1		**E-Filed 1/14/09**
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	NOT FOR CITATION	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11		
12	DOLORES MANDRIGUES, JUANITA JONES,	Case Number C 07-4497 JF (RS)
13	AL F. MINYEN, WILMA R. MINYEN, MARK CLAUSON, and CHRISTINA CLAUSON,	ORDER¹ LIMITING SCOPE OF
14 15	individually and on behalf of others similarly situated,	ORAL ARGUMENT ON PENDING MOTIONS
15	Plaintiffs,	
17	V.	
18		
19	WORLD SAVINGS, INC., WORLD SAVINGS BANK FSB, and WACHOVIA MORTGAGE CORPORATION,	
20	Defendants.	
21		
22	Commentations and the form this Count one Dising	
23	Currently pending before this Court are Plaintiffs' motions for class certification and for	
24	a preliminary injunction. On November 21, 2008, Defendants filed a motion for administrative	
25	relief requesting that the Court vacate the hearing on Plaintiffs' motions and issue a stay on the ground that this action is one of four currently the subject of a motion to transfer pending before	
26	ground that this action is one of four currently the subj	ject of a motion to transfer pending before
27		
28	¹ This disposition is not designated for publication in the official reports.	

the Joint Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("JPML"). In applying the factors governing the issuance of stays, the Court observed that "much as '[a] preliminary injunction is not a preliminary adjudication on the merits, but a device for preserving the status quo and preventing irreparable loss of rights before judgment,' the present inquiry concerns only whether Plaintiffs are likely enough to succeed in obtaining preliminary injunctive relief that the Court should preserve their right to proceed without further delay, notwithstanding the countervailing interest of judicial economy discussed above." Order Denying Request for Administrative Relief, at 4:18-24 (quoting *Textile Unlimited, Inc. v. ABMH & Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 781, 786 (9th Cir. 2001)).

The Court's assessment of the likelihood that Plaintiffs might succeed in obtaining a preliminary injunction was limited to a review of Plaintiffs' moving papers and less than one page of cursory opposing argument contained in Defendants' motion for administrative relief. Noting the somewhat generalized nature of Plaintiffs' evidence of imminent, irreparable harm, the Court also considered (1) the serious and irreparable quality of the alleged harm, (2) Defendants' limited and unpersuasive attempt to undermine Plaintiffs' evidence based solely on the relative magnitude of the alleged harm, and (3) the large number of recent decisions authorizing TILA claims nearly identical to those advanced by Plaintiffs, and based on very similar loan documents. In light of the foregoing, the Court concluded that considerations of judicial economy did not justify a potentially lengthy postponement of Plaintiffs' efforts to obtain relief.

However, having now had the benefit of full briefing, the Court is inclined to deny Plaintiffs' application for a preliminary injunction on the ground that Plaintiffs have failed to provide *concrete* evidence of imminent, irreparable harm caused by Defendants' alleged wrongdoing, either with respect to the named individuals or the putative class. It follows from this conclusion that the possibility of prejudice to Plaintiffs no longer offsets the strong considerations of judicial economy outlined in the Court's previous order, and the Court therefore is inclined to stay the instant action pending a decision from the JPML. In light of the foregoing, the Court hereby advises the parties that oral argument on January 16, 2009 will be

1

2

limited to the merits of Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction.

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED: 1/14/09

- K JEREMY FOO EL United States Listrict Judge

1	This Order has been served upon the following persons: Alicia Anne Adornato AAdornato@reedsmith.com		
2	David M. Arbogast darbogast@law111.com, jkerr@law111.com		
3	Jack R. Nelson jnelson@reedsmith.com, cahunt@reedsmith.com		
4	Jeffrey K Berns jberns@law111.com, staff@jeffbernslaw.com		
	Jonathan Shub jshub@seegerweiss.com, atorres@seegerweiss.com		
5	Keith David Yandell kyandell@reedsmith.com, dkelley@reedsmith.com		
6	Michael C Eyerly eyerly@kbla.com Michael J. Quirk mquirk@wcblegal.com		
7	Patrick DeBlase deblase@kbla.com		
8	Paul R. Kiesel Kiesel@kbla.com, cgarcia@kbla.com		
9			
	Notice has been delivered by other means to:		
10	Mark R. Cuker		
11	Williams Cuker Berezofsky		
12	1617 John F. Kennedy Blvd		
13	Suite 800		
14	Philiadelphia, PA 19103		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	4		
	4 Case No. C 07-4497 JF (RS) ORDER LIMITING SCOPE OF ORAL ARGUMENT ON PENDING MOTIONS (JFLC3)		