OFFICE OF THE CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Northern District of California

CIVIL MINUTES

Date: November 20, 2025	**Time:** 16 minutes	**Judge:** LISA J. CISNEROS
Case No.: 3:23-md-03084-CRB	**Case Name:** In re: Uber Technologies, Inc. v.	

For Plaintiffs: Elizabeth Wilkins and Roopal Luhana, Chaffin Luhana LLP; Sarah London, Andrew Kaufman, and Simon Grille, Girard Sharp; Rachel Abrams and Tiffany Ellis, Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise, LLP; Sommer Luther, Wagstaff Law Firm; An Truong, Simmons Hanly Conroy, counsel for Plaintiffs.

For Defendants: Alexandra Caritis, Kaitlyn Coverstone and Christopher Cox, Kirkland & Ellis; Jennifer Hill and Maria Salcedo, Shook Hardy & Bacon, counsel for Defendants

Deputy Clerk: Brittany Sims **Reported by:** Andrea Bluedorn

PROCEEDINGS

Discovery Status Conference held. The Court directed the parties in future joint discovery letters and discovery status reports to identify specifically whether each dispute relates to a bellwether case that is set for a trial date, so the Court can prioritize more time-sensitive disputes and craft appropriate relief.

The Court expressed a tentative view that a global deadline for clawing back documents is not likely appropriate at this time, but that a mechanism should be in place to resolve relevant clawbacks in advance of each trial with time for the parties to prepare for trial and potentially substitute in alternative exhibits. The Court directed the parties to meet and confer to attempt to reach a resolution, at least with respect to the upcoming *Dean* trial.

Plaintiffs withdrew their request for an expedited schedule to meet and confer on a joint discovery letter under Pretrial Order No. 8. The parties are attempting to focus their discussions on matters relevant to the *Dean* case. Plaintiffs anticipate filing a motion for sanctions seeking adverse inferences next week if disputes are not resolved regarding material purportedly not

produced by Uber, including what Plaintiffs represented to be a new relevant database that only recently came to light in a deposition. The Court discussed the possibility that any dispute should be addressed in a discovery letter in the first instance to seek production of the information. Plaintiffs asserted that the necessary production and discovery could not feasibly be completed in advance of the *Dean* trial in January.