

PEGGY A. WHIPPLE (MO 54758)
peggy.whipple@psc.mo.gov
 Attorney for Missouri Public Service Commission
 LINDA CONTI (ME 3638)
Linda.Conti@maine.gov
 Assistant Attorney General of Maine
 PATRICK DEALMEIDA
patrick.dealmeida@dol.lps.state.nj.us
 Assistant Attorney General of New Jersey
 TATIANA D. EIRMANN (CT 03398)
tatiana.eirmann@po.state.ct.us
 Assistant Attorney General of Connecticut
 MICHAEL DONOFRIO (VT 4400)
mdonofrio@atg.state.vt.us
 Assistant Attorney General of Vermont

[Additional counsel for states and interveners appear on signature page.]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY) TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS) LITIGATION, MDL No. 1791)) This Document Relates To:)) <u>Robert Clayton, et al. v. AT&T</u>) <u>Communications of the Southwest, Inc.,</u>) <u>et al., (W.D.Mo.)</u>) <u>USA v. Steve Gaw, et al., (E.D.Mo.)</u>) <u>USA v. Kurt Adams, et al., (D. Me.)</u>) <u>USA v. Zulima V. Farber, et al., (D.N.J.)</u>) <u>USA v. Anthony J. Palermino,</u>) <u>et al., (D.Ct.)</u>) <u>USA v. James Volz, et al., (D.Vt.)</u>)))))))	MDL Docket No. 06-1791 VRW Relates to Case Nos. 07-cv-1187-VRW 07-cv-1242-VRW 07-cv-1323-VRW 07-cv-1324-VRW 07-cv-1326-VRW (N.D. Cal. Number not yet assigned to Vermont case) STATE OFFICIALS’ ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR SCHEDULING ORDER [CIVIL L.R. 7-11] Courtroom: 6, 17 th Floor Judge: The Hon. Vaughn R. Walker
---	---

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11, the state officials and interveners in Robert Clayton, et al. v. AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc., et al., (N.D. Cal. No. C-07-1187-VRW); USA v. Steve Gaw, et al., (N.D. Cal. No. C-07-1242-VRW); USA v. Kurt Adams, et al., (N.D. Cal. No. C-07-1323-VRW); USA v. Zulima V. Farber, et al., (N.D. Cal. No. C-07-1324-VRW); USA v. Anthony J. Palermino, et al., (N.D. Cal. No. C-07-1326-VRW); and USA v. James Volz, et al., (N.D. Cal. C-07-0000-VRW) (“the State Cases”), hereby make this administrative motion respectfully requesting this Court to issue a scheduling order (1) setting the date for filing reply briefs to dispositive motions already pending in the Connecticut (USA v. Palermino) and Vermont (USA v. Volz) cases, (2) setting the date for supplementation with Ninth Circuit law, as necessary, of already pending dispositive motions and briefs in all six of the above-captioned cases, and (3) setting a date for oral argument on the dispositive motions already pending in all six of the above-captioned cases.

Additionally, the pending interveners in the Maine (USA v. Adams), Connecticut (USA v. Palermino) and Vermont (USA v. Volz) cases respectfully request this Court to rule at its earliest convenience on their fully briefed motions to intervene.

I. Background

The State Cases were transferred to this Court on February 15, 2007 by order of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. Well before the date of this transfer order, cross motions for dismissal and for summary judgment had been filed and briefed in each of these cases and, with the exception of reply briefs yet to be filed in the Connecticut and Vermont cases, were ripe for determination.¹ All of these cases involve state

¹ All briefing was concluded in the Missouri Western District case on September 27, 2006; briefing was concluded in the Missouri Eastern District case on October 20, 2006; briefing was concluded in the Maine

officials, acting in their official capacities regarding public utilities subject to their jurisdiction. None of these cases involve private plaintiffs' class actions. Therefore, neither the State Cases nor the private plaintiffs' class action cases currently pending before this Court will be served by coordinated or consolidated discovery. Additionally, the resolution of these six cases will not be served by repetitive briefing. Consequently, the state officials and interveners respectfully submit that these State Cases should proceed expeditiously on a track separate from but concurrent with the track set for the private plaintiffs' class actions.

These state officials and interveners have already been in contact with Co-Lead Coordinating Counsel for the private plaintiffs' class action cases, and also with counsel for the Department of Justice, in an attempt to coordinate a proposed scheduling order for the State Cases. These state officials and interveners and the Department of Justice did not reach agreement to permit a stipulation. On the other hand, Co-Lead Coordinating Counsel for the private plaintiffs' class action cases do not object to the following proposed schedule.

II. Proposed Schedule

March 30, 2007 Parties file reply briefs to dispositive motions already pending in Connecticut and Vermont.

All movants file supplemental briefs on dispositive motions already pending in the State Cases. Said briefs shall be limited to addressing legal issues arising from the transfer of the State Cases to the Northern District of California, including choice of law issues and issues relating to relevant Ninth Circuit precedent that were not previously briefed.

case on January 8, 2007; briefing was concluded in the New Jersey case on November 13, 2006; only reply briefs are yet to be filed in the Connecticut case and those were due to be filed on February 26, 2007; and only reply briefs are yet to be filed in the Vermont case and those were due to be filed on March 13, 2007.

April 30, 2007

All respondents file responses to the supplemental briefs ordered above. Said responses shall be limited as described above for the supplemental briefs.

May __, 2007
or June __,
2007

Oral argument on all dispositive motions already pending in State Cases.
(The state officials and interveners respectfully request oral argument on these motions, the date to be set at the Court's convenience.)

III. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the state officials and interveners respectfully request that this Court issue an Order setting forth the above schedule for briefing and oral argument on the dispositive motions already pending in all six of these cases. A Proposed Order is attached hereto for the Court's consideration.

DATED: March 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Peggy A. Whipple

Peggy A. Whipple

Missouri Bar No. 54758

peggy.whipple@psc.mo.gov

Jennifer Heintz

Missouri Bar No. 57128

jennifer.heintz@psc.mo.gov

P. O. Box 360

Jefferson City, MO 65102

Tel: (573) 526-6715

Fax: (573) 751-9285

Attorneys for the

Missouri Public Service Commission

DECLARATION PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER 45, § X.B

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

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

Executed on March 9, 2007, at Jefferson City, Missouri.

/s/ Peggy A. Whipple
Peggy A. Whipple

Dated: March 9, 2007.

G. STEVEN ROWE
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MAINE
State House Station 6
Augusta, Maine 04333

By: /s/ Linda J. Conti
Linda J. Conti
Christopher C. Taub
Assistant Attorneys General

MAINE PUBLIC ADVOCATE
112 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333-0112

By: /s/ William C. Black
Acting Public Advocate
Maine Bar # 001011

ATTORNEYS FOR PROPOSED
INTERVENORS James Douglas Cowie,
et al.

/s/ John M. R. Paterson
John M. R. Paterson, Maine Bar #1400
Berstein Shur
100 Middle Street
P.O. Box 9729
Portland, ME 04104-5029

/s/ Zachary L. Heiden
Zachary L. Heiden
MCLU Foundation
402 Cumberland Ave., Ste. 105
Portland, ME 04101

STUART RABNER
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW
JERSEY

By: /s/ Patrick DeAlmeida
Patrick DeAlemeida
Assistant Attorney General
R. J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street
Trenton, NJ 08625
Tel: (609) 292-8576

Anthony J. Palermino,
Donald W. Downes,
Jack R. Gold berg,
John W. Betkoski III,
Anne C. George,
Commissioners
Connecticut Department of Public
Utility Control

RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

By: /s/ Tatiana D. Eirmann
Tatiana D. Eirmann
Assistant Attorney General
Federal Bar No. ct03398
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Tel: (860) 827-2620
Fax: (860)-860-2893

ATTORNEY FOR INTERVENING
DEFENDANTS, THE AMERICAN
CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF
CONNECTICUT

By: /s/ Seth R. Klein
SCHATZ NOBEL IZARD, P.C.
Seth R. Klein (ct18121)
20 Church Street, Suite 1700
Hartford, CT 06103
Tel: (860) 493-6292
Fax: (860) 493-6290

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION, FOUNDATION OF
CONNECTICUT
Renee Redman (ct16604),
Legal Director
32 Grand Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Tel: (860) 247-9823
Fax: (860) 728-0287

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL
Mary J. Healey, Consumer Counsel

By: /s/ William L. Vallée Jr.
Litigation Attorney
Fed. Bar No. ct02042
Ten Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06051
Tel: (860) 827-2905
Fax: (860) 827-2929

STATE OF VERMONT
WILLIAM H. SORRELL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: /s/ Michael N. Donofrio
Mark J. DiStefano
Michael N. Donofrio
Assistant Attorneys General
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609
Tel: (802) 828-3171

Counsel for Defendants James Volz,
David C. Coen, John D. Burke, and
David O'Brien

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION OF
VERMONT

By: /s/ Richard H. Saudek
Richard H. Saudek
CHENEY, BROCK & SAUDEK, P.C.
159 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05602
Tel: (802) 223-4000
Fax: (802) 229-0370

Lucia Schaefer, Esq.
American Civil Liberties Union
Foundation of Vermont