

1 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE
 AND DORR LLP
 2 John A. Rogovin (pro hac vice)
 Randolph D. Moss (pro hac vice)
 3 Samir C. Jain # 181572
 Brian M. Boynton # 222193
 4 Benjamin C. Mizer (pro hac vice)
 1875 Pennsylvania Ave, NW
 5 Washington, DC 20006
 Tel.: 202-663-6000
 6 Fax: 202-663-6363
 Email: john.rogovin@wilmerhale.com

7 Attorneys for Verizon Maryland Inc.

8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12

)	MDL NO. 06-1791 VRW
)	
13 IN RE:)	VERIZON’S OPPOSITION TO <i>BREADY</i>
)	PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR
14 NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY)	ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF
15 TELECOMMUNICATIONS)	
16 RECORDS LITIGATION)	Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker
)	
17 This Document Relates To:)	
)	
18 <i>Bready v. Verizon Maryland Inc.</i> ,)	
No. 1:06-2185)	
)	

19

20 The *Bready* Plaintiffs’ Motion for Administrative Relief should be denied because it is
 21 premature. Plaintiffs’ motion (at 2) asks the Court to “issue an order to show cause as to why the
 22 Court’s resolution of the remand motions” in the *Campbell* and *Riordan* cases “should not be
 23 applied to the remand motion pending” in the *Bready* case. But until the Court actually decides the
 24 motions to remand in *Campbell* and *Riordan*, it is impossible to know whether the Court’s ruling
 25 will be applicable to the *Bready* case. It makes no sense to ask the parties to brief *now* the impact of
 26 an order that has yet to be issued.

27 The Court’s ruling on the motions to remand in *Campbell* and *Riordan* may well be
 28 dispositive of the Plaintiffs’ motion to remand in *Bready*, but because the cases involve

1 substantively different claims under the laws of different states, the jurisdictional analysis applicable
2 to the cases could differ depending on the grounds of the Court’s decision. Indeed, when the Court
3 decided to schedule oral argument on the motions to remand filed in *Campbell* and *Riordan* but not
4 the other removed cases (including *Bready*), the Court recognized that those other cases “may
5 involve peculiar facts or peculiar circumstances.” 11-17-06 Hr’g Tr. at 77-78.

6 Verizon anticipates that the impact of the Court’s ruling in *Campbell* and *Riordan* will be
7 readily apparent once the Court issues a decision. As a result, the most efficient course is for the
8 parties to confer expeditiously following the issuance of the Court’s ruling in *Campbell* and *Riordan*
9 to determine the proper manner of resolving any disputes that may then exist as to the propriety of
10 the removal of the *Bready* case.

11 Accordingly, the *Bready* Plaintiffs’ motion should be denied as premature.

12

Dated: December 22, 2006

13

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND
DORR LLP
John A. Rogovin
Randolph D. Moss
Samir C. Jain
Brian M. Boynton
Benjamin C. Mizer

14

15

16

17

By: /s/ Brian M. Boynton

18

Brian M. Boynton

19

Attorneys for Verizon Maryland Inc.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28