



1. On October 13, 2016, this Court issued an order that permitted discovery regarding the alleged bad faith of the Massachusetts Attorney General in issuing a Civil Investigative Demand to plaintiff ExxonMobil Corp. (“Exxon”) to aid the Court in determining whether it should abstain from hearing the claims against the Massachusetts Attorney General under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). [Dkt. No. 73] At that time, the NYOAG was not a party to this action.

2. On November 10, 2016, this Court granted Exxon’s motion for leave to amend and Exxon filed an amended complaint. [Dkt. 99, 100]

3. On November 16, 2016, without leave of court, Exxon served the NYOAG with extensive pre-answer discovery. It included deposition notices for the Attorney General and the two senior officials, as well as document requests, requests for admission, and interrogatories.

4. On December 5, 2016, the NYOAG made a timely motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b), raising as grounds for dismissal: (1) that this Court lacks personal jurisdiction over the NYOAG; (2) that venue in the Northern District of Texas is improper; (3) that Exxon’s claims regarding the NYOAG’s investigative subpoena are not ripe for federal review under *Google, Inc. v. Hood*, 822 F.3d 212 (5th Cir. 2016); (4) that this Court should abstain under the *Younger* doctrine because of an ongoing proceeding in New York state court brought by the NYOAG to compel Exxon’s compliance with the investigative subpoena in which Exxon can raise all of the federal constitutional and preemption claims that it brings in this action; (5) that all of Exxon’s federal claims fail to state a plausible claim for relief; and (6) that Exxon’s state-law claims are barred by sovereign immunity. [Dkt. 134] Exxon’s opposition to the motion to dismiss is currently due December 27, 2016. *See* LR 7.1(e).

5. Also on December 5, 2016, the NYOAG moved to quash and for a protective order regarding Exxon's discovery requests on the grounds that: (1) discovery is not necessary to resolve the NYOAG's motion to dismiss because dismissal is plainly warranted in light of the lack of personal jurisdiction over the NYOAG and lack of ripeness of Exxon's claims; (2) the discovery requests were issued without leave of court in violation of Rule 26(d); and (3) the discovery requests seek privileged, protected testimony. [Dkt. 136]

6. Following a *sua sponte* order expediting the briefing [Dkt. 139], the motion to quash was fully briefed as of December 8, 2016, at 5:00 p.m. C.S.T. [Dkt. 144, 150] On December 9, 2016, at 2:22 p.m. C.S.T., this Court denied the Motion to Quash. [Dkt. 152]

7. The NYOAG respectfully asks this Court to exercise its inherent authority to stay all discovery against the NYOAG pending immediate appellate review in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, via a mandamus petition, of the discovery orders and the denial of the motion to quash. As set forth in its accompanying memorandum of law, the NYOAG's request satisfies the four traditional factors for issuance of a stay pending further appellate review: (1) whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that it is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding; and (4) whether the stay is in the public interest. *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009); *Planned Parenthood of Greater Tex. Surgical Health Servs. v. Abbott*, 734 F.3d 406, 410 (5th Cir. 2013).

**PRAYER**

For these reasons, and those set out in the accompanying Memorandum of Law in Support, this Court should STAY all discovery in this action pending a ruling from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on the NYOAG's forthcoming petition for a writ of mandamus.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Schneiderman  
Attorney General of New York

By his attorneys:

s/ Pete Marketos

Jason Brown\*  
*Chief Deputy Attorney General*  
Leslie B. Dubeck (pro hac vice)  
*Counsel to the Attorney General*  
Roderick L. Arz (pro hac vice)  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
NEW YORK STATE OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL  
120 Broadway, 25<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10271  
212-416-8085

*\*pro hac vice application pending*

Pete Marketos  
Lead Attorney  
Texas State Bar No. 24013101  
pete.marketos@rgmfirm.com  
Tyler J. Bexley  
Texas State Bar No. 24073923  
tyler.bexley@rgmfirm.com  
REESE GORDON MARKETOS LLP  
750 N. Saint Paul St. Suite 610  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(214) 382-9810  
Fax: (214) 501-0731

Jeffrey M. Tillotson  
Texas Bar No. 20039200  
TILLOTSON LAW FIRM  
750 N. Saint Paul St. Suite 610  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 382-3041  
Fax: (214) 501-0731

Dated: December 9, 2016

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that, on December 9, 2016, all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of this document via the Court's CM/ECF system. Any other counsel of record will be served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

s/ Pete Marketos  
Pete Marketos

**CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

On December 9, 2016, Counsel for Movants spoke with counsel for Plaintiff Exxon Mobil Justin Anderson and discussed the merits of the requested relief. Despite that discussion, no agreement was reached and Plaintiff opposes the relief sought by way of this motion.

s/ Pete Marketos  
Pete Marketos