

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

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 DENYING DEFENDANT’S
MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
RELIEF**

_____ /

Presently before the Court is Defendant’s Administrative Motion Regarding Seven Motions Renoticed by Plaintiffs. (hereafter, “Motion,” Docket Item No. 687.) Defendant moves the Court to take one of several forms of action in response to a number of Motions that were renoticed by Plaintiffs in response to the Court’s September 27, 2011 Order,¹ on the ground that the “record that Plaintiffs have ‘renoticed’ is both over- and under-inclusive.” (Motion at 2.)

Upon review, the Court does not find good cause to take any of the forms of action requested by Defendant. In its September 27 Order, the Court specifically identified a “number of pending Motions relating to class certification in this case,” and instructed the parties to “terminate[] and renotice[]” each of those pending Motions “[i]n light of the Court’s grant of additional time for the parties to complete [certain] Supplemental Expert Reports, and in order to control its own docket.” (September 27 Order at 1-2.) The Court further explained that “[u]pon renoticing, the Motions remain under submission pending the parties’ Supplemental Briefs.” (*Id.* at 2.) Pursuant to the

¹ (Order Requiring Parties to Renotice Pending Motions, hereafter, “September 27 Order,” Docket Item No. 680.)


United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

Court's September 27 Order, Plaintiffs renoticed the pending Motions for November 28, 2011.²
(See Docket Item No. 686.) Thus, Plaintiffs have complied with the Court's September 27 Order.

Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Administrative Relief is DENIED.

Dated: October 24, 2011



JAMES WARE
United States District Chief Judge

² As previously discussed, the Motions are taken under submission without oral argument. However, the Court reserves the right to have additional hearing upon review of the briefs submitted to date.

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

- 2 Alexandra Senya Bernay xanb@rgrdlaw.com
- Alreen Haeggquist alreenh@zhlaw.com
- 3 Andrew S. Friedman afriedman@bffb.com
- Bonny E. Sweeney bonnys@rgrdlaw.com
- 4 Brian P Murray bmurray@murrayfrank.com
- Carmen Anthony Medici cmedici@rgrdlaw.com
- 5 Caroline Nason Mitchell cnmitchell@jonesday.com
- Craig Ellsworth Stewart cestewart@jonesday.com
- 6 David Craig Kiernan dkiernan@jonesday.com
- Elaine A. Ryan eryan@bffb.com
- 7 Francis Joseph Balint fbalint@bffb.com
- George A. Riley griley@omm.com
- 8 Helen I. Zeldes helenz@zhlaw.com
- Jacqueline Sailer jsailer@murrayfrank.com
- 9 John J. Stoia jstoia@rgrdlaw.com
- Michael D Braun service@braunlawgroup.com
- 10 Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com
- 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
- 13 Todd David Carpenter tcarpenter@bffb.com

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: October 24, 2011

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk

By: /s/ JW Chambers
Susan Imbriani
Courtroom Deputy