Benitti v. Google, Inc.

Doc. 5

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that plaintiff Ric Benitti ("Plaintiff") submits this administrative motion, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12, to relate *Benitti v. Google, Inc.*, Case No. CV 10-03297 PVT ("*Benitti*") to *Berlage, et al. v. Google, Inc.*, Case No. CV 10-02187 JW. A copy of the *Benitti* complaint is attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of J. Paul Gignac.

A. THE RELATED ACTIONS

The cases listed below are related to the *Benitti* action:

- 1. Berlage, et al. v. Google, Inc., Case No. CV 10-02187 JW ("Berlage");
- 2. Stokes, et al. v. Google, Inc., Case No. CV 10-02306 JW ("Stokes"); and
- 3. Sedita v. Google, Inc., Case No. CV 10-03286 JW ("Sedita").

Sedita, like *Benitti*, was originally assigned to the Honorable Patricia V. Trumbull, but recently was related to *Berlage* and reassigned to this Court in an order entered on August 11, 2010.

B. RELATIONSHIP OF THE ACTIONS

This administrative motion is made on the grounds that both *Berlage* and *Benitti*, as well as *Stokes and Sedita*, are cases that involve a substantially similar subject matter -- namely: an alleged violation by defendant Google, Inc. ("Google") of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986, 18 U.S.C. § 2511, *et seq.* (the "Federal Wiretap Act").

Civil Local Rule 3-12 provides that actions are related when:

- (l) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and
- (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

The cases sought to be related by this administrative motion satisfy both criteria of Rule 3-12. Both *Berlage* and *Benitti*, as well as *Stokes* and *Sedita*, are cases alleging that Google violated the Federal Wiretap Act by engaging in the unauthorized interception of electronic

communications in connection with the gathering of information for use in Google's "Street View" program. The primary remedies that are sought in each of the cases are the same: injunctive relief and statutory damages. The defendant in each case (Google) is the same. Therefore, there likely will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor, as well as the potential for conflicting rulings on the same issues, if these cases remain assigned to different judges.

Moreover, *Benitti* is a potential "tag-along action" in the matter of *In re: Google, Inc.*Street View Electronic Communications Litigation, MDL No. 2184, which was recently ordered assigned to this Court. It is expected that the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("JPML") will be issuing a Conditional Transfer Order for the purpose of consolidating or coordinating *Benitti* with the eight (8) other cases that are the subject of the JPML's August 17, 2010 Transfer Order. Therefore, an administrative order relating *Benitti* to *Berlage* should be issued by this Court in advance of and in anticipation of the JPML's Conditional Transfer Order.

C. CONCLUSION

Benitti and Berlage, as well as Stokes and Sedita, satisfy the criteria of Civil Local Rule 3-12. Therefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests that Benitti be deemed related to Berlage and that Benitti be reassigned to the Honorable James Ware.

Dated: August 25, 2010. Respectfully submitted,

ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP

By: /s/
J. Paul Gignac
and

CHITWOOD HARLEY HARNES LLP

Attorneys for Plaintiff