ai v. Ta	inoo! inc, et al				DC		
	Case 4:07-cv-02151-CW	Document 110	Filed 10/22/2007	Page 1 of 4			
1							
1	Morton, H. Sklar, Executive Director msklar@humanrightsusa.org						
2	World Organization for Human Rights USA						
3	2029 P Street NW, Suite 301 Washington, DC 20036						
4	Telephone: (202) 296-5702						
5	Facsimile: (202) 296-5704 [Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>]						
6	Roger Myers (CA State Bar N	Io. 146164)					
7	roger.myers@hro.com						
8	HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP 560 Mission Street, 25 th Floor						
9	San Francisco, CA 94105-2994						
10	Telephone: (415) 268-2000 Facsimile: (415) 268-1999						
11	[Additional Attorneys Appear on Signature Page]						
12	Attorneys for Plaintiffs						
13							
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
15	SAN FRANSISCO DIVISION						
16	WANG XIAONING, YU LIN and ADDITIONAL PRESEN	, ,	Case No. C07-0215	51 CW			
17	UNNAMED AND TO BE ID INDIVIDUALS,	ENTIFIED	TORT DAMAGES (CLAIM			
18	Plaintif	fs,	PLAINTIFFS' OPPO				
19	V.		DEFENDANTS' RU SUPPLEMENTAL S				
20	YAHOO, INC., a Delaware C YAHOO! HONG KONG, LT		Judge: Hon. Claudia V	Vilken			
21	Subsidiary of Yahoo!, AND C	THER	Juage. Hom. Claudia V	VIIKOII			
22	PRESENTLY UNNAMED A IDENTIFIED CORPORATE						
23	AND UNNAMED AND TO I IDENTIFIED INDIVIDUAL						
24	OF SAID CORPORATIONS, Defend						
25	Defend	ants.	I				
26							
27							
28							
	Plaintiff's Opposition to Rule 7-11	Submission		Case No. C07-021	51 CW		

Plaintiffs object to the Defendants' seeking leave to file an administrative letter under Rule 7-11 with the court containing their views on the applicability of the newly issued decision in *Khulumani v. Barclay*, (2d Cir., decided Oct. 12, 2007) to the proceedings currently before the Court relating to jurisdictional discovery. Plaintiffs note at the outset that the Defendants' pleading and letter were filed with the Court prior to the Plaintiffs being notified of the action or given an opportunity to join (or object to) an accompanying stipulation or declaration, which was not initially submitted with the pleading, along with a proposed Order, as required under Rule 7-11 in any case, but submitted several hours later. Moreover, Rule 7-11 submissions are not intended to provide parties with additional opportunities to file supplemental submissions to the Court on pending issues that are outside of, and in addition to, the regularly scheduled pleadings. Plaintiffs note in addition that the decision in the *Khulumani* case is a matter of public record and may be interpreted and applied by the Court without the need for additional briefing by the parties.

With regard to the substantive point the Defendants seek to raise in their letter, that the TVPA portion of the complaint in *Khulumani* was dismissed because a connection between the defendant corporations' actions in that case was not sufficiently linked with official state conduct that would establish the presence of state sponsored torture, this allegation has no relevance to the Yahoo! litigation. The present proceedings are firmly based on clearly enunciated allegations that actions by state officials taken under the color of law, aided and abetted by actions by Yahoo!, produced the arbitrary arrests, long-term detentions, and acts of torture that provide the basis for the complaint. The *Khulumani* decision was noted in the Plaintiffs brief as providing support for the principle that a private corporation can be held accountable for major human rights abuses under the "aiding and abetting" principle, and the need for more detailed findings of fact regarding the aiding and abetting and justiciability issues in connection with the pending jurisdictional discovery motion. It was not cited, as the Defendants are suggesting, in reference to the question of the sufficiency of the allegations in the complaint under the TVPA, which is what the portion of the *Khulumani* decision they refer to addresses.

Both parties will have an opportunity to further address these issues, and the relevance of the *Khulumani* decision to this case, at the scheduled November 1, 2007 hearing before the Court. No further delays or supplemental pleadings are required for these issues to be properly considered.

	Case 4:07-cv-02151-CW	Document 110	Filed 10/22/2007	Page 3 of 4
1	Respectfully submitted this 2	22nd day of Octobe	er 2007 by	
2	Respectany submitted this i	2211d day 01 001000	ci, 2007, by	
3			MORTON SKLAR	
4			THERESA HARRIS	XATION FOR HUMAN
5			RIGHTS USA	
6			By: /s/ Morton Sklar Morton Sklar	
7				
8			ROGER MYERS	& OWEN LLP
9	HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP By: /s/ Roger Myers			
10			Roger Myers	
11			Attorneys for Plainti	ffs
12			Karen Parker	12496)
13			(CA State Bar No. 1 Association of Huma	
14			154 5th Avenue San Francisco, CA 9	4118
15			Telephone: (415) 666 E-mail: ied@agc.org	8-2752
16				
17			With the assistance of	
18			Rifk Ebeid, George I of Law	Mason University School
19			Legal Intern	
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	Plaintiff's Opposition to Rule 7-1	1 Submission	2	Case No. C07-02151 CW

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE						
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	This is to certify under penalty of perjury that service of the foregoing Plaintiffs' position to Defendants' Rule 7-11 Supplemental Submission has been made on the parties ed below through the Court's electronic filing system and by depositing a copy thereof in the ted States Postal Service first class mail, postage prepaid, addressed to: niel M. Petrocelli thew T. Kline n Rader Melveny & Meyers LLP 9 Avenue of the Stars						
10	Los Angeles, California 90067-6035						
11	Signed and certified to this 22nd day of October, 2007.						
12							
1314151617	By: /s/ Morton Sklar Morton Sklar Executive Director World Organization for Human Rights USA 2029 P Street NW, Suite 301 Washington, DC 20036						
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
2324							
25							
26							
27							
28							