

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
 BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342
 2 DAVID L. ANDERSON #149604
 JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134
 3 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855
 DANIEL J. RICHERT #232208
 4 50 Fremont Street
 Post Office Box 7880
 5 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
 Telephone: (415) 983-1000
 6 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200

7 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
 8 DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 9 EDWARD R. MCNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 DAVID LEE LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 10 ERIC A. SHUMSKY #206124
 1501 K Street, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20005
 11 Telephone: (202) 736-8010
 12 Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

13 Attorneys for the Cingular Defendants

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17		MDL Dkt. No. 06-1791-VRW
18	In re:	STIPULATION TO STAY CASES
19	NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY	AGAINST CINGULAR
20	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS	
	LITIGATION	
21	This Document Relates To:	[Civil L.R. 6-2, 7-1(5), 7-12]
22	06-5452-VRW	Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor
23	06-6222-VRW	Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker
24	06-6224-VRW	
	06-6253-VRW	
25	06-6254-VRW	
	06-6570-VRW	
	07-0464-VRW	

26
 27
 28

1 **RECITALS**

2 A. On January 31, 2006, *Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al.*, Case No. 06-672-
3 VRW, was filed in this District. The *Hepting* complaint alleges, *inter alia*, that certain
4 AT&T entities have cooperated with the National Security Agency (“NSA”) in connection
5 with a terrorist surveillance program.

6 B. On May 11, 2006, *USA Today* published an article entitled “NSA has
7 massive database of Americans’ phone calls,” which alleges that AT&T, Verizon and
8 BellSouth have provided customer call records to the NSA. Following the publication of
9 this article, dozens of lawsuits were filed in various fora across the United States against a
10 number of telecommunications entities. Among the named parties in these lawsuits were
11 the following entities: Cingular Wireless LLC (now known as AT&T Mobility LLC), New
12 Cingular Wireless Services, Inc., and Cingular Wireless Corporation (now known as AT&T
13 Mobility Corporation) (collectively, the “Cingular Entities”).

14 C. On July 20, 2006, this Court entered an order in *Hepting* denying motions to
15 dismiss filed by the United States of America and AT&T Corp. (the “*Hepting* Ruling”).
16 This Court certified the *Hepting* Ruling for immediate appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
17 § 1292(b). Both the United States and AT&T Corp. petitioned the Ninth Circuit for
18 permission to appeal the *Hepting* Ruling, and the *Hepting* plaintiffs filed a cross-petition.

19 D. On August 9, 2006, the Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation (“JPML”)
20 entered its Transfer Order creating this MDL and transferring cases to this Court for
21 coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. Since the
22 August 9, 2006 Initial Transfer Order, the JPML has entered additional transfer orders,
23 transferring additional cases to this Court for coordinated or consolidated pretrial
24 proceedings.

25 E. The cases transferred into the MDL that have been filed against the Cingular
26 Entities are:

27 06-5452-VRW, *Harrington v. AT&T, Inc.*

28 06-6222-VRW, *Cross v. AT&T Communications, Inc.*

1 06-6224-VRW, *Cross v. AT&T Communications of California Inc.*

2 06-6253-VRW, *Derosier v. Cingular Wireless LLC*

3 06-6254-VRW, *Crockett v. Verizon Wireless*

4 06-6570-VRW, *Chulsky v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless*

5 07-0464-VRW, *Lebow et al v. BellSouth Corporation*

6 F. On November 7, 2006, the Ninth Circuit granted the petitions of the United
7 States and AT&T Corp. to appeal the *Hepting* Ruling.

8 G. On November 17, 2006, this Court held an MDL Case Management
9 Conference where, *inter alia*, it was ordered that Plaintiffs would file master consolidated
10 complaints against various defendant groups including against the Cingular Entities.

11 H. On January 16, 2007, the Plaintiffs filed consolidated complaints against the
12 Cingular Entities.

13 I. In furtherance of judicial economy, the plaintiffs' counsel for the subscribers
14 to the Cingular Entities, and the Cingular Entities wish to stay all proceedings against the
15 Cingular Entities pending the final adjudication of all appeals of the *Hepting* Ruling,
16 including disposition of any petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court,
17 without any prejudice to the rights of any party.

18 **STIPULATION**

19 The plaintiffs' counsel for the subscribers to the Cingular Entities and the Cingular
20 Entities hereby stipulate as follows:

21 1. All proceedings against the Cingular Entities shall be stayed pending the
22 final appellate ruling on the July 20, 2006, Hepting Ruling, including the disposition of any
23 petition for certiorari (or the expiration of time to seek such a petition) from the United
24 States Supreme Court for review of any decision the Ninth Circuit issues in its interlocutory
25 review of the Hepting ruling. This stay shall encompass any proceedings against the
26 Cingular Entities transferred by the JPML to this Court and consolidated with this MDL
27 subsequent to the entry of this Stipulation.

28

1 2. This stay shall in no way affect any MDL proceedings against entities other
2 than the Cingular Entities.

3 3. This stay shall not affect the substantive and other procedural rights of the
4 Cingular Entities or of the subscribers who have filed complaints against them.

5 4. The Cingular Entities need not file any pleading responding to the
6 consolidated complaints against each of them until sixty (60) days after the expiration of
7 this stay.

8 //

9 //

10 //

11 //

12 //

13 //

14 //

15 //

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **DECLARATION PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 45, § X.B**

2 I, BRUCE A. ERICSON, hereby declare pursuant to General Order 45, § X.B, that I
3 have obtained the concurrence in the filing of this document from each of the other
4 signatories listed below.

5 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing declaration is true and correct.

6 Executed on February 1, 2007, at San Francisco, California.

7 _____
8 */s/ Bruce A. Ericson*

9 Dated: February 1, 2007.

10
11 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
12 BRUCE A. ERICSON
13 DAVID L. ANDERSON
14 JACOB R. SORENSEN
15 MARC H. AXELBAUM
16 DANIEL J. RICHERT
17 50 Fremont Street
18 Post Office Box 7880
19 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880

20
21 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
22 DAVID W. CARPENTER
23 DAVID L. LAWSON
24 BRADFORD A. BERENSON
25 EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS
26 1501 K Street, N.W.
27 Washington, D.C. 20005

28
By _____
29 */s/ Bruce A. Ericson*
30 Bruce A. Ericson
31 Attorneys for the Cingular Defendants

32
33 GEORGE & BROTHERS
34 R. JAMES GEORGE, JR.
35 D. DOUGLAS BROTHERS
36 1100 Norwood Tower
37 114 W. 7th Street
38 Austin, TX 78701
39 Tel: (592) 495-1400
40 Fax: (592) 499-0094

41
42 By _____
43 */s/ R. James George, Jr. per G.O. 45*
44 R. James George Jr.
45 Interim Class Counsel for the Cingular Subscriber
46 Class

1 **[PROPOSED] ORDER**

2 Pursuant to the foregoing Stipulation, and good cause appearing, the Court orders
3 the following:

4 1. All proceedings against Cingular Wireless LLC (now known as AT&T
5 Mobility LLC), New Cingular Wireless Services, Inc., Cingular Wireless Corporation (now
6 known as AT&T Mobility Corporation) (collectively, the “Cingular Defendants”) in this
7 MDL, including those proceedings transferred to this Court by the JPML and consolidated
8 with this MDL subsequent to entry of this Order, are hereby stayed pending the final
9 appellate ruling on this Court’s July 20, 2006 ruling in *Hepting, et. al v. AT&T Corp., et.*
10 *al.*, including the disposition of any petition for certiorari (or the expiration of time to seek
11 such a petition) from the United States Supreme Court for review of any decision the Ninth
12 Circuit issues in its interlocutory review of that Hepting ruling.

13 2. This stay shall in no way affect any MDL proceedings against entities other
14 than the Cingular Defendants.

15 3. The Cingular Defendants need not file pleadings responsive to the
16 consolidated complaints against them until sixty (60) days after the expiration of this stay.

17 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: February __, 2007.

19
20
21

Hon. Vaughn R. Walker
United States District Chief Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28