1			
1			
2			
3 4			
4 5			
6			
7	IN THE UNITED STA	ATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
10	The Apple iPod iTunes Antitrust Litigation	NO. C 05-00037 JW NO. C 07-06507 JW	
 11 12 13 14 	/ Stacie Somers, Plaintiff,	ORDER VACATING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE; DENYING AS PREMATURE INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTION PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMENDED COMPLAINT	
15 16 17	v. Apple, Inc. Defendant.		
18 19	This case is scheduled for a Case Management Conference on February 22, 2010. Pursuant		
20	to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules of this Court, the parties conferred and duly		
20 21	submitted a Joint Case Management Statement. (hereafter, "Statement," Docket Item No. 323.)		
22	A. <u>Direct Purchaser Action</u>		
23	Pursuant to the Court's request, Direct Purchaser Action Plaintiffs filed an Amended		
24	Consolidated Complaint on January 26, 2010. (See Docket Item No. 322.) Defendant's responsive		
25	pleading is due February 22, 2010, and Defendar	nt represents that it will file a dispositive motion by	
26	that date with a hearing date noticed for April 26, 2010. (Statement at 1.) In light of Defendant's		
27	anticipated dispositive motion, the Court finds good cause to VACATE the Case Management		
28	Conference pending consideration of that motion	1.	

In their Statement, the parties bring to the Court's attention an ongoing discovery dispute. Defendant asks the Court to stay certain discovery until after its dispositive Motion is decided. (Statement at 6.) The Court declines Defendant's request. As the Court has already made clear in its prior Orders in this case and its statement on the record at the November 23, 2009 hearing on the parties' various class certification motions, Plaintiffs may proceed with discovery at this time. The parties shall bring any discovery disputes before Judge Lloyd. The Court declines to interfere with 6 Judge Lloyd's decisions regarding the briefing and hearing schedule for Plaintiffs' motion to

compel. **B**. **Indirect Purchaser Action**

In its December 29, 2009 Order,¹ the Court ordered the Indirect Purchaser Action Plaintiff to 9 10 show cause, if any, why her case should not be dismissed since the basis for a separate action, 11 namely, indirect purchasers of iPods, is no longer viable in light of the Court's denial of certification of the damages class. The Court stated that once the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs amend their 12 pleadings to add remedies also sought by the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff, it appears that the Indirect 13 Purchaser Action will become unnecessary. (Id. at 11-12.) On February 1, 2010, the Indirect 14 15 Purchaser Action Plaintiff filed a Response to the Court's Order to Show Cause. (See Docket Item 16 No. 91.) On February 12, 2010, the Indirect Purchaser Action Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to File a First Amended Complaint. (hereafter, "Motion for Leave," Docket Item No. 92.) 17

18 In light of the pending Order to Show Cause re Dismissal, the Court finds that consideration 19 of the Motion for Leave would be premature at this time. Accordingly, the Court DENIES the 20 Indirect Purchaser Action Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File a First Amended Complaint without prejudice to her ability to revive the Motion if the Court determines that the two cases should remain 21 22 separate actions.

At the April 26, 2010 hearing, the Court will also address its Order to Show Cause. On or 23 24 before March 19, 2010, Defendant shall file its Reply to the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff's Response 25 to the Order to Show Cause.

¹ (Order Decertifying Classes Without Prejudice to Being Renewed; Inviting Further 27 Motions, Docket Item No. 303.)

For the Northern District of Californi

26

28

United States District Court

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

United States District Court

C. <u>Conclusion</u>

The Court VACATES the Case Management Conference scheduled for February 22, 2010. In its Order addressing Defendant's anticipated dispositive motion, the Court will set a further Case Management Conference, if necessary.

Dated: February 17, 2010

James What

JAMES WARE United States District Judge

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Alreen Haeggquist alreenh@zhlaw.com Andrew S. Friedman afriedman@bffb.com Bonny E. Sweeney bonnys@csgrr.com Brian P Murray bmurray@murrayfrank.com Caroline Nason Mitchell cnmitchell@jonesday.com Craig Ellsworth Stewart cestewart@jonesday.com David Craig Kiernan dkiernan@jonesday.com Elaine A. Ryan eryan@bffb.com Francis Joseph Balint fbalint@bffb.com Helen I. Zeldes helenz@zhlaw.com Jacqueline Sailer jsailer@murrayfrank.com John J. Stoia jstoia@csgrr.com Michael D Braun service@braunlawgroup.com Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com Michael Tedder Scott michaelscott@jonesday.com Paula Michelle Roach proach@csgrr.com Robert Allan Mittelstaedt ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com Thomas J. Kennedy tkennedy@murrayfrank.com Thomas Robert Merrick tmerrick@csgrr.com	om
13 14 15	Dated: February 17, 2010	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
16		By: /s/ JW Chambers
17		Elizabeth Garcia Courtroom Deputy
17 18		
18 19		
18 19 20		
18 19 20 21		
18 19 20 21 22		
18 19 20 21 22 23		
18 19 20 21		
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 		
18 19 20 21 22 23		
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 		
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 		
 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 		

United States District Court For the Northern District of California 1