# 2 3 4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

"The Apple iPod iTunes Anti-Trust Litigation"

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

The Apple iPod iTunes Antitrust Litigation NO. C 05-00037 JW

## ORDER REQUIRING FURTHER SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING

A hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification in this case is scheduled for June 27, 2011. On May 19, 2011, the Court denied Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification as premature.<sup>1</sup> The Court explained that it lacked information necessary to certify the class, and accordingly, the Court ordered further briefing to address the issues of how the class should be defined and the length of the class period. (Id. at 14-15.) On June 6, 2011, the parties filed supplemental briefs to address those issues.<sup>2</sup> However, in their supplemental briefs, neither party provided a sufficient definition of

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

21

Doc. 639

<sup>1 (</sup>Order Granting in part and Denying in part Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment; Denying as Premature Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification, hereafter, "May 19 Order," Docket Item No. 627.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> (<u>See</u> Supplemental Brief in Support of Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion for Class Certification and Response to Court's May 19, 2011 Order, hereafter, "Plaintiffs' Brief," Docket Item No. 629; Apple's Supplemental Brief Re Class Certification, hereafter, "Defendant's Brief," Docket Item No. 633.) In addition, on June 22, 2011, Defendant filed a Request for Leave and Supplemental Brief Re Wal-Mart Stores Inc. v. Dukes, contending that the Supreme Court's June 20, 2011 decision in Dukes has a significant effect on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification. (See Docket Item No. 638.)

the class. Thus, the Court finds that it would benefit from further supplemental briefing on these issues as well as new issues that would potentially impact the class that the Court has identified.

Accordingly, on or before **June 23, 2011**, the parties shall file simultaneous supplemental briefs addressing: (1) the specific definition of the products at issue in the class period, namely whether the class consists of purchasers of all iPod products (e.g., iPod Shuffle, iPod Nano, etc.); (2) the geographic scope of the class; and (3) the effect of the Supreme Court's decision in Dukes on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification.

The hearing on the Motion for Class Certification remains set for June 27, 2011 at 9 a.m.

Dated: June 22, 2011

JAMES WARE

United States District Chief Judge

James While

28

## THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO: 1 Alexandra Senya Bernay xanb@rgrdlaw.com Alreen Haeggquist alreenh@zhlaw.com Andrew S. Friedman afriedman@bffb.com 3 Bonny E. Sweeney bonnys@rgrdlaw.com Brian P Murray bmurray@murrayfrank.com 4 Carmen Anthony Medici cmedici@rgrdlaw.com 5 Caroline Nason Mitchell cnmitchell@jonesday.com Craig Ellsworth Stewart cestewart@jonesday.com David Craig Kiernan dkiernan@jonesday.com 6 Elaine A. Ryan ervan@bffb.com Francis Joseph Balint <a href="mailto:fbalint@bffb.com">fbalint@bffb.com</a> George A. Riley griley@omm.com 8 Helen I. Zeldes helenz@zhlaw.com Jacqueline Sailer jsailer@murrayfrank.com 9 John J. Stoia įstoia@rgrdlaw.com Michael D Braun service@braunlawgroup.com Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com 10 Michael Tedder Scott michaelscott@jonesday.com 11 Robert Allan Mittelstaedt ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com Roy Arie Katriel rak@katriellaw.com 12 Thomas J. Kennedy tkennedy@murrayfrank.com Thomas Robert Merrick tmerrick@rgrdlaw.com Todd David Carpenter tcarpenter@bffb.com 13 14 **Dated: June 22, 2011** Richard W. Wieking, Clerk 15 16 By: /s/ JW Chambers Susan Imbriani 17 **Courtroom Deputy** 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27