defendants. Plaintiffs in these cases claim to be owners or lessees of Toyota and Lexus automobiles and make claims relating to potential unintended acceleration and the voluntary safety recalls.[2]

To date, at least two motions for coordinated treatment of these cases and numerous responses have been filed with the JPML. *See In re Toyota Motor Corp. Unintended Acceleration Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL Docket No. 2151. Toyota filed its response with the JPML on February 26, 2010 and joined in the requests for consolidated treatment. *See* Toyota Defendants' Response in Support of Transfer of Actions to the Central District of California for Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, attached hereto as Exhibit A. Given that Toyota's U.S. headquarters are in the Central District of California, the most cases had been filed in that district at that time, and the first-filed class action was filed in that district, Toyota requested transfer to the Central District of California. The JPML has set a hearing to consider consolidation of these cases for March 25, 2010, see Exhibit B (Notice to All Involved Counsel), and the matter has been selected for oral argument. See Exhibit C (Notice of Hearing Session).

The need for coordination of these actions is compelling: the various proposed classes, as well as the individual actions, are overlapping and involve potentially millions of vehicle owners; the complaints contain similar allegations arising from the same recalls; similar pretrial matters will be presented in each case; and numerous groups of plaintiffs' counsel have requested consolidation. Given the strong likelihood that these cases will be transferred into a

[2] Toyota acknowledges that there are some differences in the theories of liability and claims regarding the alleged defect(s) in the various actions. Although the theories of these lawsuits may differ, all relate to the issue of unintended acceleration. Moreover, the transferee court is vested with discretion to consolidate some complaints, but not others, and to permit multiple consolidated complaints for differing types of claims or plaintiffs. Accordingly, the MDL proceeding can accommodate the various complaints and will eliminate duplicative discovery, avoid inconsistent pretrial rulings, and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary.