

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

In re PowerSchool Holdings, Inc., and PowerSchool Group, LLC Customer Data Security Breach Litigation

In re PowerSchool Customer Data Security Breach Litigation · No. MDL No. 3149 · Decided April 18, 2025

SUMMARY

The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ordered centralization of 32 related customer data security breach actions involving PowerSchool Holdings, Inc. and PowerSchool Group LLC. The Panel transferred the actions to the Southern District of California and assigned them to Judge Roger T. Benitez for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 1407. The order identifies common factual and legal issues concerning the cybersecurity incident, data security practices, breach notification, and overlapping class claims.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen K. Caldwell; Nathaniel M. Gorton; Matthew F. Kennelly; David C. Norton; Dale A. Kimball; Madeline Cox Arleo
JURISDICTION	Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation
DECIDED	April 18, 2025
DOCKET	MDL No. 3149
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to centralize 32 related data-breach actions pending in three federal districts, along with related actions pending in additional districts.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	procedural transfer order

TOPICS

[civil procedure](#) [class actions](#) [negligence](#) [breach of contract](#) [unjust enrichment](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

[multidistrict litigation](#) [civil procedure](#) [data privacy and security](#) [consumer litigation](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the actions involve common questions of fact warranting centralization under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.
2. Whether centralization in the Southern District of California would serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation.
3. Whether informal coordination rather than multidistrict centralization would be the more efficient means of managing the related actions.

HOLDINGS

1. Centralization is warranted because the actions involve common questions of fact arising from the same cybersecurity incident, and coordinated pretrial proceedings will serve convenience and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation.
2. The Southern District of California is an appropriate transferee district for the coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.
3. Informal coordination is not the most efficient method for resolving this litigation, particularly because there was no assurance that potential Section 1404 transfers would be uncontested.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“On the basis of the papers filed and the hearing session held, we find that the actions listed on Schedule A involve common questions of fact, and that centralization in the Southern District of California will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation.” (at 1)

“We are not persuaded that informal coordination is the most efficient route to resolving this litigation.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The litigation arises from a cybersecurity incident involving unauthorized access to PowerSchool's Student Information System, which schools use to store personal information concerning current and former students and staff. The plaintiffs include students, guardians, and school staff seeking overlapping nationwide and statewide class actions. The actions assert largely identical claims for negligence, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment, and discovery will address the breach, PowerSchool's data-security practices, and notice to affected individuals.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Panel considered the papers filed and held a hearing session on the motion to centralize litigation arising from unauthorized access to PowerSchool's Student Information System. The Panel granted centralization and transferred the actions listed on Schedule A to the Southern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings before Judge Roger T. Benitez, with that court's consent.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The actions listed on Schedule A are transferred to the Southern District of California and, with that court's consent, assigned to the Honorable Roger T. Benitez for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

CASES CITED

- In re StockX Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig., 412 F. Supp. 3d 1363 (J.P.M.L. 2019)
- In re [24]7.AI, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig., 338 F. Supp. 3d 1345 (J.P.M.L. 2018)
- In re Hudson's Bay Co. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig., 326 F. Supp. 3d 1372 (J.P.M.L. 2018)
- In re Best Buy Co., Cal. Song-Beverly Credit Card Act Litig., 804 F. Supp. 2d 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2011)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/judicial-panel-on-multidistrict-litigation-united-states-judicial-panel-on-multidistrict-litigation/2025/in-re-powerschool-holdings-inc-and-powerschool-group-llc-ahbwomm0>