http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

1	PETER D. KEISLER			
	Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division			
2	CARL J. NICHOLS Deputy Assistant Attorney General			
3	DOUGLAS N. LETTER			
	Terrorism Litigation Counsel			
4	JOSEPH H. HUNT			
_	Director, Federal Programs Branch			
5	ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO Special Litigation Counsel			
6				
	tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov RENÉE S. ORLEANS			
7	ANDREW H. TANNENBAUM			
	ALEXANDER K. HAAS			
8	Trial Attorneys U.S. Department of Justice			
9	Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch			
	20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW			
10	Washington, D.C. 20001			
	Phone: (202) 514-4782			
11	Fax: (202) 616-8470	: -1 C:4:		
12	Attorneys for Federal Defendants in their Offic and Federal Intervenor-Defendants (United Sta			
	National Security Agency, President George W			
13	g,			
	A TANADA DA CARA MEG		ATT.	
14	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COUR	(1	
15	NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFOR	RNIA	
1.	CANTEDANICI	ICCO DIVICION		
16	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION			
17) No. M:06-cv	-01791-VRW	
17	IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY)		
	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS) RESPONSE	OF THE UNITED	
17 18) RESPONSE) STATES TO	OF THE UNITED HEPTING PLAINTIFFS'	
17	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINISTI	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR	
17 18	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS) RESPONSE) STATES TO	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR	
17 18 19 20	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al.,) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDUL!)) Courtroom:	OF THE UNITED OF HEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER	
17 18 19	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To:) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER	
17 18 19 20 21	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al.,) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDUL!)) Courtroom:	OF THE UNITED OF HEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER	
17 18 19 20	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW	RESPONSE ATATES TO ADMINISTI SCHEDULI Courtroom: Judge:	OF THE UNITED OF HEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER	
17 18 19 20 21	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDUL!)) Courtroom:	OF THE UNITED OF HEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:)	OF THE UNITED OF HEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker	
17 18 19 20 21 22	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTROI Plaintiffs in the Hepting action have mo) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTROL) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTROI Plaintiffs in the Hepting action have mo) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker edule a Case Management to the <i>Hepting</i> case. <i>See</i>	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTROD Plaintiffs in the Hepting action have mo Conference ("CMC") that would focus primaril) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker edule a Case Management to the <i>Hepting</i> case. <i>See</i>	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTRO Plaintiffs in the Hepting action have mo Conference ("CMC") that would focus primaril Hepting Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion for S) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker edule a Case Management to the <i>Hepting</i> case. <i>See</i>	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTROD Plaintiffs in the Hepting action have mo Conference ("CMC") that would focus primaril Hepting Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion for S United States Response to Hepting) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker edule a Case Management to the <i>Hepting</i> case. <i>See</i>	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION This Document Relates To: Hepting, et al. v. AT&T Corp., et al., No. C 06 0672 VRW INTRO Plaintiffs in the Hepting action have mo Conference ("CMC") that would focus primaril Hepting Plaintiffs' Administrative Motion for S) RESPONSE) STATES TO) ADMINIST!) SCHEDULI)) Courtroom:) Judge:) DUCTION ved the Court to sch	OF THE UNITED OHEPTING PLAINTIFFS' RATIVE MOTION FOR NG ORDER 6, 17 th Floor Hon. Vaughn R. Walker edule a Case Management to the <i>Hepting</i> case. <i>See</i>	

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

States' position is that the first order of business in any CMC should be to address case management issues that apply to this multidistrict litigation ("MDL") proceeding as a whole. The *Hepting* plaintiffs instead seek a conference that would focus largely on issues specific to their case. *See* Dkt. No. 39 at 2. But those issues were discussed at length with the Court at the *Hepting* status conference on August 8, 2006, and nothing has changed in the interim to warrant another conference on the same topics. In particular, the Court of Appeals has yet to rule on pending petitions for an interlocutory appeal of the Court's decision in *Hepting*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Whether that appeal is taken will have a direct bearing on further proceedings in *Hepting* and, indeed, for this MDL proceeding.

Thus, as discussed further below, the United States proposes that the more efficient and orderly course would be for the Court to schedule a CMC after the Court of Appeals has decided whether to hear an appeal in *Hepting*. When that CMC occurs, we further propose that it should address initial management procedures that will govern all of the cases transferred to this MDL proceeding. Indeed, the Court's prior orders in this proceeding appear to contemplate an initial case management conference, and the issuance of a consolidated case management order, for *all* cases. *See* Orders at Dkt. Nos. 15 and 19 (related to "ALL CASES").

DISCUSSION

The point of MDL proceedings is to deal with numerous lawsuits in a manner that will promote their just and efficient resolution. But it is apparent from the *Hepting* plaintiffs' motion that they wish the Court to focus on matters specific to their own case, such as the filing of an Answer to the *Hepting* Complaint by the Defendants in that case, the specific discovery sought by the plaintiffs in that case, and the filing of a motion for a preliminary injunction in that case. *See Hepting* Motion (Dkt. No. 39) at 2. Indeed, the *Hepting* plaintiffs essentially propose to repeat the discussion of topics already addressed at the August 8, 2006, status conference in that case.

Since that status conference, however, the *Hepting* case has become one of more than

United States Response to *Hepting* Motion for Scheduling Order MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

234

1

5

8

7

11

10

13

12

1415

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

•

26

27

28

thirty cases that have been transferred to this Court for consolidated and coordinated proceedings. As a result, the United States submits that the focus of any CMC should concern case management issues and procedures that will apply to and govern all of the cases, not just the *Hepting* case.

Indeed, the United States respectfully submits that, because any ruling by the Court of Appeals in the *Hepting* appeal would have a direct bearing on the similar claims presented in the transferred cases, the Court should defer holding a CMC until after the Court of Appeals decides whether it will take that appeal. At that time, the first issue that a CMC should address is whether to stay all MDL proceedings while the *Hepting* appeal is pending.

The next issue to discuss in a CMC for this MDL proceeding would be how the multiple cases will be coordinated. For example, the Court may wish to consider who among the many counsel for plaintiffs will be designated to represent the plaintiffs' interests in a coordinated fashion. Consideration should also be given at that time to the development of a unified master complaint, since most of the transferred actions involve highly similar and overlapping claims (and putative classes) concerning: (i) alleged surveillance by the National Security Agency ("NSA") of the content of communications under the acknowledged Terrorist Surveillance Program; and/or (ii) alleged NSA actions to collect telephone call record information from telecommunications carriers.

If the Court does wish to address issues specific to the *Hepting* case, the parties could do so at that same CMC. While the United States would address pending issues further in a case management statement, we reiterate for now our position, stated at the August 8 conference, that the issues identified by the *Hepting* plaintiffs should be deferred until a ruling on the *Hepting* 1292(b) petitions and pending any appeal, because the further proceedings proposed by the *Hepting* plaintiffs would undoubtedly implicate the state secret privilege issues that that United States has petitioned for review.

Finally, and as already noted, the United States submits that the Court should not

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916 schedule a CMC—whatever its scope—until after the Court of Appeals decides the pending 1292(b) petitions in *Hepting*, because whether the Court of Appeals will decide the issues presented by that appeal would obviously have a direct bearing on all the coordinated cases. In addition, the United States notes that proceedings before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ("JPML") are not concluded with respect to several cases. In particular, plaintiffs in three actions against the United States—Center for Constitutional Rights v. Bush, (06-cv-313) (S.D.N.Y.); Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation v. Bush, (06-cv-274) (D. Ore.); and Shubert v. Bush, (06-cv-2282) (E.D. N.Y.)—have moved to vacate a conditional transfer order that would consolidate those cases with this MDL proceeding. Briefing on those motions should be complete by late October, and we expect they will be heard by the JPML in late November 2006. JPML proceedings are also pending with respect to cases brought by the United States against various state government entities and telecommunications carriers that seek to enjoin those state entities from requiring the disclosure to them of information related to alleged NSA foreign intelligence activities. See Exh. A (conditional transfer order dated September 28, 2006, for additional actions). Unless all parties consent to the transfer of these additional cases, briefing on whether these cases should be transferred to this MDL proceeding should be complete by late November 2006. CONCLUSION For the foregoing reasons, the United States opposes the scheduling of a Case

Management Conference that focuses on the specific issues raised by the *Hepting* case, but does not oppose a CMC that addresses case management issues and procedures applicable to all transferred cases. The United States respectfully proposes that this conference be set after a ruling on the 1292(b) petitions in the *Hepting* action.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER D. KEISLER Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division

United States Response to Hepting Motion for Scheduling Order MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

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

Case M:06-cv-01791-VRW Document 42-1 Page 6 of 13 Filed 10/06/2006 Document hosted at JDSUPRA http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916 **EXHIBIT "A"**

United States Response to *Hepting* Motion for Scheduling Order MDL No. 06-1791-VRW

SEP 28 2006

FILED CLERK'S OFFICE

DOCKET NO. 1791

BEFORE THE JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO-3)

On August 9, 2006, the Panel transferred 15 civil actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. See _____F.Supp.2d_____(J.P.M.L. 2006). Since that time, 16 additional actions have been transferred to the Northern District of California. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Vaughn R. Walker.

It appears that the actions on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Northern District of California and assigned to Judge Walker.

Pursuant to Rule 7.4 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, 199 F.R.D. 425, 435-36 (2001), these actions are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the Northern District of California for the reasons stated in the order of August 9, 2006, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Vaughn R. Walker.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 15 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 15-day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

FOR THE PANEL:

Clerk of the Panel

JPML Document 42-1

Filed 10/06/2006

Page 8 of 13

Document hosted at JDSUPRA

SCHEDULE CTO-3 - TAG WATION CONCETTONS Viewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916 DOCKET NO. 1791 IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS LITIGATION

DIST. DIV. C.A.#

CASE CAPTION

CONNECTICUT

CT 3 06-1405

United States of America v. Anthony J. Palermino, et al.

MAINE

ME 1 06-97

United States of America v. Kurt Adams, et al.

MISSOURI EASTERN

MOE 4 06-1132

United States of America v. Steve Gaw, et al.

MISSOURI WESTERN

MOW 2 06-4177

Robert Clayton, et al. v. AT&T Communications of the Southwest, Inc., et al.

NEW JERSEY

NJ 3 06-2683

United States of America v. Zulima V. Farber, et al.

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the foregoing RESPONSE OF THE UNITED STATES TO

HEPTING PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR SCHEDULING ORDER

(re: *Hepting*, **06-CV-676**), will be served by means of the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notifications to ECF registered counsel, and I hereby certify that the foregoing response of the United States will be served by first class mail on the non-ECF participants listed on the attached pages.

s/ Anthony J. Coppolino

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

1 2	Darrell Lee Barger Hartline acus et al. 800 N. Shoreline Blvd.	Nancy Scott Degan Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
3	Suite 2000 N Corpus Christi, TX	2001 St. Charles, Suite 3600 New Orleans, LA 70170
4	Marc Oliver Beem Miller Shakman & Hamilton, LLP	Val Patrick Exnicios Liska Exnicios & Nungesser
5	180 North LaSalle Street	One Canal Place
6	Suite 3600 Chicago, IL 60601	365 Canal Street New Orleans, LA 70130
7	John Beisner O'Melveny & Myers LLP	Tyrone C. Fahner Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP
8	555 13 th Street, N.W.	71 South Wacker Drive
9	Suite 500 West Washington, DC 20004-1109	Chicago, IL 60606
10	Steven K. Blackhurst Ater Wynne Hewitt Dodson & Skerritt	Daniel Martin Feeney Miller Shakman & Beem LLP
11	222 S.W. Columbia Ste. 1800 Portland, OR 97201-6618	180 North LaSalle Street, Suite 3600 Chicago, IL 60606
12	James M. Carlson	Sheila Marie Finnegan
13	Ungaretti & Harris LLP	Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP
14	3500 Three First National Plaza Chicago, IL 60602	71 South Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606
15	David R. Carpenter	Jodi W. Flowers
16	Sidley Austin LLP One South Dearborn Street	Motley Rice, LLC 28 Bridgeside Boulevard
	Chicago, IL 60603	P.O. Box 1792
17		Mount Pleasant, SC 29465
18	Edward Morgan Carstarphen, III Ellis Carstearphen, et all	Amy Collins Fontenot Liska, Exnicios & Nungesser
19	5847 San Felipe Suite 1900	One Canal Place 365 Canal Street
20	Houston, TX 77057	Suite 2290
21		New Orleans, LA 70130
22	Catherin J. Casey DLA Piper Rudnick Gary Cary US LLP	Zachary J. Freeman Miller Shakman & Beem LLP
	203 North LASalle Street, #1900	180 N. La Salle Street, Suite 3600
23	Chicago, IL 60601	Chicago, IL 60601
24	Amato A. Deluca	Susan A. Friewald
25	Deluca & Weizenbaum, Ltd. 199 North Main Street	USF School of Law 2130 Fulton Street
26	Providence, RI 02903	San Francisco, CA 94117
27		

28

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

1	Daniel N. Gall	F. Thomas Hecht
2	c/o Luna Innovations 2851 Commerce Street	Ungaretti & Harris LLP 3500 Three First National Plaza
3	Blacksburg, VA 24060	Chicago, IL 60602
4	Anthony D. Irpino Irpino Law Firm	Joseph G. Jevic, III St. Martin & Williams
	365 Canal Street	4084 Highway 311
5	22 nd Floor New Orleans, LA 70130	P.O. Box 2017 Houma, LA 70361-2017
6	Philip J. John, Jr.	C. J. Johnson
7	Baker & Botts	Kalkstein Law Firm
8	One Shell Plaza 910 Louisiana Street	P.O. Box 8568 Missoula, MT 59807
9	Houston, TX 77002	Peter D. Keisler
10	Joshua Karsh Gasslar Hughas Piers Pasnick & Dym. Ltd.	United States Department of Justice
	Gessler Hughes Piers Resnick & Dym, Ltd. Three First National Plaza	Assistant Attorney General 20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Rm. 7312
11	70 West Madison Street, Suite 4000 Chicago, IL 60602	Washington, D.C. 20530
12	Jonathan D. King	Joseph R. Knight Baker Botts LLP
13	DLA Piper Rudnick Gray Cary US LLP	98 San Jacinto Blvd.
14	203 North La Salle Street, #1900 Chicago, IL 60601-1293	Suite 1500 Austin, TX 78701-4039
15	Leondra Kruger	Melanie G. Lagarde
16	Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.	St. Martin & Williams 4084 Highway 311
	Washington, D.C. 20006-3642	Houma, LA 70360
17	David L. Lawson	Roger L. Mandel
18	Sidley Austin Brown & Wood 172 Eye Street, N.W.	Stanley Mandel & Iola LLP 3100 Monticello Avenue, Suite 750
19	Washington, D.C. 20006	Dallas, TX 75205
20	Howard A. Merten	Randolph D. Moss
21	Partridge, Snow & Hahn LLP 180 South Main Street	Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale & Dorr LLP 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
22	Providence, RI 02903	Washington, D.C. 20006
23	Michael C. O'Malley	Michele L. Odorizzi
	Siben & Siben, LLP 90 East Main Street	Mayer Brown Rowe & Maw 190 South LaSalle Street
24	BayShore, NY 11706	Chicago, IL 60603
25	Wendy Sangbee Park Rober Baldwin Foundation of ACLU, Inc.	Robert J. Patterson Watts Law Firm LLP
26	180 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 2300	555 N. Carancahua Street
27	Chicago, IL 60601	Tower II Bldg. 14 th Floor Corpus Christi, TX 78401
28		

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

1 2 3	Adam D. Schwartz Inc. 180 North Michigan Avenue Suite 2300 Chicago, IL 60601-7401	Paul Lee Peyronnin Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC 201 St. Charles Ave. Suite 3600
4		New Orleans, LA 70170
5	Christopher A. Slater Slater & Ross 1 S.W. Columbia Street	Michael James Philippi Ungaretti & Harris LLP 3500 three First National Plaza
6	Suite 1850 Portland, OR 97258	Chicago, IL 60602
7		Josep D. Ditabia
8	Michael A. St. Pierre Revens Revens & St. Pierre 946 Centerville Road	Jason R. Ritchie Holland & Hart P.O. Box 639
9	Warwick, RI 02886	Billings, MT 59103
10	Marc Ver Der Hout	Harry Rosenberg
11	Ver Der Hout & Brigagliano 180 Sutter Street, 5 th Floor	Phelps Dunbar, LLP Canal Place
12	San Francisco, CA 94123	365 Canal Street Suite 2000 New Orleans, LA 70120 6524
13	Nicholas Wagner	New Orleans, LA 70130-6534 Michael J. Ross
14	Law Offices of Wagner & Jones	Slater Ross
15	1111 East Herndon, Suite 317 Fresno, CA 93720	1850 Benjamin Franklin Plaza 1 S.W. Columbia Street Portland, OR 97258
16	Thomas P. Walsh	William A. Rossbach
17	United States Attorney's Office NDIL 219 South Dearborn Street	Rossbach & Whiston 401 North Washington Street
18	Suite 500	P.O. Box 8988
19	Chicago, IL 60604	Missoula, MT 59807-8988
20	Peter Wasylyk Law Offices of Peter Wasylyk	Alan Norris Salpeter Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw
21	1307 Chalkstone Avenue Providence, RI 02908	190 South LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60603
22	Mikal C. Watts	Mark Schlosberg
23	Watts Law Firm, LLP Bank of America Plaza	American Civil Liberties Union Fndt. 1663 Mission Street, Suite 460
24	300 Convent Street Suite 100 San Antonio, TX 78205	San Francisco, CA 94103
25		Fuis Calmaidan
26	Conrad S.P. Williams, III St. Martin, Williams & Bourque P.O. Box 2017	Eric Schneider 1730 South Federal Hwy. #104 Delray Beach, FL 33483
27	Houma, LA 70361	Denay Deach, FL 33403
28		

Case M:06-cv-01791-VRW Document 42-1 Filed 10/06/2006 Page 13 of 13

Document hosted at JDSUPRA

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=8ebc561c-71f6-4bc7-8144-74aea9ecb916

Martin Woodward Stanley, Mandel & Iola, LLP 3100 Monticello Avenue Suite 750 Dallas, TX 75205

Matthew A. Woolf Baker Donelson Bearman Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC 201 St. Charles Ave. Suite 3600 New Orleans, LA 70170