

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SEAN L. GILBERT, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
MONEYMUTUAL, LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [13-cv-01171-JSW](#)

**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
REGARDING CLASS NOTICE**

Re: Dkt. No. 405

United States District Court
Northern District of California

The Court has received and considered the parties’ Joint Report on Class Notice, which raises concerns with the Court that it should reconsider its finding that the notice plan approved is “the best practicable, ‘reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.’” *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797, 811-12 (1985) (quoting *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314-15 (1950)).

Accordingly, the parties are **HEREBY ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why the Court should not require additional notice, whether by way of an additional and more lengthy period of internet advertising, or another form of notice by publication, or require that an administrator be appointed to assist in developing a supplemental notice plan, and why it should not extend the deadline for class members to opt out of the class. The Court advises the parties that barring extraordinary circumstances, it would not find persuasive arguments about the costs involved with additional notice. *See Eisen v. Carlisle and Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 176 (1974).


//
//
//

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

The parties' responses to this Order to Show Cause shall be due by June 16, 2017.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 8, 2017



JEFFREY S. WHITE
United States District Judge