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THE COURT: Let me call the matter of Barfuss versus Live Nation Entertainment.

On the phone, we have?
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I think it's just the public.
THE COURT: They just want to listen?
THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: I guess so.
MS. KINDER: Jennifer Kinder.
THE COURT: Thank you. And in court, we have?
MR. GENGA: John Genga, Genga and Associates.
MR. O'MARA: Good morning, Your Honor. Tim O'Mara and Sam Jeffrey for the defendants.

THE COURT: All right. If some persons are present on the line, this is a matter of public hearing, so it's fine.

We're here on the motion for remand.
I issued a tentative on this. I presume both sides have seen it?

MR. GENGA: We have, Your Honor.
MR. O'MARA: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Does somebody want to argue something?
MR. GENGA: Yes, Your Honor. May I remove my mask?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. GENGA: So I did have an opportunity to review the tentative at some length, I appreciate the work the Court has done on this case, but we will start from there because there are a number of matters $I$ would like to address.

I would like to talk about what our motion does and what it doesn't do.

Our motion does not contend that the removal notice is inadequate to get us here.

That was the issue in Dark Cherokee, and the Dark Cherokee Court says all of the removal notice has to do is issue a short and plain statement of the claim, if the plaintiff has not done so himself, and that the allegations of jurisdiction are taken as true, unless they are challenged.

And that is when Section 1446 of 28, United States Code kicks in and the defendant has to put forth evidence establishing by a preponderance that jurisdiction exists.

Now, the Court in --
THE COURT: Let me stop you. To put it in a nutshell, what aspect are you raising in particular to show that there is not subject matter jurisdiction?

What is the defect, what is the absence, what is the thing that is missing?

MR. GENGA: Well, I think what is missing is there is no evidence from the defendant that either the $\$ 5$ million
aggregate jurisdictional minimum is met or that the $\$ 75,000$ per plaintiff jurisdictional minimum is met as required by subsection (c)(11)(B) (2) or whatever that odd section is in the removal statute.

You know, the issue here -- so where we get to, Your Honor, we're comparing whether it's a facial challenge or it's a factual challenge to jurisdiction.

I contend that we have made a factual challenge because there was allegations in the removal notice that well, of course, the jurisdictional minimum is met, let's look at these other cases.

Let's look at Oberstein, let's look at Heckman that are both before the Court, and you are comparing apples and oranges there, Your Honor. You are comparing a class action to mass action.

Really here, the mass action provisions, there is not a lot of law on this.

What law there is, the Courts have expressed some concern about the fact that the statute is not that clear.

But the one Court that has expressed what you do in the case of determining whether the jurisdictional minimum is met for each of at least 100 plaintiffs is the Hood case in the Supreme Court, where the Court says, look, what is a Court to do to determine whether the jurisdictional minimum is met with respect to a bunch of unnamed plaintiffs?

How are we to determine that each of those people satisfies the $\$ 75,000$ minimum?

This is clearly implying that any plaintiff who is to be before this Court has to satisfy the jurisdictional minimum.

Now, what the Court, I think, here has done in deeming this a facial challenge rather than a factual challenge has said, look, we don't need the preponderance standard at this point, because it's not a factual challenge.

Well, I don't agree with that, Your Honor, because I think we have challenged it sufficiently, just as the plaintiff in Harris had challenged the basis for assumptions in the numbers.

Now, I admit I did not challenge every single allegation upon which jurisdiction they are claiming jurisdiction is based.

I did not challenge specifically the allegation regarding, for example, the cost to comply with injunctive relief, that could be something for discovery.

What we don't have here, and I think, you know, the record could have been made better by me, and I think the record could have been made better by defendants, but the Court can make an excellent record here if its inclined to otherwise deny the motion to at least require discovery into the question of, well, disgorgement of profits, is that going to get us past the jurisdictional minimum?

Is the cost to comply with an injunction going to get us past the jurisdictional minimum?

I have computer experts who can look at that issue and see whether the steps that Ticket Master took with respect to its computer systems and the software --

THE COURT: Let me stop you. Doesn't the first amended complaint at this point in time, you know, it seeks the \$2,500 penalty --

MR. GENGA: It purports to, yes, it does.
THE COURT: -- for UCLs.
If one were just to take a conservative viewpoint as to how many of the transactions that are engaged in would fall within that, one would come back with potential penalties that would exceed billions of dollars, wouldn't it?

MR. GENGA: Yes. But that is one issue you have ruled in my favor on, Your Honor. You have already ruled that that is not -- that relief is not available to my clients in a private action.

THE COURT: So that's out. MR. GENGA: That is out. THE COURT: You are not claiming that? MR. GENGA: No, we're not. THE COURT: Then so the other question is what does remain then?

And you are saying that nothing else that one can
recover would give a dollar amount, but you are not saying you are not at this point in time attempting to put a dollar value on any sort of injunctive consequences as a result of this case?

MR. GENGA: We're not attempting to do that, Your Honor. Nor has the defendants really put a dollar value on it other than by supposition and speculation; there is no evidence.

THE COURT: Well, let me put it this way, insofar as if you are seeking at some point in time to split up Live Nation and Ticket Master, are you seeking that -- is your clients seeking that?

MR. GENGA: Well, are we seeking to split up Live Nation and Ticket Master? That would be a nice result, I suppose, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, if you are seeking that in any way, shape, or form, wouldn't just the cost of the combination of those two entities, just the processing of that cost exceed more than $\$ 5$ million?

MR. GENGA: I wouldn't be surprised if it did.
THE COURT: I wouldn't either, to tell you the truth.

MR. GENGA: I wouldn't be surprised.
THE COURT: But let me just ask you, that is the problem I have with your motion.

I mean, it seems to me that there is enough at this point in time to say that the jurisdictional amounts are met.

I don't quite understand why you are saying that -- even though I understand you are saying that you are making a facial attack --

MR. GENGA: A factual attack.
THE COURT: A factual attack, even though you are making a factual attack, I don't understand why are saying that the jurisdictional amounts aren't met?

MR. GENGA: Well, because there is no evidence that has been put forth, Your Honor.

At that point there actually has to be real evidence the Court has to find by a preponderance as opposed to, well, would I be surprised if it would cost this much.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask defense counsel, are you conceding that the plaintiffs have made a factual attack rather than a facial attack?

MR. O'MARA: No, Your Honor.
They have clearly made a facial attack, and you look at the motion to remand is what governs that analysis.

And what the case law very squarely says is they have to address each of their claims for relief to make it a factual attack. They have to address the claims that -- the allegations that the defendants made, the reasonable allegations that defendants made in the notice of removal. And
they haven't done that, and the case law squarely says, if that is the case, it's a facial attack, not a factual attack.

THE COURT: Let me hear a response from the plaintiff's counsel.

MR. GENGA: I think we have made a factual attack. There is no case that says I have to make a factual attack with respect to every single basis upon which they allege that jurisdiction exists.

If I have raised a factual issue, then it seems to me the burden shifts at that point and the evidence has to come in to show by a preponderance that jurisdiction is proper here.

And that hasn't happened, so --
THE COURT: Let me hear from the defense. MR. O'MARA: Again, Your Honor, that is not the law. The law is correctly stated in the tentative on that issue on page 5 of the tentative, which is, the plaintiffs have to address all of the claims relief and the defendant's allegations in the notice of removal and they haven't done it.

And they have only addressed the one claim at $\$ 45,000$ per plaintiff, and exactly as the tentative goes through, that doesn't address the number of the other claims they have including disgorgement, injunctive relief, restitution, trouble of damages, attorney's fees for all of their claims, they don't address any of those issues.

So it does not -- just because they put forth the 40,000
for plaintiff, that doesn't convert a facial attack into a factual attack. That is what the case law squarely says.

THE COURT: Anything else?
MR. GENGA: Other than the Court could make a better record on that by allowing discovery on those issues, Your Honor.

THE COURT: There will be discovery in this case maybe eventually.

Although, refresh my recollection, I didn't address the arbitration issue on this one yet, have I?

MR. GENGA: No. You are going to catch that motion within two weeks.

THE COURT: Let me ask, would that motion be any different than the motion that has already been made in the other case, or is it going to be different?

MR. O'MARA: I expect it will be the same, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I mean, that matter is currently pending in front of me, right?

MR. O'MARA: The Heckman motion for arbitration is currently pending.

MR. GENGA: That would be the 10th of August that you are hearing that.

THE COURT: So I guess we would hold off on that motion because you will see what happens when I rule, and, you
know, if it's different then maybe it's a different result. If it's not different, then I probably should reach the same result in this case as I did in that case, if it's the same issue, which apparently both sides are saying that it's probably the same issue.

MR. GENGA: My guess it's the same issue.
MR. O'MARA: Your Honor, currently under the schedule the motion for arbitration in this case would be two weeks from the Court's ruling on this motion?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. O'MARA: I agree with Your Honor, it would make sense to see what happens in Heckman first.

But independent of that, I was going to say it's taking us more time to put together the motion for 350 plaintiffs than I would have expected, and as a housekeeping matter, I would ask the Court for at least a couple of extra weeks.

THE COURT: Let me ask the plaintiff's counsel, I presume you don't object?

MR. GENGA: No objection.
THE COURT: I will tell you what, why don't you file a stipulation and whatever you agree to, I will agree to.

And if you can settle the case, then settle the case. MR. O'MARA: Just to clarify, Your Honor, would it make sense to discuss with plaintiff's counsel whether or not this motion should trail the ruling in Heckman?

THE COURT: I presume it would trail the motion in Heckman, because in many respects, you may want to stipulate to not to file the motion itself until such time as I make a decision on Heckman. Then you can decide if it's necessary or not.

There is no sense in spending money, if in the end, you filed a motion, and I say, well, I'm going to stay this motion because $I$ already have the issues in front of me in Heckman that I'm already considering.

It would probably save both sides some money, if you do that.

MR. O'MARA: I will discuss it with plaintiff's counsel.

THE COURT: I will make my tentative my final. I will not grant the motion to remand.

MR. GENGA: Thank you, Your Honor, for your consideration, Your Honor.

MR. O'MARA: Thank you, Your Honor.
(The proceedings concluded at 9:49 a.m.)

*     *         * 
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