

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DONGPING CAO,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, ET AL.,  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 22-cv-4688-YGR

**ORDER APPOINTING LEAD PLAINTIFF AND  
APPROVING SELECTION OF LEAD  
COUNSEL**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 7, 11

Now before the Court is movant Robert Long’s motion for appointment of lead plaintiff and for approval of selection of lead counsel.<sup>1</sup> (Dkt. No. 7.) For the reasons set forth below, Movant Long’s motion is **GRANTED**.<sup>2</sup>

**I. APPOINTMENT OF LEAD PLAINTIFF**

The Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 instructs district courts “to select as lead plaintiff the one ‘most capable of adequately representing the interests of class members.’” *In re Cavanaugh*, 306 F.3d 726, 729 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(i)). The “most capable” plaintiff is generally “the one who has the greatest financial stake in the outcome of the case, so long as he meets the requirements of [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure] 23.” *Id.* “In other words, the district court must compare the financial stake of the various plaintiffs and determine which one has the most to gain from the lawsuit. It must then focus its attention on that plaintiff and determine, based on the information [plaintiff] has provided in [its] pleadings and declarations, whether [it] satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(a), in particular those of ‘typicality’ and ‘adequacy.’” *Id.* at 730.

<sup>1</sup> Movant Erfan Mohammadian also filed a motion for appointment of lead plaintiff and for approval of selection of lead counsel. (Dkt. No. 11.) However, following the review of Movant Long’s moving papers, Movant Mohammadian filed a statement of non-opposition to Movant Long’s motion. (*See* Dkt No. 16.) The motion is thereby unopposed.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 78(b) and Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the Court finds this motion appropriate for decision without oral argument. Accordingly, the Court **VACATES** the motion hearing set for **NOVEMBER 22, 2022**.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

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

1 Movant Long submitted a declaration certifying that he suffered losses of approximately  
 2 \$2,623,662.24 on his investments in Uber Technologies (“Uber”) common stock. (See Dkt. No. 8-  
 3 3.) The Court has reviewed the supporting materials and finds that Movant Long has alleged the  
 4 greatest financial loss.

5 Next, Movant Long has made a *prima facie* showing of typicality and adequacy under Rule  
 6 23(a). The typicality requirement is readily satisfied as Movant Long’s claims arise out of the  
 7 same events and are based on the same legal theories as the claims of other class members. *See*  
 8 *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 1998) (“[R]epresentative claims are  
 9 ‘typical’ if they are reasonably co-extensive with those of absent class members; they need not be  
 10 substantially identical.”). The Court is similarly satisfied that Movant Long will adequately  
 11 represent the interests of class members. Based on the firm resume of The Rosen Law Firm P.A.  
 12 (see Dkt. No. 8-4), Movant Long’s attorneys appear competent and there is no suggestion of any  
 13 antagonistic interests or collusive action. As the plaintiff with the highest financial interest,  
 14 Movant Long has a strong incentive to pursue vigorously a substantial recovery for all putative  
 15 class members. *See Takeda v. Turbodyne Techs., Inc.*, 67 F. Supp. 2d 1129, 1135 (C.D. Cal.  
 16 1999) (“The Ninth Circuit has held that representation is ‘adequate’ when counsel for the class is  
 17 qualified and competent, the representative’s interests are not antagonistic to the interests of absent  
 18 class members, and it is unlikely that the action is collusive.”) (citing *in re N. Dist. of Cal., Dalkon*  
 19 *Shield IUD Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 693 F.2d 847, 855 (9th Cir. 1982)).

20 Accordingly, the Court finds that Movant Long is the appropriate lead plaintiff.

## 21 **II. APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF LEAD COUNSEL**

22 Section 78u-4(a)(3)(B)(v) provides: “The most adequate plaintiff shall, subject to the  
 23 approval of the court, select and retain counsel to represent the class.” Here, Movant Long has  
 24 selected The Rosen Law Firm P.A. to serve as his counsel. (Mot. at 7-8.) The Rosen Law Firm  
 25 P.A. appears to have significant experience litigating securities class actions. (Dkt. No. 8-4.)  
 26 Because Movant Long has made a “reasonable choice of counsel,” the Court will “defer to that  
 27 choice” and appoint the firm lead counsel. *See Cohen v. U.S. Dist. Court for N. Dist. of Cal.*, 586


1 **III. CONCLUSION**

2 In sum, for the foregoing reasons, the Court **GRANTS** Movant Long's motion for  
3 appointment as lead plaintiff and for approval of selection of lead counsel. The Court thus  
4 **APPOINTS** Movant Robert Long as lead plaintiff and **APPOINTS** The Rosen Law Firm P.A. as lead  
5 counsel to represent the class in the class action. A joint proposed schedule for the filing of a  
6 consolidated or amended complaint shall be filed within **14 days** of this Order, or if Lead Plaintiff  
7 confirms that he does not intend to further amend the initial complaint at that time, a proposed  
8 schedule for defendants' time to respond to the complaint shall be filed within this timeline.

9 This Order terminates Docket Numbers 7 and 11.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: November 10, 2022

12   
13 **YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS**  
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
United States District Court  
Northern District of California