United States District Court
Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

| | |
|---|---|
| IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT LITIGATION<br>_____/<br><br>This Order Relates To:<br><br>*Cases in Exhibit A* | MDL No. 3084<br><br>**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO CONVERT ORDERS OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ORDERS OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE**<br><br>Dkt. 5567 |

On February 10, 2026, the Court dismissed without prejudice the claims of certain plaintiffs who failed to comply with PTO 31 (failing to produce a bona fide ride receipt or a statement explaining search efforts). Dkt. 5216. On February 13, 2026, the Court dismissed without prejudice the claims of certain plaintiffs who failed to comply with PTO 5 (failing to provide a bona fide receipt or information sheet regarding the trip), Amended PTO 10 (failing to provide the required Plaintiff Fact Sheet), and PTO 31. Dkts. 4287, 5238, 5242. On February 17, 2026, the Court dismissed without prejudice the claims of certain plaintiffs who failed to comply with Amended PTO 10. Dkt. 5253. Uber now moves to convert those dismissals without prejudice to dismissals with prejudice, pursuant to the procedure outlined in Amended PTO 10.

The majority of plaintiffs listed in Uber's Exhibit A did not file any opposition. Those cases are dismissed with prejudice.

Wagstaff law firm opposes as to certain plaintiffs that it continues to attempt to reach. Dkt. 5734. However, those plaintiffs have been non-compliant with the Court's

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States District Court
Northern District of California

orders for months and in some cases more than a year. Therefore, the Court finds that dismissal with prejudice is warranted given the prejudice to Uber. See In re Phenylproanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig., 460 F.3d 1217, 1227 (9th Cir. 2006). The fact that the Wagstaff law firm has previously attempted to withdraw from representation as to two of those plaintiffs, where Uber discovered evidence that non-bona fide receipts were submitted, is not relevant as the Court has already denied the request for withdrawal. Therefore, the Wagstaff law firm plaintiffs' cases are also dismissed with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 13, 2026

CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge