1 2 3 IT IS SO ORDEREI 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 13 **SAN JOSE DIVISION** 14 CASE NO. 5:09-CV-04854-JW 15 MAUREEN THOMPSON, an individual, on behalf of herself and all others similarly 16 situated. D] ORDER APPOINTING 17 Plaintiffs, **PLAINTIFFS' CO-LEAD COUNSEL** 18 VS. T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware 19 Corporation, DANGER, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and MICROSOFT 20 CORPORATION, a Washington 21 Corporation, 22 Defendants. 23 24 25 26 27 28

| 1 2 | ELI MAPSTEAD, on behalf of himself and for the benefit of all with the common or general interest, any persons injured, and all | CASE NO. 5:09-CV-04901-JW |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 3 | others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, | |
| 4 | VS. | |
| 5 | T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware | |
| 6 | Corporation, DANGER, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and MICROSOFT | |
| 7 | CORPORATION, a Washington Corporation, | |
| 8 | Defendants. | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | DERIKA MOSES, an individual, on behalf | CASE NO. 5:09-CV-05901-JW |
| 11 | of herself and all other persons similarly situated, | |
| 12 | Plaintiffs, | |
| 13 | VS. | |
| 14 | T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware Corporation, DANGER, INC., a Delaware | |
| 15 | Corporation, and MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington | |
| 16 | Corporation, and DOES 1-10, inclusive, | |
| 17 | Defendants. | |
| 18 | | CASE NO. 5:09-CV-05973-JW |
| 19 | MARY PEITLER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, | CASE NO. 3.09-C V-03713-3W |
| 20 | Plaintiffs, | |
| 21 | vs. | |
| 22 | T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware | |
| 23 | Corporation, | |
| 24 | Defendant. | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |

| 1 2 | LISA MARINARO and NICOLE MARINO, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, | CASE NO. 5:09-CV-05974-JW | |
|-----|---|---------------------------|--|
| 3 | Plaintiffs, | | |
| 4 | VS. | | |
| 5 | T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware | | |
| 6 | Corporation, and MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington | | |
| 7 | Corporation, Defendants. | | |
| 8 | OREN ROSENTHAL, individually and as | CASE NO. 5:09-CV-05975-JW | |
| 9 | the representative of a class of similarly- situated persons, | | |
| 10 | Plaintiffs, | | |
| 11 | VS. | | |
| 12 | T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Washington Corporation, | | |
| 13 | Defendants. | | |
| 14 | SHANNON DRAKE, an individual, on | CASE NO. 5:09-CV-06100-JW | |
| 15 | behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, | | |
| 16 | Plaintiffs, | | |
| 17 | VS. | | |
| 18 | T-MOBILE USA, INC., a Delaware | | |
| 19 | Corporation, MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a Washington | | |
| 20 | Corporation, and DANGER, INC., a subsidiary of MICROSOFT | | |
| 21 | CORPORATION, | | |
| 22 | Defendants. | | |
| 23 | WHEREAS, the above-captioned cases have been found to be related cases pursuant to | | |
| 24 | Civil Local Rule 3-12; | | |
| 25 | WHEREAS, the parties have agreed that the related cases should be consolidated pursuant | | |
| 26 | to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a); | | |
| 27 | WHEREAS, Plaintiffs, through their counsel of record, have agreed to a leadership | | |
| 28 | structure; | | |
| | | | |

| 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 | |

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs, in order to efficiently and predictably draft and file a Consolidated Complaint and handle a multitude of case management issues for the consolidated action in a short time frame have demonstrated good cause for the usefulness at this time to have a leadership structure in place;

WHEREAS, Defendants do not oppose Plaintiffs' proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COURT ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Court appoints the following counsel as Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(3):
 - a. Ira Rothken of the Rothken Law Firm, LLP;
 - b. Sherrie R. Savett of Berger & Montague, PC;
 - c. Michael J. Aschenbrener of Edelson McGuire, LLC; and
 - d. Samuel H. Rudman of Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP.
- 2. Co-Lead Counsel shall have day-to-day responsibility for the conduct of the consolidated action; shall determine how to prosecute the action and shall initiate, coordinate and supervise the efforts of plaintiffs' counsel in the consolidated action in the areas of discovery, briefing, trial and settlement.
- 3. Co-Lead Counsel shall coordinate, initiate and conduct discovery on behalf of Plaintiffs consistent with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, including preparing joint interrogatories and requests for production of documents and the examination of witnesses in depositions; fund the necessary and appropriate costs of discovery and other common benefit efforts; consult with and employ consultants or experts, as necessary; coordinate settlement discussions or other ADR efforts on behalf of Plaintiffs, under the supervision of the Court, if and as appropriate; and enter into stipulations with opposing counsel as necessary for the conduct of the consolidated action.
- 4. Co-Lead Counsel shall designate responsibilities for specific tasks to plaintiffs' counsel in the consolidated action in a manner to assure that pretrial preparation is conducted effectively, efficiently and economically; and shall monitor the activities of plaintiffs' counsel to assure that schedules are met and unnecessary expenditures of time and money are avoided. Co-

- 4 -

| 1 | Lead Counsel shall maintain the official service list of all plaintiffs and plaintiffs' counsel in the | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | consolidated action, including their addresses. Co-Lead Counsel shall interface with the Court | |
| 3 | and shall perform any additional functions that may be assigned to them by the Court. | |
| 4 | 5. The organizational structure of Co-Lead Counsel shall bind all plaintiffs' counsel | |
| 5 | in the consolidated action, including plaintiffs' counsel in any subsequently-filed action that is | |
| 6 | found to be a related case pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12. | |
| 7 | PURSUANT TO STIPULATION OF THE PLAINTIFFS, IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | Dated: February 4, 2010 | |
| 10 | United States District Judge | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |