

Heller et al v. Menu Foods

Doc. 2



NS BERMAN  
SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

STEVE W. BERMAN  
DIRECT • (206) 224-9320  
STEVE@HBSLAW.COM

07-CV-00453-PRAE

March 28, 2007

Via Overnight Mail

FILED  
LODGED  
RECEIVED

MAIL

MAR 29 2007

Clerk of the Panel  
Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation  
Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building  
One Columbus Circle, NE  
Room G-255, North Lobby  
Washington, DC 20002-8004

AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
DEPUTY

07-453  
07-455  
07-454  
07-457

Re: In Re Menu Foods Poisoned Pet Food Litigation  
MDL No.

Dear Clerk of the Panel:

Enclosed please find for filing on March 29, 2007 the following:

- 1) Plaintiffs' Motion For Transfer and Consolidation of Related Actions To The Western District of Washington Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407;
- 2) Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Law In Support of Their Motion For Transfer and Consolidation of Related Actions To The Western District of Washington Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407;
- 3) Schedule of Actions Related To Plaintiffs Motion For Centralization and Coordination of Pretrial Proceedings Pursuant To 28 U.S.C. § 1407; and
- 4) Proof of Service.

Also enclosed is the computer generated disk required by Rule 5.13. We have enclosed face sheets of the above documents and ask that you file stamp them and return them in the envelope provided.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SEATTLE LOS ANGELES CAMBRIDGE PHOENIX CHICAGO

T 206.623.7292 F 206.623.0394

www.hagens-berman.com

001958-12 161756 V1

001958-12 161756 V1

March 28, 2007

Page 2

Sincerely,

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP



Steve W. Berman

SWB:rh

cc: All parties of service list

FILED  
LOGGED  
RECEIVED

MAIL

MAR 29 2007

AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
BY DEPUTY

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE MENU FOODS POISONED PET  
FOOD LITIGATION

No. MDL DOCKET NO.

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATION OF  
RELATED ACTIONS TO THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

Plaintiffs Tom Whaley, Stacey Heller, Toinette Robinson, David Rapp, Cecily and Terrence Mitchell, Suzanne E. Johnson, Craig R. Klemann, Audrey Kornelius, Barbara Smith, Michele Suggett and Don James ("Plaintiffs"), respectfully move the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation for an Order, under 28 U.S.C. § 1407, that (i) transfers eight putative class actions, currently pending in the Western District of Arkansas, Southern District of Florida, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern District of Tennessee, District of New Jersey, District of Connecticut, Central District of California, as well as any cases that may subsequently be filed asserting similar or related claims, to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington; and (ii) consolidates these proceedings with the five other similar actions that are currently pending in the Western District of Washington, *Tom Whaley v. Menu Foods, et al.*, No. C07-0411M; *Stacey Heller, et al. v. Menu Foods*, No. C07-0453JJC; *Suzanne E. Johnson, et al. v. Menu Foods*, No. C07-0455JCC; *Audrey Kornelius, et al. v. Menu Foods*, No. C07-0454MJP;

and *Michele Suggett, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al.*, No. C07-0457RSM, before the Honorable Ricardo Martinez. In support of their Motion for Transfer and Consolidation, Plaintiffs state as follows:

1. The class actions for which transfer and consolidation are proposed arise out of the same conduct and allege virtually identical claims. Each action is brought on behalf of a class of purchasers of dog or cat food produced by Menu Foods and sold under various labels, and alleges that Menu Foods produced tainted pet food that sickened their dogs or cats and caused the death of many of them.

2. The eight actions proposed for transfer, *Sims, et al. v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al.*, No. 07-5053 (W.D. Ark.); *Scott, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al.*, No. 07-5055 (W.D. Ark.); *Troiano v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al.*, No. 07-60428 CIV-COHN (S.D. Fla.); *Majerczyk v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, No. 07CV1543 (N.D. Ill.); *Holt v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, No. 07-cv-00094 (E.D. Tenn.); *Workman, et al. v. Menu Foods Limited, et al.*, No. 07-cv-1338-NLH-AMD (D.N.J.); *Osborne v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, No. 07CV00469RNC (D. Conn.); and *Sexton v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al.*, No. CV07-01958 GHK (AJWx) (C.D. Cal.), are the only actions on file outside the Western District of Washington of which Plaintiffs are aware.

3. Plaintiffs propose that the *Sims, Scott, Troiano, Majerczyk, Holt, Workman, Osborne* actions and the action pending in the Central District of California be consolidated with the five actions currently pending in the Western District of Washington before Judge Martinez, the lowest numbered of which is *Tom Whaley v. Menu Foods, et al.*, C07-0411M.

4. The centralization of these actions in a single judicial district for consolidated pretrial proceedings will promote the just and efficient conduct of these actions, will serve the convenience of all parties and witnesses and will promote the interest of justice because all actions involve common factual and legal issues, including:

a. whether the Defendant's dog and cat food was materially defective, and unfit for use as dog or cat food;

b. whether Defendant breached any contract, implied contract or warranties relating to the sale of the dog and cat food;

c. whether Defendant's dog and cat food caused Plaintiffs' and other Class members' pets to become ill;

d. whether Plaintiffs and other Class members have been damaged, and, if so, what is the proper measure thereof;

c. what is the appropriate form of injunctive, declaratory and other relief.

5. Consolidation of the actions before a single court will conserve judicial resources, reduce litigation costs, prevent potentially inconsistent pretrial rulings, eliminate duplicative discovery and permit the cases to proceed to trial more efficiently.

6. All 13 actions are in the very early stages of litigation; no responsive pleadings have been filed nor has any discovery been conducted.

7. The proposed transfer and consolidation in the Western District of Washington will be for the convenience of parties and witnesses and will promote the just and efficient conduct of these actions because it is expected that plaintiffs' counsel in all actions will take discovery of the same witnesses and documents.

8. The Western District of Washington has the resources and judicial expertise to properly conduct this case.

9. Plaintiffs' motion is based on the accompanying memorandum of law, the filed pleadings and papers, and other materials that may presented to the Panel before or at the time of any hearing in this matter.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Panel order that the *Sims, Scott, Troiano, Majerczyk, Holt, Workman, Osborne* and *Sexton* actions, as well as any cases that may be subsequently filed asserting related or similar claims, be transferred to the Western District of Washington for consolidated and coordinated pretrial proceedings.

Dated: March 28, 2007

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By 

Steve W. Berman  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101  
(206) 623-7292  
[steve@hbsslaw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslaw.com)

MYERS & COMPANY, P.L.L.C.  
Michael David Myers  
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 700  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 398-1188  
Facsimile: (206) 400-1112  
E-mail: [mmyers@myers-company.com](mailto:mmyers@myers-company.com)

Philip H. Gordon  
Bruce S. Bistline  
Gordon Law Offices  
623 West Hays St.  
Boise, ID 83702  
Telephone: (208) 345-7100  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
E-mail: [pgordon@gordonlawoffices.com](mailto:pgordon@gordonlawoffices.com)

Adam P. Karp  
Animal Law Offices of Adam P. Karp  
114 W. Magnolia St., Ste. 425  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
Telephone: (360) 738-7273  
Facsimile (360) 392-3936  
Email: [adam@animal-lawyrcr.com](mailto:adam@animal-lawyrcr.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Tom Whaley, Stacey Heller, Toinette Robinson, David Rapp, Cecily and Terrence Mitchell, Suzanne E. Johnson, Craig R. Klemann, Audrey Kornelius, Barbara Smith, Michele Suggett and Don James*

FILED  
LODGED  
RECEIVED **MAIL**

MAR 29 2007

AT SEATTLE  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
BY DEPUTY

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE MENU FOODS POISONED PET  
FOOD LITIGATION

No. MDL DOCKET NO.

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR  
TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATION OF RELATED ACTIONS TO THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

Plaintiffs Tom Whaley, Stacey Heller, Toinette Robinson, David Rapp, Cecily and Terrence Mitchell, Suzanne E. Johnson, Craig R. Klemann, Audrey Kornelius, Barbara Smith, Michele Suggett and Don James ("Plaintiffs") submit this memorandum of law in support of their motion for transfer and consolidation of related actions to the Western District of Washington under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

**I. FACTS**

**A. Background**

Defendant Menu Foods, a Canadian corporation doing business in the United States, makes cat and dog food. Menu Foods' cat and dog food is sold under many brands, including such familiar brand names as Iams, Eukanuba and Science Diet. Menu Foods distributes its cat and dog food throughout the United States to retailers such as Wal-Mart, Kroger and Safeway. These and other retailers also sell Menu Food pet food under their own respective private labels.

Plaintiffs assert their claims against Menu Foods as class actions under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all persons who purchased any cat or dog food that was produced by Menu Foods and whose cat or dog became ill or died as a result of eating the food. Cat and dog food that Menu Foods produced caused an unknown number of cats and dogs to become ill, and many of them to die (the current reported known tally is over 100 deaths).

A tragically typical example is the cat belonging to plaintiff Stacy Heller (Case No. C07-0453JJC, W.D. Wash.). Ms. Heller purchased a Menu Foods wet cat food from Wal-Mart under the brand, Special Kitty, for Callie, her cat. Callie ate the Special Kitty cat food for several years before her death. She became extremely ill during the week of March 12, 2007. On March 14, 2007, Ms. Heller took Callie to a veterinarian, who told her that Callie had suffered kidney failure, also known as acute renal failure. Callie's condition quickly worsened, and on March 19, 2007, she had to be euthanized.

To date, Menu Foods has recalled 50 brands of dog food and 40 brands of cat food that have sickened and killed dogs and cats. All recalled food to date is of the "cuts and gravy wet" style and was produced during a three-month period between December 3, 2006 and March 6, 2007. While the contaminant in the recalled Menu Foods pet food has not yet been conclusively identified, preliminary testing at the New York State Food Laboratory indicates a rodent poison, aminopterin, which is banned in the United States, as the likely culprit.

Menu Foods' actions have injured Plaintiffs and other Class members, who seek to recover damages that include veterinary expenses, burial and cremation expenses, work disruptions and other such losses.

**B. The Menu Foods Poisoned Pet Food Class Actions**

Following these events, several class-action complaints were filed against Menu Foods. These lawsuits assert claims for injuries arising from the sickening and deaths of pets that had consumed Menu Foods' pet food sold under various labels:



- *Tom Whaley v. Menu Foods, et al.*, No. C07-0411M (W.D. Wash.);
- *Stacey Heller, et al. v. Menu Foods*, No. C07-0453JJC (W.D. Wash.);
- *Suzanne E. Johnson, et al. v. Menu Foods*, No. C07-0455JCC (W. D. Wash.);
- *Audrey Kornelius, et al. v. Menu Foods*, No. C07-0454MJP (W.D. Wash.);
- *Michele Suggett, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al.*, No. C07-0457RSM (W.D. Wash.);
- *Sims, et al. v. Menu Foods Income Fund, et al.*, No. 07-5053 (W.D. Ark.);
- *Scott, et al. v. Menu Foods, et al.*, No. 07-5055 (W.D. Ark.);
- *Troiano v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al.*, No. 07-60428 CIV-COHN (S.D. Fla.);
- *Majerczyk v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, No. 07CV1543 (N.D. Ill.);
- *Holt v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, No. 07-cv-00094 (E.D. Tenn.);
- *Workman, et al. v. Menu Foods Limited, et al.*, No. 07-cv-1338-NLH-AMD (D.N.J.);
- *Osborne v. Menu Foods, Inc.*, No. 07CV00469RNC (D. Conn.); and
- *Sexton v. Menu Foods, Inc., et al.*, No. CV07-01958 GHK (AJWx) (C.D. Cal.).

These cases seek to recover damages on behalf of all persons whose cats and/or dogs became sick or died as a result of consuming pet food produced by Menu Foods. Submitted herewith is a Schedule of Actions Involved under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 that lists the actions to be transferred and consolidated.

Plaintiffs seek to have the latter eight class actions listed above transferred to the Western District of Washington for centralization with the five class actions already pending in that jurisdiction. Transfer and consolidation is appropriate because these cases involve common factual questions, transfer will further the convenience of the parties and the witnesses, and transfer will promote the just and efficient conduct of these actions. The Western District of Washington is the appropriate place for transfer and consolidation because the district has the

resources and judicial expertise to properly conduct this case; defendant Menu Foods transacts business in the district; five class actions are already filed there, and the Western District of Washington is easily accessed by all parties.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. **Transfer and Consolidation of All Menu Foods Poisoned Pet Food Actions for Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings Is Appropriate**

28 U.S.C. § 1407 authorizes this Panel to transfer and consolidate two or more civil cases for coordinated pretrial proceedings upon a determination that (i) they “involv[e] one or more common questions of fact,” (ii) transfer will further “the convenience of the parties and witnesses,” and (iii) transfer “will promote the just and efficient conduct of the actions.” The requirements for transfer under Section 1407 are clearly satisfied here. The 13 related Menu Foods poisoned pet food class actions are characterized almost entirely by common questions of fact. In addition, transfer and consolidation will promote convenience for the parties and efficiency in the pretrial proceedings by eliminating duplicative discovery and the potential for inconsistent rulings, including determinations on class certification.

#### 1. **The related actions involve common questions of fact**

The first requirement of § 1407 – that the actions to be transferred involve common questions of fact – is satisfied. The factual issues to be determined in each of the actions proposed for transfer and coordination arise from the same course of conduct and, hence, are identical. *See In re Neurontin Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, 342 F. Supp. 2d 1350, 1351 (J.P.M.L. 2004); *In re Publ'n Paper Antitrust Litig.*, 346 F. Supp. 2d 1370, 1371 (J.P.M.L. 2004).

Among the many common questions of law and fact at issue in the related actions are:

a. whether the Defendant's dog and cat food was materially defective, and unfit for use as dog or cat food;

- b. whether Defendant breached any contract, implied contract or warranties relating to the sale of the dog and cat food;
- c. whether Defendant's dog and cat food caused Plaintiffs' and other Class members' pets to become ill;
- d. whether Plaintiffs and other Class members have been damaged, and, if so, what is the proper measure thereof;
- e. what is the appropriate form of injunctive, declaratory and other relief.

The factual issues to be determined in all of the class actions are nearly identical, making transfer to a single forum highly appropriate. *See, e.g., Neurontin*, 342 F. Supp. 2d at 1351. In *Neurontin*, for example, the Panel ruled that there were common issues warranting transfer and consolidation where “[a]ll actions [we]re purported class actions involving allegations that common defendants have engaged in the illegal promotion and sale of the drug Neurontin for ‘off-label’ use.” *Id.*; *see also In re Ephedra Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 314 F. Supp. 2d 1373, 1375 (J.P.M.L. 2004) (“[c]ommon factual questions arise because these actions focus on alleged side effects of ephedra-containing products, and whether defendants knew of these side effects and either concealed, misrepresented or failed to warn of them”); *In re Columbia Univ. Patent Litig.*, 313 F. Supp. 2d 1383, 1385 (J.P.M.L. 2004) (common questions existed where “[a]ll actions can thus be expected to share factual and legal questions with respect to the ‘275 patent concerning patent validity and related questions such as double patenting, prosecution laches, and inequitable conduct”).

**2. Consolidating the class actions will further the convenience of the parties and the witnesses**

Consolidating the class actions will meet the second requirement for consolidation under § 1407 because it will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses. It is expected that counsel for plaintiffs in all actions will seek documents from the same defendants on such issues as, *inter alia*: (a) where the recalled Menu Foods pet food was processed, (b) the manufacturing

processes for the recalled Menu Foods pet food, (c) the intended ingredients of the recalled Menu Foods pet food, (d) the name, composition and character of the contaminant(s) of the recalled Menu Foods pet food that poisoned the Class members' cats and dogs, (e) the contaminant(s)' pathway into the recalled Menu Foods pet food, and (f) when Defendants learned or should have learned that the recalled Menu Foods pet food was contaminated. Issues such as these will be central in all of the class actions.

Because the actions arise from a common core of factual allegations, there is a strong likelihood of duplicative discovery demands and redundant depositions. Consolidation will enable a single judge to establish a pretrial program that will minimize the inconvenience to the witnesses and expenses to the parties. These savings are precisely the types of savings that this Panel has traditionally used to justify the consolidation of actions in different jurisdictions. *See, e.g., Neurontin*, 342 F. Supp. 2d at 1351; *Columbia Univ. Patent Litig.*, 313 F. Supp. 2d 1385.

**3. Transfer and consolidation will promote the just and efficient conduct of the related actions**

Finally, transferring and consolidating these class actions is appropriate because coordinating the pretrial proceedings will promote the just and efficient conduct of the actions. In light of the nearly identical factual allegations, and especially given that discovery has not yet begun in any action, transfer under § 1407 will avoid duplicative discovery and save judicial time and resources. *See Neurontin*, 342 F. Supp. 2d at 1351; *In re Oxycontin Antitrust Litig.*, 314 F. Supp. 2d 1388, 1390 (J.P.M.L. 2004); *Ephedra Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 314 F. Supp. 2d at 1375; *In re Japanese Elec. Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 388 F. Supp. 565, 567 (J.P.M.L. 1975); *see also In re European Rail Pass Antitrust Litig.*, 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 1417, at \*3 (J.P.M.L. Feb. 7, 2001) (ordering cases transferred to a single district to "eliminate duplicative discovery").

The plaintiffs in each action will seek to depose many of the same individuals from Menu Foods and its various affiliates and request production of a substantially similar set of documents. Failing to consolidate these actions will therefore result in duplicative discovery

efforts, requiring witnesses to appear for multiple depositions and defendants to produce several sets of the same documents. The consolidation and coordination of these actions would avoid this inconvenience and needless waste of resources. *See In re Univ. Serv. Fund Tel. Billing Practices Litig.*, 209 F. Supp. 2d 1385, 1386 (J.P.M.L. 2002). Moreover, the corresponding savings in time and expense would confer benefits upon both the plaintiffs and defendants. *See In re Cygnus Telecoms. Tech., LLC Patent Litig.*, 177 F. Supp. 2d 1375, 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2001); *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 173 F. Supp. 2d 1377, 1379 (J.P.M.L. 2001); *see also In re Amino Acid Lysine Antitrust Litig.*, 910 F. Supp. 696, 698 (J.P.M.L. 1995) (consolidation and coordination is appropriate to “conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary”); *In re Uranium Indus. Antitrust Litig.*, 458 F. Supp. 1223, 1230 (J.P.M.L. 1978).

Where, as here, consolidation and coordination will avoid duplicative discovery and potentially conflicting pretrial rulings, transfer for pretrial purposes is warranted to promote the interests of judicial economy and efficiency.

**B. The Western District of Washington Is The Proper Forum for Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings**

**1. The Western District of Washington has the resources and judicial expertise to properly conduct this case**

In selecting the most appropriate transferee forum for multidistrict litigation, the Panel considers the speed and efficiency with which alternative districts manage their respective caseloads. *See In re Preferential Drug Prods. Pricing Antitrust*, 429 F. Supp. 1027, 1029 (J.P.M.L. 1977) (transferring cases based in part upon transferee court’s low median time between filing and disposition in civil actions); *In re Corn Derivatives Antitrust Litig.*, 486 F. Supp. 929, 932 (J.P.M.L. 1980) (faster docket cited as reason for selecting transferee court). Here, this factor favors transferring the actions to the Western District of Washington.

If transferred to the Western District of Washington and consolidated with the five actions already pending there, all 13 actions could proceed expeditiously to trial. The Western

District of Washington has a well-managed docket that is relatively undertaxed by multidistrict litigation and capable of ensuring expeditious resolution of this multi-party litigation. When the Panel has concluded that any of several forums would be appropriate for M.D.L. transfer, it has examined the relative caseloads in each district court to tip the balance in favor of the less burdened district. *See, e.g., In re Corn Derivatives Antitrust Litig.*, 486 F. Supp. 929, 932 (J.P.M.L. 1980); *In re Falstaff Brewing Corp. Antitrust Litig.*, 434 F. Supp. 1225, 1231 (J.P.M.L. 1977); *In re Air Crash Disaster at Taipei Intl. Airport on July 31, 1975*, 433 F. Supp. 1120, 1122 (J.P.M.L. 1977); *In re Eastern Airlines, Inc. Flight Attendant Weight Program Litig.*, 391 F. Supp. 763, 764 (J.P.M.L. 1975); *In re Peruvian Road Litig.*, 380 F. Supp. 796, 798 (J.P.M.L. 1974).

The rationale for these decisions goes to the very heart of a decision to transfer a great number of cases before a single district-court judge. The worthwhile purposes of consolidating multidistrict litigation would be frustrated if the transferee court is already too overburdened to give these complex cases the close study and attention they will require. As this Panel stated in the *Eastern Airlines* decision:

On balance, however, we favor the Eastern District of Virginia because that district has a significantly lighter civil action docket than the District of Massachusetts and, therefore, is in the best position to expeditiously process this particular litigation. [391 F. Supp. at 764-65.]

This rationale would be well served by transferring the other eight cases to the Western District of Washington for consolidation with the five class actions there. The Western District of Washington enjoys a swift civil action docket. The median time for civil cases from filing to “disposition” in the Western District of Washington is only 9.1 months, and only 19.0 months to trial.<sup>1</sup> This indicates an ability on the part of the Western District to move civil cases along

---

<sup>1</sup> The district has experienced a two-year bump in its case disposition median times occasioned by several judges’ transitioning to senior status. But those vacancies have been or are now being filled, so we expect a return to the district’s long-standing record of highly expeditious resolutions.

The Movants cite to Federal Court Management statistics for 2006 available on this Panel’s website, at <http://www.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/cmsd2006.pl>. For the Panel’s convenience, we attach copies of the relevant

quickly during the pretrial phase of litigation, precisely the task that will be before the transferee court here. The comparable figures for the District of New Jersey, for example, is 33.0 months to trial; Northern District of Illinois, 26.4 months; and Central District of California, 21.3 months.

While these differences in the overall civil action docket are significant, the disparity between some of the districts in regard to complex M.D.L. cases is enormous. The Western District of Washington, while possessing the resources necessary to oversee a complex multi-party action such as this, is under-utilized as a transferee court for centralized proceedings. As of September 30, 2006, the Western District of Washington has only two M.D.L. cases still pending, while the District of New Jersey has 15 pending litigations; Northern District of Illinois -- 16 litigations; and Central District of California -- 9 litigations. As this Panel has recognized, this alone can be reason to transfer multidistrict actions to such districts for centralization:

centralization in this district permits the Panel to effect the Section 1407 assignment to a major metropolitan court that (i) is not currently overtaxed with other multidistrict dockets, and (ii) possesses the necessary resources to be able to devote the substantial time and effort to pretrial matters that this complex docket is likely to require.

*In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 173 F. Supp. 2d at 1380. See also *In re Air Crash near Palembang Indon.*, 1999 U.S. Dist. Lexis 4910, at \*3-4 (J.P.M.L. Apr. 13, 1999). This Panel's rationale for transferring the *Phenylpropanolamine* and *Air Crash near Palembang* multidistrict litigations to the Western District of Washington applies to the present litigations as well.

Of course, these figures do not suggest that the next ten matters on the M.D.L. docket be assigned to the Western District of Washington. Certainly there will continue to be a relatively greater number of M.D.L. transfers to busy jurisdictions such as the Northern District of Illinois and the District of New Jersey on the basis of convenience of the particular parties. But where

---

district courts' 2006 caseload profile available from that site, at Ex. A-H hereto.

the advantages in the expeditious processing of these cases are apparent in a transfer to the Western District of Washington, this Panel should welcome the opportunity to spare its overburdened colleagues in other jurisdictions.

We also note that while currently un-taxed with M.D.L. litigations, the Western District of Washington has extensive experience in managing consolidated multi-district litigation. *See, e.g., In re Mailblocks, Inc.*, 279 F. Supp. 2d 1379, 1381 (J.P.M.L. 2003) (transferring action to Western District of Washington); *In re Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Ry. Empl. Settlement Agreements Litig.*, 162 F. Supp. 2d 699, 700 (J.P.M.L. 2001) (same); *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 173 F. Supp. 2d at 1380 (same); *In re Amazon.com/Alexa Internet Privacy Litig.*, 2000 U.S. Dist. Lexis 8201, at \*3-4 (J.P.M.L. June 7, 2000) (same); *In re Air Crash near Palembang Indon.*, 1999 U.S. Dist. Lexis 4910, at \*3-4 (same); *In re Ford Motor Co./Citibank N.A. Cardholder Rebate Program Litig.*, 1998 U.S. Dist. Lexis 205, at \*3 (J.P.M.L. Jan. 8, 1998) (same). Indeed, the Panel has specifically recognized that the Western District of Washington is equipped with the resources necessary to manage substantial consolidated multi-district litigation. *See, e.g., In re Phenylpropanolamine*, 173 F. Supp. 2d at 1380. The Panel has also previously transferred to the Western District of Washington multi-district litigation that, like the present cases, challenges the safety of products ingested into the body. *See, for example, id.* The District thus has an established track record of managing this type of complex litigation.

The Honorable Judge Ricardo Martinez, to whom the *Whaley* litigation, the first filed of the five Washington cases, is assigned, has ample experience with class action and complex commercial litigation. A judge since 1989, Judge Martinez has been on the federal bench since 1998, first as a federal magistrate, and since 2004 as a district court judge. Judge Martinez is not currently handling any other MDL matters.



**2. The Western District of Washington is an equally convenient forum for the parties and witnesses**

The convenience of the parties and witnesses is a factor in determining to which district related actions should be transferred. 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a) (related actions may be transferred to a district for coordinated proceedings upon a determination that the transfer “will be for the convenience of parties and witnesses and will promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions”). In deciding whether a particular forum is convenient, the Panel may consider the location of the parties, documents and potential witnesses relative to that district. *See In re Cigarette Antitrust Litig.*, 2000 U.S. Dist. Lexis 8209, at \*4 (J.P.M.L. June 7, 2000).

This factor is neutral in this litigation. Plaintiffs and class members reside across the country, likely in all 50 states. Defendant Menu Foods is a Canadian corporation with its principle office in Ontario, Canada. Five of the actions (with 12 plaintiffs) were filed in the Western District of Washington. These 12 plaintiffs all concur that the Western District of Washington would be the most appropriate jurisdiction.

No particular district court is more conveniently located for the parties and witnesses than another. We note that Seattle has a major international airport that serves as a transportation hub for the region, so parties traveling by air will have easy access to the district court there.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Consolidation is necessary to avoid duplication and wasted efforts. Transfer to the Western District of Washington is appropriate because five of the 13 related actions were filed there; the Western District of Washington has the resources and judicial expertise to promptly and efficiently conduct this case; and the Western District of Washington is easily accessed and as conveniently located as any district for all the parties. Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Panel order that the *Sims, Scott, Troiano, Majerczyk, Holt, Sexton* and *Workman* actions (as well as any tag-along cases that may be subsequently filed asserting related or similar

claims) be transferred to the Western District of Washington for consolidated and coordinated pretrial proceedings.

DATED: March 28, 2007

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

By   
Steve W. Berman  
1301 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2900  
Seattle, WA 98101  
(206) 623-7292  
[steve@hbsslaw.com](mailto:steve@hbsslaw.com)

MYERS & COMPANY, P.L.L.C.  
Michael David Myers  
1809 Seventh Avenue, Suite 700  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
Telephone: (206) 398-1188  
Facsimile: (206) 400-1112  
E-mail: [mmyers@myers-company.com](mailto:mmyers@myers-company.com)

Philip H. Gordon  
Bruce S. Bistline  
Gordon Law Offices  
623 West Hays St.  
Boise, ID 83702  
Telephone: (208) 345-7100  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
E-mail: [pgordon@gordonlawoffices.com](mailto:pgordon@gordonlawoffices.com)

Adam P. Karp  
Animal Law Offices of Adam P. Karp  
114 W. Magnolia St., Ste. 425  
Bellingham, WA 98225  
Telephone: (360) 738-7273  
Facsimile (360) 392-3936  
Email: [adam@animal-lawyer.com](mailto:adam@animal-lawyer.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Tom Whaley, Stacey Heller, Toinette Robinson, David Rapp, Cecily and Terrence Mitchell, Suzanne E. Johnson, Craig R. Klemann, Audrey Kornelius, Barbara Smith, Michele Suggett and Don James*

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30						Numerical Standing		
		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001			
<b>ARKANSAS WESTERN</b>										
<b>OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS</b>	Filings*	1,078	1,083	1,478	1,425	1,563	1,450	U.S.	Circuit	
	Terminations	1,140	1,337	1,514	1,399	1,446	1,227			
	Pending	808	854	1,108	1,139	1,111	997			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year		-5				25	3	
		Over Earlier Years		-27.1	-24.4	-31.0	-25.7	91	10	
Number of Judgeships		3	3	3	3	3	3			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0			
<b>ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP</b>	<b>FILINGS</b>	Total	359	361	493	475	521	483	67	8
		Civil	283	281	421	403	449	438	56	6
		Criminal Felony	65	69	60	59	56	45	53	9
		Supervised Release Hearings**	11	11	12	13	16	-	78	10
	Pending Cases	269	285	369	380	370	332	81	8	
	Weighted Filings**	399	348	423	411	436	411	65	8	
	Terminations	380	446	505	466	482	409	65	8	
	Trials Completed	13	14	19	17	24	14	71	8	
<b>MEDIAN TIMES (months)</b>	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	6.3	5.8	5.1	5.6	6.5	5.7	11	2
		Civil**	11.9	12.0	10.2	11.6	10.1	7.4	79	8
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)	13.0	13.0	15.4	14.0	13.7	12.0	3	1	
<b>OTHER</b>	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	10	5	4	0	0	1		
		Percentage	1.5	.7	.4	.0	.0	.1	2	1
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1			
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	53.35	40.59	64.04	68.94	55.00	51.17		
		Percent Not Selected or Challenged	53.4	47.5	59.7	59.6	50.5	56.6		

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	848	196	53	193	15	10	35	66	68	12	104	1	95
Criminal*	191	1	56	48	20	33	1	8	1	7	5	3	8

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.

\*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

<b>CALIFORNIA CENTRAL</b>		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30						Numerical Standing		
		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001			
<b>OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS</b>	Filings*	12,909	14,630	16,938	14,720	15,440	15,342	U.S.	Circuit	
	Terminations	13,680	16,173	15,269	15,800	16,936	16,906			
	Pending	12,401	13,180	14,720	13,129	14,525	16,142			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year		-11.8				83	13	
	Over Earlier Years			-23.8	-12.3	-16.4	-15.9	81	13	
Number of Judgeships		28	28	28	28	27	27			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		53.9	24.8	2.3	23.6	63.9	57.3			
<b>ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP</b>	FILINGS	Total	461	523	605	526	572	568	36	7
		Civil	397	450	515	451	490	521	18	4
		Criminal Felony	36	45	60	49	58	47	84	14
		Supervised Release Hearings**	28	28	30	26	24	-	30	11
	Pending Cases		443	471	526	469	538	598	26	7
	Weighted Filings**		518	565	651	590	584	557	24	6
	Terminations		489	578	545	564	627	626	32	7
	Trials Completed		12	13	12	14	12	14	79	11
<b>MEDIAN TIMES (months)</b>	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	12.4	10.3	8.2	9.4	8.6	9.1	82	14
		Civil**	7.2	7.4	7.3	7.5	7.9	7.1	10	2
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)		21.3	20.5	17.8	21.2	20.0	21.0	29	4
<b>OTHER</b>	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	1,240	809	624	609	650	541		
		Percentage	11.6	7.2	5.0	5.4	5.2	3.8	79	14
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	64.08	47.33	49.01	49.49	54.63	61.75		
		Percent Not Selected or Challenged	55.7	48.3	49.4	51.6	55.5	58.8		

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	11104	994	211	2833	274	58	754	1330	497	1425	1188	80	1460
Criminal*	999	3	151	234	88	228	54	46	43	43	25	35	49

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.  
 \*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30								
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	Numerical Standing		
<b>OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS</b>	Filings*	2,460	2,530	2,717	2,752	2,816	2,858	U.S.	Circuit	
	Terminations	2,641	2,690	2,644	2,596	3,027	2,969			
	Pending	3,121	3,276	3,407	3,337	3,190	3,415			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year		-2.8				38	4	
		Over Earlier Years		-9.5	-10.6	-12.7	-13.9	73	4	
Number of Judgeships		8	8	8	8	8	8			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		12.0	11.0	.0	6.5	.0	.0			
<b>ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP</b>	<b>FILINGS</b>	Total	308	317	340	345	353	357	75	5
		Civil	261	272	293	294	307	330	62	5
		Criminal Felony	36	32	35	37	36	27	84	5
		Supervised Release Hearings**	11	13	12	14	10	-	78	6
	Pending Cases	390	410	426	417	399	427	42	5	
	Weighted Filings**	376	379	409	396	420	415	70	5	
	Terminations	330	336	331	325	378	371	75	5	
Trials Completed		12	15	16	17	20	22	79	5	
<b>MEDIAN TIMES (months)</b>	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	13.9	12.2	11.4	9.5	10.9	12.6	87	3
		Civil**	11.6	11.4	11.6	10.5	10.1	12.8	71	5
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)		29.8	32.4	31.0	30.0	31.0	28.7	62	3
<b>OTHER</b>	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	339	358	325	318	231	292		
		Percentage	12.5	12.3	10.7	10.6	8.1	9.3	82	3
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.6	1.8	1.7	1.4	1.8	1.8		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	52.82	56.95	63.51	54.54	46.25	52.43		
		Percent Not Selected or Challenged	32.4	38.6	32.7	31.7	34.2	27.9		

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	2087	40	46	278	37	23	127	301	216	130	498	1	390
Criminal*	280	1	69	14	46	70	9	21	3	4	5	8	30

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.  
 \*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

			12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30						Numerical Standing	
			2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001		
<b>FLORIDA SOUTHERN</b>										
<b>OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS</b>	Filings*		8,511	9,097	8,479	9,058	9,490	10,790	U.S.	Circuit
	Terminations		8,979	9,463	8,904	9,370	9,797	10,170		
	Pending		6,538	6,948	7,302	7,788	8,203	9,099		
	% Change in Total Filings		Over Last Year		-6.5				57	8
			Over Earlier Years		.4	-6.0	-10.3	-21.1	86	9
Number of Judgeships			18	18	18	18	17	17		
Vacant Judgeship Months**			.0	.0	7.5	12.8	29.5	21.5		
<b>ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP</b>	FILINGS	Total	473	505	470	503	559	635	30	5
		Civil	373	397	373	396	441	527	28	5
		Criminal Felony	76	87	79	90	103	108	40	5
		Supervised Release Hearings**	24	21	18	17	15	-	39	4
	Pending Cases		363	386	406	433	483	535	52	5
	Weighted Filings**		501	525	513	558	606	667	28	5
	Terminations		499	526	495	521	576	598	28	4
	Trials Completed		19	20	20	21	23	23	47	6
<b>MEDIAN TIMES (months)</b>	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	5.8	5.8	6.1	6.2	6.5	6.3	9	2
		Civil**	6.7	6.6	6.3	6.3	7.7	7.3	9	1
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)		16.3	16.7	18.0	18.3	15.0	19.3	7	1
<b>OTHER</b>	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	962	902	1,047	714	223	278		
		Percentage	16.9	14.9	16.7	10.6	3.2	3.8	86	9
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.6	1.5	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.5		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	49.48	41.83	42.54	44.00	42.51	45.57		
		Percent Not Selected or Challenged	26.9	21.7	19.2	23.8	22.8	28.8		

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	6716	152	357	1225	107	42	1433	1045	502	334	763	16	740
Criminal*	1348	33	339	280	103	313	32	44	31	46	31	44	52

Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.  
 \* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

ILLINOIS NORTHERN		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30						Numerical Standing		
		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001			U.S.
OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS	Filings*	8,093	9,056	10,584	11,126	11,135	10,957			
	Terminations	8,255	8,805	11,461	10,888	10,709	10,319			
	Pending	7,711	7,914	7,706	8,699	8,587	8,271			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year		-10.6					78	6
		Over Earlier Years		-23.5	-27.3	-27.3	-26.1	92	7	
Number of Judgeships		22	22	22	22	22	22			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		5.7	12.0	9.6	22.1	17.8	3.3			
ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP	FILINGS	Total	367	412	481	505	506	498	66	5
		Civil	330	369	437	461	459	470	46	4
		Criminal Felony	26	34	32	38	39	28	90	7
		Supervised Release Hearings**	11	9	12	6	8	-	78	6
	Pending Cases		351	360	350	395	390	376	61	4
	Weighted Filings**		443	485	512	526	525	503	43	4
	Terminations		375	400	521	495	487	469	66	5
Trials Completed		11	13	12	12	14	15	86	6	
MEDIAN TIMES (months)	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	13.9	12.9	10.3	9.9	10.3	9.9	87	7
		Civil**	6.5	6.9	5.9	5.5	5.5	5.6	7	2
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)		26.4	27.0	28.4	26.0	26.0	26.3	51	5
OTHER	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	500	388	337	442	461	485		
		Percentage	7.4	5.6	5.0	5.6	6.0	6.4	61	6
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.8	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.6		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	45.07	51.46	39.36	45.57	43.63	39.43		
Percent Not Selected or Challenged		30.9	36.9	31.0	37.3	34.8	36.7			

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	7265	112	175	631	42	110	1401	977	565	496	1490	39	1227
Criminal*	576	1	161	44	63	140	60	23	12	17	5	18	32

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.  
 \*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30								
NEW JERSEY		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	Numerical Standing		
OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS	Filings*	7,275	7,539	7,567	7,270	7,555	6,972	U.S.	Circuit	
	Terminations	7,480	7,605	7,373	6,998	7,125	7,057			
	Pending	6,855	6,987	6,986	6,765	6,538	6,101			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year	-3.5					43	3	
		Over Earlier Years			-3.9	.1	-3.7	4.3	45	4
Number of Judgeships		17	17	17	17	17	17			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		32.3	27.8	12.0	11.0	47.8	7.5			
ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP	FILINGS	Total	428	444	446	428	445	410	46	3
		Civil	369	387	390	370	387	369	29	3
		Criminal Felony	51	48	46	48	49	41	70	3
		Supervised Release Hearings**	8	9	10	10	9	-	85	3
	Pending Cases	403	411	411	398	385	359	38	4	
	Weighted Filings**	481	493	500	486	482	463	33	2	
	Terminations	440	447	434	412	419	415	48	3	
Trials Completed		11	10	10	10	12	11	86	6	
MEDIAN TIMES (months)	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	12.1	10.0	9.8	9.0	9.4	8.0	81	5
		Civil**	8.2	7.3	7.6	7.9	8.4	7.5	21	3
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)		33.0	36.7	33.4	33.8	30.0	33.0	68	4
OTHER	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	306	346	252	236	231	179		
		Percentage	5.2	5.7	4.2	4.0	4.0	3.3	41	3
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	88.98	75.41	40.79	51.72	41.77	51.55		
Percent Not Selected or Challenged		39.2	38.3	24.1	40.3	37.7	38.9			

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE												
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	L
Civil	6274	240	343	904	82	26	845	1031	721	377	869	797
Criminal*	862	3	268	48	124	176	53	39	19	22	27	55

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.

\*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."



## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30						Numerical Standing		
		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001			
<b>TENNESSEE EASTERN</b>										
<b>OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS</b>	Filings*	1,774	2,079	2,268	2,375	2,237	2,056	U.S.	Circuit	
	Terminations	1,961	2,331	2,241	2,121	2,145	2,127			
	Pending	1,908	2,067	2,292	2,270	1,976	1,872			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year		-14.7				85	8	
		Over Earlier Years		-21.8	-25.3	-20.7	-13.7	71	8	
Number of Judgeships		5	5	5	5	5	5			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		.6	.0	.0	16.5	17.0	.0			
<b>ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP</b>	<b>FILINGS</b>	Total	355	416	453	475	448	411	69	9
		Civil	251	297	337	344	335	311	66	8
		Criminal Felony	83	87	99	112	92	100	33	3
		Supervised Release Hearings**	21	32	17	19	21	-	51	5
	Pending Cases		382	413	458	454	395	374	46	7
	Weighted Filings**		402	443	496	552	481	458	62	8
	Terminations		392	466	448	424	429	425	60	8
	Trials Completed		23	29	21	21	18	20	28	4
<b>MEDIAN TIMES (months)</b>	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	10.3	10.8	8.3	6.5	7.7	6.9	66	6
		Civil**	12.7	11.2	11.7	11.0	11.6	10.0	84	7
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)		26.5	22.0	21.5	16.3	21.5	20.0	53	5
<b>OTHER</b>	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	97	81	78	69	39	45		
		Percentage	6.6	5.0	4.3	3.7	2.3	2.9	47	6
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.6	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.4		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	34.29	36.35	37.80	40.52	32.59	33.00		
		Percent Not Selected or Challenged	27.9	28.1	33.5	40.0	34.0	36.6		

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	1257	108	60	262	9	17	84	169	174	27	280	6	61
Criminal*	412	6	139	25	122	38	20	14	10	3	9	10	16

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.  
 \*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."

## U.S. DISTRICT COURT - JUDICIAL CASELOAD PROFILE

		12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30								
WASHINGTON WESTERN		2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	Numerical Standing		
<b>OVERALL CASELOAD STATISTICS</b>	Filings*	3,471	4,167	4,858	5,038	4,103	3,257	U.S.	Circuit	
	Terminations	4,101	4,584	4,337	3,491	4,041	3,396			
	Pending	3,280	4,303	4,608	3,890	2,373	2,325			
	% Change in Total Filings	Over Last Year		-16.7				89	14	
		Over Earlier Years		-28.6	-31.1	-15.4	6.6	38	6	
Number of Judgeships		7	7	7	7	7	7			
Vacant Judgeship Months**		14.1	6.7	14.0	2.6	12.0	11.0			
<b>ACTIONS PER JUDGESHIP</b>	FILINGS	Total	496	595	694	720	586	465	27	6
		Civil	396	487	582	616	498	416	19	5
		Criminal Felony	69	74	78	68	56	49	49	8
		Supervised Release Hearings**	31	34	34	36	32	-	24	8
	Pending Cases	469	615	658	556	339	332	21	6	
	Weighted Filings**	572	626	611	621	617	557	8	3	
	Terminations	586	655	620	499	577	485	14	3	
Trials Completed	19	16	13	10	12	17	47	5		
<b>MEDIAN TIMES (months)</b>	From Filing to Disposition	Criminal Felony	7.9	7.3	6.3	6.2	5.8	6.3	33	4
		Civil**	9.1	9.6	7.2	6.4	5.8	8.1	41	6
	From Filing to Trial** (Civil Only)	19.0	19.4	16.4	16.7	18.0	15.0	16	3	
<b>OTHER</b>	Civil Cases Over 3 Years Old**	Number	310	259	32	23	36	32		
		Percentage	11.2	6.9	.8	.7	1.8	1.6	78	13
	Average Number of Felony Defendants Filed Per Case		1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6		
	Jurors	Avg. Present for Jury Selection	45.30	36.80	42.94	38.85	36.51	36.96		
		Percent Not Selected or Challenged	39.9	25.5	42.2	29.1	32.8	29.9		

2006 CIVIL AND CRIMINAL FELONY FILINGS BY NATURE OF SUIT AND OFFENSE													
Type of	TOTAL	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Civil	2772	254	101	580	48	19	258	355	302	133	378	9	335
Criminal*	474	36	97	98	82	55	22	22	1	20	14	5	22

\* Filings in the "Overall Caseload Statistics" section include criminal transfers, while filings "By Nature of Offense" do not.  
 \*\* See "Explanation of Selected Terms."