

1 DAVIDA BROOK (275370)
dbrook@susmangodfrey.com
2 KRYSTA KAUBLE PACHMAN
(280951)
kpachman@susmangodfrey.com
3 HALLEY W. JOSEPHS (338391)
hjosephs@susmangodfrey.com
4 ROHIT D. NATH (316062)
rmath@susmangodfrey.com
5 NICHOLAS N. SPEAR (304281)
nspear@susmangodfrey.com
6 MADELINE M. YZURDIAGA
(344676)
myzurdiaga@susmangodfrey.com
7 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
8 Los Angeles, CA 90067
9 Phone: (310) 789-3100
10 Fax: (310) 789-3150

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and Class*
12 *Counsel*
(Additional counsel on signature page)

MICHAEL T. ZELLER (196417)
michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com
MICHAEL E. WILLIAMS (181299)
michaelwilliams@quinnemanuel.com
DIANE CAFFERATA (190081)
dianecafferata@quinnemanuel.com
ROBERT J. BECHER (193431)
robertbecher@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
865 South Figueora Street 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2543

Attorneys for Defendants
(Additional counsel on signature page)

13
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
16 **SOUTHERN DIVISION**
17

18 JANE DOE on behalf of herself and all
19 others similarly situated,

20 Plaintiff,

v.

21 MINDGEEK USA INCORPORATED,
22 MINDGEEK S.A.R.L., MG
FREESITES, LTD (D/B/A PORNHUB),
23 MG FREESITES II, LTD, MG
CONTENT RT LIMITED, AND 9219-
24 1568 QUEBEC, INC. (D/B/A
MINDGEEK),

25 Defendants.

Case No. 8:21-cv-00338-CJC-ADS

Hon. Cormac J. Carney

**JOINT STATUS REPORT
REGARDING MOTION TO
APPROVE FORM AND MANNER
OF CLASS NOTICE**

JOINT STATUS REPORT ON CLASS NOTICE

Pursuant to the Court’s January 18, 2024 Order, the Parties submit this joint status report regarding class notice. ECF No. 219. The Ninth Circuit denied Defendants’ Rule 23(f) petition on January 18, 2024. *See Jane Doe v. MindGeek USA Inc., et al.*, No. 23-03909 (9th Cir. Jan. 18, 2024), ECF No. 15 (attached as Exhibit A). The parties met and conferred about class notice on January 22, 2024.

The parties agree that in light of the Ninth Circuit’s order denying Defendants’ Rule 23(f) petition, MindGeek’s concerns regarding the timing of notice have been rendered moot. The parties also agree that Plaintiff’s revisions to the notice attached to Plaintiff’s Reply (ECF No. 216) alleviate Defendants’ concerns regarding whether class members can opt out electronically and which MindGeek entities are described in the class notice. The only remaining disputes are: (1) whether the approved class notice should be posted on MindGeek’s websites, (2) whether the notice plan should include a global press release, (3) whether the Court’s order on class notice should require Plaintiff to bear all costs, and (4) whether Plaintiff’s counsel should be required to coordinate with counsel in another pending class action in the Northern District of Alabama on the issue of class notice. These issues are fully briefed. ECF Nos. 211, 212, 216.

The parties agree that the class notice motion—ECF Nos. 211 (Motion), 212 (Opposition), 216 (Reply)—is ripe for adjudication and request that the Court issue an order or reset the motion for hearing at the Court’s convenience.

Dated: January 23, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Krysta Kauble Pachman
DAVIDA BROOK (275370)
dbrook@susmangodfrey.com
KRYSTA KAUBLE PACHMAN (280951)
kpachman@susmangodfrey.com
HALLEY W. JOSEPHS (338391)
hjosephs@susmangodfrey.com

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

ROHIT D. NATH (316062)
rnath@susmangodfrey.com
NICHOLAS N. SPEAR (304281)
nspear@susmangodfrey.com
MADELINE M. YZURDIAGA (344676)
myzurdiaga@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6029
Telephone: (310) 789-3100
Facsimile: (310) 789-3150

AMY GREGORY (*Pro Hac Vice*)
agregory@susmangodfrey.com
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Fl.
New York, NY 10019-6023
Telephone: (212) 336-8330
Facsimile: (212) 336-8340

STEVE COHEN
POLLOCK COHEN LLP
60 Broad Street, 24th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Phone: (212) 337-5361

Attorneys for Plaintiff Jane Doe

By: /s/ Michael E. Williams
MICHAEL T. ZELLER (196417)
MICHAEL E. WILLIAMS (181299)
DIANE CAFFERATA (190081)
ROBERT J. BECHER (193431)
**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP**
865 South Figueora Street 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2543
dianecafferata@quinnemanuel.com
marihenderson@quinnemanuel.com
michaelwilliams@quinnemanuel.com
michaelzeller@quinnemanuel.com
robertbecher@quinnemanuel.com

BENJAMIN SADUN (287533)
DECHERT LLP
US Bank Tower
633 West 5th Street, Suite 4900
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2032
Phone: (213) 808-5700
Fax: (213) 808-5760
benjamin.sadun@dechert.com

KATHLEEN N. MASSEY (*pro hac vice*)
MICHELLE YEARY (*pro hac vice*)

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

HAYDEN A. COLEMAN (*pro hac vice*)
hayden.coleman@dechert.com
DECHERT LLP
Three Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
Phone: (212) 698-3500
Fax: (212) 698-3599
kathleen.massey@dechert.com
mark.cheffo@dechert.com
michelle.yeary@dechert.com
hayden.coleman@dechert.com

Counsel for Defendants

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JAN 18 2024

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

JANE DOE, on behalf of herself and all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Respondent,

v.

MINDGEEK USA INCORPORATED, et
al.;

Defendants - Petitioners.

No. 23-3909

D.C. No.

21-cv-00338

Central District of California,

Santa Ana

ORDER

Before: WARDLAW and NGUYEN, Circuit Judges.

The motion to amend the caption (Docket Entry No. 14) is granted. The Clerk will amend the caption to reflect that the case number for the underlying district court action is 8:21-cv-00338-CJC-ADS.

The motion to file under seal certain exhibits in support of the petition (Docket Entry No. 6) is granted. The Clerk will file publicly the motion to seal (Docket Entry No. 6-1) and the supporting declaration of Michael E. Williams (Docket Entry No. 6-2). The Clerk will maintain under seal exhibit Volumes 3-27 (Docket Entry Nos. 6-3 through 6-27).

The petition for permission to appeal is denied. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(f); *Chamberlan v. Ford Motor Co.*, 402 F.3d 952, 959-60 (9th Cir. 2005) (describing factors this court considers in analyzing a Rule 23(f) petition).