1	Tracie J. Renfroe (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Carol M. Wood (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	Justin A. Torres (<i>pro hac vice</i>) KING & SPALDING LLP
2	KING & SPALDING LLP 1100 Louisiana Street, Suite 4000	1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 200
3	Houston, Texas 77002	Washington, D.C. 20006-4707
4	Telephone: (713) 751-3200 Facsimile: (713) 751-3290	Telephone: (202) 737-0500 Facsimile: (202) 626-3737
5	Email: cwood@kslaw.com	Email: jtorres@kslaw.com
	Megan R. Nishikawa (SBN 271670)	George Morris (SBN 249930)
6	Nicholas Miller-Stratton (SBN 319240) KING & SPALDING LLP	KING & SPALDING LLP 601 South California Avenue
7	101 Second Street, Suite 2300 San Francisco, California 94105	Suite 100 Palo Alto, CA 94304
8	Telephone: (415) 318-1267 Facsimile: (415) 318-1300	Telephone: (650) 422-6700 Facsimile: (650) 422-6800
9	Email: mnishikawa@kslaw.com	Email: gmorris@kslaw.com
10	Counsel for Defendant ConocoPhillips	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13	CITY OF OAKLAND, a Municipal Corporation,	First Filed Case: 3:17-cv-06011-WHA
14	and THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by and through the	Related Case: 3:17-cv-06012-WHA
15	Oakland City Attorney,	Case No. 3:17-cv-06011-WHA
16	Plaintiffs,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
17	v.	ORDER REGARDING CONOCOPHILLIPS'S MOTION TO
18	BP P.L.C., et al.,	DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND
19	Defendants.	JURISDICTIONAL DISCOVERY
20		
21	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a Municipal Corporation, and THE PEOPLE OF	Case No. 3:17-cv-06012-WHA
22	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by and	
23	through the San Francisco City Attorney DENNIS J. HERRERA,	
24	Plaintiffs,	
25	V.	
26	BP P.L.C., et al.,	
27	Defendants.	
28		
	1 Stipulation and Proposed -Order	Case Nos. 3:17-cv-06011
	r	3:17-cv-06012

WHEREAS, on April 19, 2018, all Defendants in the above-styled cases filed a motion to
 dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), while some Defendants—including
 ConocoPhillips—filed a separate motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
 12(b)(2);

5 WHEREAS, ConocoPhillips's Rule 12(b)(2) motion to dismiss asserted three distinct 6 grounds for dismissal: failure to adequately plead that ConocoPhillips's subsidiaries were its 7 agents, such that their California contacts could be attributed to ConocoPhillips ("Corporate 8 Separateness Argument"); failure to adequately plead that alleged in-forum activities were a 9 "but-for" cause of Plaintiffs' alleged injury ("But-For Argument"); and that the exercise of 10 personal jurisdiction over ConocoPhillips was unreasonable under the circumstances 11 ("Unreasonableness Argument");

WHEREAS, ConocoPhillips also submitted a sworn declaration by Christopher J.
Dodson ("Dodson Declaration") to support its Corporate Separateness Argument and
Unreasonableness Argument;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs opposed the Rule 12(b)(2) motion by a brief filed May 3, 2018;
ConocoPhillips filed a reply on May 10, 2018; and the Court heard oral argument on
ConocoPhillips's Rule 12(b)(2) motion, as well as Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion, on May
24, 2018;

WHEREAS, at the conclusion of the May 24 hearing, the Court stated that it would delay
a ruling on the Rule 12(b)(6) motion until Defendants' jurisdictional defenses were resolved and
that it would allow jurisdictional discovery by Plaintiffs and by personal jurisdiction Defendants, *see* May 24 Hearing Tr. at 102:18-103:5;

WHEREAS, on May 25, 2018, the Court ordered, *inter alia*, that Plaintiffs be afforded
approximately 60 days of jurisdictional discovery and set an August 9, 2018 deadline for
Plaintiffs to file supplemental opposition briefing and an August 16, 2018 deadline for
ConocoPhillips to reply;

WHEREAS, it is in the interests of all parties to speed a resolution of the Rule 12(b)(6)
motion;

2

WHEREAS, while ConocoPhillips does not believe it has sufficient contacts with California for general or specific personal jurisdiction, due to ConocoPhillips' interest in the Court reaching the merits arguments in Defendants Rule 12(b)(6) motion and to avoid the burden and expense of jurisdictional discovery in this case, ConocoPhillips is willing to withdraw its Corporate Separateness Argument and Unreasonableness Argument for the limited purpose of this particular case;

WHEREAS, while Plaintiffs believe this Court has minimum contacts with California
sufficient to support specific jurisdiction over ConocoPhillips and contested ConocoPhillips's
motion to dismiss for that reason, they likewise are interested in the Court reaching the merits
arguments in Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6) motion, and therefore support the final resolution of the
Corporate Separateness Argument and Unreasonableness Argument by stipulation and without
the need for further Court involvement.

- NOW THEREFORE, the parties HEREBY STIPULATE AND AGREE, subject to the
 approval and order of the Court, as follows:
- 15 1. ConocoPhillips withdraws its motion for dismissal pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2), to the extent that motion asserts a Corporate Separateness Argument 16 17 and an Unreasonableness Argument. Specifically, ConocoPhillips withdraws Argument Sections 18 II.A and II.C of its opening brief and Argument Sections I.A and I.C of its reply, as well as the 19 Dodson Declaration, and any other sections or factual averments in its briefing that rely upon the 20 Dodson Declaration or upon the Corporate Separateness Argument or the Unreasonableness 21 Argument. However, ConocoPhillips specifically reserves and does not withdraw its But-For 22 Argument.
- 23 2. Plaintiffs will forgo any jurisdictional discovery against ConocoPhillips in
 24 relation to or pursuant to the Court's May 25, 2018 order and May 24 hearing; likewise
 25 ConocoPhillips will forgo any jurisdictional discovery against Plaintiffs in relation to or pursuant
 26 to the Court's May 24 hearing.
- 27 3. In light of this stipulation, there is no need for further jurisdictional discovery or
 28 briefing as relates to ConocoPhillips.

1	4. This stipulation does not operate as a waiver of personal jurisdiction in any other
2	litigation that has been or will be brought by any other plaintiff against ConocoPhillips, in any
3	forum; nor does it constitute a concession that ConocoPhillips Company or any indirect
4	subsidiary of ConocoPhillips is or has been the agent of ConocoPhillips for any purpose.
5	5. This agreement does not affect the rights of either party to assert any other
6	argument, claim, or defense in these cases, to the extent permitted by state or federal law, the
7	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or the Federal Rules of Evidence.
8	6. This agreement does not affect the rights of either party to seek appeal from, fees
9	or costs for, or any other right or remedy relating to the Rule 12(b)(6) motion currently pending
10	in these cases in this Court.
11	
12	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	4
	Stipulation and Proposed Order Case Nos. 3:17-cv-06011

1	Dated: June 5, 2018	Respectfully submitted,
2		By: <u>/s/ George Morris</u>
		Tracie J. Renfroe (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Carol M. Wood (<i>pro hac vice</i>)
3		KING & SPALDING LLP
4		1100 Louisiana, Suite 4000
5		Houston, TX 77002 Telephone: (713) 751-3200
6		Facsimile: (713) 751-3290
		Email: cwood@kslaw.com
7		Justin A. Torres (pro hac vice)
8		KING & SPALDING LLP
9		1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 200 Washington, D.C. 20006
10		Telephone: (202) 626-2959 Facsimile: (202) 626-3737
		Email: jtorres@kslaw.com
11		Megan R. Nishikawa (SBN 271670)
12		Nicholas Miller-Stratton (SBN 319240)
13		KING & SPALDING LLP
14		101 Second Street, Suite 2300 San Francisco, CA 94105
14		Telephone: (415) 318-1267
15		Facsimile: (415) 318-1300 Email: mnishikawa@kslaw.com
16		
17		George Morris (SBN 249930) KING & SPALDING LLP
		601 South California Avenue, Suite 100
18		Palo Alto, CA 94304 Telephone: (650) 422-6700
19		Facsimile: (650) 422-6800 Email: gmorris@kslaw.com
20		C C
21		Counsel for Defendant ConocoPhillips
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	Stipulation and Proposed-Order	5 Case Nos. 3:17-cv-(3:17-cv-(

		** /s/ Matthew D. Goldberg
1		DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669
2		City Attorney RONALD P. FLYNN, State Bar #184186
3		Chief Deputy City Attorney
		YVONNE R. MERÉ, State Bar #173594 Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation
4		ROBB W. KAPLA, State Bar #238896
5		Deputy City Attorney MATTHEW D. GOLDBERG, State Bar #240776
6		Deputy City Attorney City Hall, Room 234
		1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
7		San Francisco, California 94102-4602 Tel.: (415) 554-4748
8		Fax.: (415) 554-4715
9		Email: matthew.goldberg@sfcityatty.org
10		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
		CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO and PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
11		acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney
12		DENNIS J. HERRERA
13		** Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the electronic filer has obtained approval from
		this signatory.
14		** /-/ Frin Domotoin
15		<u>** /s/ Erin Bernstein</u> BARBARA J. PARKER (State Bar #069722)
16		City Attorney
17		MARIA BEE (State Bar #167716) Special Counsel
		ERIN BERNSTEIN (State Bar #231539) Supervising Deputy City Attorney
18		MALIA MCPHERSON (State Bar #313918)
19		Attorney One Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor
20		Oakland, California
		Tel.: (510) 238-3601 Fax: (510) 238-6500
21		Email: ebernstein@oaklandcityattorney.org
22		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
23		CITY OF OAKLAND and
24		PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by and through Oakland City Attorney
		BARBARA J. PARKER
25		** Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the
26		electronic filer has obtained approval from this signatory.
27		uns signatory.
28		6
	Stipulation and Proposed Order	Case Nos. 3:17-cv-06011

3:17-cv-06012

1 2 3 4 5 6 7		/s/ Steve W. Berman STEVE W. BERMAN (pro hac vice) steve@hbsslaw.com HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 1918 Eighth Ave. Suite 3300 Seattle, Washington 98101 Tel.: (206) 623-7292 Fax: (206) 623-7292 Fax: (206) 623-0594 SHANA E. SCARLETT (State Bar #217895) HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202 Berkeley, California 94710 cherge@hbsclew.com
8		shanas@hbsslaw.com Tel.: (510) 725-3000 Fax: (510) 725-3001
9 10		MATTHEW F. PAWA (pro hac vice) mattp@hbsslaw.com BENJAMIN A. KRASS (pro hac vice)
11		benk@hbsslaw.com HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
12		1280 Centre Street, Suite 230 Newton Centre, Massachusetts 02459
13		Tel.: (617) 641-9550 Fax: (617) 641-9551
14		Of Counsel Attorneys for Plaintiffs
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		7
	Stipulation and Proposed Order	Case Nos. 3:17-cv-06011 3:17-cv-06012

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER	
2	Pursuant to the above Stipulation of the parties, IT IS SO ORDERED. The deadlines	
3	for supplemental briefing on personal jurisdiction set forth in the Court's May 25 Order	
4	permitting jurisdictional discovery relative to ConocoPhillips are VACATED.	
5		
6	Date: June 6, 2018. WILLIAM H. ALSUP	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	8 Stipulation and Proposed-Order Case Nos. 3:17-cv-06011 3:17-cv-06012	