

A CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
 ATTEST
 By Debbie Nguyen on Aug 17, 2010

FOR THE UNITED STATES
 JUDICIAL PANEL ON
 MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Filed

UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

Aug 17, 2010

FILED
CLERK'S OFFICE

AUG 17 2010
UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL

on RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

**IN RE: GOOGLE INC. STREET VIEW ELECTRONIC
COMMUNICATIONS LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2184

JW

CV 10-02306
TRANSFER ORDER

PV

Before the entire Panel: Plaintiffs in one District of District of Columbia action have moved, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings of this litigation in the District of District of Columbia. Plaintiffs in the other District of District of Columbia action and a potentially-related action support the motion. Plaintiffs in the Northern District of California and Southern District of Illinois actions and another potentially-related action, as well as defendant, Google, Inc. (Google), suggest centralization in the Northern District of California. Plaintiffs in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the District of Oregon actions suggest centralization in the Northern District of California or, alternatively, the District of Oregon. Plaintiff in the District of Massachusetts action suggests centralization in the District of Massachusetts.

This litigation currently consists of eight actions listed on Schedule A and pending in six districts as follows: two actions each in the Northern District of California and the District of District of Columbia, and one action each in the Southern District of Illinois, the District of Massachusetts, the District of Oregon, and the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.¹

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, we find that these actions involve common questions of fact, and that centralization under Section 1407 in the Northern District of California will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. These actions share factual questions arising out of allegations that Google intentionally intercepted electronic communications sent or received over class members' open, non-secured wireless networks. Centralization will eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, including with respect to class certification; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary.

We are persuaded that the Northern District of California is an appropriate transferee forum for this litigation. The sole defendant, Google, is headquartered there, and most relevant documents


¹ The parties have notified the Panel that five additional related actions are pending, four actions in the Northern District of California and one action in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. These actions are potential tag-along actions. See Rules 7.4 and 7.5, R.P.J.P.M.L., 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001).

and witnesses are likely located there. Moreover, most responding parties support centralization in this district.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the actions listed on Schedule A and pending outside the Northern District of California are transferred to the Northern District of California and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable James Ware for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings with the actions pending there and listed on Schedule A.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this litigation is renamed "In re: Google Inc. Street View Electronic Communications Litigation."

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



John G. Heyburn II
Chairman

Robert L. Miller, Jr.
David R. Hansen
Frank C. Damrell, Jr.

Kathryn H. Vratil
W. Royal Furgeson, Jr.
Barbara S. Jones

**IN RE: GOOGLE INC. STREET VIEW ELECTRONIC
COMMUNICATIONS LITIGATION**

MDL No. 2184

SCHEDULE A

Northern District of California

Matthew Berlage, et al. v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 5:10-2187
B. Stokes v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 5:10-2306

District of District of Columbia

Jeffrey Colman v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 1:10-877
Patrick Keyes, et al. v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 1:10-896

Southern District of Illinois

John E. Redstone, et al. v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 3:10-400

District of Massachusetts

Galaxy Internet Services, Inc. v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 1:10-10871

District of Oregon

Vicki Van Valin, et al. v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 3:10-557

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Stephanie Carter, et al. v. Google, Inc., C.A. No. 2:10-2649