

ROBERT ATKINS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
ratkins@paulweiss.com

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP**

1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 373-3183
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

JESSICA E. PHILLIPS (*Pro Hac Vice forthcoming*)

jphillips@paulweiss.com
**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP**

2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)

rluskey@paulweiss.com
**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP**

535 Mission Street, 24th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (628) 432-5100
Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

Attorneys for Defendants

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC;
and RASIER-CA, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Case No. 3:23-MD-3084-CRB

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO
STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING DECISION
FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT ON THE PETITION FOR A
WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer

Date: January 26, 2024

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 26 at 10:00 a.m. or as soon as this matter may be heard before the Honorable Charles. R. Breyer, Courtroom 6, 17th Floor, United States District Court, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC and Rasier-CA, LLC (collectively, “Uber”) will and hereby do move this Court for an order staying all proceedings in this matter and vacating current deadlines for 60 days pending the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit’s adjudication of Uber’s Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

This Motion is based on this Notice, and on the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the pleadings, record, and filings in this action, and on such further evidence, argument, and authorities the Court may consider in deciding this Motion.

DATED: December 22, 2023

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP**

By: /s/ Randall S. Luskey
RANDALL S. LUSKEY
ROBERT ATKINS

Attorney for Defendants
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
RASIER, LLC; and RASIER-CA, LLC

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Uber respectfully requests this Court stay all proceedings in this matter and vacate current deadlines for 60 days while the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit adjudicates Uber’s Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML” or the “Panel”). The requested brief stay, which seeks to pause these proceedings for only a limited period while potentially dispositive questions about the continued existence of this MDL are resolved, is in the best interest of judicial economy and efficiency and may be accomplished without any harm or prejudice to Plaintiffs. It is in neither the Parties’ nor the Court’s best interest to expend time and resources in the immediate-term on issues that may ultimately fall away should the Court of Appeals issue a writ of mandamus to the JPML.

I. Background

On October 4, 2023, the Panel created this MDL, centralizing and transferring the various actions brought by Plaintiffs to this Court. Transfer Order, *In Re Uber Techs., Inc. Passenger Sexual Assault Litig.*, MDL No. 3084, ECF No. 94 (J.P.M.L. Oct. 4, 2023) (hereinafter “*Uber MDL*”). Shortly thereafter, Uber filed a petition for a writ of mandamus in the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit seeking to vacate the Panel’s Order creating this MDL. *See* Uber Pet. for a Writ of Mandamus to the JPML, *Uber MDL*, No. 23-3445, ECF No. 1 (9th Cir. Nov. 10, 2023).

On December 14, a three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit issued an order in which it determined that Uber’s petition for a writ of mandamus raised issues “that warrant an answer.” Order, *Uber MDL*, No. 23-3445, ECF No. 10 (9th Cir. Dec. 14, 2023). It in turn ordered Plaintiffs to file an answer within 14 days and for Uber to file a reply within five days after service of Plaintiffs’ answer. *Id.* The court also invited the JPML to answer. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit subsequently extended Plaintiffs’ filing date for their answer to January 11, 2024, and Uber’s optional reply to February 1, 2024. Order, *Uber MDL*, No. 23-3445, ECF No. 14 (9th Cir. Dec. 21, 2023).

II. Legal Standard for Granting Discretionary Stays of Proceedings

District Courts enjoy broad powers to “control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*,

299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). Inherent to such power is the discretion to stay proceedings. *Id.* When exercising that discretion, courts should weigh the stay’s effects on judicial economy and efficiency on the one hand, with the competing prejudices and harms that both the moving and non-moving parties may experience should the stay be granted or denied. *See, e.g., Ryan v. Gencor Nutrients, Inc.*, 2015 WL 729868, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2015) (citing *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997)); *Rollins v. Dignity Health*, 2014 WL 6693891, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2014); *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254–55.

III. Discussion

Granting a temporary, brief stay here while the Ninth Circuit adjudicates Uber’s writ petition best promotes judicial economy and efficiency.

As of now, the Parties and Court are scheduled to expend considerable time, effort, and resources litigating and deciding various disputes in this matter. Among other things, the Parties are actively litigating the protective order that will govern this case, a discovery plan, and a schedule for the filing of a long-form complaint and for briefing motions to dismiss, amongst other items. *See* Pretrial Order No. 4, *Uber MDL*, No. 3:23-md-3084-CRB, ECF No. 152 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2023). The only pending request before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Motion to Enforce Pretrial Order No. 2, which will be fully briefed by December 22, 2023, and which is scheduled for a hearing before Magistrate Judge Cisneros on January 4, 2024. *See* Order As Modified Granting Stip. to Have Expedited Briefing, *Uber MDL*, No. 3:23-md-3084-CRB, ECF No. 161 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2023). If the Court desires for Plaintiffs’ Motion to Enforce to proceed, Uber does not object to an exception to the requested stay to allow the Court to decide Plaintiffs’ Motion to Enforce.

Indeed, Plaintiffs themselves recognized and have argued that a stay preserves resources, and took such a position previously with this Court. They urged this Court to issue a stay pending the JPML’s decision to create this MDL, “[t]he parties may waste considerable time and effort litigating disputes and other matters here, only for this case to be transferred to a different court and a different judge who may choose to revisit the issues or resolve them differently, requiring duplicative and costly additional litigation.” Motion to Stay Proceeding Pending Potential

Transfer of This Action By the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation and Request to Vacate Pending Deadlines, *A.G. v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 3:23-cv-02071-CRB, ECF No. 31, at 6 (N.D. Cal. July 26, 2023) (hereinafter “A.G. Mot. to Stay”) (Declaration of Randall S. Luskey in Support of Uber’s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Decision From Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus (“Luskey Decl.”), Ex. A).¹ Not only would the Parties’ resources be unnecessarily expended, but as Plaintiffs recognized, so would this Court’s: “Any time and effort the Court spends on these proceedings now may be made redundant if this litigation is transferred....” *Id.* As such, “it does not make sense for this Court to expend its resources on pleadings, pleading motions, and discovery management now when significant changes to the scope and structure of this litigation may be just around the corner.” *Id.*

Those same arguments proffered by Plaintiffs’ co-lead counsel prior to the order granting the petition for the MDL are equally applicable now that the viability of that order is being reviewed on appeal. Moving ahead with these disputes now, when the Ninth Circuit may ultimately reverse the JPML’s decision to establish this MDL, makes little sense and risks unnecessarily taxing the Parties’ and Court’s resources. If the Ninth Circuit issues the writ, these efforts will have been for naught as all of these issues will need to be relitigated in individual proceedings based on the specific facts and issues in those cases. Conversely, should the Ninth Circuit deny Uber’s petition and maintain the status quo, the Parties will be in a position to quickly resume these live disputes with certainty about the consolidated nature of this litigation. In other words, “[i]mposing a stay promotes orderly litigation by preventing the parties from arguing and the Court from deciding issues that may be rendered moot by the Ninth Circuit’s decision.” *Rollins*, 2014 WL 6693891, at *5. Thus, “[r]ather than needlessly taxing this Court’s resources by forging ahead before the [Ninth Circuit’s] decision is clear and the scope of this litigation has crystalized, the Court should briefly stay these proceedings to preserve judicial resources and to ensure efficient resolution of the proceedings.” A.G. Mot. to Stay at 6–7. Pausing these proceedings for

¹ Before this MDL was established, Plaintiffs in 16 individual actions now coordinated into this MDL, moved to stay proceedings pending the JPML’s decision. These 16 motions to stay are substantially the same as the motion in the *A.G.* action.

1 a brief 60 days to ensure that the disputes remain consolidated in this Court is a fair and
2 circumscribed measure to protect against unnecessary and costly work for all constituencies.

3 Nor will granting the short stay harm or prejudice the Parties or these proceedings. Uber
4 seeks, as Plaintiffs previously sought, only a “brief stay and vacating current briefing and
5 scheduling deadlines until the [Ninth Circuit] issues its decision” as to the order creating the MDL
6 and the appropriate structure of the case is finally determined. *Id.* at 7. A stay would cause “no
7 meaningful prejudice” when, as here, the case is in “very early procedural stages” and the Ninth
8 Circuit will “hear this matter within a few months.” *Fuller v. Amerigas Propane, Inc.*, 2009 WL
9 2390358, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2009). Plaintiffs will “not be injured by freezing” temporarily
10 these efforts and “merely hav[ing] to wait until a later date,” when it is clearer that such efforts are
11 even necessary. *Rollins*, 2014 WL 6693891, at *5. Any “potential loss of efficiency” in
12 temporarily pausing these proceedings is “warranted” when denying the stay would require the
13 Parties and the Court to continue with steps that are “costly and may be rendered unnecessary
14 altogether.” *Id.*

15 In sum, the Ninth Circuit’s order requiring a response to the petition for writ of mandamus
16 reflects the appellate court’s intention to address the appropriateness of this MDL, and on an
17 accelerated timeline. The appellate briefing schedule—and the limited 60-day time period covered
18 by Uber’s proposed stay—also overlaps with numerous upcoming deadlines in these proceedings,
19 all of which implicate issues that stand to be affected by the Ninth Circuit’s disposition of the
20 question before it. In that context, and as Plaintiffs themselves previously argued, a “stay will
21 strike a common-sense balance between ensuring that the litigation continues to move forward
22 efficiently while avoiding time consuming, premature, and potentially fruitless motion practice
23 and rulings.” A.G. Mot. to Stay at 7.

24 **IV. Conclusion**

25 For the foregoing reasons, Uber respectfully requests that this Court stay all proceedings
26 in this matter and vacate current deadlines for 60 days pending the Ninth Circuit’s adjudication of
27 Uber’s Petition for a Writ of Mandamus to the JPML.
28

1 DATED: December 22, 2023

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP**

2
3 By: /s/ Randall S. Luskey
4 RANDALL S. LUSKEY
5 ROBERT ATKINS

6 *Attorney for Defendants*
7 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;
8 RASIER, LLC; and RASIER-CA, LLC
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ROBERT ATKINS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)
ratkins@paulweiss.com

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP**

1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 373-3183
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

JESSICA E. PHILLIPS (*Pro Hac Vice forthcoming*)
jphillips@paulweiss.com

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &
GARRISON LLP**

2001 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 223-7300
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)
rluskey@paulweiss.com

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON
& GARRISON LLP**

535 Mission Street, 24th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (628) 432-5100
Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

Attorneys for Defendants

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC;
and RASIER-CA, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**DECLARATION OF RANDALL S. LUSKEY
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
STAY PROCEEDINGS PENDING DECISION
FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE
NINTH CIRCUIT ON THE PETITION FOR A
WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer
Date: January 26, 2024
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

DECLARATION OF RANDALL S. LUSKEY

I, Randall S. Luskey, declare pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746:

1. I am an attorney at the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, attorneys of record for Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC, (collectively, “Uber”). I respectfully submit this declaration in support of Uber’s Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Decision from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus. I know the following facts to be true of my own knowledge, except those matters stated to be based on information and belief, and if called to testify, I could competently do so.

2. Attached as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Notice of Motion and Motion to Stay Proceedings filed by the plaintiff in *A.G. v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, No. 3:23-cv-02071-CRB (N.D. Cal. 2023). The Motion to Stay is ECF No. 31 on the *A.G.* docket.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 22, 2023, in San Francisco, California.

/s/ Randall S. Luskey
Randall S. Luskey

EXHIBIT 1

RACHEL ABRAMS (Cal Bar No. 209316)
 ADAM B. WOLF (Cal Bar No. 215914)
 ANGELA J. NEHMENS (Cal Bar No. 309433)
Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise, LLP
 4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: 415.766.3545
 Facsimile: 415.840.9435
 Email: rabrams@peifferwolf.com
 Email: awolf@peifferwolf.com
 Email: anehmens@peifferwolf.com
Counsel for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN FRANCISCO COURTHOUSE

A.G., an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a
 Delaware Corporation; RASIER, LLC, a
 Delaware Limited Liability Company; and
 DOES 1 through 50, Inclusive,

Defendants.

) Case No. 3:23-cv-02071-CRB

) **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**
) **TO STAY PROCEEDING PENDING**
) **POTENTIAL TRANSFER OF THIS**
) **ACTION BY THE JUDICIAL PANEL**
) **ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**
) **AND REQUEST TO VACATE**
) **PENDING DEADLINES**

) Action Filed: April 28, 2023

) Trial Date: None

) Hearing Date: September 1, 2023

) Hearing Time: 10:00 am

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on September 1, 2023, at 10:00 am, before the Honorable Charles R. Breyer, of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, by video conference (Zoom), Plaintiff A.G. (“Plaintiff”) will and does move this Court for an order staying all proceedings in this matter and vacating current deadlines until further order of this Court following a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) concerning potential centralization of

at least 21 related cases against Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier, LLC (“Defendants”) pending in different federal jurisdictions across the country¹. Plaintiff’s motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Law, the concurrently filed Declaration of Rachel Abrams, other documents on file in this action, and any oral argument of counsel.

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff A.G. (“Plaintiff”) respectfully requests that this Court stay all proceedings in this matter and vacate current deadlines until a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) concerning potential centralization of a least 21 cases in 11 federal courts into one proceeding.² On July 14, 2023, Plaintiff (as well as numerous other Plaintiffs) filed a petition to transfer this and other cases into a federal Multidistrict Litigation (“MDL”) for coordinated or consolidated proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 1407. (*See* Doc. No. 29; Abrams Dec. **Exhibit A**, MDL No. 3084, Doc. No. 1).

Courts have repeatedly recognized the propriety of staying proceedings while the JPML considers a motion to consolidate and transfer similar cases to a single transferee court. A stay is particularly appropriate here for several reasons.

Plaintiff A.G. and other plaintiffs who are not present in this action will have an interest in case management, pleadings, and discovery of a potentially coordinated action. Defendants want to press ahead with this case without waiting for the JPML’s decision or coordinating with other plaintiffs or their counsel, but that is not the best approach to the efficient management of these cases. Many of the cases are actions brought by other Plaintiffs’ counsel, and therefore Plaintiff’s counsel here does not and will not represent those parties.

Should the MDL Petition be granted, it is essential that pleadings in the consolidated cases be conducted in an orderly and efficient manner. Yet Defendants’ counsel insists that this case should press ahead with motions, including dispositive motions, without coordination with any other actions, and even before the JPML has an opportunity to decide whether to coordinate the cases. Further, Defendants have filed the same motions in multiple cases pending in the same district court (which are before different

¹ Plaintiffs’ counsel is aware of numerous other impending federal filings.

² A full list of the related matters pending potential transfer for coordination or consolidation before the JPML is attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Rachel Abrams (“Abrams Dec.”) in Support of Motion.

judges),³ which will undoubtably lead to inconsistent or duplicative rulings. A stay would also avoid such rulings and conserve judicial resources.

Finally, there is no prejudice to Defendants to stay proceedings and vacate existing deadlines in this case. The case was recently filed and is just beginning. There has been no discovery. A brief stay would strike a common-sense balance between ensuring that this case proceeds efficiently while also serving the principle aims of multidistrict litigation—promoting judicial economy, avoiding duplicative discovery and inconsistent rulings, and preserving the resources of the court and litigants. *See In re Air Crash near Kirksville, Mo.*, on Oct 19, 2004, 383 F. Supp. 2d 1382, 1383 (J.P.M.L. 2005). A brief stay of this action, pending further order of this Court following the JPML’s decision, is appropriate here.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed her Complaint on April 28, 2023, (Doc. No. 1), and served Defendants on May 3, 2023. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(1)(A)(i), Defendants’ original deadline to respond to the Complaint was May 24, 2023. The Court ordered the parties to file a Joint Case Management Statement on or before August 18, 2023 (Doc. No. 15), but because counsel for Plaintiff and Defendants are engaged in active litigation with regard to several matters filed in the Northern District of California and other United States District Courts throughout the country, the parties stipulated pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-1(a) to extend Defendants’ deadline to respond to the Complaint to June 23, 2023 (Doc. No. 25). The parties further stipulated pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-1(a)-(b) and 6-2 to extend Defendants’ deadlines to file a Motion to Transfer Venue, Briefing Schedule for a Motion to Dismiss and a Continuance of the Case Management Conference and related deadlines on June 21, 2023 (*Id.*). This Court ordered issued an order extending Defendants’ deadlines to file a Motion to Transfer Venue, Briefing Schedule for a Motion to Dismiss and a Continuance of the Case Management Conference and related deadlines on June 22, 2023 (Doc. No. 27).

³ In this district alone, there are 7 additional cases filed against the same Defendants and assigned to 5 different judges: *Hylin v. Uber Tech., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-1630 and *Gavin v. Uber Tech, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-2111 assigned to Honorable Judge Araceli Martinez-Olguin; *Crawford v. Uber Tech., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-2290 and *H.B. v. Uber Tech., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-03488 assigned to Honorable Judge Vince Chhabria; *E.R. v. Uber Tech, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-2051 assigned to Honorable Judge Trina L. Thompson; *A.M. v. Uber Tech, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-03406 assigned to Honorable Judge James Dunado; *A.H.M. v. Uber Tech., Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-03482 assigned to Honorable Judge Jacqueline Scott Corley.

On July 14, 2023, Defendants filed their Motion to Transfer Venue. (Doc. No. 28). Four days prior, on July 10, 2023, Plaintiff's counsel advised Defendants of the anticipated MDL petition filing and met and conferred regarding the numerous pending and anticipated motions, as well as Case Management Statements, ADR filings, and accompanying deadlines. (*See* Abrams Dec.). Plaintiff's counsel requested Stipulations to Stay matters subject to the MDL Petition, including Plaintiff's case herein. (*Id.*)

On July 14, 2023, Plaintiff (along with numerous other plaintiffs) filed a petition to transfer this and other cases into an MDL for coordinated or consolidated proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 1407. (*See* Doc. No. 29 and Abrams Dec., **Exhibit A.**) To avoid burdening the Court with unnecessary motions, and to promote judicial efficiency, Plaintiff's counsel made repeated attempts with Defendants' counsel to stay actions pending against it or extending deadlines until after the JPML coordination decision. (*See* Abrams Dec., **Exhibit B.**) Defendants made it clear they would not, at this juncture, agree to this approach in cases pending against it. (*Id.*). Therefore, Plaintiff was forced to file her Motion to Stay and Vacate Pending Deadlines.

III. MEMORANDUM OF LAW

Federal courts possess inherent powers to stay proceedings before them. *See Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936) (“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.”); *Dependable Highway Express, Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059, 1066 (9th Cir. 2007).

Courts have repeatedly recognized the propriety of staying proceedings while the JPML considers a motion to consolidate and transfer similar cases to a single transferee court. *See e.g. Good v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 5 F. Supp. 2d 804, 809 (N.D. Cal. 1998) (noting that courts “frequently grant stays pending a decision by the MDL Panel regarding whether to transfer a case”); *Poff v. McKesson Corp.*, 2013 WL 3949207, at *2 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 2013) (explaining that a stay pending resolution of a motion to consolidate before the JPML would “promote judicial economy, uniformity and consistency in decision making”); *Freitas v. McKesson Corp.*, No. 11-cv-05967-JW, 2012 WL 161211 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2012) (granting motion to stay pending decision by the JPML); *Couture v. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-

2657-PJH, 2012 WL 3042994, at *2 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2012) (same); *McCrerey v. Merck & Co.*, No. 4-cv-2576-WQH, 2005 WL 6124182 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2005).

Where a motion for transfer has been filed with the JPML, courts consider the following factors to determine whether a stay is appropriate: (1) “hardship and inequity to the moving party if the action is not stayed;” (2) “the judicial resources that would be saved by avoiding duplicative litigation if the cases are in fact consolidated;” and (3) “potential prejudice to the non-moving party.” *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997); *see also Couture*, 2012 WL 3042994, at *2 (enumerating the same test). All of these factors support a stay of the proceedings before this Court until after the pending MDL Motion is resolved.

A. There Is A Substantial Risk Of Hardship And Inequity To Plaintiff If A Stay Is Not Granted.

If a stay is not granted, Plaintiff in this case (as well as other MDL petition plaintiffs) will suffer undue hardship in continuing to litigate while the JPML considers coordination. This makes no sense given that if these cases are consolidated, there may be an injection of new parties, new theories, and new allegations. It is extremely common for courts to require consolidated pleadings in an MDL rather than dozens of complaints and responses. Assuming that would be the case here, it would be a colossal waste of the parties’ resources to respond to multiple motions before we know if these cases will be consolidated in an MDL and, if so, how they will be managed.

The parties may waste considerable time and effort litigating disputes and other matters here, only for this case to be transferred to a different court and a different judge who may choose to revisit the issues or resolve them differently, requiring duplicative and costly additional litigation. *See Weaver v. Pfizer, Inc.*, 2014 WL 2002212, at *4 (noting the harm to the defendant if required to “relitigate any decisions. . . if the case is transferred to the MDL court”); *see also Ernyes-Kofler v. Sanofi S.A.*, No. 5:16-cv-07307-EJD, 2017 WL 813506, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2017) (noting that a stay “might help Plaintiffs avoid unnecessary effort and expense”).

A brief stay of the proceedings and vacating current deadlines in this action will preserve the parties’ time and resources and avoid unnecessary duplicative proceedings.

B. A Stay Would Preserve Judicial Resources and Promote Judicial Efficiency.

For the same reasons above, a brief stay would also “save judicial resources and promote judicial efficiency.” *Couture*, 2012 WL 3042994, at *2 (citing *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360-61). Any time and effort the Court spends on these proceedings now may be made redundant if this litigation is transferred to a different district court. *See Fuller v. Amerigas Propane, Inc.*, No. 9-cv-2493-TEH, 2009 WL 2390358, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2009) (“There is simply no reason for this Court to expend its time and energy on these cases until the pending motion before the [JPML] is resolved, as transfer of this matter to another court would render redundant the efforts of this Court.”); *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360-61 (granting request for stay pending JPML ruling and holding that a “great deal of this Court’s time and energy” would be saved by a stay).

In addition, even if the cases are ultimately transferred here, it does not make sense for this Court to expend its resources on pleadings, pleading motions, and discovery management now when significant changes to the scope and structure of this litigation may be just around the corner. *See Mandrigues v. World Sav., Inc.*, No. 07-4497, 2008 WL 5221074, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2008) (Fogel, J.) (finding that judicial economy favored grant of a stay pending JPML ruling even though the court anticipated it would receive the coordinated actions); *Jennings v. Fresenius USA Inc.*, No. 13-cv-03795-WHO, 2013 WL 5487224, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2013); *see also Ernyes-Kofler v. Sanofi S.A.*, 2017 WL 813506, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2017) (noting that courts “frequently grant stays pending a decision by the MDL Panel regarding whether to transfer a case,” and explaining that a stay pending resolution of a motion to transfer before the JPML would “conserve judicial resources,” avoid “duplicative discovery and motion practice,” and avoid “inconsistent rulings”); *Grove v. Organon USA, Inc.*, No. 13-2138-SC, 2013 WL 3286225, at *1 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2013) (holding that “staying the case promote[d] judicial economy and uniform decision-making”). If the MDL Petition is granted, there will be additional plaintiffs, and counsel raising issues related to pleadings, discovery, scheduling, and case management. It makes good sense to wait until those parties are present before plowing ahead with this proceeding.

Rather than needlessly taxing this Court’s resources by forging ahead before the JPML’s decision is clear and the scope of this litigation has crystalized, the Court should briefly stay these proceedings to

1 preserve judicial resources and to ensure efficient resolution of the proceedings.

2 **C. A Brief Stay Would Not Prejudice Defendants.**

3 Finally, there will be no “prejudice to the non-moving part[ies]” should the proceedings in these
 4 actions be stayed. *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360. All Plaintiff seeks through this motion is a brief stay and
 5 vacating current briefing and scheduling deadlines until the JPML issues its decision on the motion to
 6 transfer and the cases can be coordinated and appropriately structured. The Petition will be heard at the
 7 Panel’s next session on September 28, 2023, and a decision will likely be rendered shortly thereafter.
 8 Such a brief stay would cause “no meaningful prejudice” to Defendants, particularly where, as here, “any
 9 delay caused by this stay will be of very short duration.” *Fuller*, 2009 WL 2390358, at *1 (finding “no
 10 meaningful prejudice...as a result of a stay where the JPML was “expected to hear [the] matter within a
 11 few months” and a stay was “unlikely to cause the degradation of memories or the loss of material
 12 evidence”); *Couture*, 2012 WL 3042994, at *3 (finding that a short stay would not prejudice Plaintiffs);
 13 *Good*, 5 F. Supp. 2d at 809 (finding that stay of case pending JPML transfer decision would not
 14 prejudice... where the stay “would likely be brief”); *see also Rosenfeld v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*, No. 88-
 15 cv-2153-MJL, 1988 WL 49065, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 12, 1988). A stay will strike a common-sense
 16 balance between ensuring that the litigation continues to move forward efficiently while avoiding time
 17 consuming, premature, and potentially fruitless motion practice and rulings.

18 **IV. CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court stay all proceedings in this
 20 matter and vacate current deadlines until further order of this Court following a decision by the JPML on
 21 the motions to consolidate and transfer.

22 Alternatively, if the Court is inclined to deny the instant motion, Plaintiff respectfully requests a
 23 two-week extension to respond to Defendants’ pending motions.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1 Dated: July 26, 2023

**PEIFFER WOLF CARR KANE
CONWAY & WISE, LLP**

2
3 By: /s/ Rachel Abrams

4 Rachel Abrams (SBN: 209316)
5 Adam B. Wolf (SBN: 215914)
6 Angela J. Nehmens (SBN: 309433)
7 4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400
8 San Francisco, CA 94111
9 Telephone: 415.766.3545
10 Facsimile: 415.840.9435

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff A.G.*
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on July 26, 2023, I electronically transmitted the foregoing **MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDING PENDING POTENTIAL TRANSFER OF THIS ACTION BY THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION AND REQUEST TO VACATE PENDING DEADLINES** to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing thereby transmitting a Notice of *Electronic Filing* to all CM/ECF registrants.

/s/ Rachel Abrams
Rachel Abrams

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING STAY OF
PROCEEDINGS PENDING DECISION FROM
THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH
CIRCUIT ON THE PETITION FOR A WRIT
OF MANDAMUS**

This Document Relates to:

ALL ACTIONS

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer
Date: January 26, 2024
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor

[PROPOSED] ORDER

The Court having considered Defendants' Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Decision from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus, all other papers and evidence submitted in support and opposition, the pertinent pleadings and papers on file in this action, and the arguments of counsel, and all other matters presented to the Court, the Court here rules as follows:

1. Defendants' Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Decision from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit on the Petition for a Writ of Mandamus is GRANTED.

2. All proceedings in this matter shall be stayed for 60 days from the entry of this Order.

3. All current deadlines shall be vacated and rescheduled by future order of this Court.

4. Defendants shall notify the Court in writing within 3 days of any decision by the Ninth Circuit on Defendants' pending Petition for a Writ of Mandamus.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: _____, 2023

HON. CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE