	Case 3:19-cv-05279-EMC Docu	ment 206 Filed 11/25/20 Page 1 of 4
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Ricardo J. Prieto (Admitted <i>PHV</i>) rprieto@eeoc.net SHELLIST LAZARZ SLOBIN LLP 11 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1515 Houston, Texas 77046 Telephone: (713) 621-2277 Facsimile: (713) 621-0993 Melinda Arbuckle (Cal. Bar No. 302723) marbuckle@eeoc.net SHELLIST LAZARZ SLOBIN LLP 402 West Broadway, Suite 400 San Diego, California 92101 Telephone: (713) 621-2277 Facsimile: (713) 621-0993 Robert R. Debes, Jr. (Admitted <i>PHV</i>) bdebes@debeslaw.com DEBES LAW FIRM 5909 West Loop South, Suite 510 Bellaire, Texas 77401 Telephone: (713) 623-0900 Facsimile: (713) 623-0951 <i>Counsel for Plaintiff, Jacob McGrath, and</i> <i>Proposed Collective Action Members</i>	
14 15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 	JACOB McGRATH, on behalf of himself an all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. DOORDASH, INC., Defendant.	nd Case No: 3:19-cv-05279-EMC PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION [ECF NO. 200] Action Filed: August 23, 2019 Judge: Edward M. Chen Date: October 29, 2020 Time: N/A Place: N/A
28		Case No. 3:19-cv-05279-EMC
	CKET A R M Find authenticated court docur	ments without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBITS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION [ECF NO. 200]

Pursuant to Civil. L.R. 7-3(d), Plaintiff hereby seeks leave of the Court to file supplemental Exhibits in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 200) ("the Motion"), which are submitted herewith as Exhibits A and B.

On November 11, 2020, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Leave to file Motion for Reconsideration of Order Compelling Arbitration (ECF No. 200). The Court granted Plaintiff's Motion for leave, and deemed it the Motion for Reconsideration. (ECF No. 201).

As Plaintiff explains in the Motion, and relevant to this motion, the Court should, respectfully, reconsider its Order granting arbitration because "it failed to consider Plaintiff's timely-lodged Objection (ECF No. 192), which objects to Defendant's current arbitration agreement roll-out that took place during this litigation." (see ECF No. 200 at p. 5, citing to *O'Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, 2013 WL 6407583, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2013) (Chen, J.) (refusing to enforce arbitration agreements which were presented to putative class members during the pendency of an action)). Accordingly, Defendant's current arbitration agreement administered through CPR should not be enforced in this case. (*Id.*). Furthermore, the Court erred when it failed to consider Plaintiff's timely-lodged Objection concerning Defendant's counsel presenting arbitration agreements with class waivers to Opt-In Plaintiffs (which it then sought to enforce against them here), without first conferring with their undersigned counsel. (see ECF No. 200 at p. 3).

Notwithstanding Plaintiff's request in the Motion to invalidate <u>all</u> arbitration agreements relevant to the Opt-In Plaintiffs administered through CPR which Defendant impermissibly rolled-out during this litigation, Plaintiff seeks leave to submit two Exhibits which: (1) lists the individuals who were presented with arbitration agreements by Defendant, without notifying the undersigned counsel, despite Defendant's knowledge of their legal representation (Exhibit A); and (2) which lists the individuals who had yet to opt-into this case, but who were represented by

Plaintiff's Request for Leave to File

Case No. 3:19-cv-05279-EMC

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

the undersigned counsel, and were presented with arbitration agreements by Defendant (Exhibit
 B).

3

4

5

6

7

8

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

It is Plaintiff's position that Defense counsel had an ethical and legal obligation to confer with the undersigned counsel before presenting the individuals listed in Exhibit A with an arbitration agreement and class waiver. Furthermore, it is Plaintiff's position that had Defense counsel timely conferred with the undersigned regarding its planned arbitration agreement rollout, Plaintiff's counsel would have had an opportunity to notify Defense counsel of its representation of the individuals listed in Exhibit B.

9 Good cause exists to grant Plaintiff's request. Plaintiff previously notified the Court in his 10 Motion (see ECF 200 at p. 11), that "Plaintiff is currently reviewing Defendant's late filed 11 declaration (ECF No. 187-1) to determine: (1) which Opt-In Plaintiffs have been affected by the 12 arbitration roll out and/or (2) which Opt-In Plaintiffs Defendant had knowledge of their legal 13 representation but nonetheless presented them with a class action waiver without consulting with their undersigned counsel." The purpose was to compile a list of specific examples, as reflected 14 15 in Exhibits A and B, in support of Plaintiff's Motion so that Plaintiff could present the result of 16 such review in a Motion for Reconsideration. (see ECF No. 200 at p. 4 fn. 3). Indeed, the 17 information reflected in Exhibits A and B is directly relevant to Plaintiff's Motion because it will 18 assist the Court in determining that violations occurred consequent to Defendant's arbitration 19 roll-out. Finally, Plaintiff has no other opportunity to provide this information to the Court, in 20light of the Clerk's Notice that "there shall be no reply brief or hearing absent further order of the 21 Court." (ECF No. 201).

Exhibits A and B are limited to identifying information for the above discussed Opt-In Plaintiffs, which shows when they opted into this case, when they were presented with Defendant's arbitration agreement, and when they retained Plaintiff's counsel.

Defendant's counsel has advised Plaintiff's counsel that it opposes his request. DATED: November 25, 2020

> <u>- 2 -</u> Plaintiff's Request for Leave to File

Case No. 3:19-cv-05279-EMC

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1

2

3

4

Δ

M

Respectfully submitted,

By: <u>/s/Ricardo J. Prieto</u> Ricardo J. Prieto

SHELLIST | LAZARZ | SLOBIN LLP

Ricardo J. Prieto (Admitted PHV) 5 rprieto@eeoc.net 11 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1515 6 Houston, Texas 77046 Telephone: (713) 621-2277 7 Facsimile: (713) 621-0993 8 Melinda Arbuckle (Cal. Bar No. 302723) marbuckle@eeoc.net 9 402 West Broadway, Suite 400 San Diego, California 92101 10 Telephone: (713) 621-2277 Facsimile: (713) 621-0993 11 & 12 **DEBES LAW FIRM** 13 Robert R. Debes, Jr. (Admitted PHV) 14 bdebes@debeslaw.com 5909 West Loop South, Suite 510 15 Bellaire, Texas 77401 Telephone: (713) 623-0900 16 Facsimile: (713) 623-0951 17 Counsel for Plaintiff, Jacob McGrath, and Proposed Collective Action Members 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 Case No. 3:19-cv-05279-EMC - 3 -28 Plaintiff's Request for Leave to File

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.