These judges' familiarity with these cases makes the Central District a particularly appropriate transferee district. *See In re Land Rover LR3 Tire Wear Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 598 F. Supp. 2d 1384, 1386 (J.P.M.L. 2009) ("The Central District of California is an appropriate transferee forum because the first-filed and most procedurally advanced actions are pending there."); *In re Pet Food Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 499 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1347 (J.P.M.L. 2007) (ordering transfer to a particular venue where "[p]retrial proceedings are advancing well there and about one-third of all pending actions are already in this district."); *In re Mirapex Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2007) (transferring cases to the district where litigation had become the most advanced and the judge had the opportunity to become familiar with the litigation).

B. More Relevant Documents and Witnesses Will Likely Be Located in the Central District of California Than in Any Other Proposed Transferee District.

The presence of a defendant's corporate headquarters or other principal place of business in a forum militates strongly in favor of transfer to that forum because it "implies that relevant witnesses and documents are likely to be found there." *In re UICI "Association-Group" Ins. Litig.*, 305 F. Supp. 1360, 1362 (J.P.M.L. 2004); *see also In re Aftermarket Automotive Lighting Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 598 F. Supp. 2d 1366, 1368 (J.P.M.L. 2009) (transferring to the Central District of California where "several defendants are headquartered within the Central District of California and accordingly pertinent documents and witnesses are likely located there"); *In re DirectTV, Inc. Early Cancellation Fee Marketing and Sales Pracs. Litig.*, 655 F. Supp. 2d 1369, 1370-71 (J.P.M.L. 2009) ("DirecTV, Inc., is headquartered in that district and, therefore, relevant documents and witnesses are likely located there."); *In re European Rail Pass Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1386, 2001 WL 587855 (J.P.M.L. 2001); *In re Baldwin-United Corp. Litig.*, 581 F. Supp. 739, 741 (J.P.M.L. 1984); *In re California Armored Car Antitrust Litig.*, 476 F. Supp. 452,