

1 Michael L. Charlson (Bar No. 122125)
 2 Maren J. Clouse (Bar No. 228726)
 3 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
 4 525 University Avenue, 4th Floor
 5 Palo Alto, California 94301
 Telephone: (650) 463-4000
 Facsimile: (650) 463-4199
 michael.charlson@hoganlovells.com
 maren.clouse@hoganlovells.com

6 Christopher Wolf (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 7 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
 8 Columbia Square
 9 555 Thirteenth Street, NW
 Washington, DC 20004
 Telephone: (202) 637-5600
 Facsimile: (202) 637-5910
 christopher.wolf@hoganlovells.com

10 Clayton C. James (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
 11 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
 12 One Tabor Center, Suite 1500
 13 1200 Seventeenth Street
 Denver, Colorado 80202
 Telephone: (303) 899-7300
 Facsimile: (303) 899-7333
 clay.james@hoganlovells.com

14 Attorneys for Defendant
 15 APPLE INC., a California corporation

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 18 SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 JONATHAN LALO, Individually and On
 20 Behalf of a Class of Similarly Situated
 Individuals.

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 APPLE INC., a California Corporation;
 24 BACKFLIP, a Delaware Corporation;
 DICTONARY.COM, a California
 Corporation; PANDORA, INC., a
 25 California Corporation; THE WEATHER
 CHANNEL, a Georgia Corporation,

26 Defendants.
 27

Case No. CV 10-5878 LHK

**ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
 CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD
 BE RELATED**

Honorable Lucy H. Koh

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12, Defendant Apple, Inc., a California corporation (“Apple”)
2 submits this Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related to give notice
3 of the following related actions:

- 4 • *Anthony Chiu, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. Apple, Inc., a California Corporation, et al., Defendants*, Case No. CV 11-00407 LHK, filed January 27, 2011¹
- 6 • *Daniel Rodimer, et al., individuals, on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. Apple, Inc., a California Corporation, et al., Defendants*, Case No. CV 11-0700 PSG, filed February 15, 2011²

8 Apple respectfully suggests that the two actions are related to this action and to the related action
9 titled *Freeman, et al. v. Apple, Inc., et al.*, Case No. CV 10-5881 LHK (N.D. Cal.).³

10 All the actions are related because they arise from the same or substantially identical
11 transactions, happenings or events, and call for determination of the same or substantially
12 identical questions and fact, and related questions of law. In particular, all the actions involve
13 allegations that certain applications that can be downloaded by users to work on iPhone or iPad
14 devices capture and abuse personal identifying information of iPhone and iPad users by
15 transmitting information from the Unique Device Identification (“UDID”) associated with each
16 device. Although the group of defendants in each action differs somewhat, Apple is a defendant
17 in all the actions, and the other named defendants are alleged to be developers of various iPhone
18 and iPad applications and their affiliates. The alleged capture and abuse of user information from
19 the devices’ UDID’s is claimed in all the actions to constitute violations of various statutes and
20 common law principles concerning personal privacy and consumer protection.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 ¹ A copy of the *Chiu* Complaint is attached as Exhibit A.

27 ² A copy of the *Rodimer* Complaint is attached as Exhibit B.

28 ³ See Related Case Order, filed February 9, 2011 (Docket No. 15), finding that the *Freeman* action and this action are related.

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

For the foregoing reasons, assignment of all the actions to a single district court judge is likely to effect a saving of judicial effort and other economies, and it will diminish the likelihood of inconsistent results.

Dated: February 18, 2011

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

By: /s/ Michael L. Charlson
Michael L. Charlson

Attorneys for Defendant
APPLE INC., a California corporation