



VIA ECF AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

May 29, 2009

Hon. Peter G. Sheridan
United States District Court for the
District of New Jersey
Clarkson S. Fisher Federal Building and
U.S. Courthouse
402 East State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08608

William J. O'Shaughnessy

Partner
T. 973.639.2094
F. 973.297.3722
woshaughnessy@mccarter.com

Re: Oshinsky v. New York Football Giants, Inc., Giants Stadium LLC, New York
Jets LLC, Jets Stadium Development LLC, and New Meadowlands Stadium
Company, LLC
Civil Action No. 09-1186 (PGS) (ES)

Dear Judge Sheridan:

McCarter & English, LLP
Four Gateway Center
100 Mulberry Street
Newark, NJ 07102
T. 973.622.4444
F. 973.624.7070
www.mccarter.com

We are counsel for defendants New York Football Giants, Inc. and Giants Stadium Development LLC ("Giants Defendants"). We write together with Proskauer Rose LLP, counsel for New York Jets LLC and Jets Stadium Development LLC ("Jets Defendants").

By this action, Plaintiff challenges each team's respective sale of Personal Seat Licenses ("PSLs") in connection with season tickets for games at their new stadium expected to open for 2010-11 season. In accordance with stipulated dates, both the Giants and Jets Defendants intend to file motions to dismiss the Complaint on June 5, 2009. See Stipulation and Order filed 5/5/09, Docket No. 24. Because the claims and underlying allegations against all Defendants substantially overlap, we respectfully propose, in the interests of efficiency and judicial economy, to cross-reference points set forth in each other's briefs and thereby avoid duplication wherever feasible for the benefit of the Court and all parties. By proceeding that way, we believe each of the two briefs will be no more than 25 pages. Of course, if the Court would prefer Defendants to proceed otherwise, we will make our submissions however directed.

As a further clarification for the Court, we also note that, by the referenced Stipulation, the case is stayed against defendant New Meadowlands Stadium Company, LLC ("NMSCo") pending determination of the motions to dismiss. The same claims that will be subject to the motions are asserted against NMSCo, which we advised Plaintiff's counsel had no substantive role with respect to the marketing

BOSTON

HARTFORD

NEW YORK

NEWARK

PHILADELPHIA

STAMFORD

WILMINGTON

Hon. Peter G. Sheridan
May 29, 2009
Page 2

or sale of PSLs. Because dismissal of claims against the other defendants would, by extension, apply to NMSCo, NMSCo will not be filing a separate motion to dismiss, though we can arrange for one to be filed if your Honor would prefer that.

Respectfully,

William J. O'Shaughnessy

William J. O'Shaughnessy

cc: All counsel (via ECF)

SU ORDERED: *Peter G. Sheridan*
DATED: *6/3/09*