1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
10	CLRB Hanson Industries, LLC, et al., NO. C 05-03649 JW		
11	Plaintiffs, AMENDED ORDER DENYING MOTION v. TO INTERVENE		
12	Google Inc., et al.,		
13 14	/ Defendant.		
15			
16			
17	7 The Motion is brought by "Bernard Madoff d/b/a Jonathan Lee Riches" ("Movant"), who seeks to		
18	8 intervene pursuant to Rule 24(a)(2) and Rule 24(b). (Motion at 1.) The parties filed a timely joint		
19	9 opposition. ( <u>See</u> Docket Item No. 323.)		
20	Under Rule 24(a)(2), a court must permit anyone to intervene who "claims an interest		
21	relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action, and is so situated that		
22	2 disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its		
23	3 interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest." Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). Under		
24	Rule 24(b), a court may permit anyone to intervene who "(A) is given a conditional right to		
25	intervene by a federal statute; or (B) has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a		
26	common question of law or fact." Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b).		

Here, although Movant represents that he has a "common vested interest and . . . documents,
emails, exhibits, and photographs related to this case," and that he is a "convicted computer hacker

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

with knowledge about Googles [sic] systems and hard drives," he does not state why such knowledge would be relevant to the class' settlement. (Motion at 1.) Further, Movant is not a member of the class certified in this case. (Declaration of Markham Sherwood ¶¶ 1-2, Docket Item No. 323.) Thus, Movant has failed to establish an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of this action. Further, Movant fails to make an adequate showing that he has a conditional right to intervene pursuant to a federal statute, or that he has a claim that shares with a common question of law or fact with this action. Thus, the Court finds Movant has not established sufficient grounds for intervention under Rule 24.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES Movant's Motion to Intervene as Plaintiff and for Leave to File a Brief of Amicus Curiae. 

Dated: June 19, 2009

James Wase

JAMÉS WARE United States District Judge

**United States District Court** 

For the Northern District of California

1	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS	ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:
2	Adel A. Nadji anadji@audetlaw.com	
3	Daniel Jeffrey Shih <u>dshih@susmangodfrey.com</u> Daralyn J. Durie ddurie@durietangri.com	
4	David T. Biderman dbiderman@perkinscoie.com Farschad Farzan ffarzan@perkinscoie.com	
5		
6		
7		
8	Ryan Marshall Kent rkent@durietangri.com Stephen D. Susman ssusman@susmangodfrey.com	
9	William M. Audet waudet@audetlaw.com	
10	Bernard Madoff d/b/a Jonathan Lee Riches	
11	1306 Ash Bridge Rd. West Chester, PA 19380	
12		
13	Dated: June 19, 2009	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk
14		
15		By: /s/ JW Chambers Elizabeth Garcia
		By: /s/ JW Chambers Elizabeth Garcia Courtroom Deputy
15		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17 18		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17 18 19		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17 18 19 20		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17 18 19 20 21		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		Elizabeth Garcia
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Elizabeth Garcia

26 27 28