



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 18, 2016

Media Contact: Glenn Lammi | glammi@wlf.org | 202-588-0302

## WLF Asks Supreme Court to Overturn Ninth Circuit Decision Granting Plaintiffs Extra Appeals of Class Certification Denials

*(Microsoft Corp. v. Baker)*

**“The Ninth Circuit’s holding not only deprives appeals courts of their discretion, but it also unfairly favors plaintiffs over defendants—who cannot similarly exercise a right to immediate appeal via strategic dismissal.”**

**—Cory Andrews, WLF Senior Litigation Counsel**

WASHINGTON, DC—Washington Legal Foundation today asked the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit that effectively grants plaintiffs immediate appeal rights to which federal law does not entitle them. In its *amicus* brief filed on the merits in *Microsoft Corp. v. Baker*, WLF argues that permitting plaintiffs (and *only* plaintiffs) automatic immediate appeals from denials of class certification will encourage multiple, piecemeal appeals from a single lawsuit and will undermine the evenhanded administration of justice.

The case involves a district court’s interlocutory order striking the plaintiffs’ class allegations from the complaint—an order for which a panel of the Ninth Circuit had already refused interlocutory appeal. Rather than proceed to trial on their individual claims and then contest the denial of class certification in a post-trial appeal, plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed all of their claims with prejudice, then immediately appealed the class-certification denial as part of their appeal from the “final order” dismissing their claims.

As WLF’s brief points out, the plaintiffs’ stipulated dismissal with prejudice rendered the case moot when it destroyed the adversity necessary for a live dispute under Article III of the U.S. Constitution. WLF also demonstrates that the statute governing appeals, 28 U.S.C. § 1291, strictly limits appeals to final decisions, and that a pre-trial order denying class certification does not become “final” simply because plaintiffs strategically elect to dismiss their case with prejudice. And WLF further contends that the Ninth Circuit’s holding subverts Rule 23(f), which permits an appeals court *at its sole discretion* to allow interlocutory appeal (by either plaintiffs *or* defendants) from a class-certification order.

WLF’s *amicus* brief was joined by the National Association of Manufacturers, the International Association of Defense Counsel, and the NFIB Small Business Legal Institute. Upon filing, WLF issued the following statement by Senior Litigation Counsel Cory Andrews:

“The Ninth Circuit’s holding not only deprives appeals courts of their discretion, but it also unfairly favors plaintiffs over defendants—who cannot similarly exercise a right to immediate appeal via strategic dismissal.”

*WLF is a national public interest law firm and policy center that regularly litigates in support of civil justice reform to ensure that unwarranted lawsuits do not drive up costs for all consumers.*