

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUN 06 2016

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

ABDUL KADIR MOHAMED,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. And
RASIER, LLC,

Defendants - Appellants,

And

HIREASE, LLC,

Defendant.

No. 15-16178

D.C. No. 3:14-cv-05200-EMC
Northern District of California,
San Francisco

ORDER

RONALD GILLETTE,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 15-16181

D.C. No. 3:14-cv-05241-EMC
Northern District of California,
San Francisco

ABDUL KADIR MOHAMED,

No. 15-16250

individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC. And
RASIER, LLC,

Defendants,

And

HIREASE, LLC,

Defendant - Appellant.

D.C. No. 3:14-cv-05200-EMC
Northern District of California,
San Francisco

The parties should be prepared to discuss at oral argument whether there remains a case or controversy for which this court may grant effective relief. *See Steffel v. Thompson*, 415 U.S. 452, 460 n.10 (1974) (“The rule in federal cases is that an actual controversy must be extant at all stages of review, not merely at the time the complaint is filed.”) We understand the parties have notified the district court that they have “reached a settlement agreement that will resolve the *In re Uber FCRA Litigation* lawsuit.” Dist. Ct. Dkt #175 at 3. Specifically, the parties should be prepared to discuss if there is a settlement in this case, and if so, why this case is not now moot and why there is standing on appeal. *See In re Cellular 101, Inc.*, 539 F.3d 1150, 1154-55 (9th Cir. 2008). The parties should also be prepared

to discuss the impact, if any, of the proposed settlement in *O'Connor v. Uber Technologies Inc.*, Case No. 13-cv-03826-EMC, on this appeal.

FOR THE COURT:

MOLLY C. DWYER
CLERK OF COURT

By: Omar Cubillos
Deputy Clerk