1	SHANNON LISS-RIORDAN (SBN 310719)	
	(sliss@llrlaw.com)	
2	THOMAS FOWLER (pro hac vice forthcoming)
3	(tfowler@llrlaw.com)	
	LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C.	
4	729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000	
5	Boston, MA 02116	
	Telephone: (617) 994-5800	
6	Facsimile: (617) 994-5801	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Emmanuel Cornet,	
	Justine De Caires, Grae Kindel,	
8	Alexis Camacho, and Jessica Pan,	
9	on behalf of themselves	
	and all others similarly situated	
10		
11		DICEDICE COLUM
		DISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	SCO DIVISION
13	SANTRANCE	SCO DIVISION
14		Case No. 3:22-cv-6857
15	EMMANUEL CORNET, JUSTINE DE	
	CAIRES, GRAE KINDEL, ALEXIS	
16	CAMACHO, AND JESSICA PAN, on behalf	CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
17	of themselves and all others similarly situated,	
,	D1 1 100	1. VIOLATION OF WARN ACT (29
18	Plaintiffs,	U.S.C. §§ 2101 <i>ET SEQ</i> .)
19		2. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA
	V.	WARN ACT (CAL. LAB. CODE §§
20	TWITTER, INC.	1400 ET SEQ.)
21	I WITER, INC.	3. DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ACT, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02
41	Defendant.	28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02
22		
23		
		-
24		
25		
26		
27		
		1
28	CLASS ACTIO	N COMPLAINT

I.

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

- 1. Emmanuel Cornet, Justine De Caires, Grae Kindel, Alexis Camacho, and Jessica Pan, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, file this Class Action Complaint against Defendant Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter") for its violation and anticipated further violation of the federal Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 *et seq.* (the "WARN Act"), as well as the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400 *et seq.* (the "California WARN Act").
- 2. As described further below, shortly after the company's purchase by Elon Musk, during the first week of November 2022, Twitter began a mass layoff. It has been widely reported that Twitter plans to lay off about 3,700 employees, approximately 50% of its total workforce. See, e.g., Jon Brodkin, Musk to cut half of Twitter jobs and end remote work for the rest, report says, ARS TECHNICA (November 3, 2022), https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2022/11/report-musk-to-lay-off-50-of-twitter-staff-reverse-work-from-home-policy/; Kate Conger, Elon Musk Begins Layoffs at Twitter, New York Times (November 3, 2022), https://www.nytimes.com/2022/11/03/technology/twitter-layoffs-elon-musk.html?smid=nytcore-ios-share&referringSource=articleShare; Alex Heath, Elon Musk's Twitter layoffs are starting, The Verge (November 3, 2022), https://www.theverge.com/2022/11/3/23439802/elon-musks-twitter-layoffs-start-friday-november-4; Kali Hays, Elon Musk starts layoffs at Twitter immediately after an email went out saying cuts would start the next day, Business Insider, https://www.businessinsider.com/layoffs-at-twitter-begin-night-before-elon-musk-said-they-would-2022-11.
- 3. Twitter began the layoffs with a few employees. For example, on November 1, 2022, Twitter terminated Plaintiff Emmanuel Cornet without providing advanced written warning, as required by the federal WARN Act and California WARN Act, which require sixty (60) days advance written notice of a mass layoff.

- 4. On November 3, 2022, Plaintiffs Justine De Caires, Jessica Pan, and Grae Kindel were locked out of their Twitter accounts, which they understood to signal that they were being laid off.
- 5. Plaintiffs are very concerned that Twitter will continue these layoffs without providing the requisite notice. News reports have stated that more widespread layoffs will proceed beginning tomorrow, November 4, 2022.
- 6. Another company owned by Elon Musk, Tesla, recently engaged in mass layoffs without notice. That company attempted to obtain releases from laid off employees without informing them of their rights under the federal or California WARN Acts. A federal court subsequently ordered the company to provide employees notice of the claims that had been filed on their behalf. See Lynch v. Tesla, Inc., 2022 WL 42952953 *6 (W.D. Tex. Sept. 16, 2022).
- 7. Plaintiffs file this action seeking to ensure that Twitter comply with the law and6 provide the requisite notice or severance payment in connection with the anticipated layoffs and that it not solicit releases of claims of any employees without informing them of the pendency of this action and their right to pursue their claims under the federal or California WARN Act.
- 8. Plaintiffs seek immediate injunctive relief, as well as a declaratory judgment under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02, on behalf of themselves and all similarly situated employees, precluding Twitter from circumventing the requirements of the WARN Act and the California WARN Act.

3II. PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff Emmanuel Cornet is an adult resident of San Francisco, California, where he worked from January 2021 until his layoff on November 1, 2022.
- 10. Plaintiff Justine De Caires is an adult resident of San Francisco, California, where they have worked as an employee of Twitter assigned to Twitter's office in San Francisco.

- 11. Plaintiff Grae Kindel is an adult resident of Medford, Massachusetts, where they have worked as an employee of Twitter assigned to Twitter's office in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 12. Plaintiff Alexis Camacho is an adult resident of Honolulu, Hawaii, where she has worked as an employee of Twitter assigned to Twitter's headquarters in San Francisco, California.
- 13. Plaintiff Jessica Pan is an adult resident of Alameda, California, where she has worked as an employee of Twitter assigned to Twitter's headquarters in San Francisco, California.
- 14. Plaintiffs Cornet, De Caires, Pan, and Kindel bring this lawsuit as a Rule 23 class action asserting (1) a federal WARN Act claim on behalf of all Twitter employees throughout the United States who are laid off in a "mass layoff" or "plant closing," as defined by the WARN Act, following the purchase of Twitter by Elon Musk, and who are not given a minimum of sixty (60) days' written notice of termination and (2) a California WARN Act claim on behalf of all California Twitter employees who are laid off in a "mass layoff" or "plant closing," as defined by the California WARN Act, following the purchase of Twitter by Elon Musk, and who are not given a minimum of sixty (60) days' written notice of termination.
- 15. All Plaintiffs bring a declaratory judgment claim asking the Court to enjoin Twitter from violating the federal and California WARN Act and from soliciting releases from employees who are being laid off without informing them of the pendency of this case and their rights under those statutes.
- 16. Defendant Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter") is a Delaware corporation, headquartered in San Francisco, California.

III. <u>JURISDICTION</u>

17. This Court has jurisdiction over this proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and

29 U.S.C. § 2104(a)(5).

- 18. This Court has personal jurisdiction over this matter because Twitter is headquartered in this District and conducts substantial business operations in this District.
- 19. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 over Plaintiffs' state law claims, because those claims derive from a common nucleus of operative facts with Plaintiffs' federal claims.

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 20. Twitter employs thousands of people across the United States. Following the purchase of the company by Elon Musk, in early November 2022, Twitter initiated what has been widely reported as a mass layoff of employees at its sites across the country. It has been widely reported in the media that Twitter's CEO Elon Musk communicated to Twitter's staff that the company plans to eliminate approximately 3,700 of Twitter's employees, making up about 50% of its total workforce. See, e.g., Jon Brodkin, Musk to cut half of Twitter jobs and end remote work for the rest, report says, ARS TECHNICA (November 3, 2022), https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2022/11/report-musk-to-lay-off-50-of-twitter-staff-reverse-work-from-home-policy/.
- 21. Plaintiffs Cornet, De Caires, Camacho, and Pan have been employed in Twitter's headquarters in San Francisco, California, and Plaintiff Kindel was employed in Twitter's office in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- 22. As an early example of the anticipated mass layoff, on November 1, 2022, Plaintiff Cornet was notified that his employment was being terminated effective immediately. Twitter did not provide sixty (60) days advance written notice (or any advance notice at all) to Plaintiff Cornet of his impending layoff. Nor did Twitter provide any severance pay to Plaintiff Cornet.

- 23. Although not formally notified of a layoff, or given any advance notice, Plaintiffs De Caires, Pan, and Kindel were locked out of their company accounts on November 3, 2022.
- 24. At all relevant times, Twitter employed 100 or more employees, exclusive of part-time employees, (i.e., those employees who had worked fewer than 6 of the 12 months prior to the date notice was required to be given or who had worked fewer than an average of 20 hours per week during the 90 day period prior to the date notice was required to be given), or employed 100 or more employees who in the aggregate worked at least 4,000 hours per week exclusive of hours of overtime within the United States and within California.
- 25. These anticipated terminations are expected to result in the loss of employment for more than 500 employees (excluding part-time employees).
- 26. However, Twitter has given no formal written advance notice of these anticipated layoffs not sixty (60) days in advance of the terminations, nor as much notice as practicable under the circumstances.
- 27. It has also been reported that California's Employment Development Department has not received notice of a mass layoff from Twitter. See Kate Conger, Elon Musk Begins

 Layoffs at Twitter, NEW YORK TIMES (November 3, 2022),

 https://www.nytimes.com/2022/11/03/technology/twitter-layoffs-elon-musk.html?smid=nytcore-ios-share&referringSource=articleShare.
- 28. Elon Musk, who owns Twitter, engaged in similar violations of the WARN Act and the California WARN Act earlier during the summer of 2022, when another company he owns, Tesla, engaged in mass layoffs without providing advanced written notice. Several former Tesla employees brought a suit against Tesla for these violations. See Lynch et al. v. Tesla, Inc., Civ. Act. No., 1:22-cv-00597-RP (W.D. Tex.). When informing employees of their layoff, Tesla sought to obtain full releases of all WARN Act and California WARN Act claims in exchange for small severance payments of one or two weeks pay (significantly less than the sixty (60) days

pay and benefits required to satisfy the WARN Act and the California WARN Act). See Lynch, 2022 WL 4295295, at *1-4. A federal court ruled that Tesla's conduct was "misleading because [the separation agreements] fail to inform potential class members of this lawsuit and the rights that they are potentially giving up under the WARN Act." Id. at *4.

29. Plaintiffs here are reasonably concerned that, absent court intervention, Twitter will engage in similar behavior and seek releases from laid off employees without informing them of their rights or the pendency of this case. Plaintiffs have therefore brought this complaint seeking immediate relief to ensure that Twitter does not violate the federal and California WARN Act and then seek to obtain releases from employees who do not have notice of their rights or the claims brought here on their behalf.

<u>COUNT I</u> Federal WARN Act

At all times material herein, Plaintiffs and similarly situated persons have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the federal WARN Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 et. seq. 24. Twitter was, and is, subject to the notice and back pay requirements of the federal WARN Act because Twitter is a business enterprise that employed 100 or more employees, excluding part-time employees, and/or, employed 100 or more employees who in the aggregate work at least 4,000 hours per week (exclusive of overtime), as defined in the WARN Act. 29 U.S.C. §§ 2101(1)(A) and(B). Twitter is now engaged in conducting mass layoffs without providing the required notice under the federal WARN Act.

COUNT II California WARN Act

At all times material herein, Plaintiffs and similarly situated persons who have worked for Twitter in California have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28 the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400 et seq. Twitter was, and is, subject to the notice and back pay requirements of the California WARN Act because Twitter is a business enterprise that employed 75 or more employees, as defined in the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400(a). Twitter is now engaged in conducting mass layoffs without providing the required notice under the California WARN Act.

COUNT III Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02

An actual controversy of sufficient immediacy exists between the parties as to the concern by Plaintiffs that Twitter should be prohibited from circumventing the requirements of the WARN Act and the California WARN Act by conducting mass layoffs without providing the required notice and by soliciting the employees it is laying off to sign separation agreements that release their claims under the WARN Act and/or California WARN Act, without first informing them of this lawsuit or their rights under those statutes. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment and an injunction prohibiting Twitter from engaging in such conduct.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that this Court enter the following relief:

- Declare and find that the Defendant has violated the WARN Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 et seq. and the California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1400 et seq.
- Certify a class action and appoint Plaintiffs and their counsel to represent a class of Twitter employees under Count I who have worked for Twitter anywhere in the United States and are laid off without required notice, in conjunction with the mass layoff described herein;
- c. Certify a class action and appoint Plaintiffs and their counsel to represent a class of Twitter employees under Count II who have worked for Twitter in California and are laid off, without required notice, in conjunction with the mass layoff described herein;

- d. Enter declaratory relief and an injunction under Count III enjoining Twitter from violating the WARN Act and/or California WARN Act and from seeking releases of claims under the WARN Act and/or California WARN Act under claims without informing employees of the pendency of this lawsuit and their rights under those statutes.
- e. Award compensatory damages, including all expenses and wages owed, in an amount according to proof;
- f. Award pre- and post-judgment interest;
- g. Award reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses;
- h. Any other relief to which the Plaintiffs may be entitled.

1			Respectfully submitted,
3			EMMANUEL CORNET, JUSTINE DE CAIRES GRAE KINDEL, ALEXIS CAMACHO, AND JESSICA PAN, on behalf of themselves and all
4			others similarly situated,
5			By their attorneys,
6			
7 8			/s/ Shannon Liss-Riordan Shannon Liss-Riordan, SBN 310719
9			Thomas Fowler (pro hac vice forthcoming)
10			LICHTEN & LISS-RIORDAN, P.C. 729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000
11			Boston, MA 02116 (617) 994-5800
12			Email: sliss@llrlaw.com; tfowler@llrlaw.com
13			
14			
15	Dated:	November 3, 2022	
16	Dated.	140vember 3, 2022	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			10 CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
			CEASO ACTION COMEDAIN

iled 11/03/22 Page 1 of 2 Case 3:22-cv-06857-ŞI

The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. ((a)	PI.	AIN	П	$\mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}$	S
1.	a					N

Emmanuel Cornet, Justine De Caires, Grae Kindel, Alexis Camacho, and Jessica Pan

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

San Francisco, CA

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Shannon Liss-Riordan, Thomas Fowler Lichten & Liss-Riordan, P.C., 729 Boylston St. Suite 2000, Boston, MA 02116; 617-994-5800

DEFENDANTS

Twitter, Inc.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

П.	BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)					
			PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF	
1	U.S. Government Plaintiff Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	1	1	Incorporated <i>or</i> Principal Place of Business In This State	4	4	
2	U.S. Government Defendant 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2	2	Incorporated <i>and</i> Principal Place of Business In Another State	5	5	
	(matcase University by 1 writes in Hem 111)	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3	3	Foreign Nation	6	6	

NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT **TORTS** FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES 110 Insurance 625 Drug Related Seizure of 422 Appeal 28 USC § 158 375 False Claims Act PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY Property 21 USC § 881 120 Marine 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 310 Airplane 365 Personal Injury - Product 690 Other § 3729(a)) 130 Miller Act Liability 315 Airplane Product Liability LABOR PROPERTY RIGHTS 400 State Reapportionment 140 Negotiable Instrument 367 Health Care 320 Assault, Libel & Slander Pharmaceutical Personal 410 Antitrust 150 Recovery of 330 Federal Employers' 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 820 Copyrights Injury Product Liability 430 Banks and Banking Overpayment Of Liability 720 Labor/Management 830 Patent 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Veteran's Benefits 450 Commerce 340 Marine Relations 835 Patent-Abbreviated New Product Liability 151 Medicare Act 460 Deportation 740 Railway Labor Act 345 Marine Product Liability Drug Application PERSONAL PROPERTY 152 Recovery of Defaulted 470 Racketeer Influenced & 350 Motor Vehicle 751 Family and Medical 840 Trademark Student Loans (Excludes 370 Other Fraud Corrupt Organizations 880 Defend Trade Secrets 355 Motor Vehicle Product Leave Act 371 Truth in Lending 480 Consumer Credit Act of 2016 × 790 Other Labor Litigation Liability 153 Recovery of 380 Other Personal Property 485 Telephone Consumer 791 Employee Retirement 360 Other Personal Injury SOCIAL SECURITY Overpayment Damage Protection Act Income Security Act 362 Personal Injury - Medical of Veteran's Benefits 861 HIA (1395ff) 385 Property Damage Product 490 Cable/Sat TV Malpractice 160 Stockholders' Suits IMMIGRATION Liability 862 Black Lung (923) 850 Securities/Commodities/ 190 Other Contract 462 Naturalization 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIONS Exchange Application 195 Contract Product Liability 864 SSID Title XVI 890 Other Statutory Actions 440 Other Civil Rights HABEAS CORPUS 465 Other Immigration 196 Franchise 865 RSI (405(g)) 891 Agricultural Acts 441 Voting 463 Alien Detainee Actions REAL PROPERTY FEDERAL TAX SUITS 893 Environmental Matters 442 Employment 510 Motions to Vacate 895 Freedom of Information 210 Land Condemnation 443 Housing/ Sentence 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Act Defendant) Accommodations 530 General 220 Foreclosure 896 Arbitration 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 445 Amer, w/Disabilities-535 Death Penalty 899 Administrative Procedure Employment § 7609 240 Torts to Land OTHER Act/Review or Appeal of 446 Amer. w/Disabilities-Other 245 Tort Product Liability 540 Mandamus & Other Agency Decision 448 Education 290 All Other Real Property 550 Civil Rights 950 Constitutionality of State 555 Prison Condition Statutes 560 Civil Detainee-Conditions of Confinement ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) Original Removed from Remanded from Multidistrict Reinstated or 5 Transferred from Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened Another District (specify) Litigation-Transfer Litigation-Direct File Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): CAUSE OF Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2101 et seq.; California WARN Act, Cal. Lab. Code § 1400 et seq. ACTION Brief description of cause: Plaintiffs bring this complaint against Twitter for its violation and anticipated further violation of the federal and California WARN REQUESTED IN

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION **DEMAND S** CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: UNDER RULE 23, Fed. R. Civ. P. JURY DEMAND: Yes X No **COMPLAINT:**

VIII. RELATED CASE(S), JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER **IF ANY** (See instructions):

DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (Civil Local Rule 3-2)

× SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND SAN JOSE **EUREKA-MCKINLEYVILLE** (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS-CAND 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet. The JS-CAND 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved in its original form by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court to initiate the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- **I. a) Plaintiffs-Defendants.** Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
 - b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
 - c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)."
- II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.
 - (1) United States plaintiff. Jurisdiction based on 28 USC §§ 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.
 - (2) United States defendant. When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.
 - (3) <u>Federal question</u>. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.
 - (4) <u>Diversity of citizenship</u>. This refers to suits under 28 USC § 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; **NOTE: federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)**
- **III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties.** This section of the JS-CAND 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerk(s) in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the six boxes.
 - (1) Original Proceedings. Cases originating in the United States district courts.
 - (2) Removed from State Court. Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 USC § 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.
 - (3) Remanded from Appellate Court. Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing
 - (4) Reinstated or Reopened. Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.
 - (5) <u>Transferred from Another District</u>. For cases transferred under Title 28 USC § 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.
 - (6) <u>Multidistrict Litigation Transfer</u>. Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 USC § 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.
 - (8) Multidistrict Litigation Direct File. Check this box when a multidistrict litigation case is filed in the same district as the Master MDL docket.
 - Please note that there is no Origin Code 7. Origin Code 7 was used for historical records and is no longer relevant due to changes in statute.
- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC § 553. Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service.
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.
 - Demand. In this space enter the actual dollar amount being demanded or indicate other demand, such as a preliminary injunction.
 - Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.
- VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS-CAND 44 is used to identify related pending cases, if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.
- IX. Divisional Assignment. If the Nature of Suit is under Property Rights or Prisoner Petitions or the matter is a Securities Class Action, leave this section blank. For all other cases, identify the divisional venue according to Civil Local Rule 3-2: "the county in which a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred or in which a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated."

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.