1	Theodore B. Olson (#38137)		
2	TOlson@gibsondunn.com Uslai C. Walker (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)		
	Helgi C. Walker (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) <u>HWalker@gibsondunn.com</u>		
3	Michael R. Huston (#278488)		
4	MHuston@gibsondunn.com		
5	Jacob T. Spencer (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )		
5	JSpencer@gibsondunn.com GDSON_DUNN & CRUTCHER LLD		
6	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.		
7	Washington DC 20026 5206		
,	Telephone: 202.955.8668		
8	Facsimile: 202.530.9575		
9	Joshua S. Lipshutz (#242557)		
10	Joshua D. Dick (#268853)  JDick@gibsondunn.com  Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP  555 Mission Street  San Francisco, CA 94105-0921		
11			
12			
13			
14	Facsimile: 415.374.8469		
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
16	CTIA – The Wireless Association®		
	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT	
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
18	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
19			
1)	CTIA – THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION®,	CASE NO. 3:15-cv-02529-EMC	
20			
21	Plaintiff,	FURTHER JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT	
22			
23	V.		
	THE CITY OF BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA,	Date: May 12, 2016	
24	and CHRISTINE DANIEL, CITY MANAGER OF BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA,	Time: 10:30 AM	
25	in her official capacity,	Place: Courtroom 5, 17th Floor, San Francisco	
26			
27	Defendants.		
28			

Pursuant to Local Rule 16-10 and this Court's Standing Order, Plaintiff CTIA – The Wireless Association® ("CTIA") and Defendants the City of Berkeley, California, ("the City") and Christine Daniel, in her official capacity as City Manager of Berkeley, California, (collectively, "Defendants") file this Further Joint Case Management Statement.

#### 1. Jurisdiction and Service.

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1337. There is no dispute regarding personal jurisdiction or venue. All parties have been served.

#### 2. Facts.

This action challenges the City's Ordinance "REQUIRING NOTICE CONCERNING RADIO FREQUENCY EXPOSURE OF CELL PHONES," Berkeley Municipal Code Chapter 9.96 ("Ordinance"), which requires cell phone retailers to distribute to their customers or post a notice stating that:

The City of Berkeley requires that you be provided the following notice:

To assure safety, the Federal Government requires that cell phones meet radio frequency (RF) exposure guidelines. If you carry or use your phone in a pants or shirt pocket or tucked into a bra when the phone is ON and connected to a wireless network, you may exceed the federal guidelines for exposure to RF radiation. This potential risk is greater for children. Refer to the instructions in your phone or user manual for information about how to use your phone safely.

Berkeley Municipal Code § 9.96.030(A).

On June 8, 2015, CTIA filed a motion for preliminary injunction (Dkt. 4) asking this Court to enjoin enforcement of the Ordinance on a preliminary basis as preempted by federal law and violating the First Amendment. This Court on September 21, 2015 "grant[ed] in part and denie[d] in part CTIA's motion for a preliminary injunction," enjoining the Ordinance "unless and until the sentence in the City notice regarding children's safety is excised from the notice." (Dkt. 53).

On November 17, 2015, Defendants filed a motion to dissolve the preliminary injunction based on the Berkeley City Council's amendment of the Ordinance to remove the sentence regarding children's safety. CTIA filed its opposition to Defendants' motion on December 1, 2015, Defendants

11

10

13 14

12

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

23

22

25

24

26 27

28

filed their reply on December 8, 2015, and oral argument was heard on January 21, 2016. On January 27, 2016, the Court granted Defendants' motion, which incorporated the holding and reasoning of the Court in its prior ruling on CTIA's motion for preliminary injunction, and also denied CTIA's request for a stay of dissolution pending appeal. (Dkt. 74).

On February 1, 2016, CTIA appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (the "Ninth Circuit") from this Court's Order granting Defendants' motion to dissolve the preliminary injunction. (Dkt. 76). CTIA filed its opening brief with the Ninth Circuit on February 29, 2016, Defendants filed their answering brief on April 4, 2016, and CTIA's reply is due on May 9, 2016.

The City of Berkeley began enforcing the Ordinance on March 21, 2016.

# 3. Legal Issues.

The legal issues in this case are: (1) whether the Ordinance violates the First Amendment; (2) whether the Ordinance violates the Supremacy Clause and is preempted by federal law; and (3) whether Defendants have violated CTIA's members' constitutional rights in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

### 4. Motions.

#### A. **Pending Motions**

There are no pending motions before this Court. As noted above, CTIA's appeal to the Ninth Circuit is currently pending and CTIA's reply brief is due on May 9, 2016.

#### В. **Prior Motions**

All prior motions filed in this case, listed below, have been resolved:

- 1) CTIA's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 4), filed on June 8, 2015; granted in part and denied in part by order (Dkt. 53), filed on September 21, 2015.
- 2) Motions for leave to appear Pro Hac Vice, filed on June 8, 2015 (Dkt. 8, 9), June 22, 2015 (Dkt. 27), and July 1, 2015 (Dkt. 32), respectively; all granted by orders, filed on June 22, 2015 (Dkt. 28, 29), June 24, 2015 (Dkt. 30), and July 7, 2015 (Dkt. 35), respectively.

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

- 3) National Resources Defense Council's Motion to File Amicus Brief in Opposition to CTIA's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 36); granted by order (Dkt. 53), filed on September 21, 2015.
- 4) Defendants' Motion to Dissolve Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 59), filed on December 8, 2015; granted by order (Dkt. 74), filed on January 27, 2016.
  - 5. Amendment of Pleadings.

CTIA does not currently anticipate amending its complaint, but reserves all rights to do so.

6. Evidence Preservation.

Although the parties do not anticipate seeking any discovery, they are aware of and have complied with their evidence preservation obligations.

7. <u>Disclosures.</u>

The parties have agreed to defer any initial disclosures until such time as they may become relevant.

8. Discovery.

The parties do not anticipate that any discovery will be necessary. The parties agree that, should either party wish to take discovery, the parties will meet and confer regarding the prompt scheduling of such discovery.

9. Class Actions.

This case is not a class action.

10. Related Cases.

The parties are not aware of any related cases or proceedings, except for CTIA's currently pending appeal to the Ninth Circuit, as discussed above.

11. Relief.

CTIA seeks the relief set forth in its complaint.

12. Settlement and ADR.

The parties have conferred and agree that the validity of the Ordinance is an issue of broad importance that is not amenable to resolution through settlement or ADR.

# 13. Consent to Magistrate Judge For All Purposes.

The parties do not consent to assignment to a Magistrate Judge for all purposes.

#### 14. Other References.

This case is not suitable for assignment to binding arbitration, to a Special Master, or to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.

#### 15. Narrowing of Issues.

The parties believe that the issues are adequately framed by the complaint and that no furthering narrowing of the issues or bifurcation of the case is necessary or advisable.

### 16. Expedited Trial Procedures.

The parties agree that this is not the type of case that can be handled under the Expedited Trial Procedure of General Order No. 64 Attachment A.

## 17. Scheduling.

The parties do not believe that any dates need to be scheduled at this time given CTIA's currently pending appeal to the Ninth Circuit of this Court's Order granting Defendants' motion to dissolve the preliminary injunction, which incorporated the holding and reasoning of the Court in its prior ruling on CTIA's motion for preliminary injunction.

## 18. <u>Trial.</u>

The parties expect this case to be resolved through motions practice, without the need for any trial.

# 19. Disclosure of Non-party Interested Entities or Persons.

CTIA filed its Certification of Interested Entities or Persons on June 8, 2015. As stated in that Certification, CTIA is a nonprofit membership organization that represents the wireless communications industry. Membership in the association includes wireless carriers and their suppliers, as well as providers and manufacturers of wireless data services and products. The current membership list is available at http://www.ctia.org/about-us/current-members.

#### 20. Professional Conduct.

All attorneys of record for the parties have reviewed the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Northern District of California.

26

27

1	May 5, 2016	By: /s/ Theodore B. Olson
2		Theodore B. Olson
3		Helgi C. Walker
4		Joshua S. Lipshutz Joshua D. Dick
		Michael R. Huston
5		Jacob T. Spencer
6		GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
7		Attorneys for Plaintiff
8		$CTIA-The\ Wireless\ Association$ ®
9	May 5 2016	Dry **/a/ Zacham D. Carran
10	May 5, 2016	By: **/s/ Zachary D. Cowan
11		Zach Cowan, City Attorney (#96372)
12		CITY OF BERKELEY 2180 Milvia Street, Fourth Floor
		Berkeley, CA 94704
13		Telephone: 510.981.6998 Facsimile: 510.981.6960
14		
15		Attorney for Defendants City of Berkeley, California and
16		Christine Daniel, City Manager of
17		Berkeley, California
18		** Pursuant to Civ. L.R. 5-1(i)(3), the
		electronic signatory has obtained approval from this signatory.
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20		
	1	