Gould v. Facebook, Inc.

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

27

28

v.

Karen Bryant, et al.,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN JOSE DIVISION NO. C 10-02389-JW In Re: Facebook Privacy Litigation NO. C 10-05192-PVT ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO **RELATE CASES** Plaintiffs. Facebook, Inc., et al., Defendants. Presently before the Court is Plaintiff Karen Bryant's ("Bryant") Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related. Bryant seeks the Court's determination as to whether Bryant v. Facebook, Inc., Case No. CV 10-05192-PVT should be related to In Re: Facebook Privacy Litigation, Case No. CV 10-02389-JW. Bryant contends that these cases arise from substantially similar factual allegations that Facebook's "referrer headers" caused user information to be leaked to third parties, involve overlapping legal claims and involve overlapping parties on both sides of the litigation. (Motion at 1.) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and

Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) provides:

An action is related to another action when:

- The action concerns substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and (1)
- (2) expenseor conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different judges.

Here, the Court finds that these cases involve substantially the same parties: Defendants

Zynga and Facebook, and overlapping classes. The Court also finds that these cases involve 26

Doc. 53

⁽See Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related, hereafter, "Motion," CV 10-02389-JW, Docket Item No. 48.)

substantially the same transactions and events.² Plaintiffs in all cases allege that, via "referrer headers," Zynga and Facebook disclosed unique Facebook user identification numbers ("UID"), allowing third parties to obtain private information about users and their activities online. All cases involve overlapping causes of action and factual inquiries. The Court also finds that the two actions pose a substantial risk of inconsistent judgments. In light of the substantial similarity of parties, events and causes of action, the Court finds that there is a risk of "an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different judges." Thus, the Court finds that the cases are related within the meaning of Rule 3-12(a).

Accordingly, the Clerk of Court shall immediately relate <u>Bryant v. Facebook, Inc.</u>, Case No. CV 10-05192-PVT to In Re: Facebook Privacy Litigation, Case No. CV 10-02389-JW.

On November 5, 2010, Defendant Zynga, in its Motion to Relate,³ raised the issue of whether these related actions should be consolidated into a single action. The Court invites the parties to fully brief the issue. On or before **November 22, 2010**, the parties shall file briefs as to whether this related action should be consolidated into the current action, <u>In Re: Facebook Privacy Litigation</u>, or consolidated as a separate action, <u>In Re: Zynga Litigation</u>. In their briefs, the parties shall nominate Lead Plaintiffs as well as Lead Counsel. The Court will take the parties' briefs under submission without oral argument. <u>See</u> Civ. L.R. 7-1(b).

Dated: November 19, 2010

United States District Judge

³ (See CV 10-02389, Docket Item No. 41.)

² (Compare Class Action Complaint, CV 10-05192-PVT, Docket Item No. 1 with

Consolidated Class Action Complaint, CV 10-02389-JW, Docket Item No. 36.)

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO: Andrew N. Friedman afriedman@cohenmilstein.com Daniel A. Small dsmall@cohenmilstein.com Daniel A. Small dsmall@conenmistein.com David Knothe Stein ds@girardgibbs.com Dylan Hughes dsh@girardgibbs.com Eric H. Gibbs ehg@girardgibbs.com Philip Scott Friedman psf@consumerlawhelp.com Stefanie M. Ramirez sramirez@cohenmilstein.com Richard W. Wieking, Clerk Dated: November 19, 2010 /s/ JW Chambers **By:**_ Elizabeth Garcia **Courtroom Deputy**