

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

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

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

SUMMARY

The United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation orders centralization of actions arising from the PowerSchool customer data security breach. The Panel transfers the actions listed on Schedule A to the Southern District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings and assigns them to Judge Roger T. Benitez. The order identifies common factual and legal issues involving the breach, data security practices, notification, negligence, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment.

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	United States 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 additional related actions, for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Panel evaluates whether actions involve common questions of fact and whether centralization will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	MDL transfer order; limited precedential value
PARTIES	Plaintiffs in the Western District of Missouri J.J. action listed on Schedule A v. PowerSchool Holdings, Inc., PowerSchool Group LLC

TOPICS

civil procedure

class actions

commercial litigation

negligence

breach of contract

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

multidistrict litigation

commercial litigation

data security

class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the related actions involve common questions of fact warranting centralization under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.
2. Whether centralization would serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation.
3. Which federal district should serve as the transferee district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

HOLDINGS

1. The actions involve common questions of fact, and centralization is warranted because it will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation.
2. The Southern District of California is an appropriate transferee district for the centralized litigation.

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)

“IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that actions listed on Schedule A are transferred to the Southern District of California and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Roger T. Benitez for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The actions arise from unauthorized access to PowerSchool's Student Information System, which schools use to store personal information concerning current and former students and staff. Plaintiffs, including students, guardians, and school staff, seek certification of overlapping nationwide and statewide classes and assert substantially identical claims involving negligence, breach of contract, and unjust enrichment. Discovery is expected to address how and when the breach occurred, the adequacy of PowerSchool's data-security practices, and the timing and sufficiency of notice to affected individuals.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Panel considered the parties' written submissions and held a hearing session. It determined that the actions shared common factual questions and that centralization in the Southern District of California would promote convenience and the just and efficient conduct of the litigation. The Panel transferred the Schedule A actions to

the Southern District of California, with that court's consent, and assigned them to Judge Roger T. Benitez for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The actions listed on Schedule A were 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)