## 

1	Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064) Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260)				
2	Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 199643) Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 250298)				
3	Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255928) Katherine M. Lehe (State Bar No. 273472)				
4	LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor				
5 6	San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: (415) 956-1000 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008				
7 8	Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Siddharth Hariharan, Brandon Marshall, Michael Devine, Mark Fichtner, and Daniel Stover				
9	[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]				
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
12					
13	SIDDHARTH HARIHARAN,	Case No. C 11-2509 SBA			
14	individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED			
15	Plaintiff,	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO TRANSFER ACTIONS TO THE SAN JOSE DIVISION			
16	V.	DIVISION			
17	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC., et al.,				
18	Defendants.				
19	BRANDON MARSHALL, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. C 11-3538 SBA			
20	Plaintiff,				
21	V.				
22	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC., et al.,				
23	Defendants.				
24					
25	[Caption continued next page]				
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>	[Caption continued next page]				
	[Caption continued next page]				
26	[Caption continued next page]				

## 

1 2	MICHAEL DEVINE, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. C 11-3539 SBA	
3	Plaintiff,		
4	V.		
	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC., et al.,		
5	Defendants.		
6	MARK FICHTNER, individually and on	Case No. C 11-3540 SBA	
7	behalf of all others similarly situated,	Cuse 110. C 11 3340 BB/1	
8	Plaintiff,		
9	V.		
	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC., et al.,		
10	Defendants.		
11 12	DANIEL STOVER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No. C 11-3541 SBA	
	Plaintiff,		
13	v.		
14	ADOBE SYSTEMS INC., et al.,		
15	Defendants.		
16			
17	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, all Plaintiffs in the above-captioned actions hereby file		
18	this Unopposed Administrative Motion to Transfer Actions to the San Jose Division of the		
19	Northern District of California. A Proposed Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The Parties		
20	have met and conferred and Defendants have advised Plaintiffs that they do not oppose this		
21	Administrative Motion. (See attached Declaration of Eric B. Fastiff in Support of Plaintiffs'		
22	Unopposed Administrative Motion to Transfer Actions to the San Jose Division, at ¶ 2.) Pursuant		
23	to Civil Local Rule 7-11(c), this Administrative Motion is submitted for immediate determination		
24	without hearing.		
25	I. <u>BACKGROUND</u>		
26	After Plaintiff Siddharth Hariharan filed the initial action in Alameda County Superior		
27	Court, Defendants removed it to the San Francisco/Oakland Division (Dkt. No. 1). Four cases		

alleging the same conspiracy and asserting the same claims for relief against the same seven

28

### Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK Document56 Filed08/02/11 Page3 of 6

1	Defendants were filed in Santa Clara Superior Court. Defendants subsequently removed those
2	actions to the San Jose Division, and filed an Administrative Motion to Relate Cases to the first
3	filed action (Dkt. No. 41). The Court ordered the cases related on July 27, 2011 (Dkt. No. 52).
4	As a result, all five actions are now pending before this Court in the San Francisco/Oakland
5	Division. <sup>1</sup>
6 7	II. ALL FIVE CASES AROSE IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY BECAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL PART OF THE EVENTS WHICH GIVE RISE TO PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS OCCURRED THERE
8	These actions are properly venued in the San Jose Division. Local Rule 3-2(c) states, "A
9	civil action arises in the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give
10	rise to the claim occurred " As alleged in all five complaints, Defendants engaged in a
11	conspiracy with each other to fix their employees' compensation. Five of the seven Defendants
12	are headquartered in Santa Clara County. The five complaints allege the other two Defendants,
13	Pixar (headquartered in Alameda County) and Lucasfilm Ltd. (headquartered in San Francisco
14	County), reached agreements with the Santa Clara County-based Defendants.
15	The Plaintiffs in the four related actions were all employed by a Defendant headquartered
16	in Santa Clara County. Plaintiffs Michael Devine and Brandon Marshall worked as software
17	engineers for Defendant Adobe Systems Inc., headquartered in San Jose. (Devine Compl. ¶ 21;
18	Marshall Compl. ¶ 21.) Plaintiff Mark Fichtner worked as a software engineer for Defendant
19	Intel Corp., headquartered in Santa Clara. (Fichtner Compl. ¶ 21.) Plaintiff Daniel Stover
20	worked as a software engineer for Defendant Intuit Inc., headquartered in Mountain View.
21	(Stover Compl. ¶ 21.)
22	In the fifth action, Plaintiff Siddharth Hariharan worked as a software engineer for
23	Defendant Lucasfilm Ltd., headquartered in San Francisco County. (Hariharan Compl. ¶ 19.)
24	Hariharan alleges he was harmed by all Defendants' illegal agreements, including those in which
25	the Santa Clara County-based Defendants participated. (Hariharan Compl. ¶¶ 19, 25, 48-85.)
26	The cases are: (1) Havilanary v. Adoba Sustanta Iras. et al. Case No. 11 CV 2500 SD A.
<ul><li>27</li><li>28</li></ul>	<sup>1</sup> The cases are: (1) Hariharan v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al., Case No. 11-CV-2509-SBA; (2) Marshall v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al., Case No. 11-CV-3538-SBA; (3) Devine v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al., Case No. 11-CV-3539-SBA; (4) Fichtner v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al., Case No. 11-CV-3540-SBA; and (5) Stover v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al., Case No. 11-CV-3541-

SBA.

#### Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK Document56 Filed08/02/11 Page4 of 6

By Defendants' estimates, the five Santa Clara County-based Defendants employed at				
<u>least 98%</u> of class members. <sup>2</sup> These five Defendants allegedly negotiated, finalized,				
implemented, and enforced agreements to eliminate competition with each other, within Santa				
Clara County. (Devine Compl. ¶¶ 61-96; Marshall Compl. ¶¶ 61-96; Fichtner Compl. ¶¶ 61-96;				
and Stover Compl. ¶¶ 61-96.)				
Accordingly, "a substantial part of the events which give rise to the claim occurred" in				
Santa Clara County. Civ. L.R. 3-2(c). Civil Local Rule 3-2(e) directs civil actions arising in				
Santa Clara County be assigned to the San Jose Division.				
III. THE COURT SHOULD ORDER INTRADISTRICT TRANSFER OF THE FIVE ACTIONS TO THE SAN JOSE DIVISION				
This Court should transfer the five cases to the San Jose Division. Pursuant to Civil Local				
Rule 3-2(h), "Whenever a Judge finds, upon the Judge's own motion or the motion of any party,				
that a civil action has not been assigned to the proper division within this district in accordance				
with this rule, or that the convenience of parties and witnesses and the interests of justice will be				
served by transferring the action to a different division within the district, the Judge may order				
such transfer, subject to the provisions of the Court's Assignment Plan."				

Here, the vast majority of the percipient witnesses, relevant documents, and Defendants are located in Santa Clara County. Four of the five Plaintiffs worked for Defendants headquartered in Santa Clara County. At least 98% of class members worked for Defendants headquartered in Santa Clara County. Accordingly, transfer to the San Jose Division will best serve the "convenience of parties and witnesses" and will be in the "interests of justice." Civ. L.R. 3-2(h).

This Court has granted motions for transfer under similar circumstances. See, e.g., Rivera

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

UNOPPOSED ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO - 3 -

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In Defendants' notice of removal and supporting papers, Defendants use current employees as a surrogate for employees who worked from January 1, 2005 through January 1, 2010 (the class period). (See Notice of Removal ¶ 21, at p. 6, Dkt. No. 1.) Defendants estimate that they currently employ 83,300 individuals who would otherwise qualify as members of the class. (*Id.*) Of these, Defendants estimate that 82,283 work for defendants who maintain their principal places of business in Santa Clara County: Adobe Systems Inc., Apple Inc., Google Inc., Intel Corp., and Intuit Inc. (Declarations of Rhonda Hjort ¶ 3, Dkt. No. 4; Jack Gilmore ¶ 3, Dkt. No. 5; Joel Podolny ¶ 3, Dkt. No. 6; Tadhg Bourke ¶ 3, Dkt. No. 7; James M. Kennedy ¶ 3, Dkt. No. 8; Debbie R. Oldham-Auker ¶ 2, Dkt. No. 9; and Kumud Kokal ¶ 3, Dkt. No. 31-1.)

## 

1	v. Hewlett Packard Corp., Case No. 03-0939, 2003 WL 24029472, at *1-*2 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22,			
2	2003) (Armstrong, J.) (granting Hewlett Packard's motion for transfer to the San Jose Division in			
3	an unlawful termination case, because Hewlett Pacl	an unlawful termination case, because Hewlett Packard maintained its principal place of business		
4	4 in Santa Clara County); Baltazar v. Apple Inc., Case	in Santa Clara County); Baltazar v. Apple Inc., Case No. 10-3231, 2010 WL 4392740, at *1 (N.D.		
5	5 Cal. Oct. 29, 2010) (White, J.) (granting Apple's m	Cal. Oct. 29, 2010) (White, J.) (granting Apple's motion for transfer to the San Jose Division in a		
6	product defect case regarding the iPad, where the design and development of the iPad occurred in			
7	Santa Clara County, and the advertising and marketing plans were developed there as well).			
8	8 As the substantial part of the events occurre	As the substantial part of the events occurred in Santa Clara County, and because it will be		
9	9 more convenient for the parties and witnesses and i	more convenient for the parties and witnesses and in the interests of justice for all five cases to		
10	proceed before a Judge in the San Jose Division, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court			
11	transfer all five actions to the San Jose Division.			
12	Dated: August 2, 2011 Respectful	y Submitted,		
13	13			
14	LIEFF, CA	BRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP		
15	15			
16	By. <u>/8/1</u>	Eric B. Fastiff		
17	17	ric B. Fastiff		
18	Eric B. Fas	Saveri (State Bar No. 130064) tiff (State Bar No. 182260)		
19	Dean M. H	Glackin (State Bar No. 199643) arvey (State Bar No. 250298)		
20	Katherine 1	naver (State Bar No. 255928) M. Lehe (State Bar No. 273472) BRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP		
21	275 Batter	Street, 29th Floor Sco, CA 94111-3339		
22	Telephone	(415) 956-1000 (415) 956-1008		
23	23			
24	Eric L. Cra Shanon J. G			
25		chalman-Bergen & MONTAGUE, P.C.		
26	26 1622 Locu	st Street		
27	Telephone	a, PA 19103 (800) 424-6690		
28	Facsimile:	(215) 875-4604		

# Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK Document56 Filed08/02/11 Page6 of 6 Linda P. Nussbaum John D. Radice GRANT & EISENHOFER P.A. 485 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor New York, NY 10017 Telephone: (646) 722-8500 Facsimile: (646) 722-8501 Attorneys for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs Siddharth Hariharan, Brandon Marshall, Michael Devine, Mark Fichtner, and Daniel Stover

- 5 -