs contend defendants failed to comply with  
13 the Court’s discovery order, and, based thereon, ask the Court to draw an inference that  
14 George and Reber were “substantially involved in the stories” (see Supp. Memo at 10:7),  
15 or, in the alternative, allow “full jurisdictional discovery” (see id. at 9:13-14). Again, the  
16 Court is not persuaded.

17 First, plaintiffs contend defendants failed to produce some of the documents to  
18 which George made reference in her deposition, specifically, two Facebook messages in  
19 which the publication of the podcasts was announced, and emails she retrieved using  
20 search terms suggested by Reveal in the course of discovery. As to the former, there is  
21 nothing to indicate the documents are anything other than as described by George, and,  
22 as to the latter, plaintiffs, who received numerous email chains in which George was  
23 included, have not shown George retrieved any other emails relevant to the instant  
24 inquiry.

25 Plaintiffs next contend defendants improperly redacted portions of some of the  
26 documents defendants produced. Defendants have submitted, however, a privilege log  
27 explaining such redactions were made to preserve the identities of confidential sources  
28 as well as to protect unpublished information unrelated to the instant action. (See Burke

1 Decl., filed Jan. 24, 2018, Ex. E.)<sup>3</sup>

2 Likewise unavailing is plaintiffs' contention, based wholly on speculation, that, if  
3 they had received "native, electronic copies of documents" (see Supp. Reply at 9:17),  
4 such discovery could have been used to impeach George's deposition testimony.<sup>4</sup>  
5 Similarly speculative is plaintiffs' contention that a search of other forms of  
6 communication used by George, e.g., Google Chat, would have disclosed relevant  
7 communications, as the excerpted portions of George's deposition provided to the Court  
8 in support thereof are devoid of any questions pertaining to whether George used such  
9 forms of communication to discuss the challenged podcasts.


10 Lastly, given the Maryland court's finding that the podcasts "were drawn from a  
11 variety of sources . . . across the United States and several countries" (see Planet Aid,  
12 Inc., et al. v. Reveal, Center for Investigative Reporting, et al., 16-CV-2974-GLR, 19 (D.  
13 Md. June 26, 2017)), defendants' disclosure of three additional Maryland sources does  
14 not, contrary to plaintiffs' contention, warrant further inquiry.

15 **CONCLUSION**

16 For the reasons stated, plaintiffs' motion is hereby DENIED.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: March 8, 2018

19   
20 MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
21 United States District Judge

22  
23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>3</sup> To the extent plaintiffs challenge the redaction of an email chain between George  
26 and Walters on the asserted ground that George "claims not to have discussed  
27 confidential sources" (see Supp. Reply at 5 n.7), plaintiffs' characterization of George's  
28 testimony is not supported by the record (see Burke Decl., filed Jan. 24, 2018, Ex. D  
(George Dep.) at 65:2-6).

<sup>4</sup> Further, plaintiffs have not disputed defendants' response that there was no  
request for production in native format.