

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE
AGENCY, ET AL., PREFERRED STOCK
PURCHASE AGREEMENTS THIRD
AMENDMENT LITIGATION

MDL No. 2713

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Plaintiff Arnetia Joyce Robinson respectfully submits this Supplemental Information to her Response in Opposition to the Federal Housing Finance Agency's Motion for Transfer (Apr. 6, 2016), Doc. 18 ("Response"):

1. On April 20, 2016, the Honorable Amul R. Thapar held a status conference in *Robinson v. FHFA*, No. 7:15-cv-109 (E.D. Ky.), to discuss the joint motion to stay filed by Defendants the Department of the Treasury ("Treasury") and the Federal Housing Finance Agency ("FHFA") (collectively, "Defendants"). Defendants moved to stay the proceedings in Kentucky pending a decision by this Panel on FHFA's motion for transfer. Plaintiff Robinson opposed the stay.

2. On April 21, 2016, Judge Thapar issued an order granting Defendants' motion in part. Order, *Robinson v. FHFA*, No. 7:15-cv-109 (Apr. 21, 2016), ECF No. 45 ("Order"). The Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A. It stays proceedings in *Robinson* until the earlier of Friday, July 1, 2016, or when the parties notify the court that the Panel has acted on FHFA's motion. At that point, unless the Panel has granted FHFA's motion, Judge Thapar has indicated that he will rule on the Defendants' pending motions to dismiss within thirty days. Order at 5.

3. Plaintiff Robinson wishes to draw the Panel's attention to two features of the Order.

4. First, Judge Thapar has represented that he is prepared to rule on Defendants' fully-briefed motions to dismiss in short order if Ms. Robinson's litigation remains in the Eastern District of Kentucky. This further underscores the delay and prejudice Ms. Robinson would experience by having her case consolidated with others that have not progressed as far as hers or that present unique issues not present in her case. See Response at 15.

5. Second, the Order notes that Judge Thapar "is happy to oversee the consolidated litigation if the MDL Panel so chooses." Order at 4. Judge Thapar's willingness to accept the MDL and the advanced stage of the case before him both support Plaintiff Robinson's alternative request to centralize the cases in the Eastern District of Kentucky if the Panel grants FHFA's motion.

April 27, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert B. Craig

Robert B. Craig
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
1717 Dixie Highway, Ste. 910
Covington, KY 41011-2799
(859) 547-4300
(513) 381-6613 (fax)
craigr@taftlaw.com

Counsel for Arnetia Joyce Robinson

BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE
AGENCY, ET AL., PREFERRED STOCK
PURCHASE AGREEMENTS THIRD
AMENDMENT LITIGATION

MDL No. 2713

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 27th day of April, 2016, I electronically filed the foregoing SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION on behalf of Plaintiff Arnetia Joyce Robinson, via the Panel's Electronic Case Filing system. Notice of this filing will be served on all parties of record by operation of the ECF System.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Robert B. Craig

Robert B. Craig
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
1717 Dixie Highway, Ste. 910
Covington, KY 41011-2799
(859) 547-4300
(513) 381-6613 (fax)
craigr@taftlaw.com

Counsel for Arnetia Joyce Robinson

Jacobs v. Federal National Mortgage Association

D. Delaware, No. 1:15-cv-00708

Myron T. Steele
Christopher Nicholas Kelly
Michael A. Pittenger
Potter Anderson & Corroon, LLP
Hercules Plaza
P.O. Box 951
Wilmington, DE 19899-0951
(302) 964-6030
msteele@potteranderson.com
ckelly@potteranderson.com
mpittenger@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs David Jacobs; Gary Hindes

Michael Joseph Ciatti
Graciela Maria Rodriguez
King & Spalding LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-5508
mciatti@kslaw.com
gmrdriguez@kslaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation

Robert J. Stearn, Jr.
Robert C. Maddox
Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.
920 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
stearn@rlf.com
maddox@rlf.com

Attorneys for Defendants Federal Housing Finance Agency; Federal National Mortgage Association; Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation

Paul D. Clement
D. Zachary Hudson
Bancroft PLLC
500 New Jersey Ave. NW, 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
pclement@bancroftpllc.com
zhudson@bancroftpllc.com

Attorneys for Defendant Federal National Mortgage Association

Deepthy Kishore
Thomas D. Zimpleman
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-8095
Deepthy.c.kishore@usdoj.gov
Thomas.d.zimpleman@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendant U.S. Department of the Treasury

David Evan Ross
Ross Aronstam & Moritz LLP
100 S. West Street, Suite 400
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 576- 1600
dross@ramllp.com

Attorneys for Movant Timothy Howard

Roberts v. Federal Housing Finance Agency
N.D. Illinois, No. 1:16-cv-02107

Christian D. Ambler
Stone & Johnson, Chartered
111 West Washington St., #1800
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 332-5656
cambler@stonejohnsononlaw.com

Attorneys for Christopher Roberts; Thomas P. Fischer

AUSA – Chicago
United States Attorney's Office
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60604
USAILN.ECFAUSA@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for U.S. Department of the Treasury; Jacob J. Lew

Caroline J. Anderson
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Room 7305
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 305-8645
Deepthy.c.kishore@usdoj.gov
Thomas.d.zimpleman@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendant U.S. Department of the Treasury; Jacob J. Lew

Kristen E. Hudson
Chuhak & Tecson, P.C.
30 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 855-4315
khudson@chuhak.com

Attorneys for Defendant Federal Housing Finance Agency; Melvin L. Watt

Saxton v. Federal Housing Finance Agency
N.D. Iowa, No. 1:15-cv-00047

Alexander Michael Johnson
Sean Patrick Moore
Brown, Winick, Graves, Gross, Baskerville & Schoenebaum
666 Grand Ave., Suite 2000
Des Moines, IA 50309-0231
(515) 242-2400
ajohnson@brownwinick.com
moore@brownwinick.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Thomas Saxton; Ida Saxton; Bradley Paynter

Matthew C. McDermott
Stephen H. Locher
Belin McCormick, P.C.
666 Walnut Street, Suite 2000
Des Moines, IA 50309-3989
(515) 283-4643
mmcdermott@belinmccormick.com
shlocher@belinmccormick.com

Attorneys for Federal Housing Finance Agency; Melvin L. Watt

Deepthy Kishore
Thomas D. Zimpleman
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-8095
Deepthy.c.kishore@usdoj.gov
Thomas.d.zimpleman@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendant U.S. Department of the Treasury

Kendra Lou Mills Arnold
Matthew G. Whitaker
Whitaker, Hagenow & Gustoff LLP
400 East Court Ave., Suite 346
Des Moines, IA 50309
(515) 868-0215
karnold@whgllp.com
mwhitaker@whgllp.com

Matt M. Dummermuth
Whitaker, Hagenow & Gustoff LLP
305 – 2nd Ave., SE, Suite 202
Cedar Rapids, IA 52401
(319) 849-8390
mdummermuth@whgllp.com

Charles Justin Cooper
Brian Wesley Barnes
David Henry Thompson
Peter Andrew Patterson
Cooper & Kirk, PLLC
1523 New Hampshire Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 220-9600
ccooper@cooperkirk.com
bbarnes@cooperkirk.com
dthompson@cooperkirk.com
ppatterson@cooperkirk.com

Attorneys for Amicus Fairholme Funds, Inc.

Ryan Gene Koopmans
Ryan Wade Leemkuil
Nyemaster, Goode, West Hall & O'Brien
700 Walnut Street, Suite 1600
Des Moines, IA 50309
(515) 283-3108
rkoopmans@nyemaster.com
rleemkuil@nyemaster.com

Michael H. Krimminger
Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton, LLP
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 974-1720
mkrimminger@cgsh.com

Attorneys for Amicus Investors Unite

Robinson v. Federal Housing Finance Agency
E.D. Kentucky, No. 7:15-cv-00109

Robert B. Craig
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP
1717 Dixie Highway, Suite 910
Covington, KY 41011-4704
(859) 547-4300
craigr@taftlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Arnetia Joyce Robinson

T. Scott White
Morgan & Pottinger, PSC
133 W. Short Street
Lexington, KY 40507-1395
(859) 255-20395
tsw@morganandpottinger.com

Attorneys for Federal Housing Finance Agency; Melvin L. Watt

Deepthy Kishore
Thomas D. Zimpleman
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-8095
Deepthy.c.kishore@usdoj.gov
Thomas.d.zimpleman@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendant U.S. Department of the Treasury

Pagliara v. Federal Housing Loan Mortgage Corporation
E.D. Virginia, No. 1:16-cv-00337

Nathaniel Thomas Connally, III
Hogan Lovells US LLP
Park Place II
7930 Jones Branch Dr., 9th Floor
McLean, VA 22102-6200
Tom.connally@hoganlovells.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Timothy J. Pagliara

Taylor Thomas Lankford
King & Spalding
1700 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-5514
tlankford@kslaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation

Ian S. Hoffman
Arnold & Porter LLP (DC)
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW
Washington, DC 2001-3743
(202) 942-6406
ian.hoffman@aporter.com

Attorneys for Movant Federal Housing Finance Agency

Pagliara v. Federal National Mortgage Association
D. Delaware, No. 1:16-cv-00193

C. Barr Flinn
Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor LLP
Rodney Square
1000 N. King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 571-6600
bflinn@ycst.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Timothy J. Pagliara

S. Mark Hurd
Zi-Xiang Shen
Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP
1201 N. Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
SHurd@mnat.com
Zshen@mnat.com

Attorneys for Federal National Mortgage Association

Of Counsel:
Mike Walsh
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
1625 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 383-5280
mwalsh@omm.com

Robert J. Stearn, Jr.
Robert C. Maddox
Richards, Layton & Finger, P.A.
920 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
stearn@rlf.com
maddox@rlf.com

Attorneys for Federal Housing Finance Agency

Edwards v. Deloitte & Touche, LLP

S.D. Florida, No. 1:16-cv-21221

Hector J. Lombana
Gamba Lombana & Herrera
2701 Ponce De Leon Blvd., Mezzanine
Coral Gables, FL 33134
(305) 448-4010
hjl@gambalombana.com

Steven William Thomas
Thomas, Alexander, Forrester & Sorensen LLP
14 27th Avenue
Venice, CA 90291
(310) 961-2536
steventhomas@tafattorneys.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Howard N. Cayne
Arnold & Porter LLP
601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 942-5656
Howard.cayne@aporter.com

Samuel Johnathan Dubbin
Dubbin & Kravetz LLP
1200 Anastasia Avenue, Suite 300
Coral Gables, FL 33134
(305) 357-9004
sdubbin@dubbinkravetz.com

Attorneys for FHFA

Matthew Weinshall
Peter Prieto
Podhurst Orseck
25 West Flagler St., Suite 800
Miami, FL 33130
(305) 358-2800
mweinshall@podhurst.com
pprieto@podhurst.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Deloitte & Touche
LLP*

Edwards v. PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP
S.D. Florida, No. 1:16-cv-21224

Gonzalo Ramon Dorta
Dorta Law
334 Minorca Avenue
Coral Gables, FL 33134
(305) 441-2299
grd@dortalaw.com

Hector J. Lombana
Gamba, Lombana & Herrera
2701 Ponce De Leon Blvd., Mezzanine
Coral Gables, FL 33134
(305) 448-4010
hjl@gambalombana.com

Steven William Thomas
Thomas, Alexander, Forrester & Sorensen LLP
14 27th Avenue
Venice, CA 90291
(310) 961-2536
steventhomas@tafattorneys.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Howard N. Cayne
Arnold & Porter LLP
601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 942-5656
Howard.cayne@aporter.com

Samuel Johnathan Dubbin
Dubbin & Kravetz LLP
1200 Anastasia Avenue, Suite 300
Coral Gables, FL 33134
(305) 357-9004
sdubbin@dubbinkravetz.com

Attorneys for FHFA

Valerie Shea
Sedgwick LLP
2 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 1500
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 671-2184
Valerie.Shea@sedgwicklaw.com

Ramon A. Abadin
Abadin Jaramillo Cook et al
9155 S. Dadeland Blvd., Suite 1208
Miami, FL 33156
(305) 671-2124
ramon.abadin@sedgwicklaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendant
PricewaterhouseCoopers, LLP*

EXHIBIT A

including those in the Sixth Circuit, “frequently grant stays pending a decision by the MDL Panel regarding whether to transfer a case.” *Dowler v. Med. Shoppe*, No. 2:07 CV 848, 2007 WL 2907519, at *2 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 3, 2007)) (quoting *Good v. Prudential Ins. Co. of Am.*, 5 F.Supp.2d 804, 809 (N.D.Cal.1998)); *see also Ohio v. U.S. Env. Prot. Agency*, No. 2:15-cv-2467, 2016 WL 525480, at *2 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 8, 2016) (noting that the Court had stayed the case pending MDL Panel’s decision on motion to transfer). When deciding whether to grant a stay pending a motion to transfer, courts in the Sixth Circuit have considered: 1) the need for a stay, 2) the balance of potential hardship to the parties and the public, and 3) the promotion of judicial economy. *Dowler*, 2007 WL 2907519, at *2.

All of these factors weigh in favor of granting a stay. First, a stay is needed “to eliminate duplicative discovery, prevent inconsistent or repetitive pretrial rulings,” as well as “conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary.” *In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine, Fenfluramine, Dexfenfluramine) Products Liab. Litig.*, 990 F. Supp. 834, 836 (J.P.M.L. 1998). All of these are goals of multidistrict litigation. *See id.* Second, neither the plaintiff nor the public would be significantly prejudiced by a stay, as there is no evidence that staying the case for a short period would cause any party or stakeholder to suffer additional harm. Finally, granting a stay would promote judicial economy by ensuring multiple courts do not rule on the same jurisdictional question that is at issue in this case. When multiple courts face the same jurisdictional issue, courts have said that the “best course” is to stay the action and allow the transferee court to “resolve the jurisdictional question.” *Johnson v. AMR*

Corp., No. 95 C 7659, 1996 WL 164415, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 3, 1996) (declining to rule on jurisdictional issues until MDL panel made final transfer decision).¹

In response, the plaintiff identified two main ways in which she said she would be prejudiced by the Court staying this case. First, she points out that fully briefed motions to dismiss are currently pending before this Court and that “settling the jurisdictional issue now would save the parties the added expense, effort, and delay of additional briefing before the MDL Panel.” R. 41 at 7. But even if the Court denied the stay, the MDL Panel may still grant the motion to transfer. If this happens, the plaintiff would likely have to submit additional briefing to the MDL Panel. Such an outcome would impose upon the plaintiff the added “expense, effort, and delay” that she so fears. Thus, whether or not the plaintiff faces the “expense, effort, and delay” of additional briefing does not depend upon whether this Court grants the stay, but instead upon whether the MDL Panel grants the motion to transfer. The plaintiff may raise this issue with the MDL Panel when that court holds oral argument on the motion to transfer. But because the plaintiff’s alleged prejudice arises from transfer—not from staying this litigation—the plaintiff has not shown that she would be prejudiced by a stay. To the contrary, if the MDL Panel does grant the motion to transfer, the plaintiff’s resources overall would be conserved by staying the litigation in this Court until the MDL Panel’s decision. This is because the plaintiff would not need to continue expending resources litigating this case only to have to replicate all of these expenditures if the case is transferred.

¹ The plaintiff also urged the Court to consider the merits of the motion to transfer when deciding whether a stay was warranted. R. 41 at 8–12. Although the Court recognizes that other courts have considered this factor when deciding whether to grant a motion to stay, *see Bertram v. Fed. Express Corp.*, No. CIV.A.05 28 C, 2006 WL 3388473, at *2 (W.D. Ky. Nov. 20, 2006), the Court believes that the merits of the motion to transfer are best considered by the MDL Panel. The Court declines to pre-judge the merits here.

Thus, staying this case best guards against the plaintiff's concerns and ensures that she is not prejudiced by transferring this case.

Second, the plaintiff says that she would be prejudiced by the delay created by a stay. The Court agrees that "justice delayed is justice denied." Accordingly, the Court will stay this action only temporarily. This temporary stay will give the MDL Panel a chance to rule on the motion to transfer without significantly delaying this litigation and prejudicing the plaintiff. If the MDL Panel has not ruled on the motion to transfer by July 1, 2016, the Court will lift the stay and rule on the underlying motions to dismiss by July 29, 2016.

During the call, the plaintiff informed the Court that she had requested that the MDL Panel, if it chooses to consolidate this case and the related cases, transfer the multidistrict litigation to the Eastern District of Kentucky. The undersigned notes that he is happy to oversee the consolidated litigation if the MDL Panel so chooses.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that:

- (1) The defendants' joint motion to stay, R. 40, is **GRANTED IN PART**.
- (2) This case is **STAYED** until **Friday, July 1, 2016**.
- (3) The parties **SHALL FILE** a joint status report updating the Court on the status of the motion to transfer, *see* R. 39-1, by **Wednesday, June 29, 2016**. This report should inform the Court whether the MDL Panel has granted the motion to transfer, denied the motion to transfer, or taken no action on the motion to transfer.
- (4) If the MDL Panel does not act on the motion to transfer by **July 1, 2016**, the stay will automatically lift on **Friday, July 1, 2016**. In this case, the Court will rule on the motions to dismiss by **Friday, July 29, 2016**.

- (5) If the MDL Panel grants or denies the motion to transfer prior to July 1, 2016, the parties **SHALL INFORM** the Court of this action. If the MDL Panel denies the motion to transfer, the Court will rule on the motions to dismiss within **30 days** of receiving notice of the MDL Panel's decision from the parties.
- (6) If the parties would like to schedule oral argument on the underlying motions to dismiss, they **SHALL SUBMIT** a mutually agreeable date to the Court. The parties' chosen date must be **within 14 days of July 1, 2016**.

This the 21st day of April, 2016.



Signed By:

Amul R. Thapar AT

United States District Judge

TIC: 15 minutes, Covington