

1 ROBERT ATKINS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
ratkins@paulweiss.com  
2 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**  
3 **& GARRISON LLP**  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
4 Telephone: (212) 373-3183  
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

5 JESSICA E. PHILLIPS (*Pro Hac Vice forthcoming*)  
jphillips@paulweiss.com  
6 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &**  
7 **GARRISON LLP**  
2001 K Street, NW  
8 Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 223-7300  
9 Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

10 RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)  
rluskey@paulweiss.com  
11 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**  
12 **& GARRISON LLP**  
535 Mission Street, 24th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
13 Telephone: (628) 432-5100  
Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

14 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC;  
and RASIER-CA, LLC

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

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

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**

24 This Document Relates to:

25 ALL ACTIONS

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

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

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

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

12  
13 DATED: December 22, 2023

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

14  
15 By: /s/ Randall S. Luskey  
16 RANDALL S. LUSKEY  
17 ROBERT ATKINS

18 *Attorney for Defendants*  
19 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
20 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.*,

1 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). Inherent to such power is the discretion to stay proceedings. *Id.* When  
2 exercising that discretion, courts should weigh the stay’s effects on judicial economy and  
3 efficiency on the one hand, with the competing prejudices and harms that both the moving and  
4 non-moving parties may experience should the stay be granted or denied. *See, e.g., Ryan v. Gencor*  
5 *Nutrients, Inc.*, 2015 WL 729868, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2015) (citing *Rivers v. Walt Disney*  
6 *Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997)); *Rollins v. Dignity Health*, 2014 WL 6693891, at  
7 \*4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2014); *Landis*, 299 U.S. at 254–55.

### 8 **III. Discussion**

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

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

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

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

11 Those same arguments proffered by Plaintiffs’ co-lead counsel prior to the order granting  
 12 the petition for the MDL are equally applicable now that the viability of that order is being  
 13 reviewed on appeal. Moving ahead with these disputes now, when the Ninth Circuit may  
 14 ultimately reverse the JPML’s decision to establish this MDL, makes little sense and risks  
 15 unnecessarily taxing the Parties’ and Court’s resources. If the Ninth Circuit issues the writ, these  
 16 efforts will have been for naught as all of these issues will need to be relitigated in individual  
 17 proceedings based on the specific facts and issues in those cases. Conversely, should the Ninth  
 18 Circuit deny Uber’s petition and maintain the status quo, the Parties will be in a position to quickly  
 19 resume these live disputes with certainty about the consolidated nature of this litigation. In other  
 20 words, “[i]mposing a stay promotes orderly litigation by preventing the parties from arguing and  
 21 the Court from deciding issues that may be rendered moot by the Ninth Circuit’s decision.” *Rollins*,  
 22 2014 WL 6693891, at \*5. Thus, “[r]ather than needlessly taxing this Court’s resources by forging  
 23 ahead before the [Ninth Circuit’s] decision is clear and the scope of this litigation has crystalized,  
 24 the Court should briefly stay these proceedings to preserve judicial resources and to ensure  
 25 efficient resolution of the proceedings.” A.G. Mot. to Stay at 6–7. Pausing these proceedings for  
 26

27 <sup>1</sup> Before this MDL was established, Plaintiffs in 16 individual actions now coordinated into this  
 28 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  
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

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

1 ROBERT ATKINS (*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*)  
ratkins@paulweiss.com  
2 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**  
**& GARRISON LLP**  
3 1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
4 Telephone: (212) 373-3183  
Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

5 JESSICA E. PHILLIPS (*Pro Hac Vice forthcoming*)  
jphillips@paulweiss.com  
6 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &**  
**GARRISON LLP**  
7 2001 K Street, NW  
8 Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 223-7300  
9 Facsimile: (212) 492-0183

10 RANDALL S. LUSKEY (SBN: 240915)  
rluskey@paulweiss.com  
11 **PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON**  
**& GARRISON LLP**  
12 535 Mission Street, 24th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
13 Telephone: (628) 432-5100  
Facsimile: (628) 232-3101

14 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
15 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC;  
and RASIER-CA, LLC

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

21 IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT  
22 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**

24 This Document Relates to:  
25 ALL ACTIONS

Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer  
Date: January 26, 2024  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
27 Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor  
28



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

**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



1 at least 21 related cases against Uber Technologies, Inc. and Rasier, LLC (“Defendants”) pending in 11  
 2 different federal jurisdictions across the country<sup>1</sup>. Plaintiff’s motion is based on this Notice of Motion  
 3 and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Law, the concurrently filed Declaration of Rachel  
 4 Abrams, other documents on file in this action, and any oral argument of counsel.

## 5 I. INTRODUCTION

6 Plaintiff A.G. (“Plaintiff”) respectfully requests that this Court stay all proceedings in this matter  
 7 and vacate current deadlines until a decision by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”)   
 8 concerning potential centralization of a least 21 cases in 11 federal courts into one proceeding.<sup>2</sup> On July  
 9 14, 2023, Plaintiff (as well as numerous other Plaintiffs) filed a petition to transfer this and other cases  
 10 into a federal Multidistrict Litigation (“MDL”) for coordinated or consolidated proceedings under 28  
 11 U.S.C. § 1407. (*See* Doc. No. 29; Abrams Dec. **Exhibit A**, MDL No. 3084, Doc. No. 1).

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

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

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

26 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs’ counsel is aware of numerous other impending federal filings.

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

judges),<sup>3</sup> which will undoubtedly 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).

<sup>3</sup> 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.

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

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

### 14 III. MEMORANDUM OF LAW

15 Federal courts possess inherent powers to stay proceedings before them. *See Landis v. N. Am. Co.*,  
 16 299 U.S. 248, 254–55 (1936) (“[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in  
 17 every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself,  
 18 for counsel, and for litigants.”); *Dependable Highway Express, Inc. v. Navigators Ins. Co.*, 498 F.3d 1059,  
 19 1066 (9th Cir. 2007).

20 Courts have repeatedly recognized the propriety of staying proceedings while the JPML considers  
 21 a motion to consolidate and transfer similar cases to a single transferee court. *See e.g. Good v. Prudential*  
 22 *Ins. Co. of Am.*, 5 F. Supp. 2d 804, 809 (N.D. Cal. 1998) (noting that courts “frequently grant stays pending  
 23 a decision by the MDL Panel regarding whether to transfer a case”); *Poff v. McKesson Corp.*, 2013 WL  
 24 3949207, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 2013) (explaining that a stay pending resolution of a motion to  
 25 consolidate before the JPML would “promote judicial economy, uniformity and consistency in decision  
 26 making”); *Freitas v. McKesson Corp.*, No. 11-cv-05967-JW, 2012 WL 161211 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2012)  
 27 (granting motion to stay pending decision by the JPML); *Couture v. Hoffman-La Roche, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-

1 2657-PJH, 2012 WL 3042994, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2012) (same); *McCreery v. Merck & Co.*, No. 4-  
 2 cv-2576-WQH, 2005 WL 6124182 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2005).

3 Where a motion for transfer has been filed with the JPML, courts consider the following factors to  
 4 determine whether a stay is appropriate: (1) “hardship and inequity to the moving party if the action is not  
 5 stayed;” (2) “the judicial resources that would be saved by avoiding duplicative litigation if the cases are  
 6 in fact consolidated;” and (3) “potential prejudice to the non-moving party.” *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*,  
 7 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997); *see also Couture*, 2012 WL 3042994, at \*2 (enumerating the  
 8 same test). All of these factors support a stay of the proceedings before this Court until after the pending  
 9 MDL Motion is resolved.

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

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

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

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

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

2           For the same reasons above, a brief stay would also “save judicial resources and promote judicial  
3 efficiency.” *Couture*, 2012 WL 3042994, at \*2 (citing *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360-61). Any time and  
4 effort the Court spends on these proceedings now may be made redundant if this litigation is transferred  
5 to a different district court. *See Fuller v. Amerigas Propane, Inc.*, No. 9-cv-2493-TEH, 2009 WL  
6 2390358, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2009) (“There is simply no reason for this Court to expend its time and  
7 energy on these cases until the pending motion before the [JPML] is resolved, as transfer of this matter to  
8 another court would render redundant the efforts of this Court.”); *Rivers*, 980 F. Supp. at 1360-61 (granting  
9 request for stay pending JPML ruling and holding that a “great deal of this Court’s time and energy” would  
10 be saved by a stay).

11           In addition, even if the cases are ultimately transferred here, it does not make sense for this Court  
12 to expend its resources on pleadings, pleading motions, and discovery management now when significant  
13 changes to the scope and structure of this litigation may be just around the corner. *See Mandrigues v.*  
14 *World Sav., Inc.*, No. 07-4497, 2008 WL 5221074, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2008) (Fogel, J.) (finding  
15 that judicial economy favored grant of a stay pending JPML ruling even though the court anticipated it  
16 would receive the coordinated actions); *Jennings v. Fresenius USA Inc.*, No. 13-cv-03795-WHO, 2013  
17 WL 5487224, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2013); *see also Ernyes-Kofler v. Sanofi S.A.*, 2017 WL 813506, at  
18 \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2017) (noting that courts “frequently grant stays pending a decision by the MDL  
19 Panel regarding whether to transfer a case,” and explaining that a stay pending resolution of a motion to  
20 transfer before the JPML would “conserve judicial resources,” avoid “duplicative discovery and motion  
21 practice,” and avoid “inconsistent rulings”); *Grove v. Organon USA, Inc.*, No. 13-2138-SC, 2013 WL  
22 3286225, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2013) (holding that “staying the case promote[d] judicial economy and  
23 uniform decision-making”). If the MDL Petition is granted, there will be additional plaintiffs, and counsel  
24 raising issues related to pleadings, discovery, scheduling, and case management. It makes good sense to  
25 wait until those parties are present before plowing ahead with this proceeding.

26           Rather than needlessly taxing this Court’s resources by forging ahead before the JPML’s decision  
27 is clear and the scope of this litigation has crystalized, the Court should briefly stay these proceedings to  
28



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  
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

Dated: July 26, 2023

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

By: /s/ Rachel Abrams

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

*Attorneys for Plaintiff A.G.*

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

**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

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

**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

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

**[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