

1 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342
2 DAVID L. ANDERSON #149604
JACOB R. SORENSEN #209134
3 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855
BRIAN J. WONG #226940
4 50 Fremont Street
Post Office Box 7880
5 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
Telephone: (415) 983-1000
6 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200
Email: bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com

7
8 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
DAVID W. CARPENTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BRADFORD A. BERENSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 DAVID L. LAWSON (admitted *pro hac vice*)
EDWARD R. MCNICHOLAS (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10 1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
11 Telephone: (202) 736-8010
Facsimile: (202) 736-8711

12 Attorneys for Defendants
13 AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

17
18 TASH HEPTING, GREGORY HICKS,
CAROLYN JEWEL and ERIK KNUTZEN
19 on Behalf of Themselves and All Others
Similarly Situated,
20
Plaintiffs,
21
vs.
22 AT&T CORP., AT&T INC. and DOES 1-20,
23 inclusive,
24 Defendants.

No. C-06-0672-VRW

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT
AT&T CORP.'S MOTION TO
DISMISS**

[Fed. R. Evid. 201]

Date: June 8, 2006
Time: 2 p.m.
Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker

Filed concurrently:
1. AT&T Corp.'s Motion to Dismiss
2. Proposed Order

25
26
27
28

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**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE**

Defendant **AT&T CORP.** (“AT&T”) hereby requests that the Court take judicial notice of the following documents attached as Exhibits A through J. This request is made pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence and the authorities cited below. This request is made in connection with AT&T’s motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint for Damages, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief filed by plaintiffs Tash Hepting, Gregory Hicks, Carolyn Jewel and Erik Knutzen (Dkt. 8).

Exhibit	Description
A	Complaint in <i>American Civil Liberties Union et al. v. National Security Agency et al.</i> , Civ. 06-10204 (E.D. Mich. filed Jan. 17, 2006).
B	Complaint in <i>Center for Constitutional Rights v. Bush et al.</i> , Civ. 06-00313 (S.D.N.Y. filed Jan. 17, 2006).
C	Complaint in <i>Electronic Privacy Information Center v. Department of Justice</i> , Civ. 06-00096 (D.D.C. filed Jan. 19, 2006).
D	Complaint in <i>Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc., et al. v. Bush, et al.</i> , Civ. 06-274-MO (D. Ore. filed Feb. 28, 2006).
E	<i>United States v. al-Timimi</i> , Crim. No. 1:04cr385 (E.D.Va. Feb. 3, 2005) (superseding indictment).
F	<i>United States v. al-Timimi</i> , No. 05-4761 (4th Cir. Apr. 25, 2006) (order granting defendant’s/appellant’s motion to vacate and to remand).
G	<i>United States v. Aref, et al.</i> , Crim. No. 04-CR-402 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 10, 2006) (order denying defendants’ motion for reconsideration).
H	<i>United States v. Albanna</i> , Crim No. 02-CR-255-S (W.D.N.Y. Mar. 21, 2006) (order denying defendants’ demand for information).
I	<i>United States v. Hayat, et al.</i> , Crim. No. S-05-240-GEB (E.D.Cal. Apr. 3, 2006) (order denying defendants’ motion to compel discovery).
J	Press Briefing by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales and General Michael Hayden, Principal Deputy Director for National Intelligence (Dec. 19, 2005). ¹

BASIS FOR REQUESTING JUDICIAL NOTICE

On a motion to dismiss, a court may take judicial notice of matters of public record in accordance with Federal Rule of Evidence 201 without converting the motion to dismiss

¹ Available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/20051219-1.html>.

1 to a motion for summary judgment. *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688-689 (9th
2 Cir. 2001) (citing *Mack v. South Bay Beer Distributors, Inc.*, 798 F.2d 1279, 1282 (9th Cir.
3 1986)). Courts may take judicial notice of documents outside of the complaint that are
4 capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot
5 reasonably be questioned. Fed. R. Evid. 201(d); *Wietschner v. Monterey Pasta Co.*, 294 F.
6 Supp. 2d 1117, 1109 (N.D. Cal. 2003). Courts can take judicial notice of such matters
7 when considering a motion to dismiss. *Wietschner*, 294 F. Supp. 2d at 1109; *MGIC Indem.*
8 *Corp. v. Weisman*, 803 F. 2d 500, 504 (9th Cir. 1986). As explained further below, the
9 Court may take judicial notice of Exhibits A through J.

10 *Exhibits A through I:* Courts may take judicial notice of proceedings in other courts.
11 *U.S. ex rel Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.*, 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th
12 Cir. 1992) (citing *St. Louis Baptist Temple, Inc. v. FDIC*, 605 F.2d 1169 (10th Cir. 1979))
13 (“[W]e ‘may take notice of proceedings in other courts, both within and without the federal
14 judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct relation to matters at issue.’”). Exhibits
15 A through D are complaints from the files of other federal district courts, and Exhibit E is a
16 superseding indictment from the file of another federal district court, and Exhibits F
17 through I are orders from the files of other federal courts. The contents of these filings are
18 public records that are “not subject to reasonable dispute [and] capable of accurate and
19 ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.”
20 Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)(2). These exhibits reflect the proceedings in other federal courts, and
21 are appropriate for judicial notice as set forth in *U.S. ex rel Robinson Rancheria Citizens*
22 *Council*. AT&T requests that this Court take judicial notice of Exhibits A through I solely
23 to demonstrate their existence and the similarity of the claims in those cases, and not for the
24 truth of their contents.

25 *Exhibit J:* As stated in *Lee*, on a motion to dismiss, the court may take judicial
26 notice of “undisputed matters of public record.” *Lee*, 250 F.3d at 690. Exhibit J is a
27 transcript of public statements made by members of the President’s
28

1 administration—Attorney General Alberto Gonzales and General Michael Hayden,
2 Principal Deputy Director for National Intelligence—and is undisputed and easily
3 verifiable. Neither plaintiffs nor defendants challenge the authenticity or admissibility of
4 Exhibit J. Indeed, plaintiffs also seek judicial notice of this document in their Request for
5 Judicial Notice in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 20-21,
6 filed March 31, 2006). As plaintiffs argue in their Request for Judicial Notice, many courts
7 have taken judicial notice of documents like Exhibit J. AT&T also asks this Court to take
8 judicial notice of Exhibit J.

9 For the foregoing reasons, Exhibits A through J may properly be considered by the
10 Court in ruling on AT&T’s motion to dismiss.

11 Dated: April 28, 2006.

12 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
13 BRUCE A. ERICSON
14 DAVID L. ANDERSON
15 JACOB R. SORENSEN
16 MARC H. AXELBAUM
17 BRIAN J. WONG
18 50 Fremont Street
19 Post Office Box 7880
20 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880

17 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
18 DAVID W. CARPENTER
19 BRADFORD A. BERENSON
20 DAVID L. LAWSON
21 EDWARD R. McNICHOLAS
22 1501 K Street, N.W.
23 Washington, D.C. 20005

21 By _____ /s/ Bruce A. Ericson
22 Bruce A. Ericson

23 Attorneys for Defendants
24 AT&T CORP. and AT&T INC.

25
26
27
28