UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: CONVERGENT TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA) LITIGATION

MDL No. 2478

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO -8)

On October 8, 2013, the Panel transferred 6 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407. See 981 F.Supp.2d 1385 (J.P.M.L. 2013). Since that time, 15 additional action(s) have been transferred to the District of Connecticut. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Alvin W Thompson.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the District of Connecticut and assigned to Judge Thompson.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to the District of Connecticut for the reasons stated in the order of October 8, 2013, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Alvin W Thompson.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7–day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

Inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.

Feb 27, 2015

CLERK'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

FOR THE PANEL

Jeffery N. Lüthi Clerk of the Panel

IN RE: CONVERGENT TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT (TCPA) LITIGATION

MDL No. 2478

SCHEDULE CTO-8 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

<u>DIST</u>	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	CASE CAPTION
OHIO SOU	THERN		
OHS	1	15-00015	Bevins v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc.