

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
on  
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**NOTICE OF HEARING SESSION**

Pursuant to the order of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation filed today, notice is hereby given that a hearing session has been scheduled to consider various matters under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

DATE OF HEARING SESSION: **July 31, 2025**

LOCATION OF HEARING SESSION: James A. McClure Federal Building  
and U.S. Courthouse  
Courtroom No. 3, 6th Floor  
550 West Fort Street  
Boise, Idaho 83724

TIME OF HEARING SESSION: In those matters designated for oral argument, counsel requesting oral argument must be present at **8:00 a.m.** in order for the Panel to allocate the amount of time for oral argument. Oral argument will commence at **9:30 a.m.**

SCHEDULED MATTERS: Matters scheduled for consideration at this hearing session are listed on the enclosed Hearing Session Order and Schedule of Matters for Hearing Session.

- Section A of this Schedule lists the matters designated for oral argument and includes all actions encompassed by Motion(s) for Transfer filed pursuant to Rules 6.1 and 6.2. Any party waiving oral argument pursuant to Rule 11.1(d) need not attend the Hearing Session.
- Section B of this Schedule lists the matters that the Panel has determined to consider **without oral argument**, pursuant to Rule 11.1(c). Parties and counsel involved in these matters need not attend the Hearing Session.

ORAL ARGUMENT:


- The Panel carefully considers the positions advocated in filings with the Panel when it allocates time to attorneys presenting oral argument. The Panel, therefore, expects attorneys to adhere to those positions including those concerning an appropriate transferee district. Any change in position should be conveyed to Panel staff before the beginning of oral argument. Where an attorney thereafter advocates a position different from that conveyed to Panel staff, the Panel may reduce the allotted argument time and decline to hear further from that attorney.

-2-

- The Panel expects attorneys presenting oral argument to be prepared to discuss what steps they have taken to pursue alternatives to centralization including, but not limited to, engaging in informal coordination of discovery and scheduling, and seeking Section 1404 transfer of one or more of the subject cases.
- A transcript of the oral argument will be filed in each docket when it becomes available. Parties who wish to order a transcript may obtain the court reporter's contact information from the court reporter at the hearing or from the Panel at 202-502-2800 following the hearing.

For those matters listed on Section A of the Schedule, the "Notice of Presentation or Waiver of Oral Argument" must be filed in this office no later than **July 7, 2025**. The procedures governing Panel oral argument (Panel Rule 11.1) are attached. The Panel strictly adheres to these procedures.

FOR THE PANEL:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James V. Ingold  
Clerk of the Panel

cc: Clerk, United States District for the District of Idaho

**UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL**  
**on**  
**MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**HEARING SESSION ORDER**

The Panel issues the following orders in connection with its next hearing session,

IT IS ORDERED that on July 31, 2025, the Panel will convene a hearing session in Boise, Idaho, to consider the matters on the attached Schedule under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel may, on its own initiative, consider transfer of any or all of the actions in those matters to any district or districts.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel will hear oral argument on the matters listed on Section A of the attached Schedule, unless the parties waive oral argument or unless the Panel later decides to dispense with oral argument pursuant to Panel Rule 11.1(c).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Panel will consider without oral argument the matters listed on Section B of the attached Schedule pursuant to Panel Rule 11.1(c). The Panel reserves the prerogative, on any basis including submissions of parties pursuant to Panel Rule 11.1(b), to designate any of those matters for oral argument.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation shall direct notice of this hearing session to counsel for all parties involved in the matters on the attached Schedule.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



Karen K. Caldwell  
Chair

Nathaniel M. Gorton  
David C. Norton  
Dale A. Kimball

Matthew F. Kennelly  
Roger T. Benitez  
Madeline Cox Arleo

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS FOR HEARING SESSION  
July 31, 2025 — Boise, Idaho

**SECTION A**  
**MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR ORAL ARGUMENT**

(This schedule contains only those civil actions listed in the Schedule(s) of Actions submitted with the docketed motion(s) for transfer. See Panel Rules 6.1 and 6.2. If these dockets are centralized, other actions of which the Panel has been informed may be subject to transfer pursuant to Panel Rule 7.1.)

**MDL No. 3152 – IN RE: CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT RENTAL ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff Mack’s Junk Removal, LLC, to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Central District of California, and motion of plaintiff AXG Roofing, LLC, to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

Central District of California

MACK'S JUNK REMOVAL, LLC v. ROUSE SERVICES LLC, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 2:25–03565  
HAXTON MASONRY, INC. v. RB GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–03902

Southern District of Iowa

SIGNS v. ROUSE SERVICES LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:25–00158

Northern District of Illinois

AXG ROOFING, LLC v. RB GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–03487  
IMMEDIATE APPLIANCE SERVICE, INC. v. RB GLOBAL, INC., ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 1:25–04139  
KRIS SWANSON CONSTRUCTION LLC v. RB GLOBAL, INC., ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 1:25–04236  
IPCS CORP. v. RB GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04825  
IZQ CONSTRUCTION LLC v. RB GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04872

**MDL No. 3153 – IN RE: COINBASE CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH  
LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff Allen Shakib to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Central District of California

EISENBERG v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–04460

Northern District of California

BELIAN v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:25–04171

SHAKIB v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:25–04207

ORTIZ v. COINBASE, INC., C.A. No. 3:25–04235

SQUEO, ET AL. v. COINBASE, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:25–04254

NEU, ET AL. v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:25–04243

Southern District of New York

PANTHAKI, ET AL. v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04094

MCAFEE v. COINBASE, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04137

BENDER v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04148

SCHEUBER v. COINBASE, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04151

Western District of Washington

QUITO v. COINBASE GLOBAL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–00940

**MDL No. 3154 – IN RE: RESPIMAT PHARMACEUTICALS ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff Massachusetts Laborers' Health & Welfare Fund to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts:

District of Connecticut

1199SEIU NATIONAL BENEFIT FUND, ET AL. v. BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM  
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:24–00783

District of Massachusetts

MASSACHUSETTS LABORERS' HEALTH & WELFARE FUND v. BOEHRINGER  
INGELHEIM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:24–10565

**MDL No. 3155 – IN RE: AIR CRASH AT TORONTO PEARSON INTERNATIONAL  
AIRPORT ON FEBRUARY 17, 2025**

Motion of defendants Delta Air Lines, and Endeavor Air, Inc., to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota:

Northern District of Georgia

LOURENS v. DELTA AIR LINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–00905

District of Minnesota

KREBS v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00675  
KOUKOV v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00807  
CARLETON v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00837  
SINCLAIR v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00962  
SOMERS–BERNER v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00963  
BOUFFARD, ET AL. v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00965  
GONZALES v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00966  
OMOSEN, ET AL. v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00967  
SOBREVIELA v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:25–00968

Southern District of Texas

SALVADOR STAMM v. DELTA AIRLINES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:25–01145

**MDL No. 3156 – IN RE: SAMANTHA S. KUMARAN LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiff Samantha Kumaran to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut:

District of Connecticut

KUMARAN, ET AL. v. VISION FINANCIAL MARKETS, LLC, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 3:22–01653  
HIGH RIDGE FUTURES, LLC v. NEFERTITI RISK CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, LLC,  
C.A. No. 3:24–00641

Southern District of New York

KUMARAN, ET AL. v. NATIONAL FUTURES ASSOCIATION, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 1:20–03668  
KUMARAN, ET AL. v. ADM INVESTOR SERVICES, INC., C.A. No. 1:20–03873

**MDL No. 3157 – IN RE: PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY "PROTECT, GROW AND RESTORE" MARKETING AND SALES PRACTICES LITIGATION**

Motion of plaintiffs Melissa Lowry, Michael Dunn, and Lisa Kopecki to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington:

Northern District of California

ALZAIDI, ET AL. v. PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY, C.A. No. 3:25–04519

Northern District of Illinois

DEAN, ET AL. v. PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY, C.A. No. 1:25–05977

District of Massachusetts

GIARRIZZO, ET AL. v. PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY, C.A. No. 1:25–11524

District of Minnesota

DUPONT v. PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY, C.A. No. 0:25–02260

Southern District of New York

MAGGIO v. THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–02667  
WILLIS, ET AL. v. PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY, C.A. No. 1:25–04461

Western District of Washington

LOWRY, ET AL. v. PROCTOR & GAMBLE COMPANY, C.A. No. 2:25–00108

**MDL No. 3158 – IN RE: SAP SE, ET AL., PATENT LITIGATION**

Motion of defendants TMX Group Limited, Trayport Limited, and TSX Alpha U.S., Inc., to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Delaware:

District of Delaware

SAP SE, ET AL. v. TSX ALPHA U.S. INC., C.A. No. 1:25–00232

Northern District of Illinois

SAP SE, ET AL. v. TRAYPORT LIMITED, C.A. No. 1:25–00562  
SAP SE, ET AL. v. TRAYPORT LIMITED, C.A. No. 1:25–02075

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

SAP SE, ET AL. v. TMX GROUP LIMITED, C.A. No. 2:25–01038

**MDL No. 3159 – IN RE: KEFFER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES, LLC, DATA SECURITY  
BREACH LITIGATION**

Motion of defendant Keffer Development Services, LLC, to transfer the following actions to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan:

Central District of California

DOE 1 v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:25–00997

Northern District of Illinois

DOE v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04233

District of Massachusetts

DOE v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–11151

Eastern District of Michigan

DOE 1, ET AL. v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–10806

DOE I, ET AL. v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–10855

ROE CLF 001 v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–10870

DOE v. UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN BOARD OF REGENTS, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 2:25–10876

DOE 1, ET AL. v. THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 2:25–10946

DOE v. BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 2:25–10951

DOE v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–10988

DOE v. BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 2:25–10999

Middle District of North Carolina

DOE 1, ET AL. v. HIGH POINT UNIVERSITY, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–00303

Northern District of Ohio

DOE v. WEISS, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:25–00827

**SECTION B**  
**MATTERS DESIGNATED FOR CONSIDERATION WITHOUT ORAL ARGUMENT**

**MDL No. 2406 – IN RE: BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Bon Secours Mercy Health, Inc., et al., NorthBay Healthcare Corporation, et al., Phoebe Putney Memorial Hospital, Inc., et al., IES Central Texas PLLC, et al., AmeriTeam Services, LLC, et al., CommonSpirit Health, et al., Adventist Health System Sunbelt Healthcare Corporation, et al., Duke University Health System, Inc., et al., Weill Cornell Medicine, Temple University Health System, Inc., et al., LHHealth, LLC, and Mount Nittany Health System to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama:

Northern District of California

BON SECOURS MERCY HEALTH, INC., ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:25–02231  
NORTHBAY HEALTHCARE CORPORATION, ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:25–03570

Middle District of Georgia

PHOEBE PUTNEY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL, INC., ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–00062

Northern District of Illinois

IES CENTRAL TEXAS PLLC, ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–02267  
AMERITEAM SERVICES, ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–02295  
COMMONSPIRIT HEALTH, ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–02296  
ADVENTIST HEALTH SYSTEM SUNBELT HEALTHCARE CORPORATE, ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–02367  
DUKE UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM, INC., ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–03565

Southern District of New York

WEILL CORNELL MEDICINE v. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–02516

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM, INC., ET AL. v. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:25-01156  
LHHEALTH, LLC v. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 5:25-01158

Middle District of Pennsylvania

MOUNT NITTANY HEALTH SYSTEM v. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 4:25-00549

MDL No. 2873 – **IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina:

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

AQUA PENNSYLVANIA, INC. v. ARKEMA INC., C.A. No. 2:25-01101

MDL No. 2964 – **IN RE: SOCIETY INSURANCE COMPANY COVID-19 BUSINESS INTERRUPTION PROTECTION INSURANCE LITIGATION**

Motion of defendant Society Insurance to “resolve” the MDL or, in the alternative, to remand under 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a) the following actions to their respective transferor courts:

Southern District of Iowa

RSV ENTERPRISES, INC., ET AL. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 4:20-00256  
ELEVATED INDUSTRY, LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 4:20-00274

Central District of Illinois

SMASH MANAGEMENT, INC., ET AL. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 1:20-01327  
LASTPUTT, INC. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 1:20-01328

Southern District of Illinois

GEM CITY FRESH-MEX, INC., ET AL. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 3:20-00765

Northern District of Indiana

T & J'S 5TH DOWN, INC. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, A MUTUAL COMPANY, C.A. No. 1:20-00308  
WING MEN LLP v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 1:20-00492

District of Minnesota

LUCY'S BURGERS, LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, INC., C.A. No. 0:20-01029

Middle District of Tennessee

PEG LEG PORKER RESTAURANT, LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE,  
C.A. No. 3:20-00337

FARM2TABLE, LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 3:20-00604

A RAY HOSPITALITY, LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, A MUTUAL COMPANY,  
C.A. No. 3:20-00904

A RAY HOSPITALITY, LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, A MUTUAL COMPANY,  
C.A. No. 3:20-00905

A RAY HOSPITALITY LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, A MUTUAL COMPANY,  
C.A. No. 3:20-00906

Eastern District of Wisconsin

RISING DOUGH, INC., ET AL. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 2:20-00623  
AMBROSIA INDY LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE A MUTUAL COMPANY,  
C.A. No. 2:20-00771

WISEGUYS PIZZERIA & PUB LLC v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 2:20-01340  
THE BAG TAVERN LLC, ET AL. v. SOCIETY INSURANCE, C.A. No. 2:21-00916

**MDL No. 2985 – IN RE: APPLE INC. APP STORE SIMULATED CASINO-STYLE GAMES  
LITIGATION**

Motion of defendants Apple Inc. and Apple Payments Inc. to transfer the following action to the  
United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

District of New Jersey

BARGO, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25-02025

**MDL No. 3001 – IN RE: GOOGLE PLAY STORE SIMULATED CASINO-STYLE GAMES  
LITIGATION**

Motion of defendants Google LLC and Google Payment Corp. to transfer the following action to  
the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

District of New Jersey

BARGO, ET AL. v. APPLE INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25-02025

**MDL No. 3010 – IN RE: GOOGLE DIGITAL ADVERTISING ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Ansoumane Kande to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York:

Northern District of California

KANDE v. GOOGLE LLC, C.A. No. 3:25–03733

**MDL No. 3036 – IN RE: GARDASIL PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiffs Marina Bednarczyk, et al., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina:

District of New Jersey

BEDNARCZYK, ET AL. v. MERCK & CO., INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:25–02044

**MDL No. 3052 – IN RE: KIA HYUNDAI VEHICLE THEFT MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff James Cheeks to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Central District of California:

District of Minnesota

CHEEKS v. KIA AMERICA, INC., C.A. No. 0:25–01593

**MDL No. 3087 – IN RE: FUTURE MOTION, INC. PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Joseph Martins to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Middle District of Florida

MARTINS v. ENTOURAGE EXCURSIONS LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 8:25–00785

**MDL No. 3108 – IN RE: CHANGE HEALTHCARE, INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY  
BREACH LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Emergency Medicine Specialists of Orange County, Nomi Health, Inc., Diagnostic Imaging Alliance of Louisville, P.S.C., and Premera Blue Cross to transfer of their respective following actions to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota:

Central District of California

EMERGENCY MEDICINE SPECIALISTS OF ORANGE COUNTY v. CHANGE  
HEALTHCARE TECHNOLOGY ENABLED SERVICES, LLC, C.A. No. 8:25–01065

Northern District of Georgia

NOMI HEALTH, INC. v. CHANGE HEALTHCARE SOLUTIONS, LLC, ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 1:25–01550

Middle District of Tennessee

DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING ALLIANCE OF LOUISVILLE, P.S.C. v. CHANGE  
HEALTHCARE OPERATIONS, LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 3:25–00470

Western District of Washington

PREMERA BLUE CROSS v. CHANGE HEALTHCARE, INC., ET AL.,  
C.A. No. 2:25–00497

**MDL No. 3111 – IN RE: CAPITAL ONE 360 SAVINGS ACCOUNT INTEREST RATE  
LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff The People of the State of New York, by Letitia James, to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia:

Southern District of New York

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, BY LETITIA JAMES v. CAPITAL ONE,  
N.A., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:25–04037

**MDL No. 3114 – IN RE: AT&T INC. CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH  
LITIGATION**

Oppositions of plaintiffs Jenna Regal, Claims Holding Group, LLC, Daniel Alcantara, Juli Greely, Karger Realty, Melissa Davimos, Jose Garcia, Alina Gonzalez, Oscar Cisneros, Brenda Corea, Lazaro Gonzalez, Barbara Moscoso, Randolph Alan, and Johnny Suriel to transfer of their respective actions to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas:

Southern District of Florida

REGAL v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 0:25–60417  
CLAIMS HOLDING GROUP v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–20526  
CLAIMS HOLDING GROUP, LLC v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–20927  
CLAIMS HOLDING GROUP, LLC v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–20930  
CLAIMS HOLDING GROUP, LLC v. AT&T MOBILITY, LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–20934  
ALCANTARA v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–20939  
GREELY v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21404  
KARGER REALTY v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21410  
DAVIMOS v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21415  
GARCIA v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21427  
GONZALEZ v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21435  
CISNEROS v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21436  
COREA v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21438  
GONZALEZ v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21440  
MOSCOSO v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21449  
ALAN v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21450  
SURIEL v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, C.A. No. 1:25–21451

**MDL No. 3126 – IN RE: SNOWFLAKE, INC., DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Hlevictor Hoskins, Jr., to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Montana:

Southern District of Texas

HOSKINS JR. v. AT&T, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:25–00804

**MDL No. 3128 – IN RE: DIVIDEND SOLAR FINANCE, LLC, AND FIFTH THIRD BANK  
SALES AND LENDING PRACTICES LITIGATION**

Opposition of plaintiff Zamena Khan to transfer of the following action to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota:

Middle District of Florida

KHAN v. DIVIDEND, A DIVISION OF FIFTH THIRD BANK NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 6:25–00804

## RULE 11.1: HEARING SESSIONS AND ORAL ARGUMENT

(a) Schedule. The Panel shall schedule sessions for oral argument and consideration of other matters as desirable or necessary. The Chair shall determine the time, place and agenda for each hearing session. The Clerk of the Panel shall give appropriate notice to counsel for all parties. The Panel may continue its consideration of any scheduled matters.

(b) Oral Argument Statement. Any party affected by a motion may file a separate statement setting forth reasons why oral argument should, or need not, be heard. Such statements shall be captioned "Reasons Why Oral Argument Should [Need Not] Be Heard" and shall be limited to 2 pages.

(i) The parties affected by a motion to transfer may agree to waive oral argument. The Panel will take this into consideration in determining the need for oral argument.

(c) Hearing Session. The Panel shall not consider transfer or remand of any action pending in a federal district court when any party timely opposes such transfer or remand without first holding a hearing session for the presentation of oral argument. The Panel may dispense with oral argument if it determines that:

(i) the dispositive issue(s) have been authoritatively decided; or

(ii) the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented and oral argument would not significantly aid the decisional process. Unless otherwise ordered, the Panel shall consider all other matters, such as a motion for reconsideration, upon the basis of the pleadings.

(d) Notification of Oral Argument. The Panel shall promptly notify counsel of those matters in which oral argument is scheduled, as well as those matters that the Panel will consider on the pleadings. The Clerk of the Panel shall require counsel to file and serve notice of their intent to either make or waive oral argument. Failure to do so shall be deemed a waiver of oral argument. If counsel does not attend oral argument, the matter shall not be rescheduled and that party's position shall be treated as submitted for decision on the basis of the pleadings filed.

(i) Absent Panel approval and for good cause shown, only those parties to actions who have filed a motion or written response to a motion or order shall be permitted to present oral argument.

(ii) The Panel will not receive oral testimony except upon notice, motion and an order expressly providing for it.

(e) Duty to Confer. Counsel in an action set for oral argument shall confer separately prior to that argument for the purpose of organizing their arguments and selecting representatives to present all views without duplication. Oral argument is a means for counsel to emphasize the key points of their arguments, and to update the Panel on any events since the conclusion of briefing.

(f) Time Limit for Oral Argument. Barring exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall allot a maximum of 20 minutes for oral argument in each matter. The time shall be divided among those with varying viewpoints. Counsel for the moving party or parties shall generally be heard first.