

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER, LLC,

Defendant.

Index No. 631543/2024

Motion Seq. No. 004

**NOTICE OF PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on July 2, 2025 at 11:00 a.m., upon: (1) the accompanying Memorandum of Law, (2) the Affirmation of Cameron R. Azari dated June 27, 2025, (3) the Affirmation of Philip L. Fraietta dated June 27, 2025, and the exhibits attached thereto (including the Parties' Class Action Settlement Agreement), Plaintiff Joshua Homer, through his undersigned attorneys, will move this Court, at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, 1 Court St, Riverhead, New York, for an Order, pursuant to Article 9 of the CPLR: (i) granting final approval of the Class Action Settlement; (ii) final certification of the Settlement Class under CPLR 902 for settlement purposes only in connection with the settlement process; and (iii) granting such other, further, or different relief as the court deems just and proper.

* * *

A Proposed Final Approval Order is submitted herewith.

Dated: June 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Philip L. Fraietta
Philip L. Fraietta

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
Philip L. Fraietta
Eleanor R. Grasso
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com
egrasso@bursor.com

Stefan Bogdanovich
1990 North California Blvd., 9th Floor
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Telephone: (925) 300-4455
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700
E-mail: sbogdanovich@bursor.com

Class Counsel

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER, LLC,

Defendant.

Index No. 631543/2024

Motion Seq. No. 004

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED MOTION
FOR FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS AND FINAL
APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Dated: June 27, 2025

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

Philip L. Fraietta
Eleanor R. Grasso
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com
egrasso@bursor.com

Stefan Bogdanovich
1990 North California Boulevard, 9th Floor
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Telephone: (925) 300-4455
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700
Email: sbogdanovich@bursor.com

Class Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE(S)
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4).....	2
B. Plaintiff’s Allegations	2
C. The Litigation And Settlement Negotiations	3
TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT.....	4
A. Class Definition	4
B. Monetary Relief	5
C. Prospective Relief.....	5
D. Release	5
E. Notice And Administration Expenses.....	6
F. Service Award, Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, And Expenses	6
ARGUMENT.....	6
I. FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT IS APPROPRIATE.....	6
A. The Value Of The Settlement Outweighs The Likelihood Of Plaintiff’s Success On The Merits	7
B. The Class Members and Parties Unanimously Support The Settlement	9
C. Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel Are Experienced Class Action Litigators, And They Support The Settlement.....	12
D. The Settlement Is The Result Of Arm’s-Length Negotiations Between The Parties	12
E. The Nature Of The Legal And Factual Issues Is Complex.....	12
II. FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS IS APPROPRIATE.....	13
CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	PAGE(S)
CASES	
<i>Brad H. v. City of New York</i> , 2003 WL 22721558 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cnty. Nov. 12, 2003).....	6
<i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i> , 495 F.2d 448 (2d Cir. 1974)	7
<i>Colt Indus. Shareholder Litig. v. Colt Indus. Inc.</i> , 77 N.Y.2d 185 (1991).....	6
<i>Curanaj v. Tao Group, Inc.</i> , Index No. 56152/2024 (Sup. Ct. Westchester Cnty. July 25, 2024)	8
<i>Fiala v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 899 N.Y.S.2d 531 (Sup. Ct., New York Cnty. 2010).....	11, 12
<i>Frias v. City Winery New York, LLC</i> , Index No. 651284/2024 (Sup. Ct. New York Cnty. Oct. 15, 2024)	8
<i>Gordon v. Verizon Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 148 A.D.3d 146 (1st Dep't 2017).....	12
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. June 9, 1998).....	10
<i>Hibbs v. Marvel Enters.</i> , 19 A.D.3d 232 (1st Dep't 2005).....	9
<i>In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litig.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 2d 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2000)	12
<i>In re Colt Indus. S'holder Litig.</i> , 155 A.D.2d 154 (1st Dep't 1990).....	7
<i>Lowenschuss v. Bluhdorn</i> , 613 F.2d 18 (2d Cir. 1980)	12
<i>Massiah v. MetroPlus Health Plan, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 5874655 (E.D.N.Y. 2012)	10
<i>Milton v. Bells Nurses Registry & Employment Agency, Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 9271692 (Sup. Ct. Kings Cnty. Dec. 21, 2015)	7

Ortega v. Uber Techs. Inc.,
2018 WL 4190799 (E.D.N.Y. May 4, 2018)..... 10

Saska v. Metropolitan Museum of Art,
2016 WL 6682271 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cnty. Nov. 10, 2016)..... 6

Velez v. Majik Cleaning Serv., Inc.,
2007 WL 7232783 (S.D.N.Y. June 25, 2007)..... 7

STATUTES

New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07 Passim

RULES

CPLR 909..... 6

REGULATIONS

22 N.Y.C.R.R. §202.8-b 1

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

On April 10, 2025 this Court issued an order granting preliminary approval of the class action settlement between Plaintiff Joshua Homer (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant HY Attractions Manager LLC (“Defendant”) and directed that notice be sent to the Settlement Class.¹ *See* Affirmation of Philip L. Fraietta (“Fraietta Aff.”) Ex. 2, Preliminary Approval Order (NYSCEF Doc. No. 23) (“Prelim. App. Order”). The Settlement Administrator has implemented the notice plan that was submitted by the parties and approved by the Court and direct notice by email has reached 95.3% of the certified Settlement Class.² *See* Affirmation Of Cameron R. Azari, Esq. Regarding Implementation And Adequacy Of Notice Plan (“Epiq Aff.”) ¶¶ 18, 26. The reaction from the Settlement Class has been overwhelmingly positive. Specifically, of the 53,383 Settlement Class Members, **zero** objected and only two requested to be excluded.³ *Id.* ¶ 31. The Settlement is an excellent result for the Class and the Court should grant final approval.

The strength of the Settlement speaks for itself. Defendant collected approximately \$250,000 in processing fees during the class period. Fraietta Aff. ¶ 12. And after extensive negotiations, the Parties reached a Settlement under which Defendant has agreed to create a \$250,000 non-reversionary Settlement Fund to pay approved class member claims, notice and

¹ Capitalized terms used in this memorandum are defined in the Class Action Settlement Agreement (the “Settlement”), attached to the Fraietta Affirmation as Exhibit 1.

² As noted *infra* at 9–10, the parties recently learned that the Settlement Administrator provided notice by email, pursuant to [whatever the document is], but did not provide notice by first class mail. For the reasons explained below, Class counsel believes that adequate notice has been provided. In the event the Court concludes that additional notice is required, such as by requiring notice by first class mail to the class members who did not receive email notice, the Settlement Administrator stands ready to follow that direction.

³ The deadline for Settlement Class Members to object or request exclusion was June 23, 2025. *See* Prelim. App. Order at 4.

administration costs, the service award of the Plaintiff, and attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to Class Counsel. *Id.* ¶ 11.

What's more, the Settlement also provides meaningful prospective relief aimed at the challenged conduct, as Defendant acknowledges that it has changed the purchase flow for tickets to The Edge NYC on its website and online platforms to disclose the processing fee at issue in this litigation before the ticket is selected for purchase, and agrees to continue to comply with New York's Arts and Cultural Affairs Law ("ACAL") § 25.07(4) going forward. *Id.* ¶ 14.

Given the relief provided by the Settlement, the Court should not hesitate to grant final approval.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4)

Effective August 29, 2022, New York enacted Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4), which provides that:

Every operator or operator's agent of a place of entertainment ... shall disclose the total cost of the ticket, inclusive of all ancillary fees that must be paid in order to purchase the ticket, and disclose in a clear and conspicuous manner the portion of the ticket price stated in dollars that represents a service charge, or any other fee or surcharge to the purchase. Such disclosure of the total cost and fees shall be displayed in the ticket listing prior to the ticket being selected for purchase. ... The price of the ticket shall not increase during the purchase process.

Id. (emphasis added).

The ACAL provides a private right of action to "any person who has been injured by reason of a violation of" its provisions. ACAL § 25.33.

B. Plaintiff's Allegations

Defendant owns and operates The Edge NYC. *See* Complaint (NYSCEF Doc. No. 1) ("Compl.") ¶ 10. Plaintiff alleges that when consumers purchase tickets from Defendant's

website, they are “quoted a fee-less price, only to be charged a \$5.00 ‘processing fee’ at checkout after clicking through the various screens required to make a purchase.” *Id.* ¶ 1; *see also id.* ¶¶ 11-14 and Figures 1-4.

Plaintiff alleges that this conduct violates ACAL § 25.07(4) because Defendant failed to “disclose the ‘total cost of a ticket, inclusive of all ancillary fees that must be paid in order to purchase the ticket’ after a ticket is selected” and because Defendant “increase[ed] the total cost of its tickets during the purchase process.” *Id.* ¶¶ 27-28. As alleged in the Complaint, Plaintiff is an individual who purchased tickets on Defendant’s website to The Edge NYC and paid processing fees that were not disclosed to him at the beginning of the purchase process. *Id.* ¶ 30.

Defendant denies these allegations and denies any wrongdoing.

C. The Litigation And Settlement Negotiations

On June 11, 2024, Plaintiff, through Counsel, sent a demand letter to Defendant alleging that Defendant failed to disclose a “processing fee” on its Website for electronic admission tickets to it’s the Edge NYC, prior to those tickets being selected for purchase, in alleged violation of New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4). *Fraietta Aff.* ¶ 4. In response to the letter, counsel for the Parties conducted numerous conferences regarding potential settlement and, as a part of those negotiations, Plaintiff and Defendant exchanged informal discovery, including on issues such as the size and scope of the putative class and the amount of processing fees Defendant collected during the relevant time period. *Id.* ¶ 5. That informal discovery showed that Defendant collected approximately \$250,000 in processing fees from February 16, 2024 to and through July 6, 2024. *Id.* ¶ 12. Given that the information exchanged would have been, in large part, the same information produced in formal discovery related to issues of class certification and summary judgment, the Parties had sufficient information to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses. *Id.* ¶ 5.

After Plaintiff's counsel received the information, counsel for the Parties had additional conferences, and, on November 7, 2024, the Parties reached agreement on all material terms of a class action settlement and executed a term sheet. *Id.* ¶ 6. On December 19, 2024, Plaintiff filed a putative class action in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Kings County. *Id.* ¶ 7. The Parties then worked extensively to finalize and memorialize the agreement into a formal Class Action Settlement Agreement, including proposed class notice documents. *Id.* ¶ 8. That process included multiple rounds of redlines and phone calls to discuss proposed edits. *Id.* The Parties ultimately drafted and executed the Settlement Agreement, which is annexed to the Fraietta Affirmation as Exhibit 1. *Id.* ¶ 2.

On February 22, 2025, Plaintiff filed his Motion for Preliminary Approval. *See* NYSCEF Doc. No. 14. The Court preliminarily approved the Settlement on April 10, 2025. *See* NYSCEF Doc. No. 23. A copy of the Court's Preliminary Approval Order is attached to the Fraietta Affirmation as Exhibit 2.

TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT

The key terms of the Settlement are briefly summarized as follows:

A. Class Definition

The "Settlement Class" or "Settlement Class Members" is defined as:

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.⁴

Prelim. App. Order at 3. Defendant's records reflect that the processing fee at issue was only in

⁴ Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, Defendant's subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who submit a timely and valid request for exclusion from the class; and (4) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons. Prelim. App. Order at 3.

effect from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024, and also reflected that Defendant collected approximately \$250,000 in processing fees associated with 53,383 purchasers of electronic tickets to The Edge NYC tickets during that time period. Fraietta Aff. ¶ 12.

B. Monetary Relief

Defendant has agreed to create a \$250,000 non-reversionary Settlement Fund to pay approved class member claims, notice and administration costs, the service award of the Plaintiff, and attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to Class Counsel. Fraietta Aff. ¶ 11; Settlement ¶¶ 1.4, 1.17, 1.35, 1.36, 2.1. Class Members who submit a valid claim form will be entitled to receive a *pro rata* cash payment as a percentage of the total amount of processing fees he or she paid to Defendant during the class period. Settlement ¶ 2.1(b).

C. Prospective Relief

As a part of the Settlement, Defendant acknowledges that it has changed the purchase flow for tickets to The Edge NYC on its website and online platforms to disclose the processing fee at issue in this litigation before the ticket is selected for purchase, and agrees to continue to comply with ACAL § 25.07(4) going forward. Settlement ¶ 2.2. And Defendant agrees not to reinstate the processing fees unless: (1) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated. *Id.*

D. Release

In exchange for the relief described above, Defendant and each of the "Released Parties" as defined at ¶ 1.32 of the Settlement will receive a full release of all claims arising out of any facts, transactions, events, matters, occurrences, acts, disclosures, statements, representations, omissions or failures to act regarding the alleged collection of processing fees in connection with

electronic ticket sales from February 16, 2024 through and including July 6, 2024. *See id.* ¶¶ 1.32, 3.1 for full release language.

E. Notice And Administration Expenses

Defendant will pay the Settlement Administration Expenses from the Settlement Fund, which includes sending the Notice set forth in the Agreement and any other notice as required by the Court as well as all costs of administering the Settlement. Settlement ¶ 1.36.

F. Service Award, Attorneys' Fees, Costs, And Expenses

In recognition for his efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, Plaintiff may receive, subject to Court approval, a service award of \$5,000, as appropriate compensation for his time and effort serving as Class Representative and as a party to the Action. Such award will be paid from the Settlement Fund within five (5) business days after entry of the Final Judgment. Settlement ¶ 8.3.

Furthermore, pursuant to CPLR 909 and ACAL § 25.33, Defendant agrees that Class Counsel shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in an amount to be determined by the Court as the Fee Award. With no consideration given or received, Class Counsel will limit its petition for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to no more than \$83,333.33. Settlement ¶ 8.1. Such award will be paid from the Settlement Fund within ten (10) business days after entry of the Court's Settlement Approval Order and Final Judgment. Settlement ¶ 8.2.

Plaintiff and Class Counsel moved for these awards separately on June 6, 2025. *See* NYSCEF Doc. No. 24. That motion is unopposed.

ARGUMENT

I. FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT IS APPROPRIATE

New York has a well-established public policy favoring settlement, especially in the class

action context. *Brad H. v. City of New York*, 2003 WL 22721558, at *1 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cnty. Nov. 12, 2003). Although the CPLR does not define the specific mechanism for approval of class action settlements, New York courts look to federal case law for guidance. *See, e.g., Colt Indus. Shareholder Litig. v. Colt Indus. Inc.*, 77 N.Y.2d 185, 194 (1991) (“New York’s class action statute has much in common with Federal Rule 23.”). Federal courts use a two-step class settlement approval process which has routinely been followed by New York state courts. *See, e.g., Saska v. Metropolitan Museum of Art*, 2016 WL 6682271, at *9-10 (Sup. Ct., N.Y. Cnty. Nov. 10, 2016) (setting forth procedure). This is the second step of the two-step process.

In ruling on final approval motions, New York Courts look to: (1) the likelihood of success on the merits; (2) the extent of support from the parties; (3) the judgment of counsel; (4) the presence of good faith bargaining; and (5) the nature of the issues of law and fact. *Milton v. Bells Nurses Registry & Employment Agency, Inc.*, 2015 WL 9271692, at *1-2 (Sup. Ct. Kings Cnty. Dec. 21, 2015).

A review of the key factors for final approval supports approval here. Here, as set forth below, each factor weighs in favor of final approval.

A. The Value Of The Settlement Outweighs The Likelihood Of Plaintiff’s Success On The Merits

The first factor in determining fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of a proposed settlement is to “balance the value of th[e] settlement against the present value of the anticipated recovery following a trial on the merits, discounted for the inherent risks of litigation.” *In re Colt Indus. S’holder Litig.*, 155 A.D.2d 154, 160 (1st Dep’t 1990). Litigation inherently involves risks, and the settlement benefits the class by ensuring some measure of relief and eliminating the “risk that an outcome unfavorable to plaintiffs will emerge from a trial.” *Velez v. Majik Cleaning Serv., Inc.*, 2007 WL 7232783, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. June 25, 2007). Thus, “there is no

reason, at least in theory, why a satisfactory settlement could not amount to a hundredth or even a thousandth part of a single percent of the potential recovery.” *City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.*, 495 F.2d 448, 455 n.2 (2d Cir. 1974).

Here, the Settlement provides a substantial benefit to Settlement Class Members. Each Settlement Class Member will be entitled to submit a claim that will, if valid, entitle him or her to receive a *pro rata* cash payment as a percentage of the total amount of processing fees he or she paid to Defendant during the class period. Settlement ¶ 2.1(b). And equally important, the Settlement also provides meaningful prospective relief as Defendant acknowledges that it has changed the purchase flow for tickets to The Edge NYC to no longer charge processing fees. Settlement ¶ 2.2. And Defendant agrees not to reinstate the processing fees unless: (1) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated. *Fraietta Aff.* ¶ 14; Settlement ¶ 2.2.

The Settlement reflects Plaintiff’s belief that while his claims are meritorious and class treatment is warranted, his ultimate success would require favorable outcomes at all steps of the litigation, including overcoming Defendant’s defenses which include that Plaintiff’s claims are precluded by the voluntary payment doctrine, Plaintiff is precluded from seeking a statutory penalty in a class action and the pertinent statute provides for an excessive penalty that is constitutionally infirm, and the fees at issue are authorized by ACAL § 25.29. *Fraietta Aff.* ¶ 18. Indeed, two New York state courts have dismissed similar ACAL claims on motions to dismiss. *See Curanaj v. Tao Group, Inc.*, Index No. 56152/2024, NYSCEF No. 36 (Sup. Ct. Westchester Cnty. July 25, 2024); *Frias v. City Winery New York, LLC*, Index No. 651284/2024 (Sup. Ct. New York Cnty. Oct. 15, 2024).

Moreover, Defendant intended to vigorously contest class certification and raise its defenses with a motion for summary judgment, as well as at trial and on appeal, all of which are inherently uncertain and lengthy. *Id.* Class Counsel is also cognizant of the potential problems of proof and defenses to the claims raised in this action. *Id.* ¶ 17. Indeed, Class Counsel filed the very first case under the newly enacted ACAL § 25.07(4) in December 2023, and thus far only one has advanced to contested class certification or summary judgment, and none have advanced to trial. *Id.* In sum, Class Counsel is experienced and realistic, and understands that the resolution of class certification, liability issues, the outcome of the trial, and the inevitable appeals, all pose meaningful risks in terms of outcome and duration. *Id.* Moreover, Defendant is represented by experienced and capable counsel who made clear that, absent the Settlement, they were prepared to vigorously defend this case and oppose certification of a litigated class. *Id.* ¶ 18. The proposed Settlement alleviates these risks and provides a substantial benefit to the Settlement Class in a timely fashion. This factor favors preliminary approval.

B. The Class Members and Parties Unanimously Support The Settlement

Under New York law, support for a proposed Settlement from the opposing parties and Settlement Class Members demonstrates its fairness and reasonableness. *See, e.g., Hibbs v. Marvel Enters.*, 19 A.D.3d 232, 233 (1st Dep’t 2005).

Here, the reaction of the Class Members to the Settlement has been overwhelmingly positive. Class Notice has been provided to the Settlement Class Members in accordance with the requirements of the CPLR and the Preliminary Approval Order (NYSCEF Doc. No. 23 at 12-14).

Class Notice was only sent by email, as was contemplated by the Settlement Agreement and Exhibits, and as was incorporated by the Preliminary Approval Order. NYSCEF Doc. No. 23 at 3 (“The Court approves the proposed Notice Plan for the Class Action Settlement described

in the Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits.”). While the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order also directs that notice shall be made by first class mail (NYSCEF Doc. No. 23 at 4 (“The Settlement Claims Administrator shall mail, via First Class United States mail, postage prepaid, the Notice of Class Members within 24 days after the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order by the Court.”)), the Settlement Administrator made service by email only. Class Counsel / the Settlement Administrator believed the Court’s separate requirement of notice by first class mail was an oversight because of the Court’s approval of the proposed notice plan. The Settlement Administrator’s decision to send notice only by email was only recently brought to counsel’s attention, and the Settlement Administrator stands ready to provide notice by first class mail if the Court believes doing so is necessary. Nevertheless, Class Counsel respectfully suggests that, in the particular circumstances of this case, the notice that has already occurred by email is sufficient because email notice reached 98.5% of class members and avoided an estimated \$31,815 expense to conduct notice by first-class mail.⁵ Email notice satisfies the requirements of the CPLR, particularly in cases where consumers are known to regularly use their email addresses. *See Ortega v. Uber Techs. Inc.*, 2018 WL 4190799, at *11 (E.D.N.Y. May 4, 2018) (“Given the specific facts of this case, as well as the successful arguments in other such cases that notice by email is reasonably calculated to reach the class members, the court finds that Plaintiff’s proposed plan of notice by email, followed by notice by United States mail for all class members whose emails are returned as undeliverable, is sufficient.”). And in this case, each and every member of the Settlement Class purchased online admission tickets to Defendant’s The

⁵ The Defendant takes no position on whether additional notice at this time by first class mail is necessary. In any event, should the Court require that notice be sent by first-class United States mail, Class Counsel and Counsel for Defendant propose that such notice by first class mail be sent only to those class members for whom email notice was unsuccessful.

Edge, which were accessed by email. Thus, it is not surprising that email notice reached 95.3% of the Settlement Class. *See* Epiq Aff. ¶ 26.

As of April 18, 2025, zero class members objected to the Settlement, and only two opted-out. *See* Epiq Aff. ¶ 31. This exceptional participation rate and lack of objections from the Settlement Class leaves no question that the class members view the Settlement favorably, which weighs heavily in favor of final approval and further supports the “presumption of fairness.” *See, e.g., Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1027 (9th Cir. June 9, 1998) (“[T]he fact that the overwhelming majority of the class willingly approved the offer and stayed in the class presents at least some objective positive commentary as to its fairness.”); *Massiah v. MetroPlus Health Plan, Inc.*, 2012 WL 5874655, at *4 (E.D.N.Y. 2012) (“The fact that the vast majority of class members neither objected nor opted out is a strong indication of fairness.”).

Moreover, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have reviewed and analyzed the disclosures and documents provided by Defendant and those obtained via their own investigation, considered and researched Defendant’s defenses, and examined the benefits made available by the Settlement. *Fraietta Aff.* ¶ 5. Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that the Settlement is fair, adequate, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. *Id.* ¶ 19.

Defendant likewise believes that the Settlement is appropriate. Settlement, Recitals ¶ E. Defendant denies each and every one of the allegations of wrongdoing or liability and has asserted numerous defenses. *Id.* Defendant has also engaged well-qualified counsel with extensive complex class action experience and recognizes the risks and uncertainties inherent in litigation, the significant expense associated with defending the action, the costs of any appeals, and the disruption to its business operations arising out of burdensome and protracted litigation. *Id.* This factor favors final approval.

C. Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel Are Experienced Class Action Litigators, And They Support The Settlement

New York courts grant significant weight to the judgment of experienced counsel in determining the fairness of a class action settlement. *See Fiala v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, 899 N.Y.S.2d 531, 538 (Sup. Ct., New York Cnty. 2010) (finding that the settlement is supported by the “judgment of counsel” weights in favor of approval). The Settlement is the product of intense and protracted negotiations involving highly experienced law firms. As set forth more fully in the Fraietta Affirmation, Class Counsel has years of experience litigating and settling consumer class actions, and in their view, the Settlement represents a fair value and commendable result. Fraietta Aff. ¶¶ 20-22. Counsel for Defendant also has significant experience defending class actions, are well regarded within the class action bar, and support the Settlement as well. *Id.* ¶ 18. This factor favors final approval.

D. The Settlement Is The Result Of Arm’s-Length Negotiations Between The Parties

“[N]egotiations are presumed to have been conducted at arm’s length and in good faith where there is no evidence to the contrary[.]” *Gordon v. Verizon Commc’ns, Inc.*, 148 A.D.3d 146, 157 (1st Dep’t 2017). As detailed above, this Settlement is the result of informed, arm’s-length negotiations, with extensive discussions involving experienced counsel for the Parties. Fraietta Aff. ¶¶ 5-6. This factor favors final approval.

E. The Nature Of The Legal And Factual Issues Is Complex

Finally, courts consider the complexity of the case and whether continued litigation would be “expensive and protracted” in determining whether to approve a settlement. *Lowenschuss v. Bluhdorn*, 613 F.2d 18, 19 (2d Cir. 1980) (affirming approval of a settlement where further litigation would have been “expensive and protracted” with no guarantee of any relief to the class). “Most class actions are inherently complex and settlement avoids the costs,

delays and multitude of other problems associated with them.” *In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litig.*, 80 F. Supp. 2d 164, 174 (S.D.N.Y. 2000); *see also Fiala*, 899 N.Y.S.2d at 540 (noting that “the complexity of the litigation, its expenses and its duration favored settlement for both the plaintiffs and defendant”).

Here, the legal and factual issues support approval of the Settlement. While Plaintiff believes that his claims are strong, they are not without risk. As aforementioned, ACAL § 25.07(4) has not been heavily litigated and numerous legal issues would need to be decided in Plaintiff’s favor. *Fraietta Aff.* ¶¶ 17-18. For example, Defendant would likely argue that none of the Settlement Class Members were injured because the processing fee was disclosed prior to purchase and any violation of ACAL § 25.07(4) is merely procedural and barred by the voluntary payment doctrine since the processing fees were ultimately disclosed to the Settlement Class Members prior to completing their purchases. *Id.* ¶ 18. While Plaintiff believes that he would ultimately prevail at trial, the Settlement eliminates these risks and will provide substantial recovery for the Settlement Class without the risk and delay of continued litigation.

In sum, the Settlement readily meets all the factors weighted by courts in determining whether it is fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, and therefore should be finally approved.

II. FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS IS APPROPRIATE

At the preliminary approval stage, the Court certified the following Settlement Class for settlement purposes:

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

Prelim. App. Order at 3. The Court’s preliminary approval order also appointed Philip L.

Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. as Class Counsel and Plaintiff Joshua

Homer as Class Representative, both for settlement purposes. *Id.*

Having already notified Class Members of the Settlement and having received no objection that would call into question the Court's findings in its Preliminary Approval Order, final certification of the Class for settlement purposes only is appropriate and warranted.⁶ The Settlement's benefits can be realized only through final certification of the Class and entry of a Final Order.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grants his Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement and enter Final Judgment in the form submitted herewith.

Dated: June 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

By: /s/ Philip L. Fraietta
Philip L. Fraietta

Philip L. Fraietta
Eleanor R. Grasso
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com
egrasso@bursor.com

Stefan Bogdanovich
1990 North California Blvd., 9th Floor
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Telephone: (925) 300-4455
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700
E-mail: sbogdanovich@bursor.com

Class Counsel

⁶ Those findings were based on Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law in Support of Unopposed Motion For Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, filed February 22, 2025 (NYSCEF Doc. No. 15), which Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein.

PRINTING SPECIFICATION STATEMENT

1. Pursuant to 22 N.Y.C.R.R. §202.8-b, the undersigned counsel certifies that the foregoing brief was prepared on a computer using Microsoft Word. A proportionally spaced typeface was used as follows:

Name of Typeface: Times New Roman
Point Size: 12
Line Spacing: Double

2. The total number of words in the brief, inclusive of point headings and footnotes and exclusive of the caption, table of contents, table of authorities, signature block, and this Certification, is 4,095 words. By operation of Microsoft Word's word count function, this number includes legal citations and certain forms of punctuation.

Dated: June 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Philip L. Fraietta
Philip L. Fraietta

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
Philip L. Fraietta
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com

Class Counsel

**SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

<p>JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER, LLC,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant.</p>

Index No. 631543/2024

Motion Seq. No. 004

**AFFIRMATION OF PHILIP L. FRAIETTA IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF’S
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT
CLASS AND FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Philip L. Fraietta, Esq., an attorney duly admitted to practice law in the courts of the State of New York, does state and say under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am a partner at Bursor & Fisher, P.A., and I am Class Counsel in this action. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of New York. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. I make this affirmation in support of Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion for Final Certification of the Settlement Class and Final Approval of the Class Action Settlement.

Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Parties’ Class Action Settlement Agreement, and the exhibits attached thereto.

3. Beginning in November 2023, my firm commenced a pre-suit investigation of companies’ violations of the newly-enacted New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4), including Defendant HY Attractions Manager LLC (“Defendant”). Our investigation

was extensive and involved in-depth research into the legislative history of ACAL § 25.07(4), issues pertaining to statutory interpretation under New York law, as well as factual research regarding Defendant’s website and implementation of processing fees.

4. On June 11, 2024, Plaintiff, through Counsel, sent a demand letter to Defendant alleging that Defendant failed to disclose a “processing fee” on its Website for electronic admission tickets to it’s the Edge NYC, prior to those tickets being selected for purchase, in alleged violation of New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4).

5. In response to the letter, counsel for the Parties conducted numerous conferences regarding potential settlement and, as a part of those negotiations, Plaintiff and Defendant exchanged informal discovery, including on issues such as the size and scope of the putative class and the amount of processing fees Defendant collected during the relevant time period. Given that information would have been, in large part, the same information produced in formal discovery related to issues of class certification and summary judgment, the Parties had sufficient information to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses.

6. After Plaintiff’s counsel received the information, counsel for the Parties had additional conferences, and, on November 7, 2024, the Parties reached agreement on all material terms of a class action settlement and executed a term sheet.

7. On December 19, 2024, Plaintiff Homer filed this case in the Supreme Court of New York, Suffolk County.

8. My firm then worked extensively with defense counsel to finalize and memorialize the agreement into a formal Class Action Settlement Agreement, including proposed class notice documents. That process included multiple rounds of redlines and phone calls to discuss proposed edits.

9. After finalizing and executing the Class Action Settlement Agreement, my firm prepared Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval, which was filed on January 9, 2025.

10. The Court preliminarily approved the Settlement on April 10, 2025. *See* NYSCEF Doc. No. 23. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is the Court's Preliminary Approval Order.

11. Under the Settlement, Defendant has agreed to create a \$250,000 non-reversionary Settlement Fund to pay approved class member claims, notice and administration costs, the service award of the Plaintiff, and attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to Class Counsel.

12. Defendant's records reflect that the processing fee at issue was only in effect from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024, and also reflected that Defendant collected approximately \$250,000 in processing fees associated with 53,383 purchasers of electronic tickets to The Edge NYC tickets during that time period.

13. The Settlement provides that each Settlement Class Member will be entitled to submit a claim that will, if valid, entitle him or her to receive a *pro rata* cash payment as a percentage of the total amount of processing fees he or she paid to Defendant during the class period. *See* Settlement ¶ 2.1(b).

14. The Settlement also provides meaningful prospective relief as Defendant acknowledges that it has changed the purchase flow for tickets to The Edge NYC to no longer charge processing fees. Settlement ¶ 2.2. And Defendant agrees not to reinstate the processing fees unless: (1) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated. *Id.*

15. The Parties agreed to the terms of the Settlement through experienced counsel who possessed all the information necessary to evaluate the case, determined all the contours of the proposed class, and reached a fair and reasonable compromise after negotiating the terms of the Settlement at arms' length.

16. Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize that despite our belief in the strength of Plaintiff's claims, and Plaintiff's and the Class's ability to secure an award of damages under ACAL §§ 25.07(4) and 25.33, the expense, duration, and complexity of protracted litigation would be substantial and the outcome of trial uncertain. Thus, the Settlement secures a more proximate and more certain monetary benefit to the Class than continued litigation.

17. Plaintiff and Class Counsel are also mindful that absent a settlement, the success of Defendant's various defenses in this case could deprive the Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members of any potential relief whatsoever. Class Counsel filed the very first case under the newly enacted ACAL § 25.07(4) in December 2023, and only one has advanced to contested class certification and summary judgment, and none have advanced to trial. Numerous motions to dismiss also remain pending. *See, e.g., Presson v. Alamo Intermediate II Holdings, LLC*, Case No. 24-cv-00170-ER (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2024); *Adorno v. Shipwrecked Brooklyn LLC*, Index No. 801912/2025E (Sup. Ct. New York Bronx Cnty. June 9, 2025). Class Counsel is experienced and realistic, and understands that the resolution of class certification, liability issues, the outcome of the trial, and the inevitable appeals, all pose meaningful risks in terms of outcome and duration.

18. Defendant is also represented by highly experienced attorneys who have made clear that absent a settlement, they were prepared to continue their vigorous defense of this case, including by moving to dismiss the Complaint, and, if unsuccessful, moving for summary

judgment after discovery. More specifically, Plaintiff and Class Counsel are aware that Defendant would continue to assert a number of defenses on the merits, including that: (i) Plaintiff's alleged claims are precluded by the voluntary payment doctrine, (ii) Plaintiff is precluded from seeking a statutory penalty in a class action and the pertinent statute provides for an excessive penalty that is constitutionally infirm, and (iii) the fees at issue are authorized by ACAL § 25.29. Indeed, two New York state courts have dismissed similar ACAL claims on motions to dismiss. *See Curanaj v. Tao Group, Inc.*, Index No. 56152/2024, NYSCEF No. 36 (Sup. Ct. Westchester Cnty. July 25, 2024); *Frias v. City Winery New York, LLC*, Index No. 651284/2024 (Sup. Ct. New York Cnty. Oct. 15, 2024). Defendant would have also vigorously contested the certification of a litigation class. An adverse ruling on any of those defenses would have resulted in Plaintiff and the Settlement Class receiving a substantially reduced recovery, or no recovery at all. Looking beyond trial, Plaintiff is keenly aware that Defendant could appeal the merits of any adverse decision.

19. Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that the monetary relief provided by the settlement weighs heavily in favor of a finding that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and well within the range of approval.

20. As aforementioned, my firm, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., has significant experience in litigating class actions of similar size, scope, and complexity to the instant action. *See Firm Resume of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.*, attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**. Indeed, my firm has brought several other cases on behalf of putative class members for violations of ACAL § 25.07(4). *See, e.g., Norcross v. Tishman Speyer Properties, L.P.*, Case No. 1:23-cv-11153-JPO, ECF No. 36 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 16, 2024) (granting final approval of similar ACAL § 25.07(4) settlement); *Charles v. Color Factory, LLC*, Case No. 1:24-cv-00322-JSR, ECF No. 48 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7,

2024) (same); *Puller v. Legends OWO, LLC*, Case No. 1:24-cv-00209-RA, ECF No. 43 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 6, 2024) (granting preliminary approval of similar ACAL § 25.07(4) settlement and setting final fairness hearing for March 7, 2025).

21. In addition, my firm has also been recognized by courts across the country for its expertise. *See Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561, 566 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014) (Rakoff, J.) (“Bursor & Fisher, P.A., are class action lawyers who have experience litigating consumer claims. ... The firm has been appointed class counsel in dozens of cases in both federal and state courts, and has won multi-million dollar verdicts or recoveries in five class action jury trials since 2008.”)¹; *In re Welspun Litigation*, Case No. 16-cv-06792-RJS (S.D.N.Y. January 26, 2017) (appointing Bursor & Fisher interim lead counsel to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of mislabeled Welspun Egyptian cotton bedding products).

22. Moreover, my firm has served as trial counsel for class action plaintiffs in six jury trials and has won all six, with recoveries ranging from \$21 million to \$299 million.

23. The Settlement Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit 1 is the only agreement in connection with the proposed settlement.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above and foregoing is true and accurate.

Executed this 27th day of June, 2025 at New York, New York.

/s Philip L. Fraietta

Philip L. Fraietta

¹ Bursor & Fisher has since won a sixth jury verdict in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, Case No. 4:16-cv-03396-YGR (N.D. Cal.), for \$267 million.

PRINTING SPECIFICATION STATEMENT

1. Pursuant to 22 N.Y.C.R.R. §202.8-b, the undersigned counsel certifies that the foregoing brief was prepared on a computer using Microsoft Word. A proportionally spaced typeface was used as follows:

Name of Typeface: Times New Roman
Point Size: 12
Line Spacing: Double

2. The total number of words in the brief, inclusive of point headings and footnotes and exclusive of the caption, table of contents, table of authorities, signature block, and this Certification, is 1,642 words. By operation of Microsoft Word's word count function, this number includes legal citations and certain forms of punctuation.

Dated: June 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Philip L. Fraietta
Philip L. Fraietta

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
Philip L. Fraietta
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com

Class Counsel

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER LLC,

Defendant.

Index No. 631543/2024

CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Agreement (“Agreement” or “Settlement Agreement”) is entered into by and among (i) Plaintiff Joshua Homer (“Plaintiff”); (ii) each and every member of the Settlement Class (as defined herein); and (iii) Defendant HY Attractions Manager LLC (“Defendant”). The Settlement Class and Plaintiff are collectively referred to as the “Plaintiffs” unless otherwise noted. The Plaintiff and the Defendant are collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.” This Agreement is intended by the Parties to fully, finally and forever resolve, discharge, and settle the Released Claims (as defined herein), upon and subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and subject to the final approval of the Court.

RECITALS

A. On June 11, 2024, Plaintiff, through Class Counsel, sent a demand letter to Defendant alleging that Defendant failed to disclose a “processing fee” on its Website for electronic admission tickets to its The Edge NYC, prior to those tickets being selected for purchase, in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4).

B. In response to the letter, counsel for the Parties conducted numerous conferences regarding potential settlement, and, as part of those negotiations, Plaintiff and Defendant

exchanged informal discovery, including on issues such as the size and scope of the putative class and the amount of processing fees Defendant collected during the relevant time period. Given that the information exchanged would have been, in large part, the same information produced in formal discovery related to issues of class certification and summary judgment, the Parties had sufficient information to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses.

C. After Plaintiff's counsel received the information, counsel for the Parties had additional conferences, and, on November 7, 2024, the Parties reached agreement on all material terms of a class action settlement and executed a term sheet.

D. On December 19, 2024, Plaintiff filed this case in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk to process the settlement.

E. Defendant believes that the claims asserted in the above-captioned action (the "Action") against it have no merit, that this Court would not have jurisdiction to hear the merits because of a valid and controlling arbitration clause and that it would have prevailed on a motion to compel arbitration, to dismiss, at summary judgment, and/or at trial and that Plaintiff would not have been able to certify a class under the requirements of CPLR 901. Defendant has denied and continues to deny any wrongdoing, liability, or fault whatsoever and has denied and continues to deny that it committed, or attempted to commit, any wrongful act or violation of law or duty alleged in the Action. Defendant has opposed and continues to oppose certification of a litigation class in this Action. Nonetheless, taking into account the uncertainty and risks inherent in any litigation, Defendant has concluded it is desirable and beneficial that the Action be fully and finally settled and terminated in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement. This Agreement is a compromise. The Agreement, any related documents, and any negotiations relating to or supporting the Agreement shall not be construed as or deemed to

be evidence of, an admission, or a concession of liability, fault, or wrongdoing on the part of Defendant, or any of the Released Parties (defined below), with respect to any claim of fault or liability or wrongdoing or damage whatsoever, or with respect to the certifiability of a litigation class.

F. Plaintiff believes that the claims asserted in the Action against Defendant have merit and that he would have prevailed on a motion to compel arbitration, at summary judgment and/or trial. Nonetheless, Plaintiff and Class Counsel (defined below) recognize that Defendant has raised factual and legal defenses that present a risk that Plaintiff may not prevail. Plaintiff and Class Counsel also recognize the expense and delay associated with continued prosecution of the Action against Defendant through a motion to compel arbitration and dismiss, class certification, summary judgment, trial, and any subsequent appeals. Plaintiff and Class Counsel also have taken into account the uncertain outcome and risks of litigation, especially in complex class actions, as well as the difficulties inherent in such litigation. Therefore, Plaintiff believes it is desirable that the Released Claims be fully and finally compromised, settled, and resolved with prejudice. Based on its evaluation, Class Counsel has concluded that the terms and conditions of this Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and that it is in the best interests of the Settlement Class to settle the claims raised in the Action pursuant to the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among Plaintiff, the Settlement Class, and each of them, and Defendant, by and through their undersigned counsel that, subject to final approval of the Court after a hearing or hearings as provided for in this Settlement Agreement, in consideration of the benefits flowing to the Parties from the Agreement set forth herein, that the Action and the Released Claims shall be finally and

fully compromised, settled, and released, and the Action shall be dismissed with prejudice, upon and subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

AGREEMENT

1. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Settlement Agreement, the following terms have the meanings specified below:

- 1.1 “Action”** means *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024, pending in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk.
- 1.2 “Alternate Judgment”** means a form of final judgment that may be entered by the Court herein, but in a form other than the form of Judgment provided for in this Agreement and where none of the Parties elect to terminate this Settlement by reason of such variance.
- 1.3 “Approved Claim”** means a Claim Form submitted by a Settlement Class Member that is: (a) submitted timely and in accordance with the directions on the Claim Form and the provisions of the Settlement Agreement; (b) fully and truthfully completed by a Settlement Class Member with all of the information requested in the Claim Form; (c) signed by the Settlement Class Member, physically or electronically; and (d) approved by the Settlement Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement.
- 1.4 “Available Settlement Fund”** means the Settlement Fund less any Settlement Administration Expenses, any Service Award to the Class Representative, any Fee Award to Class Counsel, any taxes paid on the Settlement Fund (including any interest or penalties thereon), and any other costs, fees or expenses approved by the Court to be paid from the Settlement Fund.

1.5 “Cash Award” means the cash compensation, payable by the Settlement Administrator from the Settlement Fund on a *pro rata* basis, that each Settlement Class Member who submits an Approved Claim shall be entitled to receive.

1.6 “Claim Form” means the document substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, as approved by the Court. The Claim Form, to be completed by Settlement Class Members who wish to file a Claim for a payment, shall be available in electronic and paper format in the manner described below.

1.7 “Claims Deadline” means the date by which all Claim Forms must be postmarked or received to be considered timely and shall be set as a date no later than forty-five (45) days after entry of the Final Judgment. The Claims Deadline shall be clearly set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order as well as in the Notice and Claim Form. Failure to submit a timely claim by the Claims Deadline will prevent a Settlement Class Member from receiving a settlement payment from the Settlement Fund.

1.8 “Class Counsel” means Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.

1.9 “Class Representative” means the named Plaintiff in this Action, Joshua Homer.

1.10 “Court” means the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk.

1.11 “Days” means calendar days, except that when computing any period of time prescribed or allowed by this Settlement Agreement, the day of the act, event or default from which the designated period of time begins to run shall not be included. When computing any period of time prescribed or allowed by this Settlement Agreement, the last day of the period so computed shall be included, unless it is a Saturday, Sunday or federal or State of New York legal holiday, in which event the period runs until the end of the next day which is not a Saturday, Sunday or federal or State of New York legal holiday.

1.12 “**Defendant**” means HY Attractions Manager LLC.

1.13 “**Defendant’s Counsel**” means Sean Haran of Walden Macht Haran & Williams LLP.

1.14 “**Defendant’s Website**” means <https://www.edgenyc.com/>.

1.15 “**Effective Date**” means the date ten (10) days after which all of the events and conditions specified in Paragraph 9.1 have been met and have occurred.

1.16 “**Escrow Account**” means the separate, interest-bearing escrow account to be established by the Settlement Administrator under terms acceptable to all Parties at a depository institution insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Settlement Fund shall be deposited by or on behalf of Defendant into the Escrow Account in accordance with the terms of this Agreement and the money in the Escrow Account shall be invested in the following types of accounts and/or instruments and no other: (i) demand deposit accounts and/or (ii) time deposit accounts and certificates of deposit, in either case with maturities of forty-five (45) days or less. The costs of establishing and maintaining the Escrow Account shall be paid from the Settlement Fund.

1.17 “**Fee Award**” means the amount of attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses awarded by the Court to Class Counsel, which will be paid out of the Settlement Fund.

1.18 “**Final**” means one business day following the latest of the following events: (i) the date upon which the time expires for filing or noticing any appeal of the Court’s Final Judgment approving the Settlement Agreement; (ii) if there is an appeal or appeals, other than an appeal or appeals solely with respect to the Fee Award, the date of completion, in a manner that finally affirms and leaves in place the Final Judgment without any material modification, of all proceedings arising out of the appeal or appeals (including, but not limited to, the expiration of all deadlines for motions for reconsideration or petitions for review and/or *certiorari*, all

proceedings ordered on remand, and all proceedings arising out of any subsequent appeal or appeals following decisions on remand); or (iii) the date of final dismissal of any appeal or the final dismissal of any proceeding on *certiorari*.

1.19 “Final Approval Hearing” means the hearing before the Court where the Parties will request the Final Judgment to be entered by the Court approving the Settlement Agreement, the Fee Award, and the service award to the Class Representative.

1.20 “Final Judgment” means the Final Judgment and Order to be entered by the Court approving the Agreement after the Final Approval Hearing.

1.21 “Individual Out-of-Pocket Fees” means the total amount of processing fees paid to Defendant by any one Settlement Class Member in connection with the Settlement Class Member’s purchase of an electronic ticket or electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s Website, from February 16, 2024 through and including July 6, 2024.

1.22 “Notice” means the notice of this proposed Class Action Settlement Agreement and Final Approval Hearing, which is to be sent to the Settlement Class substantially in the manner set forth in this Agreement, is consistent with the requirements of Due Process, CPLR 904, and is substantially in the form of Exhibits A, B, and C hereto.

1.23 “Notice Date” means the date by which the Notice set forth in Paragraph 4.1(b) is complete, which shall be no later than twenty-eight (28) days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order.

1.24 “Objection/Exclusion Deadline” means the date by which a written objection to this Settlement Agreement or a request for exclusion submitted by a Person within the Settlement Class must be made, which shall be designated as a date no later than sixty (60) days after the Notice Date and no sooner than fourteen (14) days after papers supporting the Fee Award are

filed with the Court and posted to the settlement website listed in Paragraph 4.1(d), or such other date as ordered by the Court.

1.25 “Out-of-Pocket Fees” means the total amount of processing fees paid to Defendant collectively by every Settlement Class Member.

1.26 “Out-of-Pocket Percentage” for a Settlement Class Member means that Settlement Class Member’s Individual Out-of-Pocket Fees divided by Out-of-Pocket Fees.

1.27 “Person” shall mean, without limitation, any individual, corporation, partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, association, joint stock company, estate, legal representative, trust, unincorporated association, government or any political subdivision or agency thereof, and any business or legal entity and their spouses, heirs, affiliates, parents, predecessors, successors, representatives, or assigns, subsidiaries, insurers, and their past, present and future directors, officers, shareholders, members, faculty, employees, agents, and attorneys both individually and in their capacities as directors, officers, shareholders, members, employees, agents, and attorneys. “Person” is not intended to include any governmental agencies or governmental actors, including, without limitation, any state Attorney General office.

1.28 “Plaintiffs” means Joshua Homer and the Settlement Class Members.

1.29 “Preliminary Approval” means the Court’s certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes, preliminary approval of this Settlement Agreement, and approval of the form and manner of the Notice.

1.30 “Preliminary Approval Order” means the order preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement, certifying the Settlement Class for settlement purposes, and directing notice thereof to the Settlement Class, which will be agreed upon by the Parties and submitted to the Court in conjunction with Plaintiff’s motion for Preliminary Approval of the Agreement.

1.31 “Released Claims” means any and all actual, potential, filed, known or unknown, fixed or contingent, claimed or unclaimed, suspected or unsuspected, claims, demands, liabilities, rights, causes of action, contracts or agreements, extra contractual claims, damages, punitive, exemplary or multiplied damages, expenses, costs, attorneys’ fees and or obligations (including “Unknown Claims,” as defined below), whether in law or in equity, accrued or unaccrued, direct, individual or representative, of every nature and description whatsoever, whether based on the ACAL or other state, federal, local, statutory or common law or any other law, rule or regulation, against the Released Parties, or any of them, arising out of any facts, transactions, events, matters, occurrences, acts, disclosures, statements, representations, omissions or failures to act arising out of or in any way allegedly related to the collection of processing fees in connection with online ticket sales to The Edge NYC from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024, including all claims that were brought or could have been brought in the Action relating to any and all Releasing Parties.

1.32 “Released Parties” means HY Attractions Manager LLC, and all of its current, former, and future parents, predecessors, successors, affiliates, assigns, subsidiaries, members, partners, divisions, or related corporate entities, and all of their respective current, future, and former employees, officers, directors, shareholders, assigns, agents, trustees, administrators, executors, insurers, attorneys, and customers.

1.33 “Releasing Parties” means Plaintiff, Settlement Class Members, and all of their respective present or past heirs, executors, estates, administrators, predecessors, successors, assigns, parent companies, subsidiaries, associates, affiliates, employers, employees, agents, consultants, independent contractors, insurers, directors, managing directors, officers, partners, principals, members, attorneys, accountants, financial and other advisors, underwriters,

shareholders, lenders, auditors, investment advisors, legal representatives, successors in interest, assigns and companies, firms, trusts, and corporations.

1.34 “Service Award” means any Court-approved award to the Class Representative, in his capacity as individual class representative, as set forth in Paragraph 8.3, and payable by the Settlement Administrator from the Settlement Fund.

1.35 “Settlement Administration Expenses” means the expenses incurred by the Settlement Administrator in providing Notice, processing claims, responding to inquiries from members of the Settlement Class, mailing checks, and related services, paying taxes and tax expenses related to the Settlement Fund (including all federal, state or local taxes of any kind and interest or penalties thereon, as well as expenses incurred in connection with determining the amount of and paying any taxes owed and expenses related to any tax attorneys and accountants).

1.36 “Settlement Administrator” means Epiq, or such other reputable administration company that has been selected jointly by the Parties and approved by the Court to perform the duties set forth in this Agreement, including but not limited to serving as Escrow Agent for the Settlement Fund, overseeing the distribution of Notice, as well as the processing and payment of any claims to the Settlement Class as set forth in this Agreement, handing all approved payments out of the Settlement Fund, and handling the determination, payment and filing of forms related to all federal, state and/or local taxes of any kind (including any interest or penalties thereon) that may be owed on any income earned by the Settlement Fund.

1.37 “Settlement Amount” means \$250,000.00 United States Dollars.

1.38 “Settlement Class” means all individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge presiding over this Action and members of

their families; (2) the Defendant, Defendant's subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who submit a timely and valid request for exclusion from the class; (4) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons; and (5) Class Counsel.

1.39 "Settlement Class Member" means an individual who falls within the definition of the Settlement Class as set forth above and who has not submitted a timely and valid request for exclusion from the Settlement Class.

1.40 "Settlement Fund" means the non-reversionary cash fund that shall be established by or on behalf of Defendant in the total amount of the Settlement Amount to be deposited into the Escrow Account, according to the schedule set forth herein, plus all interest earned thereon. From the Settlement Fund, the Settlement Administrator shall pay all Cash Awards to Settlement Class Members, Settlement Administration Expenses, any Service Award to the Class Representative, any Fee Award to Class Counsel, and any other costs, fees or expenses approved by the Court to be paid from the Settlement Fund. The Settlement Fund shall be kept in the Escrow Account with permissions granted to the Settlement Administrator to access said funds until such time as the listed payments are made. The Settlement Fund includes all interest that shall accrue on the sums deposited in the Escrow Account. The Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for all tax filings with respect to any earnings on the Settlement Fund and the payment of all taxes that may be due on such earnings. The Settlement Fund represents the total extent of Defendant's monetary obligations under this Agreement. Defendant shall not be responsible for paying any interest that may accrue on the sums deposited in the Escrow Account, and shall not be responsible for any banking fees or costs associated with the sums deposited in the Escrow Account. The payment of the Settlement Amount by, or on

behalf of, Defendant fully discharges the Defendant and the other Released Parties' financial obligations (if any) in connection with the Settlement, meaning that no Released Party shall have any other obligation to make any payment into the Escrow Account or to any Class Member, or any other Person, under this Agreement. In no event shall the total monetary obligation with respect to this Agreement on behalf of Defendant exceed \$250,000.00.

1.41 “Settlement Website” means the dedicated website created and maintained by the Settlement Administrator, which will contain relevant documents and information about the Settlement, including this Settlement Agreement, the long-form Notice and the Claim Form, as well as web-based forms for Settlement Class Members to submit electronic Claim Forms, requests for exclusion from the Settlement, and updated postal addresses to which Cash Awards should be sent after the Settlement becomes Final.

1.42 “Unknown Claims” means claims that could have been raised in the Action and that any or all of the Releasing Parties do not know or suspect to exist, which, if known by him or her, might affect his or her agreement to release the Released Parties or the Released Claims or might affect his or her decision to agree, object or not to object to the Settlement. Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties shall be deemed to have, and shall have, expressly waived and relinquished, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the provisions, rights and benefits of § 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties also shall be deemed to have, and shall have, waived any and all provisions, rights and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States, or principle of common law, or the law of any jurisdiction outside of the

United States, which is similar, comparable or equivalent to § 1542 of the California Civil Code. The Releasing Parties acknowledge that they may discover facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of this release, but that it is their intention to finally and forever settle and release the Released Claims, notwithstanding any Unknown Claims they may have, as that term is defined in this Paragraph.

2. SETTLEMENT RELIEF.

2.1 Payments to Settlement Class Members.

(a) Within thirty (30) days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant shall pay or cause to be paid the Settlement Amount into the Escrow Account.

(b) Settlement Class Members shall have until the Claims Deadline to submit an Approved Claim. Each Settlement Class Member with an Approved Claim shall be entitled to receive as a Cash Award a pro rata payment from the Settlement Fund. The pro rata payment for each Settlement Class Member will be equal to that Settlement Class Member's Out-of-Pocket Percentage multiplied by the Available Settlement Fund. Proration of amounts due to Settlement Class Members with Approved Claims shall be determined no later than 60 days after Final Judgment.

(c) The Settlement Administrator shall pay from the Settlement Fund all Cash Awards to those Settlement Class Members with Approved Claims by check or electronic payment, at the Settlement Class Member's election. Payments of Cash Awards to all Settlement Class Members with Approved Claims shall be made within ninety (90) days after entry of Final Judgment.

(d) To the extent that any Settlement Class Members do not claim their Cash Awards within one-hundred-eighty (180) days after Cash Awards are distributed in accordance with Section 2.1(b), such Settlement Class Members shall have waived their right to a Cash

Award and any unclaimed funds shall be redistributed on a *pro rata* basis (after first deducting any necessary settlement administration expenses from such unclaimed funds) to all Settlement Class Members who claimed their payments.

(e) To the extent a secondary distribution would be infeasible, any unclaimed funds shall, subject to Court approval, revert to the Legal Aid Society, a non-sectarian, not-for-profit organization, or another non-sectarian, not-for-profit organization(s) recommended by Class Counsel, not objectionable to the Defendant, and approved by the Court.

(f) Subject to the provisions pertaining to the termination or cancellation of the Settlement, as set forth in Paragraph 9, no portion of the Settlement Fund shall revert back to Defendant.

2.2 Prospective Relief. Defendant acknowledges that it has changed the purchase flow for tickets to The Edge NYC to no longer charge processing fees. Defendant agrees not to reinstate the processing fees unless: (i) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior to the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated.

3. RELEASE.

3.1 The obligations incurred pursuant to this Settlement Agreement shall be a full and final disposition of the Action and any and all Released Claims as against all Released Parties.

3.2 Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties, and each of them, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Final Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims against the Released Parties, and each of them.

4. NOTICE TO THE CLASS.

4.1 The Notice Plan shall consist of the following:

(a) *Settlement Class List.* No later than twenty-eight (28) days after the execution of this Agreement, Defendant shall produce to the Settlement Administrator with a copy to Class Counsel an electronic list from its records that includes the names, last known mail and email addresses, and the total amount of Out-of-Pocket Fees paid by each Settlement Class Member, to the extent available. This electronic document shall be called the “Class List”.

(b) *Direct Notice via Email.* No later than twenty-eight (28) days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator shall send Notice via email substantially in the form attached as Exhibit B to all Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is in the Class List. In the event transmission of email notice results in any “bounce-backs,” the Settlement Administrator shall, if possible, correct any issues that may have caused the “bounce-back” to occur, including running a “skip-trace” to identify any potential alternative email addresses, and make a second attempt to re-send the email notice.

(c) *Reminder Notice.* Both thirty (30) days prior to the Claims Deadline and seven (7) days prior to the Claims Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall send Notice via email substantially in the form attached as Exhibit B (with minor, non-material modifications to indicate that it is a reminder email rather than an initial notice), along with an electronic link to the Claim Form, to all Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Class List.

(d) *Settlement Website.* Within ten (10) days from entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Notice shall be provided on a website at an available settlement URL (such as, for example, www.hyattractionsettlement.com) which shall be obtained, administered and maintained by the Settlement Administrator and shall provide Settlement Class Members with the ability to file Claim Forms online. Copies of this Settlement Agreement, the long-form

Notice, and other pertinent documents and Court filings pertaining to the Settlement (including the motion for attorneys' fees upon its filing), shall be provided on the Settlement Website. The Notice provided on the Settlement Website shall be substantially in the form of Exhibit C hereto.

4.2 The Notice shall advise the Settlement Class of their rights, including the right to be excluded from, comment upon, and/or object to the Settlement Agreement or any of its terms. The Notice shall specify that any objection to the Settlement Agreement, and any papers submitted in support of said objection, shall be considered by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing only if, on or before the Objection/Exclusion Deadline approved by the Court and specified in the Notice, the Person making the objection files notice of an intention to do so and at the same time (a) files copies of such papers he or she proposes to be submitted at the Final Approval Hearing with the Clerk of the Court, or alternatively, if the objection is from a Class Member represented by counsel, files any objection through the Court's NYSCEF system, and (b) sends copies of such papers by mail, hand, or overnight delivery service to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel.

4.3 Any Settlement Class Member who intends to object to this Agreement must present the objection in writing, which must be personally signed by the objector, and must include: (1) the objector's name and address; (2) an explanation of the basis upon which the objector claims to be a Settlement Class Member; (3) all grounds for the objection, including all citations to legal authority and evidence supporting the objection; (4) the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting the objector in connection with the preparation or submission of the objection or who may profit from the pursuit of the objection (the "Objecting Attorneys"); and (5) a statement indicating whether the

objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either personally or through counsel who files an appearance with the Court in accordance with the Local Rules).

4.4 If a Settlement Class Member or any of the Objecting Attorneys has/have objected to any class action settlement where the objector or the Objecting Attorneys asked for or received any payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection, or any related appeal, without any modification to the settlement, then the objection described in Paragraph 4.3 above must include a statement identifying each such case by full case caption and amount of payment received.

4.5 A Settlement Class Member may request to be excluded from the Settlement Class by timely submitting a request for exclusion on the Settlement Website or sending a written request to the address identified in the Notice. Any such request for exclusion must be submitted on the Settlement Website or be postmarked on or before the Objection/Exclusion Deadline approved by the Court and specified in the Notice. To exercise the right to be excluded, a Person who would otherwise be a Settlement Class Member must timely submit a request for exclusion on the Settlement Website or send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator that contains his/her name and address, that he/she purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website, from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024; and paid a processing fee in connection with such purchase, the name and case number of the Action, and a statement that he or she wishes to be excluded from the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement. A request to be excluded that does not include all of this information, or that is sent to an address other than that designated in the Notice, or that is not postmarked within the time specified, shall be invalid, and the Person(s) serving such a request shall be a member(s) of the Settlement Class and shall be bound as a Settlement Class Member by this Agreement, if approved. Any member of the Settlement Class who validly

elects to be excluded from this Agreement shall not: (i) be bound by any orders or the Final Judgment; (ii) be entitled to relief under this Settlement Agreement; (iii) gain any rights by virtue of this Agreement; or (iv) be entitled to object to any aspect of this Agreement. Any request for exclusion must be personally signed by each Person requesting exclusion. So-called “mass” or “class” opt-outs shall not be allowed. To be valid, a request for exclusion must be submitted on the Settlement Website by 11:59 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, on the date specified in the Notice, or be postmarked or received by the date specified in the Notice.

4.6 The Final Approval Hearing shall be no earlier than ninety (90) days after the Notice described in Paragraph 4.1(b) is provided.

4.7 Any Settlement Class Member who does not, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, timely and validly seek exclusion from the Settlement Class, will be bound by all of the terms of this Agreement, including the terms of the Final Judgment to be entered in the Action and the Releases provided for in the Agreement, and will be barred from bringing any action against any of the Released Parties concerning the Released Claims.

5. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

5.1 The Settlement Administrator shall, under the supervision of the Court, administer the relief provided by this Settlement Agreement by processing Claim Forms and requests for exclusion from the Settlement, and disbursing funds from the Settlement Fund in a rational, responsive, cost effective, and timely manner. The terms of this Agreement, upon approval by the Court, shall at all times govern the scope of the services to be provided by the Settlement Administrator to administer the Settlement, and the terms of any separate contract or agreement entered into between or among the Settlement Administrator and Class Counsel, Defendant’s Counsel, or the Defendant to administer the Settlement shall be consistent in all material respects with the terms of this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain reasonably

detailed records of its activities under this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain all such records as are required by applicable law in accordance with its normal business practices and such records will be made available to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel upon request. The Settlement Administrator shall also provide reports and other information to the Court as the Court may require. The Settlement Administrator shall provide Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel with regular reports at weekly intervals containing information concerning Notice, administration, and implementation of the Settlement Agreement. Should the Court request, the Parties shall submit a timely report to the Court summarizing the work performed by the Settlement Administrator, including a report of all amounts from the Settlement Fund paid to Settlement Class Members. Without limiting the foregoing, the Settlement Administrator shall:

(a) Forward to Defendant's Counsel, with copies to Class Counsel, all original documents and other materials received in connection with the administration of the Settlement, and all copies thereof, within thirty (30) days after the Claims Deadline;

(b) Provide Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel with drafts of all administration related documents, follow-up class notices or communications with Settlement Class Members, telephone scripts, website postings or language or other communications with the Settlement Class, at least five (5) days before the Settlement Administrator is required to or intends to publish or use such communications, unless Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel agree to waive this requirement in writing on case by case basis;

(c) Receive requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class and other requests and promptly provide to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel copies thereof. If the Settlement Administrator receives any exclusion forms or other requests after the deadline for

the submission of such forms and requests, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly provide copies thereof to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel;

(d) Provide weekly reports to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel, including without limitation, reports regarding the number of Claim Forms and requests for exclusion and/or objections received; and

(e) Make available for inspection by Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel the Claim Forms received by the Settlement Administrator at any time upon reasonable notice.

5.2 The Settlement Administrator shall be obliged to employ reasonable procedures to screen claims for abuse or fraud and deny Claim Forms where there is evidence of abuse or fraud. The Settlement Administrator will reject any claim that does not comply in any material respect with the instructions on the Claim Form or is submitted after the Claims Deadline. Each claimant who submits an invalid Claim Form to the Settlement Administrator must be given a notice of the Claim Form's deficiency and an opportunity to cure the deficiency within twenty-one (21) days of the date of the notice. The Settlement Administrator may contact any Person who has submitted a Claim Form to obtain additional information necessary to verify the Claim Form.

5.3 Defendant's Counsel and Class Counsel shall have the right to challenge the acceptance or rejection of a Claim Form submitted by Settlement Class Members and to obtain and review supporting documentation relating to such Claim Form. The Settlement Administrator shall follow any decisions of Class Counsel as to the validity of any disputed submitted Claim Form.

5.4. Defendant, the Released Parties, and Defendant's Counsel shall have no responsibility for, interest in, or liability whatsoever with respect to: (i) any act, omission, or determination by Class Counsel, or the Settlement Administrator, or any of their respective

designees or agents, in connection with the administration of the Settlement or otherwise; (ii) the management, investment, or distribution of the Settlement Fund; (iii) the allocation of Settlement Funds to Settlement Class Members or the implementation, administration, or interpretation thereof; (iv) the determination, administration, calculation, or payment of any claims asserted against the Settlement Fund; (v) any losses suffered by, or fluctuations in value of, the Settlement Fund; or (vi) the payment or withholding of any Taxes, Tax Expenses, or costs incurred in connection with the taxation of the Settlement Fund or the filing of any federal, state, or local returns. The Settlement Administrator and Class Counsel will indemnify, hold harmless and defend the Defendant, the Released Parties, and Defendant's Counsel from and against any and all liabilities, including suits, judgments, costs and reasonable attorneys' fees, for anything done or omitted by the Settlement Administrator in the execution of its performance, except to the extent any such liability arises as a result of the gross negligence, willful misconduct, or bad faith of the Defendant, the Released Parties or Defense Counsel.

5.5. All taxes and tax expenses shall be paid out of the Settlement Fund, and shall be timely paid by the Settlement Administrator pursuant to this Agreement and without further order of the Court. Any tax returns prepared for the Settlement Fund (as well as the election set forth therein) shall be consistent with this Agreement and in all events shall reflect that all taxes on the income earned by the Settlement Fund shall be paid out of the Settlement Fund as provided herein. The Released Parties shall have no responsibility or liability for the acts or omissions of the Settlement Administrator or its agents with respect to the payment of taxes or tax expenses.

6. TERMINATION OF SETTLEMENT.

6.1 Subject to Paragraphs 9.1-9.3 below, Defendant or the Class Representative on behalf of the Settlement Class, shall have the right but not the obligation to terminate this

Agreement by providing written notice of the election to do so (“Termination Notice”) to all other Parties hereto within twenty-one (21) days of any of the following events: (i) the Court’s refusal to grant Preliminary Approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (ii) the Court’s refusal to grant final approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (iii) the Court’s refusal to enter the Final Judgment in this Action in any material respect; (iv) the date upon which the Final Judgment is modified or reversed in any material respect by an appellate court with jurisdiction; or (v) the date upon which an Alternate Judgment, as defined in Paragraph 9.1(d) of this Agreement is modified or reversed in any material respect by an appellate court with jurisdiction.

6.2 In addition, and subject to Paragraphs 9.1-9.3 below, Defendant shall have the right, but not the obligation, in its sole discretion, to terminate this Agreement by providing written notice to Class Counsel within twenty-five (25) days after the Objection/Exclusion Deadline if individuals comprising more than five percent (5%) of the Settlement Class in total have timely and validly opted out of and/or objected to the Agreement.

6.3 Confirmatory Discovery. Defendant has represented that it collected approximately \$250,000 in processing fees associated with electronic ticket purchases for The Edge NYC from February 16, 2024 through and including July 6, 2024. Simultaneous with the execution of this Agreement, Defendant has provided an affidavit from an appropriate representative with knowledge attesting to the same.

7. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER AND FINAL APPROVAL ORDER.

7.1 Promptly after the execution of this Settlement Agreement, Class Counsel shall file this Agreement together with the Exhibits annexed hereto with the Court and shall move the Court for Preliminary Approval of the settlement set forth in this Agreement; certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only; appointment of Class Counsel and the Class

Representatives; and entry of a Preliminary Approval Order, which order shall set a Final Approval Hearing date and approve the Notice and Claim Form for dissemination substantially in the form of Exhibits A, B, and C hereto. The Preliminary Approval Order shall also authorize the Parties, without further approval from the Court, to agree to and adopt such amendments, modifications and expansions of the Settlement Agreement and its implementing documents (including all exhibits to this Agreement) so long as they are consistent in all material respects with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and do not limit or impair the rights of the Settlement Class or materially expand the obligations of Defendant.

7.2 At the time of the submission of this Agreement to the Court as described above, Class Counsel shall request that, after Notice is given, the Court hold a Final Approval Hearing and finally approve the Settlement of the Action as set forth herein.

7.3 After Notice is given, the Parties shall request and seek to obtain from the Court a Final Judgment, which will (among other things):

(a) find that the Court has personal jurisdiction over all Settlement Class Members and that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction to approve the Agreement, including all exhibits thereto;

(b) approve the Settlement Agreement and the proposed settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to, and in the best interests of, the Settlement Class Members; direct the Parties and their counsel to implement and consummate the Agreement according to its terms and provisions; and declare the Agreement to be binding on, and have *res judicata* and preclusive effect in all pending and future lawsuits or other proceedings maintained by or on behalf of Plaintiffs and Releasing Parties;

(c) find that the Notice implemented pursuant to the Agreement (1) constitutes the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (2) constitutes notice that is

reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Agreement, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (3) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (4) meets all applicable requirements of the CPLR, the Due Process Clauses of the United States and New York Constitutions, and the rules of the Court;

(d) find that the Class Representative and Class Counsel adequately represent the Settlement Class for purposes of entering into and implementing the Agreement;

(e) dismiss the Action (including all individual claims and Settlement Class Claims presented thereby) on the merits and with prejudice, without fees or costs to any party except as provided in the Settlement Agreement;

(f) incorporate the Release set forth above, make the Release effective as of the date of the Effective Date, and forever discharge the Released Parties as set forth herein;

(g) permanently bar and enjoin all Settlement Class Members who have not been properly excluded from the Settlement Class from filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in, or participating (as class members or otherwise) in any lawsuit or other action in any jurisdiction based on the Released Claims;

(h) without affecting the finality of the Final Judgment for purposes of appeal, retain jurisdiction as to all matters relating to administration, consummation, enforcement, and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement and the Final Judgment, and for any other necessary purpose; and

(i) incorporate any other provisions, as the Court deems necessary and just.

8. CLASS COUNSEL'S ATTORNEYS' FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES; SERVICE AWARD.

8.1 Pursuant to CPLR 909 and ACAL § 25.33, Defendant agrees that Class Counsel shall be entitled to seek an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs out of the Settlement Fund in an amount to be determined by the Court as the Fee Award. With no consideration given or received, Class Counsel will limit its petition for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund (i.e., \$83,333.33). Payment of the Fee Award shall be made from the Settlement Fund and should the Court award less than the amount sought by Class Counsel, the difference in the amount sought and the amount ultimately awarded pursuant to this Paragraph shall remain in the Settlement Fund.

8.2 The Fee Award shall be payable by the Settlement Administrator within ten (10) days after entry of the Court's Final Judgment, subject to Class Counsel executing the Undertaking Regarding Attorneys' Fees and Costs (the "Undertaking") attached hereto as Exhibit D, and providing all payment routing information and tax I.D. numbers for Class Counsel. Payment of the Fee Award shall be made from the Settlement Fund by wire transfer to Class Counsel in accordance with wire instructions to be provided by Class Counsel, and completion of necessary forms, including but not limited to W-9 forms. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if for any reason the Final Judgment is reversed or rendered void as a result of an appeal(s) then any Persons or firms who shall have received the funds shall be severally liable for payments made pursuant to this subparagraph, and shall return such funds to the Settlement Fund. Additionally, should any parties to the Undertaking dissolve, merge, declare bankruptcy, become insolvent, or cease to exist prior to the final payment to Class Members, those parties shall execute a new undertaking guaranteeing repayment of funds within fourteen (14) days of such an occurrence.

8.3 Class Counsel intends to file a motion for Court approval of a Service Award to the Class Representative, to be paid from the Settlement Fund, in addition to any funds the Class

Representative stands to otherwise receive from the Settlement. With no consideration having been given or received for this limitation, Plaintiff will seek no more than \$5,000 as a Service Award. Should the Court award less than this amount, the difference in the amount sought and the amount ultimately awarded pursuant to this Paragraph shall remain in the Settlement Fund. Such Service Award shall be paid from the Settlement Fund (in the form of a check to the Class Representative that is sent care of Class Counsel), within five (5) business days after entry of the Final Judgment if there have been no objections to the Settlement Agreement, and, if there have been such objections, within five (5) business days after the Effective Date.

9. CONDITIONS OF SETTLEMENT, EFFECT OF DISAPPROVAL, CANCELLATION OR TERMINATION.

9.1 The Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement shall not occur unless and until each of the following events occurs and shall be the date upon which the last (in time) of the following events occurs:

- (a) The Parties and their counsel have executed this Agreement;
- (b) The Court has entered the Preliminary Approval Order;
- (c) The Court has entered an order finally approving the Agreement,

following Notice to the Settlement Class, as provided in the CPLR, and has entered the Final Judgment, or a judgment consistent with this Agreement in all material respects; and

(d) The Final Judgment has become Final, as defined above, or, in the event that the Court enters an Alternate Judgment, such Alternate Judgment becomes Final.

9.2 If some or all of the conditions specified in Paragraph 9.1 are not met, or in the event that this Agreement is not approved by the Court, or the Settlement set forth in this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective in accordance with its terms, then this Settlement Agreement shall be canceled and terminated subject to Paragraph 6.1, unless Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel mutually agree in writing to proceed with this Agreement. If

any Party is in material breach of the terms hereof, any other Party, provided that it is in substantial compliance with the terms of this Agreement, may terminate this Agreement on notice to all of the Parties and Settlement Class Members (which notice may be given by the Settlement Administrator via email to the email addresses on record for Settlement Class Members). Notwithstanding anything herein, the Parties agree that the Court's failure to approve, in whole or in part, the Fee Award to be requested by Class Counsel and/or the Service Award to be requested for the Class Representative, as set forth in Paragraph 8 above, shall not prevent the Agreement from becoming effective, nor shall it be grounds for termination.

9.3 If this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 6.1, 6.2 and 9.1-9.2 above, the Parties shall be restored to their respective positions in the Action as of the date of the signing of this Agreement. In such event, any Final Judgment or other order entered by the Court in accordance with the terms of this Agreement shall be treated as vacated, *nunc pro tunc*, and the Parties shall be returned to the *status quo ante* with respect to the Action as if this Agreement had never been entered into. Within five (5) business days after written notification of termination as provided in this Agreement is sent to the other Parties, the Settlement Fund (including accrued interest thereon), less any Settlement Administration costs actually incurred, paid or payable and less any taxes and tax expenses paid, due or owing, shall be refunded by the Settlement Administrator to Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel. In the event that the Final Judgment or any material part thereof is vacated, overturned, reversed, or rendered void as a result of any timely filed appeal, or the Settlement Agreement is voided, rescinded, or otherwise terminated for any other reason, Class Counsel shall, within thirty (30) days thereof repay to Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the full amount of the Fee Award, including any accrued interest, and shall cause Class Representative to repay to

Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the full amount of the Service Award, including any accrued interest. In the event the Fee Award, Service Award, or any part thereof is vacated, modified, reversed, or rendered void as a result of a timely filed appeal, Class Counsel shall within thirty (30) days thereof repay, or cause Class Representative to repay, to the Settlement Fund, based upon written instructions provided by the Settlement Administrator, the Fee Award and/or Service Award, in the amount vacated or modified, including any accrued interest.

10. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

10.1 The Parties (a) acknowledge that it is their intent to consummate this Settlement Agreement; and (b) agree, subject to their fiduciary and other legal obligations, to cooperate to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate and implement all terms and conditions of this Agreement, to exercise their reasonable best efforts to accomplish the foregoing terms and conditions of this Agreement, to secure final approval, and to defend the Final Judgment through any and all appeals. Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel agree to cooperate with one another in seeking Court approval of the Settlement Agreement, entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, and the Final Judgment, and promptly to agree upon and execute all such other documentation as may be reasonably required to obtain final approval of the Agreement.

10.2 The Parties intend this Settlement Agreement to be a final and complete resolution of all disputes between them with respect to the Released Claims by Plaintiff, the Settlement Class and each or any of them, on the one hand, against the Released Parties, and each or any of the Released Parties, on the other hand. Accordingly, the Parties agree not to assert in any forum that the Action was brought by Plaintiff or defended by Defendant, or each or any of them, in bad faith or without a reasonable basis.

10.3 The Parties have relied upon the advice and representation of counsel, selected by them, concerning their respective legal liability for the claims hereby released. The Parties have read and understand fully the above and foregoing agreement and have been fully advised as to the legal effect thereof by counsel of their own selection and intend to be legally bound by the same.

10.4 Whether or not the Effective Date occurs or the Settlement Agreement is terminated, neither this Agreement nor the settlement contained herein or any term, provision or definition therein, nor any act or communication performed or document executed in the course of negotiating, implementing or seeking approval pursuant to or in furtherance of this Agreement or the settlement:

(a) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency, arbitral proceeding or other tribunal against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission, concession or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claims, the truth of any fact alleged by the Plaintiff, the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in the Action, the alleged violation of any law or statute, the definition or scope of any term or provision, the reasonableness of the Settlement Amount or the Fee Award, or of any alleged wrongdoing, liability, negligence, or fault of the Released Parties, or any of them;

(b) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against any Released Party, as an admission, concession or evidence of any fault, misrepresentation or omission with respect to any statement or written document approved or made by the Released Parties, or any of them;

(c) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission or concession with respect to any

liability, negligence, fault or wrongdoing or statutory meaning as against any Released Parties, or supporting the certification of a litigation class, in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal. However, the Settlement, this Agreement, and any acts performed and/or documents executed in furtherance of or pursuant to this Agreement and/or Settlement may be used in any proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Agreement. Further, if this Settlement Agreement is approved by the Court, any Party or any of the Released Parties may file this Agreement and/or the Final Judgment in any action that may be brought against such Party or Parties in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, or any other theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim;

(d) is, may be deemed, or shall be construed against Plaintiff, the Settlement Class, the Releasing Parties, or each or any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission or concession that the consideration to be given hereunder represents an amount equal to, less than or greater than that amount that could have or would have been recovered after trial; and

(e) is, may be deemed, or shall be construed as or received in evidence as an admission or concession against Plaintiff, the Settlement Class, the Releasing Parties, or each and any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, that any of Plaintiffs' claims are with or without merit or that damages recoverable in the Action would have exceeded or would have been less than any particular amount.

10.5 The Parties acknowledge that (a) any certification of the Settlement Class as set forth in this Agreement, including certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes in the context of Preliminary Approval, shall not be deemed a concession that certification of a

litigation class is appropriate, or that the Settlement Class definition would be appropriate for a litigation class, nor would Defendant be precluded from challenging class certification in further proceedings in the Action or in any other action if the Settlement Agreement is not finalized or finally approved; (b) if the Settlement Agreement is not finally approved by the Court for any reason whatsoever, then any certification of the Settlement Class will be void, the Parties and the Action shall be restored to the status quo ante, and no doctrine of waiver, estoppel or preclusion will be asserted in any litigated certification proceedings in the Action or in any other action; and (c) no agreements made by or entered into by Defendant in connection with the Settlement may be used by Plaintiffs, any person in the Settlement Class, or any other person to establish any of the elements of class certification in any litigated certification proceedings, whether in the Action or any other judicial proceeding.

10.6. No person or entity shall have any claim against the Class Representative, Class Counsel, the Settlement Administrator or any other agent designated by Class Counsel, or the Released Parties and/or their counsel, arising from distributions made substantially in accordance with this Agreement. The Parties and their respective counsel and all other Released Parties shall have no liability whatsoever for the investment or distribution of the Settlement Fund or the determination, administration, calculation, or payment of any claim or nonperformance of the Settlement Administrator, the payment or withholding of taxes (including interest and penalties) owed by the Settlement Fund, or any losses incurred in connection therewith.

10.7. All proceedings with respect to the administration, processing and determination of Claim Forms and settlement payments and the determination of all controversies relating thereto, including disputed questions of law and fact with respect to the validity of Claim Forms and settlement payments, shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Court.

10.8 The headings used herein are used for the purpose of convenience only and are not meant to have legal effect.

10.9 The waiver by one Party of any breach of this Agreement by any other Party shall not be deemed as a waiver of any other prior or subsequent breaches of this Agreement.

10.10 All of the Exhibits annexed to this Agreement are material and integral parts thereof and are fully incorporated herein by this reference.

10.11 This Agreement and its Exhibits set forth the entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the matters set forth herein, and supersede all prior negotiations, agreements, arrangements and undertakings with respect to the matters set forth herein. No representations, warranties or inducements have been made to any Party concerning this Settlement Agreement or the Exhibits annexed hereto other than the representations, warranties and covenants contained and memorialized in such documents. This Agreement may be amended or modified only by a written instrument signed by or on behalf of all Parties or their respective successors-in-interest.

10.12 Except as otherwise provided herein, each Party shall bear its own costs.

10.13 Plaintiff represents and warrants that he has not assigned any claim or right or interest therein as against the Released Parties to any other Person or Party and that he is fully entitled to release the same.

10.14 Each counsel or other Person executing this Settlement Agreement, any of the Exhibits annexed hereto, or any related settlement documents on behalf of any Party hereto, hereby warrants and represents that such Person has the full authority to do so and has the authority to take appropriate action required or permitted to be taken pursuant to the Agreement to effectuate its terms.

10.15 This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. Signature by digital means, facsimile, or in PDF format will constitute sufficient execution of this Agreement. All executed counterparts and each of them shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument. A complete set of original executed counterparts shall be filed with the Court if the Court so requests. This Agreement is not binding on the Parties until fully executed by each of the Parties hereto.

10.16 This Settlement Agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors and assigns of the Parties hereto and the Released Parties.

10.17 The Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to implementation and enforcement of the terms of this Agreement, and all Parties hereto submit to the jurisdiction of the Court for purposes of implementing and enforcing the settlement embodied in this Agreement.

10.18 This Settlement Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of New York.

10.19 This Agreement is deemed to have been prepared by counsel for all Parties, as a result of arm's-length negotiations among the Parties. Because all Parties have contributed substantially and materially to the preparation of this Agreement, it shall not be construed more strictly against one Party than another.


10.20 Where this Agreement requires notice to the Parties, such notice shall be sent to the undersigned counsel: Philip L. Fraietta, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor, New York, NY 10019, pfraietta@bursor.com; Sean Haran, Walden Macht Haran & Williams LLP, 250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor, New York, NY 10281.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK;
SIGNATURE PAGES TO FOLLOW]

IT IS SO AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES:

Dated: Jan 06, 2025

JOSHUA HOMER

By: 
Homer, Josh (Jan 6, 2025 17:15 EST)

Joshua Homer, individually and as representative of
the Settlement Class

Dated: 1/6/25

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER LLC

By: 

Name: Francesca Merlino

Title: Chief Commercial Officer

IT IS SO STIPULATED BY COUNSEL:

Dated: January 7, 2025

BURSOR & FISHER, PA

By: 


Philip L. Fraietta
pfraietta@bursor.com
BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, New York 10019
Tel: (646) 837-7150
Fax: (212) 989-9163

Stefan Bogdanovich
sbogdanovich@bursor.com
BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Tel: (925) 300-4455
Fax: (925) 407-2700

Proposed Class Counsel

Dated 12/30/24

WALDEN MACHTHARAN & WILLIAMS LLP

By: 

Sean Haran
seanh@wmhwlaw.com
WALDEN MACHT HARAN & WILLIAMS LLP
250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor

New York, NY 10281
Tel: (212) 335-2033

Attorneys for Defendant

EXHIBIT A

Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC

Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk

Index No. 631543/2024

Settlement Claim Form

If you are a Settlement Class Member and wish to receive a cash payment, your completed Claim Form must be postmarked on or before [REDACTED], or submitted online on or before [REDACTED].

Please read the full notice of this settlement (available at www.hyattractionsettlemnt.com) carefully before filling out this Claim Form.

To be eligible to receive a cash payment from the settlement obtained in this class action lawsuit, you must submit this completed Claim Form online or by mail.

ONLINE: Submit this Claim Form.

MAIL: [ADDRESS]

PART ONE: CLAIMANT INFORMATION & PAYMENT METHOD ELECTION

Provide your name and contact information below. It is your responsibility to notify the Settlement Administrator of any changes to your contact information after the submission of your Claim Form.

FIRST NAME

LAST NAME

STREET ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

EMAIL ADDRESS

POTENTIAL CASH PAYMENT: You may be eligible to receive a *pro rata* cash payment, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, if you purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s Website (www.edgenyc.com) from February 16, 2024 to and through July 6, 2024.

PREFERRED PAYMENT METHOD:

Venmo Venmo Username: _____

PayPal PayPal Email: _____

Zelle Zelle Email: _____

Check

QUESTIONS? VISIT www.hyattractionsettlemnt.com OR CALL [NUMBER] TOLL-FREE

PART TWO: ATTESTATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that: (i) between February 16, 2024 to and through July 6, 2024, I purchased one or more electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website <https://www.edgenyc.com/>, and paid a processing fee in connection with such purchase; (ii) all of the information on this Claim Form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge; and (iii) I am authorized to submit this Claim Form and have not assigned or transferred any rights, claims, or remedies I may be entitled to as a Settlement Class Member in this settlement. I understand that my Claim Form may be subject to audit, verification, and Court review.

SIGNATURE**DATE**

Please keep a copy of your Claim Form for your records.

EXHIBIT B

From: SettlementAdministrator@hyattractionssettlement.com
To: JonQClassMember@domain.com
Re: Legal Notice of Class Action Settlement

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC, Index No. 631543/2024
(Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk)

Our Records Indicate You Purchased Electronic Tickets To The Edge NYC From Defendant's Website From February 16, 2024, To And Through July 6, 2024 And May Be Entitled To A Payment From A Class Action Settlement.

A court authorized this notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

This notice is to inform you that a settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, HY Attractions Manager LLC (“Defendant”), failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC, in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4). Defendant denies that it violated any law, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

Am I a Class Member? Our records indicate you may be a Class Member. Class Members are all individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s website (www.edgenyc.com) from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

What Does The Settlement Provide? A Settlement Fund of \$250,000.00 has been established to pay the Settlement Class, together with notice and administration expenses, approved attorneys’ fees and costs, and a service award to the class representative.¹ Additionally, as part of the Settlement, Defendant has represented that it is no longer charging processing fees for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC and has agreed not to reinstate those processing fees unless: (i) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior to the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated.

How Do I Get a Payment? To receive a *pro rata* share of the Settlement Fund, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, you **must** submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than [claims deadline]**. You can file a claim by clicking [[here](#).] Your payment will be by PayPal, Venmo, Zelle, or check, at your election. Claim Forms must be submitted online by 11:59 p.m. EST on [DATE] or postmarked and mailed by [DATE] (the “Claims Deadline”). Failure to submit a timely claim by the Claims Deadline will prevent you from receiving a settlement payment from the Settlement Fund.

¹ Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms shall have the meaning set forth in the Settlement Agreement which can be viewed at www.hyattractionssettlement.com.

What are My Other Options? You may exclude yourself from the Settlement Class by sending a letter to the settlement administrator no later than [objection/exclusion deadline]. If you exclude yourself, you cannot get a settlement payment, but you keep any rights you may have to sue the Defendant over the legal issues in the lawsuit. If you start your own lawsuit against Defendant after you exclude yourself, you'll have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you'll have to prove your claims. If you do exclude yourself so you can start or continue your own lawsuit against Defendant, you should talk to your own lawyer.

You and/or your lawyer have the right to appear before the Court and/or object to the proposed settlement. Your written objection must be filed no later than [objection/exclusion deadline]. Specific instructions about how to object to, or exclude yourself from, the Settlement are available at www.hyattractionssettlement.com. If you file a claim or do nothing, and the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by all of the Court's orders and judgments. In addition, your alleged claims relating to the collection of ticket processing fees in connection with electronic ticket sales from February 16, 2024 through and including July 6, 2024 by Defendant will be released.

Who Represents Me? The Court has appointed lawyers Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to represent the Settlement Class. These attorneys are called Class Counsel. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

When Will the Court Consider the Proposed Settlement? The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at [time].m. on [date] in Courtroom [number] at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, 1 Court Street, Riverhead, NY 11901. At that hearing, the Court will: hear any objections concerning the fairness of the settlement; determine the fairness of the settlement; decide whether to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs; and decide whether to award Class Representative Joshua Homer \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his service in helping to bring and settle this case. Defendant has agreed that Class Counsel may be paid reasonable attorneys' fees from the Settlement Fund in an amount to be determined by the Court. Class Counsel will seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, but the Court may award less than this amount.

How Do I Get More Information? For more information, including the full Notice and Settlement Agreement, go to www.hyattractionssettlement.com, contact the settlement administrator at 1-800-___-___ or The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement Administrator, [address], or call Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150.

EXHIBIT C

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF SUFFOLK*Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024**If You Purchased Electronic Tickets To The Edge NYC From Defendant’s Website From February 16, 2024, To And Through July 6, 2024, You May Be Entitled To A Payment From A Class Action Settlement.***A court authorized this notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.*

- A Settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, HY Attractions Manger LLC (“Defendant”), failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC, in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4). Defendant denies that it violated any law, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.
- You are included if you purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s website (www.edgenyc.com) from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.
- Read this notice carefully. Your legal rights are affected whether you act, or don’t act.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT	
SUBMIT A CLAIM FORM BY [DATE]	This is the only way to receive a payment.
EXCLUDE YOURSELF BY [DATE]	You will receive no benefits, but you will retain any rights you currently have to sue the Defendant about the claims in this case, in which you’ll have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you’ll have to prove your claims.
OBJECT BY [DATE]	Write to the Court explaining why you don’t like the Settlement.
GO TO THE HEARING ON [DATE]	Ask to speak in Court about your opinion of the Settlement.
DO NOTHING	You won’t get a share of the Settlement benefits and will give up your rights to sue the Defendant about the claims in the case.

These rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this Notice.

BASIC INFORMATION**1. Why was this Notice issued?**

QUESTIONS? CALL (800) 000-0000 TOLL FREE, OR VISIT www.hyattractionsettlement.com

A Court authorized this notice because you have a right to know about a proposed Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your options, before the Court decides whether to give final approval to the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, and your legal rights.

The case is called *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC.*, Index No. 631543/2024. The person who sued is called the Plaintiff. The Defendant is HY Attractions Manager LLC.

2. What is a class action?

In a class action, one or more people called class representatives (in this case, Joshua Homer) sue on behalf of a group or a “class” of people who have similar claims. In a class action, the court resolves the issues for all class members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Settlement Class.

3. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit claims that Defendant failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC, in alleged violation of ACAL § 25.07(4). Defendant denies that it violated any law, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Court has not decided whether the Plaintiff or the Defendant should win this case. Instead, both sides agreed to a Settlement. That way, they avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with ongoing litigation, and Settlement Class Members will get compensation sooner rather than, if at all, after the completion of a trial.

WHO’S INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

5. How do I know if I am in the Settlement Class?

The Court decided that everyone who fits the following description is a member of the **Settlement Class**:

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

“Defendant’s ebsite” means <https://www.edgenyc.com/>.

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

QUESTIONS? CALL (800) 000-0000 TOLL FREE, OR VISIT www.hyattractionssettlement.com

6. What does the Settlement provide?

Monetary Relief. A Settlement Fund has been created totaling \$250,000.00. Payments to Settlement Class Members, and the cost to administer the Settlement, the cost to inform people about the Settlement, attorneys' fees (inclusive of litigation costs), and an award to the Class Representative will also come out of this fund (*see* Question 12).

Prospective Relief. Additionally, as part of the Settlement, Defendant has represented that it is no longer charging processing fees for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC and has agreed not to reinstate those processing fees unless: (i) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior to the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated.

A detailed description of the settlement benefits can be found in the Settlement Agreement, a copy of which is accessible on the Settlement Website by clicking [here](#).
[insert hyperlink]

7. How much will my payment be?

To receive a *pro rata* share of the Settlement Fund, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, you **must** submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than** [claims deadline]. You can file a claim by clicking [here.] Your payment will be by PayPal, Venmo, Zelle, or check, at your election. Claim Forms must be submitted online by 11:59 p.m. EST on [DATE] or postmarked and mailed by [DATE]. You can contact Class Counsel at (646) 837-7150 to inquire as to the number of claims and/or requests for exclusion that have been received to date.

8. When will I get my payment?

The hearing to consider the fairness of the settlement is scheduled for [Final Approval Hearing Date]. If the Court approves the settlement, eligible Settlement Class Members whose claims were approved by the Settlement Administrator will receive their payment 90 calendar days after entry of Final Judgment. The payment will be made in the form of a check, unless you elect to receive payment by PayPal, Zelle, or Venmo, and all checks will expire and become void 180 days after they are issued.

HOW TO GET BENEFITS

9. How do I get a payment?

If you are a Settlement Class Member and you want to get a payment, you **must** complete and submit a Claim Form by [Claims Deadline]. Claim Forms can be found and submitted by clicking [here](#) [hyperlink], or by printing and mailing a paper Claim Form, copies of which are available for download [here](#) [hyperlink]. Failure to submit a

QUESTIONS? CALL (800) 000-0000 TOLL FREE, OR VISIT www.hyattractionssettlement.com

timely claim by the Claims Deadline will prevent you from receiving a settlement payment from the Settlement Fund.

We also encourage you to submit your claim on-line. Not only is it easier and more secure, but it is completely free and takes only minutes!

REMAINING IN THE SETTLEMENT

10. What am I giving up if I stay in the Settlement Class?

If the Settlement becomes final, you will give up your right to sue the Defendant and other Released Parties for the claims being resolved by this Settlement. The specific claims you are giving up against the Defendant are described in the Settlement Agreement. You will be “releasing” the Defendant and its affiliates, employees, and representatives as described in Section 1.32 of the Settlement Agreement. Unless you exclude yourself (*see* Question 13), you are “releasing” the claims, regardless of whether you claim your electronic payment or not. The Settlement Agreement is available through the “court documents” link on the website.

The Settlement Agreement describes the released claims with specific descriptions, so read it carefully. If you have any questions you can talk to the lawyers listed in Question 11 for free or you can, of course, talk to your own lawyer if you have questions about what this means.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

11. Do I have a lawyer in the case?

The Court has appointed Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to be the attorneys representing the Settlement Class. They are called “Class Counsel.” They believe, after conducting an extensive investigation, that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

12. How will the lawyers be paid?

The Defendant has agreed that Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs may be paid out of the Settlement Fund in an amount to be determined by the Court. The fee petition will seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, inclusive of reimbursement of their costs and expenses; the Court may award less than this amount. Under the Settlement Agreement, any amount awarded to Class Counsel will be paid out of the Settlement Fund.

Subject to approval by the Court, Defendant has agreed that the Class Representative may be paid a service award of \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his services in helping to bring and resolve this case.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

13. How do I get out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must submit a request for exclusion by 11:59 p.m. EST on [objection/exclusion deadline]. Requests for exclusion may be submitted either on the Settlement Website (via the online form accessible [here](#) [insert hyperlink]) or by mailing or otherwise delivering a letter (or request for exclusion) stating that you want to be excluded from the *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. XXXX settlement. Your letter or request for exclusion must also include your name, your address, a statement that you purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website (www.edgenyc.com) from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024, and paid a processing fee in connection with such purchase, your signature, the name and number of this case, and a statement that you wish to be excluded. If you choose to submit a request for exclusion by mail, you must mail or deliver your exclusion request, postmarked no later than [objection/exclusion deadline], to the following address:

The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement
0000 Street
City, ST 00000

14. If I don't exclude myself, can I sue the Defendant for the same thing later?

No. Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue the Defendant for the claims being resolved by this Settlement.

15. If I exclude myself, can I get anything from this Settlement?

No. If you exclude yourself, you will not receive any payment from the Settlement Fund.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

16. How do I object to the Settlement?

If you are a member of the Settlement Class, you can object to the Settlement if you don't like any part of it. You can give reasons why you think the Court should not approve it. The Court will consider your views. To object, you must file with the Court a letter or brief stating that you object to the Settlement in *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. XXXXXX and identify all your reasons for your objections

QUESTIONS? CALL (800) 000-0000 TOLL FREE, OR VISIT www.hyattractionsettlement.com

(including citations and supporting evidence) and attach any materials you rely on for your objections. Your letter or brief must also include your name, your address, the basis upon which you claim to be a member of the Settlement Class, the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting you in connection with your objection, and your signature. If you, or an attorney assisting you with your objection, have ever objected to any class action settlement where you or the objecting attorney has asked for or received payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection (or any related appeal) without modification to the settlement, you must include a statement in your objection identifying each such case by full case caption. You must also mail or deliver a copy of your letter or brief to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel listed below.

Class Counsel will file with the Court and post on this website its request for attorneys' fees by [two weeks prior to objection deadline].

If you want to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing to object to the Settlement, with or without a lawyer (explained below in answer to Question Number 20), you must say so in your letter or brief. File the objection with the Court (or mail the objection to the Court) and mail a copy of the objection to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel, at the addresses below, postmarked no later than [objection deadline].

Court	Class Counsel	Defendant's Counsel
Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk 1 Court Street, Courtroom [redacted] Riverhead, NY 11901	Philip L. Fraietta Bursor & Fisher P.A. 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor New York, NY 10019	Sean Haran Walden Macht Haran & Williams LLP 250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor New York, NY 10281

17. What's the difference between objecting and excluding myself from the Settlement?

Objecting simply means telling the Court that you don't like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Settlement Class. Excluding yourself from the Settlement Class is telling the Court that you don't want to be part of the Settlement Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you.

THE COURT'S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

18. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?

The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at [redacted] .m. on [date] in Courtroom [redacted] at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, 1 Court Street, Riverhead, NY 11901. The purpose of the hearing will be for the Court to determine

QUESTIONS? CALL (800) 000-0000 TOLL FREE, OR VISIT www.hyattractionssettlement.com

whether to approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class; to consider the Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and expenses; and to consider the request for an incentive award to the Class Representative. At that hearing, the Court will be available to hear any objections and arguments concerning the fairness of the Settlement.

The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time without notice, so it is a good idea to check for updates by visiting the Settlement Website at www.hyattractionssettlement.com or calling (800) 000-0000. If, however, you timely objected to the Settlement and advised the Court that you intend to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing, you will receive notice of any change in the date of the Final Approval Hearing.

19. Do I have to come to the hearing?

No. Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. But, you are welcome to come at your own expense. If you send an objection or comment, you don't have to come to Court to talk about it. As long as you filed and mailed your written objection on time, the Court will consider it. You may also pay another lawyer to attend, but it's not required.

20. May I speak at the hearing?

Yes. You may ask the Court for permission to speak at the Final Approval Hearing. To do so, you must include in your letter or brief objecting to the settlement a statement saying that it is your "Notice of Intent to Appear in *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024." It must include your name, address, telephone number and signature as well as the name and address of your lawyer, if one is appearing for you. Your objection and notice of intent to appear must be filed with the Court and postmarked no later than [objection deadline], and be sent to the addresses listed in Question 16.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

21. Where do I get more information?

This Notice summarizes the Settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You can get a copy of the Settlement Agreement at www.hyattractionssettlement.com. You may also write with questions to The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement, P.O. Box 0000, City, ST 00000. You can call the Settlement Administrator at (800) 000-0000 or Class Counsel at (646) 837-7150, if you have any questions. Before doing so, however, please read this full Notice carefully. You may also find additional information elsewhere on the case website.

EXHIBIT D

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER LLC,

Defendant.

Index No. 631543/2024

**STIPULATION REGARDING UNDERTAKING RE: ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS,
AND EXPENSES**

Plaintiff Joshua Homer (“Plaintiff”) and HY Attractions Manager LLC (“Defendant”) (collectively, “the Parties”), by and through and including (as applicable) their undersigned counsel, stipulate and agree as follows:

WHEREAS, Bursor & Fisher, P.A. (the “Firm”) desires to give an undertaking (the “Undertaking”) for repayment of the award of attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses approved by the Court, and

WHEREAS, the Parties agree that this Undertaking is in the interests of all Parties and in service of judicial economy and efficiency.

NOW, THEREFORE, the undersigned counsel, as agent for his law firm, hereby submits his law firm to the jurisdiction of the Court for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Undertaking.

Capitalized terms used herein without definition have the meanings given to them in the Settlement Agreement.

By receiving any payments pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Firm and its shareholders, members, and/or partners submit to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk for the enforcement of and any and all disputes relating to or arising out of the reimbursement obligation set forth herein and in the Settlement Agreement.

In the event that the Final Approval Order or any part of it is vacated, overturned, reversed, or rendered void as a result of a timely filed appeal, or the Settlement Agreement is voided, rescinded, or otherwise terminated for any other reason, the Firm shall, within thirty (30) days thereof, repay to Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the full amount of the Fee Award, including any accrued interest.

In the event the Final Approval Order is upheld, but the attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses awarded by the Court or any part of them are vacated, modified, reversed, or rendered void as a result of a timely filed appeal, the Firm shall within thirty (30) days thereof repay to the Settlement Fund, based upon written instructions provided by the Settlement Administrator, the attorneys' fees and costs paid to the Firm from the applicable Settlement Fund in the amount vacated or modified, including any accrued interest.

This Undertaking and all obligations set forth herein shall expire upon finality of all direct appeals of the Final Approval Order.

In the event the Firm fails to repay to Defendant any of attorneys' fees and costs that are owed to it pursuant to this Undertaking, the Court shall, upon application of Defendant, and notice to the Firm, summarily issue orders, including but not limited to judgments and attachment orders against the Firm, and may make appropriate findings for sanctions for contempt of court.

The undersigned stipulate, warrant, and represent that he has both actual and apparent authority to enter into this stipulation, agreement, and undertaking on behalf of the Firm.

This Undertaking may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. Signatures by facsimile, PDF, or other electronic means shall be as effective as original signatures.

The undersigned declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that they have read and understand the foregoing and that it is true and correct.

IT IS SO STIPULATED THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD:

DATED: January 7, 2025

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.



By: Scott A. Bursor, on behalf of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.
Attorneys for Plaintiff

DATED: 1/8, 2025

WALDEN MACHT HARAN & WILLIAMS LLP



By: Sean Haran, on behalf of Defendant HY Attractions
Manager LLC

EXHIBIT 2

SHORT FORM ORDER

Index No. 631543/2024

SUPREME COURT - STATE OF NEW YORK
I.A.S. PART 17 - SUFFOLK COUNTY

PRESENT:

MOTION DATE 03/03/2025
Mot. Seq. # 002-MOTD

HON. CHRISTOPHER MODELEWSKI
Justice of the Supreme Court

-----X

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

-against-

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER, LLC,

Defendant.

-----X

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A
Attorneys for Plaintiff & Proposed Class
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, New York 10019

WALDEN MACHT HARAN & WILLIAMS, LLP
Attorneys for Defendant
250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor
New York, New York 10281

Upon the e-filed documents in this matter numbered 14 to 22, considered on the instant unopposed motion of the Plaintiff’s attorney in this action for an order (I) granting preliminary approval of the Class Action Settlement; (ii) provisionally certifying the Settlement Class under CPLR 902 in connection with the settlement process; (iii) appointing Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. as Class Counsel; (iv) appointing Joshua Homer as the Class Representative for the Settlement Class; and (v) approving the Notice Plan for the Class Action Settlement described in the Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits, as well as the specific Notice of Class Action and Proposed Settlement (the “Proposed Notice”), attached as Exhibits B-C to the Settlement Agreement, and directing distribution of the Proposed Notice; it is

ORDERED that the motion is granted, to the extent and as provided for herein, and the matter is set down for a fairness hearing on JULY 2, 2025 at 11:00 A.M.

The instant matter is a putative consumer class action suit alleging that defendant failed to disclose a “processing fee” on its Website for electronic admission tickets to it’s the Edge NYC, prior to those tickets being selected for purchase, in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law (“ACAL”) § 25.07(4). Before the Court is a motion for an Order (I) granting preliminary approval of the Class Action Settlement; (ii) provisionally certifying the Settlement Class under CPLR 902 in connection with the settlement process; (iii) appointing Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. as Class Counsel; (iv) appointing Joshua Homer as the Class Representative for the Settlement Class; and (v) approving the Notice Plan for the Class Action Settlement described in the Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits, as well as the specific Notice of Class Action and Proposed

Homer v HY Attractions Manager, LLC
Index No. 631543/2024
Page 2

Settlement (the “Proposed Notice”), attached as Exhibits B-C to the Settlement Agreement, and directing distribution of the Proposed Notice.

Article 9 of the CPLR is to be “liberally construed” (*Beller v William Penn Life Ins. Co. of N.Y.*, 37 AD3d 747, 748, 830 NYS2d 759 [2d Dept 2007]; *Jacobs v Macy’s e, Inc.*, 17 AD3d 318, 319, 792 NYS2d 574 [2d Dept 2005] in favor of the granting of class certification if all of the prerequisites of CPLR 901(a)(1) through (5) and CPLR 902(1) through (5) are met (*see Matter of Colt Indus. Shareholder Litig.*, 77 NY2d 185, 566 NE2d 1160, 565 NYS2d 755 [1991]; *Klein v Robert’s Am. Gourmet Food, Inc.*, 28 AD3d 63, 808 NYS2d 766 [2d Dept 2006]; *Ackerman v Price Waterhouse*, 252 AD2d 179, 683 NYS2d 179 [1st Dept 1998]).

“The prerequisites articulated in CPLR 901(a) include proof that the proposed class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, that common questions of law and fact applicable to the class predominate over questions affecting only individual members, that claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class, and that the class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.”

Preliminary Approval of Settlement

At the outset, this Court must make an initial evaluation of whether the proposed settlement “is fair, adequate, reasonable, and in the best interest of class members” (*Klein v Robert’s Am. Gourmet Food, Inc.*, 28 AD3d at 73; *see Matter of Traffic Exec. Assoc.-Eastern R.R.*, 627 F.2d 631, 634 [2d Cir 1980]).

“Where, as here, the action is primarily one for the recovery of money damages, determining the adequacy of a proposed settlement generally involves balancing the value of that settlement against the present value of the anticipated recovery following a trial on the merits, discounted for the inherent risks of litigation” (*Klein v Robert’s Am. Gourmet Food, Inc.*, 28 AD3d at 73).

In light of the nature of the alleged processing fee violation that was only in effect from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024, and which also showed that Defendant collected approximately \$250,000 in processing fees associated with electronic ticket purchases to The Edge NYC during that time period, and on the submissions now before the Court, it appears that the lump sum fund set forth in the settlement agreement in the amount of \$250,000 fairly and adequately compensates the class members for the undisclosed processing fee, and is in their overall best interest.

Conditional Certification of the Proposed Settlement Class

On the record before the Court at this time, it appears to the Court that this action satisfies all of the prerequisites of New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (“CPLR”) §901, and that consideration of the CPLR §902 factors support certification for purposes of settlement.

The Court provisionally certifies the following class under Article 9 of the CPLR, for settlement purposes only (“Settlement Class”).

Homer v HY Attractions Manager, LLC

Index No. 631543/2024

Page 3

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, Defendant's subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who submit a timely and valid request for exclusion from the class; (4) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons; and (5) Class Counsel.

Appointment of Named Plaintiff's Counsel as Class Counsel

The Court appoints Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A., as Class Counsel because based upon the record before the Court, it appears they did substantial work identifying, investigating, litigating, and settling the named plaintiff's and the class members' claims, have experience prosecuting and settling consumer class actions, and are well-versed in consumer class action lawsuits.

Based upon the record before the Court, it appears that the work that the Bursor & Fisher, P.A. law firm has performed both in litigating and settling this case demonstrates their commitment to the class and to representing the interests of class members.

Appointment of the Named Plaintiff

The Court appoints Named Plaintiff Joshua Homer as the class representative.

Class Notice and Claims Form

The Court approves the proposed Notice Plan for the Class Action Settlement described in the Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits.

CPLR §908 requires that "[n]otice of the proposed. . . compromise [of a class action] shall be given to members of the class in such manner as the court directs."

The contents of the Class Notice complies with due process. The Class Notice describes the terms of the settlement, explains how class members can participate in the settlement and how class members can object or opt-out, informs the class about the allocation of attorneys' fees and costs, and provides specific information regarding the date, time, and place of the final approval hearing.

Class Action Settlement Procedure

The Court hereby adopts the following settlement procedure:

Within 14 days after the Court issues its Order Granting Preliminary Approval, Defendant will provide both Class Counsel and the Settlement Claims Administrator with

Homer v HY Attractions Manager, LLC
Index No. 631543/2024
Page 4

a list, in electronic form with the names, dates of employment and last known address of Named Plaintiff and all Class Members (the "Class List");

The Settlement Claims Administrator shall mail, via First Class United States mail, postage prepaid, the Notice of Class Members within 24 days after the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order by the Court;

Class Members will have 45 days from the date the Class Notice and Claims Form is initially mailed to file a Claims Form, opt out of or object to the settlement ("Notice Period"). To be effective, the Claims Form, objection or opt-out must be received by the Settlement Claims Administrator within 45 days of the initial mailing of the Class Notice and Claims Form.

Named Plaintiff will file a Motion for Final Approval of Settlement no later than five (5) calendar days before the Fairness Hearing.

The Court will hold a final Fairness Hearing on JULY 2, 2025 at 11:00 a.m., (which date is approximately 90 days after the date of this Order) at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, located at 1 Court Street, Riverhead, New York, 11901.

If the Court grants Named Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Court will issue an Order Granting Final Approval. If no party appeals the Court's Order Granting Final Approval, the "Final Effective Date" of settlement will be thirty (30) days after the Court enters its Order Granting Final Approval and the expiration of any appeal period.

If there is an appeal the latest of the following, if applicable, becomes the Final Effective Date: (1) any appeal from the Final Approval Order has been finally dismissed; (2) the Final Approval Order has been affirmed on appeal in a form substantially identical to the form of the Final Approval Order entered by the Court; (3) the time to petition for review with respect to any appellate decision affirming the Final Approval Order has expired; and (4) if a petition for review of an appellate decision is filed, the petition has been denied or dismissed, or, if granted, has resulted in affirmance of the Final Approval Order in a form entered by the Court;

The Settlement Claims Administrator will pay the Class Members who timely file a Claims Form and who do not opt out, their individual settlement payments within thirty (30) days after the Final Effective Date;

The Settlement Claims Administrator will pay the Court-approved service payment to Named Plaintiff within thirty (30) days after the Final Effective Date;

The Settlement Claims Administrator will pay Class Counsel its Court-approved attorneys' fees and expenses within thirty (30) days after the motion for final approval is granted;

The Settlement Claims Administrator shall recover its agreed upon fees from the Settlement Amount. In the event that the Settlement Agreement is not finally approved,


Homer v HY Attractions Manager, LLC
Index No. 631543/2024
Page 5

any fees and expenses of the Settlement Claims Administrator already spent or funds attributable to labor and/or expenses incurred but not yet paid shall be paid out of the Settlement Fund; and

The parties shall abide by all other terms of the Settlement Agreement.

The foregoing constitutes the decision and Order of the Court.

Dated: April 10, 2025



HON. CHRISTOPHER MODELEWSKI, J.S.C.

____ FINAL DISPOSITION X NON-FINAL DISPOSITION



www.bursor.com

701 BRICKELL AVENUE
MIAMI, FL 33131

1330 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019

1990 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD.
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

FIRM RESUME

With offices in Florida, New York, and California, BURSOR & FISHER lawyers have represented both plaintiffs and defendants in state and federal courts throughout the country.

The lawyers at our firm have an active civil trial practice, having won multi-million-dollar verdicts or recoveries in six of six class action jury trials since 2008. Our most recent class action trial victory came in May 2019 in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel and won a \$267 million jury verdict against a debt collector found to have violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. During the pendency of the defendant's appeal, the case settled for \$75.6 million, the largest settlement in the history of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

In August 2013 in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel, we won a jury verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (II)*, we obtained a \$50 million jury verdict in favor of a certified class of 150,000 purchasers of the Avacor Hair Regrowth System. The legal trade publication VerdictSearch reported that this was the second largest jury verdict in California in 2009, and the largest in any class action.

The lawyers at our firm have an active class action practice and have won numerous appointments as class counsel to represent millions of class members, including customers of Honda, Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, Sprint, Haier America, and Michaels Stores as well as purchasers of Avacor™, Hydroxycut, and Sensa™ products. Bursor & Fisher lawyers have been court-appointed Class Counsel or Interim Class Counsel in:

1. *O'Brien v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.* (D.N.J. Dec. 16, 2010) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of LG French-door refrigerators,
2. *Ramundo v. Michaels Stores, Inc.* (N.D. Ill. June 8, 2011) to represent a certified nationwide class of consumers who made in-store purchases at Michaels Stores using a debit or credit card and had their private financial information stolen as a result,
3. *In re Haier Freezer Consumer Litig.* (N.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2011) to represent a certified class of purchasers of mislabeled freezers from Haier America Trading, LLC,
4. *Rodriguez v. CitiMortgage, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 14, 2011) to represent a certified nationwide class of military personnel against CitiMortgage for illegal foreclosures,

5. *Rossi v. The Procter & Gamble Co.* (D.N.J. Jan. 31, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Crest Sensitivity Treatment & Protection toothpaste,
6. *Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp. et al.* (D.N.J. Feb. 21, 2012) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of mislabeled Maytag Centennial washing machines from Whirlpool Corp., Sears, and other retailers,
7. *In re Sensa Weight Loss Litig.* (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Sensa weight loss products,
8. *In re Sinus Buster Products Consumer Litig.* (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers,
9. *Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Capatriti 100% Pure Olive Oil,
10. *Forcellati v. Hyland's, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of children's homeopathic cold and flu remedies,
11. *Ebin v. Kangadis Family Management LLC, et al.* (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Capatriti 100% Pure Olive Oil,
12. *In re Scotts EZ Seed Litig.* (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 26, 2015) to represent a certified class of purchasers of Scotts Turf Builder EZ Seed,
13. *Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., et al.* (E.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2015) to represent a certified class of purchasers of mislabeled KitchenAid refrigerators from Whirlpool Corp., Best Buy, and other retailers,
14. *Hendricks v. StarKist Co.* (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2015) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of StarKist tuna products,
15. *In re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Card Litig.* (N.D. Cal. May 8, 2015) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of NVIDIA GTX 970 graphics cards,
16. *Melgar v. Zicam LLC, et al.* (E.D. Cal. March 30, 2016) to represent a certified ten-jurisdiction class of purchasers of Zicam Pre-Cold products,
17. *In re Trader Joe's Tuna Litigation* (C.D. Cal. December 21, 2016) to represent purchaser of allegedly underfilled Trader Joe's canned tuna.
18. *In re Welspun Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. January 26, 2017) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of Welspun Egyptian cotton bedding products,
19. *Retta v. Millennium Products, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. January 31, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of Millennium kombucha beverages,
20. *Moeller v. American Media, Inc.,* (E.D. Mich. June 8, 2017) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
21. *Hart v. BHH, LLC* (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2017) to represent a nationwide class of purchasers of Bell & Howell ultrasonic pest repellers,
22. *McMillion v. Rash Curtis & Associates* (N.D. Cal. September 6, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received calls from Rash Curtis & Associates,

23. *Lucero v. Solarcity Corp.* (N.D. Cal. September 15, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received telemarketing calls from Solarcity Corp.,
24. *Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2017) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
25. *Gasser v. Kiss My Face, LLC* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2017) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of cosmetic products,
26. *Gastelum v. Frontier California Inc.* (S.F. Superior Court February 21, 2018) to represent a certified California class of Frontier landline telephone customers who were charged late fees,
27. *Williams v. Facebook, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2018) to represent a proposed nationwide class of Facebook users for alleged privacy violations,
28. *Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2018) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
29. *Bayol v. Health-Ade* (N.D. Cal. August 23, 2018) to represent a proposed nationwide class of Health-Ade kombucha beverage purchasers,
30. *West v. California Service Bureau* (N.D. Cal. September 12, 2018) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received calls from California Service Bureau,
31. *Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corporation* (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 14, 2018) to represent a nationwide class of purchasers of protein shake products,
32. *Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2018) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
33. *Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel Inc. d/b/a Holiday Cruise Line* (N.D. Ill. Mar. 21, 2019) to represent a certified class of individuals who received calls from Holiday Cruise Line,
34. *Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson* (E.D. Cal. March 29, 2019) to represent a certified class of purchasers of Benecol spreads labeled with the representation “No Trans Fat,”
35. *Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. April 24, 2019) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
36. *Galvan v. Smashburger* (C.D. Cal. June 25, 2019) to represent a proposed class of purchasers of Smashburger’s “Triple Double” burger,
37. *Kokoszki v. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Feb. 7, 2020) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
38. *Russett v. The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.* (S.D.N.Y. May 28, 2020) to represent a class of insurance policyholders that were allegedly charged unlawful paper billing fees,
39. *In re: Metformin Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (D.N.J. June 3, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of generic diabetes medications that were contaminated with a cancer-causing carcinogen,

40. *Hill v. Spirit Airlines, Inc.* (S.D. Fla. July 21, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of passengers whose flights were cancelled by Spirit Airlines due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19, and whose tickets were not refunded,
41. *Kramer v. Alterra Mountain Co.* (D. Colo. July 31, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers to recoup the unused value of their Ikon ski passes after Alterra suspended operations at its ski resorts due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
42. *Qureshi v. American University* (D.D.C. July 31, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by American University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
43. *Hufford v. Maxim Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2020) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
44. *Desai v. Carnegie Mellon University* (W.D. Pa. Aug. 26, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Carnegie Mellon University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
45. *Heigl v. Waste Management of New York, LLC* (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 27, 2020) to represent a class of waste collection customers that were allegedly charged unlawful paper billing fees,
46. *Stellato v. Hofstra University* (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Hofstra University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
47. *Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), to represent consumers who purchased defective chainsaws,
48. *Soo v. Lorex Corporation* (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), to represent consumers whose security cameras were intentionally rendered non-functional by manufacturer,
49. *Miranda v. Golden Entertainment (NV), Inc.* (D. Nev. Dec. 17, 2020), to represent consumers and employees whose personal information was exposed in a data breach,
50. *Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, Inc.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Feb. 4, 2021), to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received text messages from SmileDirectClub, in alleged violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act,
51. *Suren v. DSV Solutions, LLC* (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Apr. 8, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
52. *De Lacour v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.* (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 23, 2021), to represent a certified class of consumers who purchased allegedly “natural” Tom’s of Maine products,
53. *Wright v. Southern New Hampshire University* (D.N.H. Apr. 26, 2021), to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Southern New Hampshire University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,

54. *Sahlin v. Hospital Housekeeping Systems, LLC* (Cir. Ct. Williamson Cnty. May 21, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
55. *Landreth v. Verano Holdings LLC, et al.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. June 2, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.
56. *Rocchio v. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey*, (Sup. Ct., Middlesex Cnty. October 27, 201), to represent a certified nationwide class of students for fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Rutgers due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
57. *Malone v. Western Digital Corp.*, (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2021), to represent a class of consumers who purchased hard drives that were allegedly deceptively advertised,
58. *Jenkins v. Charles Industries, LLC*, (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Dec. 21, 2021) to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
59. *Frederick v. Examsoft Worldwide, Inc.*, (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Jan. 6, 2022) to represent a certified class of exam takers who used virtual exam proctoring software, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
60. *Isaacson v. Liqui-Box Flexibles, LLC, et al.*, (Cir. Ct. Will Cnty. Jan. 18, 2022) to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
61. *Goldstein et al. v. Henkel Corp.*, (D. Conn. Mar. 3, 2022) to represent a proposed class of purchasers of Right Guard-brand antiperspirants that were allegedly contaminated with benzene,
62. *McCall v. Hercules Corp.*, (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Westchester Cnty. Mar. 14, 2022) to represent a certified class of who laundry card purchasers who were allegedly subjected to deceptive practices by being denied cash refunds,
63. *Lewis v. Trident Manufacturing, Inc.*, (Cir. Ct. Kane Cnty. Mar. 16, 2022) to represent a certified class of workers who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
64. *Croft v. Spinx Games Limited, et al.*, (W.D. Wash. Mar. 31, 2022) to represent a certified class of Washington residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Washington law,
65. *Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC*, (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022) to represent a certified class of Illinois residents whose identities were allegedly used without their consent in alleged violation of the Illinois Right of Publicity Act,
66. *Rivera v. Google LLC*, (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Apr. 25, 2022) to represent a certified class of Illinois residents who appeared in a photograph in Google Photos, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
67. *Loftus v. Outside Integrated Media, LLC*, (E.D. Mich. May 5, 2022) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,

68. *D'Amario v. The University of Tampa*, (S.D.N.Y. June 3, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by The University of Tampa due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
69. *Fittipaldi v. Monmouth University*, (D.N.J. Sept. 22, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Monmouth University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
70. *Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al.* (Cir. Ct. Henderson Cnty. Oct. 3, 2022) to present a certified class of Kentucky residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Kentucky law,
71. *Cruz v. The Connor Group, A Real Estate Investment Firm, LLC*, (N.D. Ill. Oct. 26, 2022) to represent a certified class of workers who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
72. *Delcid et al. v. TCP HOT Acquisitions LLC et al.* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Sure and Brut-brand antiperspirants that were allegedly contaminated with benzene,
73. *Kain v. The Economist Newspaper NA, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Dec. 15, 2022) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
74. *Strano v. Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Jan. 6, 2023) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
75. *Moeller v. The Week Publications, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Jan. 6, 2023) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
76. *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC* (D. Mass. May 25, 2023) to represent a nationwide class of newspaper subscribers who were also Facebook users under the Video Privacy Protection Act,
77. *In re: Apple Data Privacy Litigation*, (N.D. Cal. July 5, 2023) to represent a putative nationwide class of all persons who turned off permissions for data tracking and whose mobile app activity was still tracked on iPhone mobile devices,
78. *Young v. Military Advantage, Inc. d/b/a Military.com* (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. July 26, 2023) to represent a nationwide class of website subscribers who were also Facebook users under the Video Privacy Protection Act,
79. *Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd.* (Cir. Ct. Henderson Cnty. Aug. 15, 2023) to represent a certified class of Kentucky residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Kentucky law,
80. *Kotila v. Charter Financial Publishing Network, Inc.* (W.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2024) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
81. *Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research* (W.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2024) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,

82. *Norcross v. Tishman Speyer Properties, et al.* (S.D.N.Y. May 17, 2024) to represent a class of online ticket purchasers under New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4).

SCOTT A. BURSOR

Mr. Bursor has an active civil trial practice, having won multi-million verdicts or recoveries in six of six civil jury trials since 2008. Mr. Bursor's most recent victory came in May 2019 in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel and won a \$267 million jury verdict against a debt collector for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA).

In *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.* (2013), where Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel, the jury returned a verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc.* (2009), the jury returned a \$50 million verdict in favor of the plaintiff and class represented by Mr. Bursor. The legal trade publication VerdictSearch reported that this was the second largest jury verdict in California in 2009.

Class actions are rarely tried to verdict. Other than Mr. Bursor and his partner Mr. Fisher, we know of no lawyer that has tried more than one class action to a jury. Mr. Bursor's perfect record of six wins in six class action jury trials, with recoveries ranging from \$21 million to \$299 million, is unmatched by any other lawyer. Each of these victories was hard-fought against top trial lawyers from the biggest law firms in the United States.

Mr. Bursor graduated from the University of Texas Law School in 1996. He served as Articles Editor of the Texas Law Review, and was a member of the Board of Advocates and Order of the Coif. Prior to starting his own practice, Mr. Bursor was a litigation associate at a large New York based law firm where he represented telecommunications, pharmaceutical, and technology companies in commercial litigation.

Mr. Bursor is a member of the state bars of New York, Florida, and California, as well as the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits, and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, and the Eastern District of Michigan.

Representative Cases

Mr. Bursor was appointed lead or co-lead class counsel to the largest, 2nd largest, and 3rd largest classes ever certified. Mr. Bursor has represented classes including more than 160 million class members, roughly 1 of every 2 Americans. Listed below are recent cases that are representative of Mr. Bursor's practice:

Mr. Bursor negotiated and obtained court-approval for two landmark settlements in *Nguyen v. Verizon Wireless* and *Zill v. Sprint Spectrum* (the largest and 2nd largest classes ever certified). These settlements required Verizon and Sprint to open their wireless networks to

third-party devices and applications. These settlements are believed to be the most significant legal development affecting the telecommunications industry since 1968, when the FCC's Carterfone decision similarly opened up AT&T's wireline telephone network.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum, L.P.* representing a class of approximately 2 million California consumers who were charged an early termination fee under a Sprint cellphone contract, asserting claims that such fees were unlawful liquidated damages under the California Civil Code, as well as other statutory and common law claims. After a five-week combined bench-and-jury trial, the jury returned a verdict in June 2008 and the Court issued a Statement of Decision in December 2008 awarding the plaintiffs \$299 million in cash and debt cancellation. Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel for this class again in 2013 during a month-long jury trial in which Sprint asserted a \$1.06 billion counterclaim against the class. Mr. Bursor secured a verdict awarding Sprint only \$18.4 million, the exact amount calculated by the class's damages expert. This award was less than 2% of the damages Sprint sought, less than 6% of the amount of the illegal termination fees Sprint charged to class members. In December 2016, after more than 13 years of litigation, the case was settled for \$304 million, including \$79 million in cash payments plus \$225 million in debt cancellation.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *White v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* representing a class of approximately 1.4 million California consumers who were charged an early termination fee under a Verizon cellphone contract, asserting claims that such fees were unlawful liquidated damages under the California Civil Code, as well as other statutory and common law claims. In July 2008, after Mr. Bursor presented plaintiffs' case-in-chief, rested, then cross-examined Verizon's principal trial witness, Verizon agreed to settle the case for a \$21 million cash payment and an injunction restricting Verizon's ability to impose early termination fees in future subscriber agreements.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *Thomas v. Global Visions Products Inc.* Mr. Bursor represented a class of approximately 150,000 California consumers who had purchased the Avacor® hair regrowth system. In January 2008, after a four-week combined bench-and-jury trial, Mr. Bursor obtained a \$37 million verdict for the class, which the Court later increased to \$40 million.

Mr. Bursor was appointed class counsel and was elected chair of the Official Creditors' Committee in *In re Nutraquest Inc.*, a Chapter 11 bankruptcy case before Chief Judge Garrett E. Brown, Jr. (D.N.J.) involving 390 ephedra-related personal injury and/or wrongful death claims, two consumer class actions, four enforcement actions by governmental agencies, and multiple adversary proceedings related to the Chapter 11 case. Working closely with counsel for all parties and with two mediators, Judge Nicholas Politan (Ret.) and Judge Marina Corodemus (Ret.), the committee chaired by Mr. Bursor was able to settle or otherwise resolve every claim and reach a fully consensual Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, which Chief Judge Brown approved in late 2006. This settlement included a \$12.8 million recovery to a nationwide class of consumers who alleged they were defrauded in connection with the purchase of Xenadrine® dietary supplement products.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *In re: Pacific Bell Late Fee Litigation*. After filing the first class action challenging Pac Bell's late fees in April 2010, winning a contested

motion to certify a statewide California class in January 2012, and defeating Pac Bell's motion for summary judgment in February 2013, Mr. Bursor obtained final approval of the \$38 million class settlement. The settlement, which Mr. Bursor negotiated the night before opening statements were scheduled to commence, included a \$20 million cash payment to provide refunds to California customers who paid late fees on their Pac Bell wireline telephone accounts, and an injunction that reduced other late fee charges by \$18.6 million.

L. TIMOTHY FISHER

L. Timothy Fisher has an active practice in consumer class actions and complex business litigation and has also successfully handled a large number of civil appeals.

Mr. Fisher has been actively involved in numerous cases that resulted in multi-million dollar recoveries for consumers and investors. Mr. Fisher has handled cases involving a wide range of issues including nutritional labeling, health care, telecommunications, corporate governance, unfair business practices and consumer fraud. With his partner Scott A. Bursor, Mr. Fisher has tried five class action jury trials, all of which produced successful results. In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products*, Mr. Fisher obtained a jury award of \$50,024,611 — the largest class action award in California in 2009 and the second-largest jury award of any kind. In 2019, Mr. Fisher served as trial counsel with Mr. Bursor in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, where the jury returned a verdict for \$267 million in statutory damages under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Mr. Fisher was admitted to the State Bar of California in 1997. He is also a member of the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, the Northern District of Illinois, the Eastern District of Michigan, and the Eastern District of Missouri. Mr. Fisher taught appellate advocacy at John F. Kennedy University School of Law in 2003 and 2004. In 2010, he contributed jury instructions, a verdict form and comments to the consumer protection chapter of Justice Elizabeth A. Baron's *California Civil Jury Instruction Companion Handbook* (West 2010). In January 2014, Chief Judge Claudia Wilken of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California appointed Mr. Fisher to a four-year term as a member of the Court's Standing Committee on Professional Conduct.

Mr. Fisher received his Juris Doctor from Boalt Hall at the University of California at Berkeley in 1997. While in law school, he was an active member of the Moot Court Board and participated in moot court competitions throughout the United States. In 1994, Mr. Fisher received an award for Best Oral Argument in the first-year moot court competition.

In 1992, Mr. Fisher graduated with highest honors from the University of California at Berkeley and received a degree in political science. Prior to graduation, he authored an honors thesis for Professor Bruce Cain entitled "The Role of Minorities on the Los Angeles City Council." He is also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Representative Cases

Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (Alameda County Superior Court). Mr. Fisher litigated claims against Global Vision Products, Inc. and other individuals in connection with the sale and marketing of a purported hair loss remedy known as Avacor. The case lasted more than seven years and involved two trials. The first trial resulted in a verdict for plaintiff and the class in the amount of \$40,000,000. The second trial resulted in a jury verdict of \$50,024,611, which led to a \$30 million settlement for the class.

In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases - Handset Locking Actions (Alameda County Superior Court). Mr. Fisher actively worked on five coordinated cases challenging the secret locking of cell phone handsets by major wireless carriers to prevent consumers from activating them on competitive carriers' systems. Settlements have been approved in all five cases on terms that require the cell phone carriers to disclose their handset locks to consumers and to provide unlocking codes nationwide on reasonable terms and conditions. The settlements fundamentally changed the landscape for cell phone consumers regarding the locking and unlocking of cell phone handsets.

In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases - Early Termination Fee Cases (Alameda County Superior Court and Federal Communications Commission). In separate cases that are a part of the same coordinated litigation as the Handset Locking Actions, Mr. Fisher actively worked on claims challenging the validity under California law of early termination fees imposed by national cell phone carriers. In one of those cases, against Verizon Wireless, a nationwide settlement was reached after three weeks of trial in the amount of \$21 million. In a second case, which was tried to verdict, the Court held after trial that the \$73 million of flat early termination fees that Sprint had collected from California consumers over an eight-year period were void and unenforceable.

Selected Published Decisions

Melgar v. Zicam LLC, 2016 WL 1267870 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2016) (certifying 10-jurisdiction class of purchasers of cold remedies, denying motion for summary judgment, and denying motions to exclude plaintiff's expert witnesses).

Salazar v. Honest Tea, Inc., 2015 WL 7017050 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2015) (denying motion for summary judgment).

Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., 2015 WL 1932484 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2015) (certifying California class of purchasers of refrigerators that were mislabeled as Energy Star qualified).

Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc., 78 F.Supp.3d 1252 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (denying motion to dismiss claims alleging unlawful late fees under California Civil Code § 1671).

Forcellati v. Hyland's, Inc., 2015 WL 9685557 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2015) (denying motion for summary judgment in case alleging false advertising of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc., 2014 WL 4793935 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2014) (denying motion to transfer venue pursuant to a forum selection clause).

Forcellati v. Hyland's Inc., 2014 WL 1410264 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) (certifying nationwide class of purchasers of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

Hendricks v. StarKist Co., 30 F.Supp.3d 917 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (denying motion to dismiss in case alleging underfilling of 5-ounce cans of tuna).

Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., 2013 WL 5781673 (E.D. Cal. October 25, 2013) (denying motion to dismiss in case alleging that certain KitchenAid refrigerators were misrepresented as Energy Star qualified).

Forcellati v. Hyland's Inc., 876 F.Supp.2d 1155 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (denying motion to dismiss complaint alleging false advertising regarding homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

Clerkin v. MyLife.com, 2011 WL 3809912 (N.D. Cal. August 29, 2011) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss in case alleging false and misleading advertising by a social networking company).

In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases, 186 Cal.App.4th 1380 (2010) (affirming order approving \$21 million class action settlement).

Gatton v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., 152 Cal.App.4th 571 (2007) (affirming order denying motion to compel arbitration).

Selected Class Settlements

Melgar v. Zicam (Eastern District of California) - \$16 million class settlement of claims alleging cold medicine was ineffective.

Gastelum v. Frontier California Inc. (San Francisco Superior Court) - \$10.9 million class action settlement of claims alleging that a residential landline service provider charged unlawful late fees.

West v. California Service Bureau, Inc. (Northern District of California) - \$4.1 million class settlement of claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp. (Southern District of New York) - \$9 million class settlement of false advertising claims against protein shake manufacturer.

Morris v. SolarCity Corp. (Northern District of California) - \$15 million class settlement of claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Retta v. Millennium Products, Inc. (Central District of California) - \$8.25 million settlement to resolve claims of bottled tea purchasers for alleged false advertising.

Forcellati v. Hyland's (Central District of California) – nationwide class action settlement providing full refunds to purchasers of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children.

Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool (Eastern District of California) – class action settlement providing \$55 cash payments to purchasers of certain KitchenAid refrigerators that allegedly mislabeled as Energy Star qualified.

In Re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation (Northern District of California) - \$4.5 million class action settlement of claims alleging that a computer graphics card was sold with false and

misleading representations concerning its specifications and performance.

Hendricks v. StarKist Co. (Northern District of California) – \$12 million class action settlement of claims alleging that 5-ounce cans of tuna were underfilled.

In re Zakskorn v. American Honda Motor Co. Honda (Eastern District of California) – nationwide settlement providing for brake pad replacement and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses in case alleging defective brake pads on Honda Civic vehicles manufactured between 2006 and 2011.

Correa v. Sensa Products, LLC (Los Angeles Superior Court) - \$9 million settlement on behalf of purchasers of the Sensa weight loss product.

In re Pacific Bell Late Fee Litigation (Contra Costa County Superior Court) - \$38.6 million settlement on behalf of Pac Bell customers who paid an allegedly unlawful late payment charge.

In re Haier Freezer Consumer Litigation (Northern District of California) - \$4 million settlement, which provided for cash payments of between \$50 and \$325.80 to class members who purchased the Haier HNCM070E chest freezer.

Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (Alameda County Superior Court) - \$30 million settlement on behalf of a class of purchasers of a hair loss remedy.

Guyette v. Viacom, Inc. (Alameda County Superior Court) - \$13 million settlement for a class of cable television subscribers who alleged that the defendant had improperly failed to share certain tax refunds with its subscribers.

JOSEPH I. MARCHESE

Joseph I. Marchese is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joe focuses his practice on consumer class actions, employment law disputes, and commercial litigation. He has represented corporate and individual clients in a wide array of civil litigation, and has substantial trial and appellate experience.

Joe has diverse experience in litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of mislabeling, false or misleading advertising, privacy violations, unlawful and junk fees, data breach claims, and violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Joe also has significant experience in multidistrict litigation proceedings. Recently, he served on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In Re: Blue Buffalo Company, Ltd. Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2562, which resulted in a \$32 million consumer class settlement. Currently, he serves on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee for Economic Reimbursement in *In Re: Valsartan Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2875.

Joe is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York,

and the Eastern District of Michigan, as well as the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Second and Sixth Circuits.

Joe graduated from Boston University School of Law in 2002 where he was a member of The Public Interest Law Journal. In 1998, Joe graduated with honors from Bucknell University.

Selected Published Decisions:

Farwell v. Google, LLC, 595 F. Supp. 3d 702 (C.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), denying defendant's motion to dismiss BIPA claims brought on behalf of Illinois students using Google's Workspace for Education platform.

Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 269 F. Supp. 3d 172 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 7, 2017), granting plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment on state privacy law violations in putative class action.

Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 192 F. Supp. 3d 427 (S.D.N.Y. June 17, 2016), denying publisher's motion to dismiss its subscriber's allegations of state privacy law violations in putative class action.

In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

In re Michaels Stores Pin Pad Litigation, 830 F. Supp. 2d 518 (N.D. Ill. 2011), denying retailer's motion to dismiss its customers' state law consumer protection and privacy claims in data breach putative class action.

Selected Class Settlements:

Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation, Case No. 22-cv-0188-HYJ-RSK (W.D. Mich. 2024) – final approval granted for \$52.5 million class settlement to resolve claims of periodical subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Edwards v. Mid-Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, Case No. 22-cv-00562-TJM-CFH (N.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$2.2 million class settlement to resolve claims alleging unlawfully charged overdraft fees on accounts with sufficient funds.

Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, LLC, Case No. 2020-CH-07269 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$11.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged TCPA violations.

Marquez v. Google LLC, Case No. 2021-CH-1460 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$100 million class settlement to resolve alleged BIPA violations of Illinois residents appearing on the Google Photos platform.

Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc., Case No. 15-cv-09279-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$50 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast, Case No. 15-cv-05671-NRB (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$13.75 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation, Case No. 12-cv-4727-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$47 million class settlement to resolve false advertising claims of purchasers of combination grass seed product.

In Re: Blue Buffalo Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation, Case No. 14-MD-2562-RWS (E.D. Mo. 2016) – final approval granted for \$32 million class settlement to resolve claims of pet owners for alleged false advertising of pet foods.

Rodriguez v. Citimortgage, Inc., Case No. 11-cv-4718-PGG (S.D.N.Y. 2015) – final approval granted for \$38 million class settlement to resolve claims of military servicemembers for alleged foreclosure violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, where each class member was entitled to \$116,785 plus lost equity in the foreclosed property and interest thereon.

O'Brien v. LG Electronics USA, Inc., et al., Case No. 10-cv-3733-DMC (D.N.J. 2011) – final approval granted for \$23 million class settlement to resolve claims of Energy Star refrigerator purchasers for alleged false advertising of the appliances' Energy Star qualification.

SARAH N. WESTCOT

Sarah N. Westcot is the Managing Partner of Bursor & Fisher's Miami office. She focuses her practice on consumer class actions, complex business litigation, and mass torts.

She has represented clients in a wide array of civil litigation, and has substantial trial and appellate experience. Sarah served as trial counsel in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, where Bursor & Fisher won a jury verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

Sarah also has significant experience in high-profile, multi-district litigations. She currently serves on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re Zantac (Ranitidine) Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2924 (S.D. Florida). She also serves on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In re Apple Inc. App Store Simulated Casino-Style Games Litigation*, MDL No. 2985 (N.D. Cal.) and *In Re: Google Play Store Simulated Casino-Style Games Litigation*, MDL No. 3001 (N.D. Cal.).

Sarah is admitted to the State Bars of California and Florida, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern Districts of California, the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, and the bars of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Eighth, and Ninth Circuits.

Sarah received her Juris Doctor from the University of Notre Dame Law School in 2009. During law school, she was a law clerk with the Cook County State's Attorney's Office in Chicago and the Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office in San Jose, CA, gaining early trial experience in both roles. She graduated with honors from the University of Florida in 2005.

Sarah is a member of The National Trial Lawyers Top 100 Civil Plaintiff Lawyers, and was selected to The National Trial Lawyers Top 40 Under 40 Civil Plaintiff Lawyers for 2022.

JOSHUA D. ARISOHN

Joshua D. Arisohn is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Josh has litigated precedent-setting cases in the areas of consumer class actions and terrorism. He participated in the first ever trial to take place under the Anti-Terrorism Act, a statute that affords U.S. citizens the right to assert federal claims for injuries arising out of acts of international terrorism. Josh's practice continues to focus on terrorism-related matters as well as class actions.

Josh is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Josh previously practiced at Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP and DLA Piper LLP. He graduated from Columbia University School of Law in 2006, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, and received his B.A. from Cornell University in 2002. Josh has been honored as a 2015, 2016 and 2017 Super Lawyer Rising Star.

Selected Published Decisions:

Fields v. Syrian Arab Republic, Civil Case No. 18-1437 (RJL), entering a judgment of approximately \$850 million in favor of the family members of victims of terrorist attacks carried out by ISIS with the material support of Syria.

Farwell v. Google LLC, 2022 WL 1568361 (C.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), denying social media defendant's motion to dismiss BIPA claims brought on behalf of Illinois school students using Google's Workspace for Education platform on laptop computers.

Weiman v. Miami University, Case No. 2020-00614JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

Smith v. The Ohio State University, Case No. 2020-00321JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

Waitt v. Kent State University, Case No. 2020-00392JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

Duke v. Ohio University, Case No. 2021-00036JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

Keba v. Bowling Green State University, Case No. 2020-00639JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

Kirkbride v. The Kroger Co., Case No. 2:21-cv-00022-ALM-EPD, denying motion to dismiss claims based on the allegation that defendant overstated its usual and customary prices and thereby overcharged customers for generic drugs.

Selected Class Settlements:

Morris v. SolarCity Corp., Case No. 3:15-cv-05107-RS (N.D. Cal.) - final approval granted for \$15 million class settlement to resolve claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.*

Marquez v. Google LLC, Case No. 2021-CH-1460 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$100 million class settlement to resolve alleged BIPA violations of Illinois residents appearing in photos on the Google Photos platform.

NEAL J. DECKANT

Neal J. Deckant is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A., where he serves as the firm's Head of Information & e-Discovery. Neal focuses his practice on complex business litigation and consumer class actions. Prior to joining Bursor & Fisher, Neal counseled low-income homeowners facing foreclosure in East Boston.

Neal is admitted to the State Bars of California and New York, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and the bars of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Neal received his Juris Doctor from Boston University School of Law in 2011, graduating cum laude with two Dean's Awards. During law school, Neal served as a Senior

Articles Editor for the Review of Banking and Financial Law, where he authored two published articles about securitization reforms, both of which were cited by the New York Court of Appeals, the highest court in the state. Neal was also awarded Best Oral Argument in his moot court section, and he served as a Research Assistant for his Securities Regulation professor. Neal has also been honored as a 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 Super Lawyers Rising Star. In 2007, Neal graduated with Honors from Brown University with a dual major in East Asian Studies and Philosophy.

Selected Published Decisions:

Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson, 2019 WL 1429653 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2019), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of Benecol spreads labeled with the representation “No Trans Fats.”

Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp., 2017 WL 6513347 (D.N.J. Dec. 20, 2017), granting class certification of consumer protection claims brought by purchasers of Maytag Centennial washing machines marked with the “Energy Star” logo.

Duran v. Obesity Research Institute, LLC, 204 Cal. Rptr. 3d 896 (Cal. Ct. App. 2016), reversing and remanding final approval of a class action settlement on appeal, regarding allegedly mislabeled dietary supplements, in connection with a meritorious objection.

Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al., 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting individual and law firm defendants’ motion for judgment as a matter of law on plaintiff’s claims for retaliation and defamation, as well as for all claims against law firm partners, Nadeem and Lubna Faruqi.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor’s motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

Selected Class Settlements:

In Re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation, Case No. 15-cv-00760-PJH (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2016) – final approval granted for \$4.5 million class action settlement to resolve claims that a computer graphics card was allegedly sold with false and misleading representations concerning its specifications and performance.

Hendricks v. StarKist Co., 2016 WL 5462423 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016) – final approval granted for \$12 million class action settlement to resolve claims that 5-ounce cans of tuna were allegedly underfilled.

In re: Kangadis Food Inc., Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014) – class action claims resolved for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy, following claims that its olive oil was allegedly sold with false and misleading representations.

Selected Publications:

Neal Deckant, *X. Reforms of Collateralized Debt Obligations: Enforcement, Accounting and Regulatory Proposals*, 29 Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 79 (2009) (cited in *Quadrant Structured Products Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, 16 N.E.3d 1165, 1169 n.8 (N.Y. 2014)).

Neal Deckant, *Criticisms of Collateralized Debt Obligations in the Wake of the Goldman Sachs Scandal*, 30 Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 407 (2010) (cited in *Quadrant Structured Products Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, 16 N.E.3d 1165, 1169 n.8 (N.Y. 2014)); *Lyon Village Venetia, LLC v. CSE Mortgage LLC*, 2016 WL 476694, at *1 n.1 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. Feb. 4, 2016); Ivan Ascher, *Portfolio Society: On the Capitalist Mode of Prediction*, at 141, 153, 175 (Zone Books / The MIT Press 2016); Devon J. Steinmeyer, *Does State National Bank of Big Spring v. Geithner Stand a Fighting Chance?*, 89 Chi.-Kent. L. Rev. 471, 473 n.13 (2014)).

YITZCHAK KOPEL

Yitzchak Kopel is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Yitz focuses his practice on consumer class actions and complex business litigation. He has represented corporate and individual clients before federal and state courts, as well as in arbitration proceedings.

Yitz has substantial experience in successfully litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of consumer fraud, data breaches, and violations of the telephone consumer protection act. Since 2014, Yitz has obtained class certification on behalf of his clients five times, three of which were certified as nationwide class actions. Bursor & Fisher was appointed as class counsel to represent the certified classes in each of the cases.

Yitz is admitted to the State Bars of New York and New Jersey, the bar of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Eleventh, and Ninth Circuits, and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, Eastern District of New York, Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern District of Wisconsin, Northern District of Illinois, and District of New Jersey.

Yitz received his Juris Doctorate from Brooklyn Law School in 2012, graduating *cum laude* with two Dean's Awards. During law school, Yitz served as an Articles Editor for the Brooklyn Law Review and worked as a Law Clerk at Shearman & Sterling. In 2009, Yitz graduated *cum laude* from Queens College with a B.A. in Accounting.

Selected Published Decisions:

Bassaw v. United Industries Corp., 482 F.Supp.3d 80, 2020 WL 5117916 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2020), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning insect foggers.

Poppiti v. United Industries Corp., 2020 WL 1433642 (E.D. Mo. Mar. 24, 2020), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning citronella candles.

Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc., 2019 WL 6699188 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 9, 2019), granting summary judgment on behalf of certified class in robocall class action.

Krumm v. Kittrich Corp., 2019 WL 6876059 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 17, 2019), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning mosquito repellent.

Crespo v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 394 F. Supp. 3d 260 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), denying defendant's motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action regarding Raid insect fogger.

Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc., 2019 WL 1294659 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 21, 2019), certifying a class of persons who received robocalls in the state of Illinois.

Bourbia v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 375 F. Supp. 3d 454 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), denying defendant's motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action regarding mosquito repellent.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 323 F. Supp. 3d 560 (S.D.N.Y. 2018), denying defendants' motion for summary judgment in certified class action involving the sale of ultrasonic pest repellers.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 2018 WL 3471813 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2018), denying defendants' motion to exclude plaintiffs' expert in certified class action involving the sale of ultrasonic pest repellers.

Penrose v. Buffalo Trace Distillery, Inc., 2018 WL 2334983 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 5, 2018), denying bourbon producers' motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action.

West v. California Service Bureau, Inc., 323 F.R.D. 295 (N.D. Cal. 2017), certifying a nationwide class of "wrong-number" robocall recipients.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 2017 WL 2912519 (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2017), certifying nationwide class of purchasers of ultrasonic pest repellers.

Browning v. Unilever United States, Inc., 2017 WL 7660643 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2017), denying motion to dismiss fraud and warranty claims in putative class action concerning facial scrub product.

Brenner v. Procter & Gamble Co., 2016 WL 8192946 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2016), denying motion to dismiss warranty and consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning baby wipes.

Hewlett v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc., 2016 WL 4466536 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2016), denying telemarketer's motion to dismiss TCPA claims in putative class action.

Bailey v. KIND, LLC, 2016 WL 3456981 (C.D. Cal. June 16, 2016), denying motion to dismiss fraud and warranty claims in putative class action concerning snack bars.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 2016 WL 2642228 (S.D.N.Y. May 5, 2016) denying motion to dismiss warranty and consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning ultrasonic pest repellents.

Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al., 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting clients' motion for judgment as a matter of law on claims for retaliation and defamation in employment action.

In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

Brady v. Basic Research, L.L.C., 101 F. Supp. 3d 217 (E.D.N.Y. 2015), denying diet pill manufacturers' motion to dismiss its purchasers' allegations for breach of express warranty in putative class action.

Ward v. TheLadders.com, Inc., 3 F. Supp. 3d 151 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), denying online job board's motion to dismiss its subscribers' allegations of consumer protection law violations in putative class action.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor's motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

Selected Class Settlements:

Hart v. BHH, LLC, Case No. 1:15-cv-04804 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 22, 2020), resolving class action claims regarding ultrasonic pest repellents.

In re: Kangadis Food Inc., Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014), resolving class action claims for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy following the certification of nationwide claims alleging that its olive oil was sold with false and misleading representations.

West v. California Service Bureau, Case No. 4:16-cv-03124-YGR (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2019), resolving class action claims against debt-collector for wrong-number robocalls for \$4.1 million.

PHILIP L. FRAIETTA

Philip L. Fraietta is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Phil focuses his practice on data privacy, complex business litigation, consumer class actions, and employment law disputes. Phil has been named a “Rising Star” in the New York Metro Area by Super Lawyers[®] every year since 2019.

Phil has significant experience in litigating consumer class actions, particularly those involving privacy claims under statutes such as the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act, the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, and Right of Publicity statutes. Since 2016, Phil has recovered over \$100 million for class members in privacy class action settlements. In addition to privacy claims, Phil has significant experience in litigating and settling class action claims involving false or misleading advertising.

Phil is admitted to the State Bars of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Michigan, and California, the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the Western District of New York, the Northern District of New York, the District of New Jersey, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the Northern District of Illinois, the Central District of Illinois, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, and Ninth Circuits. Phil was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Phil received his Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law in 2014, graduating cum laude. During law school, Phil served as an Articles & Notes Editor for the Fordham Law Review, and published two articles. In 2011, Phil graduated cum laude from Fordham University with a B.A. in Economics.

Selected Published Decisions:

Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC, 2022 WL 971479 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), certifying class of Illinois residents for alleged violations of Illinois’ Right of Publicity Act by background reporting website.

Kolebuck-Utz v. Whitepages Inc., 2021 WL 157219 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 22, 2021), denying defendant’s motion to dismiss for alleged violations of Ohio’s Right to Publicity Law.

Bergeron v. Rochester Institute of Technology, 2020 WL 7486682 (W.D.N.Y. Dec. 18, 2020), denying university’s motion to dismiss for failure to refund tuition and fees for the Spring 2020 semester in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Porter v. NBTY, Inc., 2019 WL 5694312 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 4, 2019), denying supplement manufacturer’s motion for summary judgment on consumers’ allegations of false advertising relating to whey protein content.

Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 269 F. Supp. 3d 172 (S.D.N.Y. 2017), granting plaintiff’s motion for partial summary judgment on state privacy law violations in putative class action.

Selected Class Settlements:

Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc., Case No. 15-cv-09279-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$50 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc., Case No. 16-cv-02444-KMK (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$16.375 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast, Case No. 15-cv-05671-NRB (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$13.75 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, LLC, Case No. 2020-CH-07269 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2021) – final approval granted for \$11.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged TCPA violations.

Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp., Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$9 million class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.

Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc., Case No. 16-cv-01812-KMK (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$8.225 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Moeller v. American Media, Inc., Case No. 16-cv-11367-JEL (E.D. Mich. 2017) – final approval granted for \$7.6 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Rocchio v. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Case No. MID-L-003039-20 (Sup. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$5 million class settlement to resolve claims for failure to refund mandatory fees for the Spring 2020 semester in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Heigl v. Waste Management of New York, LLC, Case No. 19-cv-05487-WFK-ST (E.D.N.Y. 2021) – final approval granted for \$2.7 million class settlement to resolve claims for charging allegedly unlawful fees pertaining to paper billing.

Frederick v. Examsoft Worldwide, Inc., Case No. 2021L001116 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$2.25 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged BIPA violations.

ALEC M. LESLIE

Alec Leslie is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. He focuses his practice on consumer class actions, employment law disputes, and complex business litigation.

Alec is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bar of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York. Alec was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Alec received his Juris Doctor from Brooklyn Law School in 2016, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Alec served as an Articles Editor for Brooklyn Law Review. In addition, Alec served as an intern to the Honorable James C. Francis for the Southern District of New York and the Honorable Vincent Del Giudice, Supreme Court, Kings County. Alec graduated from the University of Colorado with a B.A. in Philosophy in 2012.

Selected Class Settlements:

Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp., Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.

Wright v. Southern New Hampshire Univ., Case No. 1:20-cv-00609-LM (D.N.H. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 tuition and fee refunds to students.

Mendoza et al. v. United Industries Corp., Case No. 21PH-CV00670 (Phelps Cnty. Mo. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve false advertising claims on insect repellent products.

Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc., Case No. 8:19-cv-01203-JVS-DFM (C.D. Cal. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly defective and dangerous chainsaws.

Rocchio v. Rutgers Univ., Case No. MID-L-003039-20 (Middlesex Cnty. N.J. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

Malone v. Western Digital Corporation, Case No. 5:20-cv-03584-NC (N.D. Cal.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve false advertising claims on hard drive products.

Frederick et al. v. ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc., Case No. 2021L001116 (DuPage Cnty. Ill. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over alleged BIPA violations with respect to exam proctoring software.

D'Amario et al. v. Univ. of Tampa, Case No. 7:20-cv-07344 (S.D.N.Y. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

Olin et al. v. Meta Platforms, Inc., Case No. 3:18-cv-01881-RS (N.D. Cal. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement involving invasion of privacy claims.

Croft v. SpinX Games et al., Case No. 2:20-cv-01310-RSM (W.D. Wash. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al., Case No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cnty. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Barbieri v. Tailored Brands, Inc., Index No. 616696/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Metzner et al. v. Quinnipiac Univ., Case No. 3:20-cv-00784 (D. Conn.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

In re GE/Canon Data Breach, Case No. 1:20-cv-02903 (S.D.N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve data breach claims.

Davis v. Urban Outfitters, Inc., Index No. 612162/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Armstead v. VGW Malta LTD et al., Civil Action No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Casler et al. v. Mclane Company, Inc. et al., Index No. 616432/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Wyland v. Woopla, Inc., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00356 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Graziano et al. v. Lego Systems, Inc., Index No. 611615/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Lipsky et al. v. American Behavioral Research Institute, LLC, Case No. 50-2023-CA-011526-XXXX-MB (Palm Beach Cnty. Fl.) – final approval granted to resolve allegedly deceptive automatic renewal and product efficacy claims.

Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00358 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

STEPHEN BECK

Stephen is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Stephen focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Stephen is admitted to the State Bar of Florida and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, the Eastern District of Missouri, and the Northern District of Illinois.

Stephen received his Juris Doctor from the University of Miami School of Law in 2018. During law school, Stephen received an Honors distinction in the Litigation Skills Program and was awarded the Honorable Theodore Klein Memorial Scholarship for excellence in written and oral advocacy. Stephen also received the CALI Award in Legislation for earning the highest grade on the final examination. Stephen graduated from the University of North Florida with a B.A. in Philosophy in 2015.

STEFAN BOGDANOVICH

Stefan Bogdanovich is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Stefan litigates complex civil and class actions typically involving privacy, intellectual property, entertainment, and false advertising law.

Prior to working at Bursor & Fisher, Stefan practiced at two national law firms in Los Angeles. He helped represent various companies in false advertising and IP infringement cases, media companies in defamation cases, and motion picture producers in royalty disputes. He also advised corporations and public figures on complying with various privacy and advertising laws and regulations.

Stefan is admitted to the State Bar of California and all of the California Federal District Courts. He is also a Certified Information Privacy Professional.

Stefan received his Juris Doctor from the University of Southern California Gould School of Law in 2018, where he was a member of the Hale Moot Court Honors Program and the Trial Team. He received the highest grade in his class in three subjects, including First Amendment Law.

BRITTANY SCOTT

Brittany Scott is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Brittany focuses her practice on data privacy, complex civil litigation, and consumer class actions. Brittany was an intern with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Brittany has substantial experience litigating consumer class actions, including those involving data privacy claims under statutes such as the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act. In addition to data privacy claims, Brittany has significant experience in litigating class action claims involving false and misleading advertising.

Brittany is admitted the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern Districts of California, the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the Northern District of Illinois, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, and Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Brittany received her Juris Doctor from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2019, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Brittany was a member of the Constitutional Law Quarterly, for which she was the Executive Notes Editor. Brittany published a note in the Constitutional Law Quarterly entitled “Waiving Goodbye to First Amendment Protections: First Amendment Waiver by Contract.” Brittany also served as a judicial extern to the Honorable Andrew Y.S. Cheng for the San Francisco Superior Court. In 2016, Brittany graduated from the University of California Berkeley with a B.A. in Political Science.

Selected Class Settlements:

Morrissey v. Tula Life, Inc., Case No. 2021L0000646 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2021) – final approval granted for \$4 million class settlement to resolve claims of cosmetics purchasers for alleged false advertising.

Clarke et al. v. Lemonade Inc., Case No. 2022LA000308 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$4 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged BIPA violations.

Whitlock v. Jabil Inc., Case No. 2021CH00626 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$995,000 class settlement to resolve claims for alleged BIPA violations.

MAX S. ROBERTS

Max Roberts is an Associate in Bursor & Fisher’s New York office. Max focuses his practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection. Max was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm and is now Co-Chair of the firm’s Appellate Practice Group.

In 2023, Max was named “Rising Star” in the New York Metro Area by Super Lawyers®.

Max received his Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law in 2019, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Max was a member of Fordham’s Moot Court Board, the Brennan Moore Trial Advocates, and the Fordham Urban Law Journal, for which he published a note entitled [*Weaning Drug Manufacturers Off Their Painkiller: Creating an Exception to the Learned Intermediary Doctrine in Light of the Opioid Crisis*](#). In addition, Max served as an intern to the Honorable Vincent L. Briccetti of the Southern District of New York and the Fordham Criminal Defense Clinic. Max graduated from Johns Hopkins University in 2015 with a B.A. in Political Science.

Outside of the law, Max is an avid triathlete.

Selected Published Decisions:

Huertas v. Bayer US LLC, 120 F.4th 1169 (3d Cir. 2024), reversing district court and holding plaintiffs had alleged an injury-in-fact sufficient for Article III standing. Max personally argued the appeal before the Third Circuit, which can be listened to [here](#).

Jackson v. Amazon.com, Inc., 65 F.4th 1093 (9th Cir. 2023), affirming district court's denial of motion to compel arbitration. Max personally argued the appeal before the Ninth Circuit, which can be viewed [here](#).

Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC, 2022 WL 1744107 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022), reversing district court and holding that Section 631 of the California Invasion of Privacy Act requires prior consent to wiretapping. Max personally argued the appeal before the Ninth Circuit, which can be viewed [here](#).

Mora v. J&M Plating, Inc., 213 N.E.3d 942 (Ill. App. Ct. 2d Dist. 2022), reversing circuit court and holding that Section 15(a) of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act requires an entity to establish a retention and deletion schedule for biometric data at the first moment of possession. Max personally argued the appeal before the Second District, which can be listened to [here](#).

Shah v. Fandom, Inc., --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2024 WL 4539577 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of California pen register statute.

Yockey v. Salesforce, Inc., --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2024 WL 3875785 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2024), denying motion dismiss alleged violations of California and Pennsylvania wiretapping statutes.

Gladstone v. Amazon Web Services, Inc., --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2024 WL 3276490 (W.D. Wash. July 2, 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of California wiretapping statute.

Rancourt v. Meredith Corp., 2024 WL 381344 (D. Mass. Jan. 11, 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of federal Video Privacy Protection Act, and finding personal jurisdiction over operator of mobile application.

Saunders v. Hearst Television, Inc., 711 F. Supp. 3d 24 (D. Mass. 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of federal Video Privacy Protection Act.

Cristostomo v. New Balance Athletics, Inc., 647 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D. Mass. 2022), denying motion to dismiss and motion to strike class allegations in case involving sneakers marketed as "Made in the USA."

Selected Class Settlements:

Sholopa v. Turk Hava Yollari A.O. (d/b/a Turkish Airlines), Case No. 1:20-cv-3294-ALC (S.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$14.1 million class settlement to resolve claims of passengers whose flights with Turkish Airlines were cancelled due to COVID-19 and who did not receive refunds.

Payero v. Mattress Firm, Inc., Case No. 7:21-cv-3061-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$4.9 million class settlement to resolve claims of consumers who purchased allegedly defective bed frames.

Miranda v. Golden Entertainment (NV), Inc., Case No. 2:20-cv-534-AT (D. Nev. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement valued at over \$4.5 million to resolve claims of customers and employees of casino company stemming from data breach.

Malone v. Western Digital Corp., Case No. 5:20-cv-3584-NC (N.D. Cal. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement valued at \$5.7 million to resolve claims of hard drive purchasers for alleged false advertised.

Frederick v. ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc., Case No. 2021-L-001116 (18th Judicial Circuit Court DuPage County, Illinois 2021) – final approval granted for \$2.25 million class settlement to resolve claims of Illinois students for alleged violations of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.

Bar Admissions

- New York State
- Southern District of New York
- Eastern District of New York
- Northern District of New York
- Northern District of Illinois
- Central District of Illinois
- Eastern District of Michigan
- District of Colorado
- Third Circuit Court of Appeals
- Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals
- Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

JULIA K. VENDITTI

Julia K. Venditti is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Julia focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions. Julia was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Julia is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Julia received her Juris Doctor in 2020 from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law, where she graduated *cum laude* with two CALI Awards for the highest grade in her Evidence and California Community Property classes. During law school, Julia was a member of the UC Hastings Moot Court team and competed at the Evans Constitutional Law Moot Court Competition, where she finished as a national quarterfinalist and received a best brief award. Julia was also inducted into the UC Hastings Honors Society and was awarded Best Brief and an Honorable Mention for Best Oral Argument in her First-Year Moot Court section.

In addition, Julia served as a Research Assistant for her Constitutional Law professor, as a Teaching Assistant for Legal Writing & Research, and as a Law Clerk at the San Francisco Public Defender's Office. In 2017, Julia graduated *magna cum laude* from Baruch College/CUNY, Weissman School of Arts and Sciences, with a B.A. in Political Science.

JULIAN DIAMOND

Julian Diamond is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Julian focuses his practice on privacy law and class actions. Julian was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Julian received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Julian was Articles Editor for the Columbia Journal of Environmental Law. Prior to law school, Julian worked in education. Julian graduated from California State University, Fullerton with a B.A. in History and a single subject social science teaching credential.

MATTHEW GIRARDI

Matt Girardi is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Matt focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions, and has focused specifically on consumer class actions involving privacy violations, illegal gambling, financial misconduct, and false advertising. Matt was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Matt is admitted to the State Bar of New York, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the First Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Matt received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School in 2020, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Matt was the Commentary Editor for the Columbia Journal of Tax Law, and represented fledgling businesses for Columbia's Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic. In addition, Matt worked as an Honors Intern in the Division of Enforcement at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Matt graduated from Brown University in 2016 with a B.A. in Economics, and worked as a Paralegal Specialist at the U.S. Department of Justice in the Antitrust Division prior to law school.

Selected Class Settlements:

Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al., Case No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cnty. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$11.75 million class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Edwards v. Mid-Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, Case No. 22-cv-00562-TJM-CFH (N.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$2.2 million class settlement to resolve claims that an upstate New York credit union was unlawfully charging overdraft fees on accounts with sufficient funds.

Fischer, et al. v. Instant Checkmate LLC, et al., No. 19-cv-04892 (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for state-by-state non-reversionary cash settlements involving alleged violations of right of publicity statutes totaling in excess of \$10.1 million.

Wyland v. Woopla, Inc., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00356 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$835,000 class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00358 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$1.32 million class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

JENNA GAVENMAN

Jenna Gavenman is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Jenna focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Jenna was a Summer Associate and a part-time intern with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full-time Associate in September 2022.

Jenna is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Jenna received her Juris Doctor in 2022 from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law (now named UC Law SF). During law school, she was awarded an Honorable Mention for Best Oral Argument in her First-Year Moot Court section. Jenna also participated in both the Medical Legal Partnership for Seniors (MLPS) and the Lawyering for Children Practicum at Legal Services for Children—two of UC Hastings’s nationally renowned clinical programs. Jenna was awarded the Clinic Award for Outstanding Performance in MLPS for her contributions to the clinic. In addition, Jenna volunteered with her law school’s Legal Advice and Referral Clinic and as a LevelBar Mentor.

In 2018, Jenna graduated *cum laude* from Villanova University with a B.A. in Sociology and Spanish (double major). Jenna was a Division I athlete, competing on the Villanova Women’s Water Polo varsity team for four consecutive years.

EMILY HORNE

Emily Horne is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Emily focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Emily was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Emily is admitted to the State Bar of California.

Emily received her Juris Doctor from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2022 (now UC, Law SF). During law school, Emily served as Editor-in-Chief for the UC Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal, and she competed on the Moot Court team. Emily also served as a judicial extern in the Northern District of California and as a

Teaching Assistant for Legal Writing & Research. In 2015, Emily graduated from Scripps College with a B.A. in Sociology.

IRA ROSENBERG

Ira Rosenberg is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ira focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Ira received his Juris Doctor in 2022 from Columbia Law School. During law school, Ira served as a Student Honors Legal Intern with Division of Enforcement at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Ira also interned during law school in the Criminal Division at the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York and with the Investor Protection Bureau at the Office of the New York State Attorney General. Ira graduated in 2018 from Beth Medrash Govoha with a B.A. in Talmudic Studies.

LUKE SIRONSKI-WHITE

Luke Sironski-White is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A., focusing on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Luke joined the firm as a full-time Associate in August 2022.

Luke is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Luke received his Juris Doctor in 2022 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Luke was on the board of the Consumer Advocacy and Protection Society (CAPS), edited for the Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, and volunteered with the Prisoner Advocacy Network.

In 2017, Luke graduated from the University of Chicago with a B.A. in Anthropology. Before entering the field of law Luke was a professional photographer and filmmaker.

INES DIAZ

Ines Diaz is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ines focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Ines is admitted to the State Bar of California.

Ines received her Juris Doctor in 2023 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Ines served as an Executive Editor of the California Law Review. She also served as an intern with the East Bay Community Law Center's Immigration Clinic and as a Fellow of the Berkeley Law Academic Skills Program. Additionally, Ines served as an instructor with the University of California, Berkeley Extension, Legal Studies Global Access Program where she taught legal writing to international law students. In 2021, Ines was selected for a summer externship at the California Supreme Court where she served as a judicial extern for the Honorable Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar.

CAROLINE C. DONOVAN

Caroline C. Donovan is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Caroline focuses her practice on complex civil litigation, data protection, mass arbitration, and class actions. Caroline interned with Bursor & Fisher during her third year of law school before joining full time in Fall 2023.

Caroline is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Caroline received her Juris Doctor in 2023 from Brooklyn Law School. During law school, Caroline was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society Trial Division, where she was chosen to serve as a National Team Member. Caroline competed and coached in numerous competitions across the country, and placed second at regionals in AAJ's national competition in both her second and third year of law school. Caroline was also the President of the Art Law Association, and the Treasurer of the Labor and Employment Law Association.

During law school, Caroline was a judicial intern for Judge Kenneth W. Chu of the National Labor Relations Board. She also interned at the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of New York, as well as a securities class action firm.

JOSHUA B. GLATT

Joshua Glatt is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joshua focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Joshua was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as an Associate.

Joshua earned his Juris Doctor from the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings). While there, he received a CALI Award for earning the highest grade in Constitutional Law II and served on the executive boards of the Jewish Law Students Association and the American Constitution Society. Prior to law school, Joshua graduated *summa cum laude* from the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Arizona State University in 2016 and earned a master's degree from the University of Southern California in 2018.

JOSHUA R. WILNER

Joshua Wilner is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joshua focuses his practice on complex civil litigation, data privacy, consumer protection, and class actions. Joshua was a Summer Associate at Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm full time in Fall 2023.

Joshua is admitted to the State Bar of California.

Joshua received his Juris Doctor in 2023 from Berkeley Law. During law school, he received the American Jurisprudence Award for Constitutional Law.

During law school, Joshua served on the board of the Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law. Joshua also interned at Disability Rights California, Legal Aid at Work, and a private firm that worked closely with the ACLU of Northern California to enforce the California

Racial Justice Act. In 2022 and 2023, Joshua worked as a research assistant for Professor Abbye Atkinson.

VICTORIA ZHOU

Victoria Zhou is an Associate in Bursor & Fisher's New York office. Victoria focuses her practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection.

Victoria is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Victoria received her Juris Doctor from Fordham Law School in 2023. During law school, Victoria served as an Associate Editor of the Moot Court Board and competed in multiple mock trial competitions as a member of the Brendan Moore Trial Advocates. In addition, Victoria served as a judicial extern to Chief Judge Mark A. Barnett of the United States Court of International Trade. In 2019, Victoria graduated *magna cum laude* from Fei Tian College with a B.F.A. in Classical Dance.

KYLE D. GORDON

Kyle Gordon is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Kyle focuses his practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection. Kyle was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Kyle is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Kyle received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School in 2023, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Kyle was a Staff Editor for the Columbia Science and Technology Law Review. In 2020, Kyle graduated *summa cum laude* from New York University with a B.A. in Politics and became a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Prior to law school, Kyle interned in the Clerk's Office of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Index No. 631543/2024

Plaintiff,

v.

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER LLC,

Defendant.

**AFFIRMATION OF CAMERON R. AZARI, ESQ. REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION AND
ADEQUACY OF NOTICE PLAN**

I, Cameron R. Azari, Esq., hereby declare and state as follows:

1. My name is Cameron R. Azari, Esq. I have personal knowledge of the matters set forth herein, and I believe them to be true and correct.

2. I am a nationally recognized expert in the field of legal notice and have served as an expert in hundreds of federal and state cases involving class action notice plans.

3. I am a Senior Vice President of Epiq Class Action and Claims Solutions, Inc. (“Epiq”) and the Managing Director of Epiq Legal Noticing (aka Hilsoft Notifications), a business unit of Epiq that specializes in designing, developing, analyzing, and implementing large-scale, un-biased, legal notice plans.

4. Epiq Legal Noticing has been involved with some of the most complex and significant notice programs in recent history, examples of which are discussed below. With experience in more than 700 cases, including more than 75 multidistrict litigation settlements, Epiq Legal Noticing has prepared notices which have appeared in 53 languages and been distributed in almost every country, territory, and dependency in the world. Courts have recognized and approved numerous notice plans developed by Epiq Legal Noticing, and those decisions have invariably withstood appellate and collateral review.

AFFIRMATION OF CAMERON R. AZARI, ESQ. REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION AND
ADEQUACY OF NOTICE PLAN

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

5. I have served as a notice expert and have been recognized and appointed by courts to design and provide notice in many significant cases, including:

a) *In re Juul Labs, Inc. Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation* 19-md-02913 (N.D. Cal.), involved two settlements totaling \$300 million for JUUL Labs, Inc. and Altria, which alleged consumers were misled about JUUL products' addictiveness and safety, causing them to pay more, and that JUUL products were unlawfully marketed to minors. Two companion notice programs were implemented with more than 10.7 million email notices and nearly 500,000 postcard notices sent to potential class members and comprehensive media efforts (over 936 million impressions delivered). The notice programs each reached approximately 80% of the class nationwide.

b) *In Re: Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Privacy Litigation*, 3:20-cv-02155 (N.D. Cal.), involved an extensive notice plan for a \$85 million privacy settlement involving Zoom, the most popular videoconferencing platform. Notice was sent to more than 158 million class members by email or mail, and millions of reminder notices were sent to stimulate claim filings. The individual notice efforts reached approximately 91% of the class. A supplemental media campaign provided notice via regional newspaper notice, nationally distributed digital and social media notice (delivering more than 280 million impressions), sponsored search, an informational release, and a settlement website.

c) *In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2599, 1:15-md-02599 (S.D. Fla.), involved \$1.91 billion in settlements with BMW, Mazda, Subaru, Toyota, Honda, Nissan, Ford, and Volkswagen regarding Takata airbags. The notice programs included individual mailed notice to more than 61.8 million potential class members and extensive nationwide media via consumer publications, U.S. Territory newspapers, radio, digital notices, mobile digital notices, and behaviorally targeted digital media. Combined, the notice

programs reached more than 95% of adults aged 18+ in the U.S. who owned or leased a subject vehicle, with a frequency of 4.0 times each.

d) *In Re: Capital One Consumer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 2915, 1:19-md-02915 (E.D. Va.), involved an extensive notice program for a \$190 million data breach settlement. Notice was sent to more than 93.6 million settlement class members by email or mail. The individual notice efforts reached approximately 96% of the identified settlement class members and were enhanced by a supplemental media plan that included digital and social media notices (delivering more than 123.4 million impressions), sponsored search, and a settlement website.

e) *In re: Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation*, 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.), involved several notice programs to notify retail purchasers of disposable contact lenses for four separate settlements totaling \$88 million. For each notice program more than 1.98 million email or postcard notices were sent to potential class members and a comprehensive media plan was implemented, with a well-read nationwide consumer publication, internet digital notices (delivering more than 312.9 million – 461.4 million impressions per campaign), sponsored search listings, and a case website.

f) *In re U.S. Office of Personnel Management Data Security Breach Litigation* MDL No. 2664, 15-cv-01394 (D.D.C.), involved a \$63 million settlement for compromised personal information of then-current and former federal government employees and contractors, and certain applicants for federal employment. An extensive nationwide media notice campaign was implemented using magazines, digital and social media notices (delivering more than 758 million impressions), traditional and satellite radio, and other forms of media. The media notice reached at least 85% of the class. In addition, more than 3.5 million email notices and/or postcard notices were sent to identified class members. The notice program was supplemented with outreach to unions and associations, sponsored search listings, an informational release, and a settlement website.

g) *In re: fairlife Milk Products Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, 1:19-cv-03924 (N.D. Ill.), involved a \$21 million settlement against The Coca-Cola Company, fairlife, LLC, and other defendants alleging false labeling and marketing of fairlife milk products. A comprehensive media plan was implemented with a consumer print publication notice, targeted digital and social media notices (delivering more than 620.1 million impressions in English and Spanish nationwide). Combined with individual notice to a small percentage of the class, the notice plan reached approximately 80.2% of the class. The reach was further enhanced by sponsored search, an informational release, and a website.

h) *In re: Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1720 (E.D.N.Y.). Second Circuit affirmed. *See Fikes Wholesale, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.* 62 F.4th 704 (2d Cir. 2023). The case involved a \$5.5 billion settlement reached by Visa and MasterCard. An intensive initial notice program included more than 19.8 million direct mail notices sent to potential class members, together with insertions in over 1,500 newspapers, consumer magazines, national business publications, trade and specialty publications, with notices in multiple languages, and a digital notice campaign (delivering more than 770 million adult impressions). Sponsored search listings and a settlement website in eight languages expanded the notice program. For the subsequent settlement reached by Visa and MasterCard, an extensive notice program was implemented, which included over 16.3 million direct mail notices to class members together with more than 354 print publication insertions and digital notices (delivering more than 689 million adult impressions).

i) *In re: Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010*, MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.), involved landmark settlement notice programs to distinct "Economic and Property Damages" and "Medical Benefits" settlement classes for BP's \$7.8 billion settlement of claims related to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Notice efforts included more than 7,900 television spots, 5,200 radio spots, and 5,400 print insertions and reached over 95% of Gulf Coast residents.

6. Courts have recognized my firm's testimony as to which method of notification is appropriate for a given case, and I have testified on numerous occasions on whether a certain method of notice represents the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Numerous court opinions and comments regarding my testimony, and the adequacy of our notice efforts, are included in the Epiq Legal Noticing *curriculum vitae* included as **Attachment 1**.

7. In forming expert opinions, my staff and I draw from our in-depth class action case experience, as well as our educational and related work experiences. I am an active member of the Oregon State Bar, having received my Bachelor of Science from Willamette University and my Juris Doctor from Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College. I have served as the Director of Legal Notice for Epiq since 2008 and have overseen the detailed planning of virtually all of our court-approved notice programs during that time. Overall, I have more than 25 years of experience in the design and implementation of legal notification and claims administration programs, having been personally involved in well over one hundred successful notice programs.

8. The facts in this affirmation are based on my personal knowledge, as well as information provided to me by my colleagues in the ordinary course of my business at Epiq and Epiq Legal Noticing (hereinafter "Epiq").

OVERVIEW

9. This affirmation describes the successful implementation of the Settlement Notice Plan ("Notice Plan") and notices ("Notice" or "Notices") for *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager, LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024, currently pending in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk. Epiq designed this Notice Plan based on our extensive prior experience and research into the notice issues particular to this Settlement. The Notice Plan as designed and implemented successfully provided notice to the Settlement Class Members.

DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY

10. Epiq has procedures in place to protect the security of class data. As with all cases,

Epiq maintains extensive data security and privacy safeguards in its official capacity as the Settlement Administrator for this Action. A Services Agreement, which formally retains Epiq as the Settlement Administrator, governs Epiq's administration responsibilities for the Action. Epiq maintains adequate insurance in case of errors.

11. With respect to the data it receives, collects, and otherwise hosts, Epiq serves as a data processor and acts only at the direction of the designated data controller or of the Court, as described in applicable contracts, statements of work, and/or Court documents and Orders. Epiq does not utilize or perform other procedures on personal data provided or obtained as part of services as Settlement Administrator. Epiq does not use any information provided by Settlement Class Members for any other purpose than the administration of this Action. Specifically, Settlement Class Member information is not used, disseminated, or disclosed by or to any other person for any other purpose unrelated to the administration of this Action.

12. The security and privacy of clients' and class members' information and data are paramount to Epiq. That is why Epiq has invested in a layered and robust set of trusted security personnel, controls, and technology to protect the data we handle. To promote a secure environment for client and class member data, industry leading firewalls and intrusion prevention systems protect and monitor Epiq's network perimeter with regular vulnerability scans and penetration tests. Epiq deploys best-in-class endpoint detection, response, and anti-virus solutions on our endpoints and servers. Strong authentication mechanisms and multi-factor authentication are required for access to Epiq's systems and the data we protect. In addition, Epiq has employed the use of behavior and signature-based analytics as well as monitoring tools across our entire network, which are managed 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, by a team of experienced professionals.

13. Epiq's world class data centers are defended by multi-layered, physical access security, including formal ID and prior approval before access is granted, closed-circuit television ("CCTV"), alarms, biometric devices, and security guards, 24 hours per day, 7 days per

week. Epiq manages minimum Tier 3+ data centers in 18 locations worldwide. Our centers have robust environmental controls including uninterruptable power supply (“UPS”), fire detection and suppression controls, flood protection, and cooling systems.

14. Beyond Epiq’s technology, our people play a vital role in protecting class members’ and our clients’ information. Epiq has a dedicated information security team comprised of highly trained, experienced, and qualified security professionals. Our teams stay on top of important security issues and retain important industry standard certifications, like SysAdmin, Audit, Network, and Security (“SANS”), Certified Information Systems Security Professional (“CISSP”), and Certified Information Systems Auditor (“CISA”). Epiq is continually improving security infrastructure and processes based on an ever-changing digital landscape. Epiq also partners with best-in-class security service providers. Our robust policies and processes cover all aspects of information security to form part of an industry leading security and compliance program, which is regularly assessed by independent third parties.

15. Epiq holds several industry certifications including: Trusted Information Security Assessment Exchange (“TISAX”), Cyber Essentials, Privacy Shield, and ISO 27001. In addition to retaining these certifications, we are aligned to Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (“HIPAA”), National Institute of Standards and Technology (“NIST”), and Federal Information Security Management Act (“FISMA”) frameworks. Epiq follows local, national, and international privacy regulations. To support our business and staff, Epiq has a dedicated team to facilitate and monitor compliance with privacy policies. Epiq is also committed to a culture of security mindfulness. All employees routinely undergo cybersecurity trainings to ensure that safeguarding information and cybersecurity vigilance is a core practice in all aspects of the work our teams complete.

16. Upon completion of a project, Epiq continues to host all data until otherwise instructed in writing by a customer to delete, archive or return such data. When a customer requests that Epiq delete or destroy all data, Epiq agrees to delete or destroy all such data; provided,

however, that Epiq may retain data as required by applicable law, rule or regulation, and to the extent such copies are electronically stored in accordance with Epiq's record retention or back-up policies or procedures (including those regarding electronic communications) then in effect. Epiq keeps data in line with client retention requirements. If no retention period is specified, Epiq returns the data to the client or securely deletes it as appropriate.

NOTICE PLAN SUMMARY

17. New York Civil Practice Law Rule 904 directs that "reasonable notice of the commencement of a class action shall be given to the class in such manner as the court directs."¹ The Notice Plan satisfied this requirement.

18. The Notice Plan as designed and implemented reached the greatest practicable number of Settlement Class Members. The Notice Plan individual notice efforts via email to identified Settlement Class Members reached approximately 95.3% of the identified Settlement Class. The reach was further enhanced by a Settlement Website. In my experience, the Notice Plan was consistent with other court-approved notice programs, was reasonable notice under the circumstances of this case, and satisfied the requirements of due process, including its "desire to actually inform" requirement.²

NOTICE PLAN DETAIL

19. On April 14, 2025, the Court approved the Notice Plan and appointed Epiq as the Settlement Administrator in the *Short Form Order* ("Preliminary Approval Order"). In the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court provisionally certified, for settlement purposes only, the following "Settlement Class":

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

¹ N.Y. CPLR 904(b).

² *Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 315 (1950) ("But when notice is a person's due, process which is a mere gesture is not due process. The means employed must be such as one desirous of actually informing the absentee might reasonably adopt to accomplish it. The reasonableness and hence the constitutional validity of any chosen method may be defended on the ground that it is in itself reasonably certain to inform those affected . . .").

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, Defendant's subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who submit a timely and valid request for exclusion from the class; (4) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons; and (5) Class Counsel.

20. After the Court's Preliminary Approval Order was entered, Epiq implemented the Notice Plan. This affirmation details the notice activities undertaken to date and explains how and why the Notice Plan was comprehensive and well-suited to reach the Settlement Class Members. This affirmation also discusses the administration activity to date.

NOTICE PLAN

Individual Notice

21. On April 28, 2025, Epiq received one data file with 54,177 records containing names, last known mail and email addresses, and the total amount of Out-of-Pocket Fees paid for identified Settlement Class Members ("Class List").

22. Epiq deduplicated, rolled-up, and loaded the unique, identified Settlement Class Member records into its database for the Settlement. These efforts resulted in 53,383 unique, identified Settlement Class Member records. An Email Notice was sent to all identified Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address was available.

Individual Notice –Email

23. Pursuant to the Notice Plan described in the Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits, on May 8, 2025, Epiq commenced sending 53,196 Email Notices to identified Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address was available (some valid email addresses were associated with multiple identified Settlement Class Members, and only one Email Notice was sent per email address). The following industry standard best practices were followed. The Email Notice was created using an embedded html text format. This format provided easy-to-read text without graphics, tables, images, and other elements to avoid the increased likelihood that the

message could be blocked by Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and/or SPAM filters for this type of email communication. Each Email Notice was also transmitted with a unique message identifier. The Email Notice included an embedded link to the Settlement Website. By clicking the link, recipients were able to access the Long Form Notice and other information about the Settlement. The Email Notice is included as **Attachment 2**.

24. If the receiving email server could not deliver the message, a “bounce code” was returned along with the unique message identifier. For any Email Notice for which a bounce code was received indicating that the message was undeliverable for reasons such as an inactive or disabled account, the recipient’s mailbox was full, technical autoreplies, etc., at least two additional attempts were made to deliver the Notice by email.

25. Additionally, a Long Form Notice and Claim Form (“Claim Package”) was mailed to all Settlement Class Members who requested one via the toll-free telephone number or other means. As of June 27, 2025, Epiq has mailed three Claim Packages as a result of such requests. The Long Form Notice is included as **Attachment 3**. The Claim Form is included as **Attachment 4**.

Notice Results

26. As of June 27, 2025, an Email Notice was delivered to 53,196 of the 53,383 unique, identified Settlement Class Members. This means the individual notice efforts reached approximately 95.3% of the identified Settlement Class Members.

Settlement Website

27. On April 24, 2025, Epiq established a dedicated website for the Settlement with an easy to remember domain name (www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com). Relevant documents, including the Long-Form Notice, Claim Form, Settlement Agreement, Preliminary Approval Order, and other important court documents are posted on the Settlement Website. In addition, the Settlement Website includes relevant dates, answers to frequently asked questions (“FAQs”), instructions for how Settlement Class Members were able to request exclusion from or object to the Settlement prior to the deadlines, contact information for the Settlement Administrator, and

how to obtain other case-related information. Settlement Class Members were able to file an online Claim Form or submit an online request for exclusion prior to the deadlines. The Settlement Website address was prominently displayed in all notice documents.

28. As of June 27, 2025, there have been 16,759 unique visitor sessions to the Settlement Website and 40,386 web pages have been presented.

Toll-Free Telephone Number and Contact Information

29. On May 8, 2025, Epiq established a toll-free telephone number (1-888-840-5013) for the Settlement. Callers are able to hear an introductory message and also have the option to learn more about the Settlement in the form of recorded answers to FAQs, and to request that a Claim Package be mailed to them. This automated phone system is available 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The toll-free telephone number was prominently displayed in all notice documents. As of June 27, 2025, there have been 81 calls to the toll-free telephone number representing 161 minutes of use.

30. A postal mailing address was established and continues to be available, allowing Settlement Class Members the opportunity to request additional information or ask questions.

Requests for Exclusion and Objections

31. The deadline to request exclusion from the Settlement or to object to the Settlement was June 23, 2025. As of June 27, 2025, Epiq has received two valid requests for exclusion. As of June 27, 2025, Epiq is aware of no objections to the Settlement. The Exclusion Report is included as **Attachment 5**.

Claim Submissions and Distribution Options

32. The Notices provided a detailed summary of the relevant information about the Settlement, including the Settlement Website address and how Settlement Class Members were able to file a Claim Form online or by mail prior to the deadline. With any method of filing a Claim Form, Settlement Class Members were given the option of receiving a digital payment or a traditional paper check.

33. The deadline for Settlement Class Members to file a Claim Form was June 23, 2025. As of June 27, 2025, Epiq has received 7,561 Claim Forms (7,500 online and 61 paper). Since the June 23, 2025, Claims Deadline has recently passed, these numbers are preliminary. As standard practice, Epiq is in the process of conducting a complete quality control review of all Claim Forms received. There is a likelihood that after detailed review, the total number of Claim Forms received will change due to duplicate and denied Claim Forms.

Reminder Notice

34. On May 27, 2025, and June 16, 2025, Epiq commenced sending a Reminder Notice to all identified Settlement Class Members who had not submitted a Claim Form or requested exclusion from the Settlement and who have a valid email address that was not previously returned as undeliverable. The Reminder Notice is included as **Attachment 6**.

CONCLUSION

35. In class action notice planning, execution, and analysis, we are guided by due process considerations under the United States Constitution, by state and local rules and statutes, and further by case law pertaining to notice. This framework directs that the notice plan be designed to reach the greatest practicable number of potential class members and that the notice or notice plan itself not limit knowledge of the availability of benefits—nor the ability to exercise other options—to class members in any way. All of these requirements were met in this case.

36. The Notice Plan included individual notice via email to identified Settlement Class Members. The Notice Plan individual notice efforts reached approximately 95.3% of the identified Settlement Class. The reach was further enhanced by a Settlement Website. In 2010, the Federal Judicial Center (“FJC”) issued a *Judges’ Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide*, which is relied upon for federal cases, and is illustrative for state courts. This Guide states that, “the lynchpin in an objective determination of the adequacy of a proposed notice effort is whether all the notice efforts together will reach a high percentage of the class. It

is reasonable to reach between 70–95%.”³ Here, we have developed and implemented a Notice Plan that readily achieved a reach at the high-end of that standard.


37. The Notice Plan followed the guidance for how to satisfy due process obligations that a notice expert gleans from the United States Supreme Court’s seminal decisions, which are: a) to endeavor to actually inform the class, and b) to demonstrate that notice is reasonably calculated to do so:

- a) “[W]hen notice is a person’s due, process which is a mere gesture is not due process. The means employed must be such as one desirous of actually informing the absentee might reasonably adopt to accomplish it,” *Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust*, 339 U.S. 306, 315 (1950); and
- b) “[N]otice must be reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections,” *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156 (1974) (citing *Mullane*, 339 U.S. at 314).

38. The Notice Plan conformed to all aspects of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rule 904 regarding notice, comported with the guidance for effective notice set forth in the Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth, and satisfied the requirements of due process, including its “desire to actually inform” requirement.

39. The Notice Plan schedule afforded enough time to provide full and proper notice to Settlement Class Members before the Objection/Exclusion Deadline.

I affirm this 27th day of June 2025, under the penalties of perjury under the laws of New York, which may include a fine or imprisonment, that the foregoing is true, and I understand that this document may be filed in an action or proceeding in a court of law.



Cameron R. Azari, Esq.

³ FED. JUDICIAL CTR, JUDGES’ CLASS ACTION NOTICE AND CLAIMS PROCESS CHECKLIST AND PLAIN LANGUAGE GUIDE 3 (2010), available at <https://www.fjc.gov/content/judges-class-action-notice-and-claims-process-checklist-and-plain-language-guide-0>.

PRINTING SPECIFICATION STATEMENT

1. Pursuant to 22 N.Y.C.R.R. §202.8-b, the undersigned counsel certifies that the foregoing brief was prepared on a computer using Microsoft Word. A proportionally spaced typeface was used as follows:

Name of Typeface: Times New Roman
Point Size: 12
Line Spacing: Double

2. The total number of words in the brief, inclusive of point headings and footnotes and exclusive of the caption, table of contents, table of authorities, signature block, and this Certification, is 4,101 words. By operation of Microsoft Word's word count function, this number includes legal citations and certain forms of punctuation.

Dated: June 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Philip L. Fraietta
Philip L. Fraietta

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
Philip L. Fraietta
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com

Class Counsel

Attachment 1



Legal Noticing Experts

Epiq Legal Noticing is a leading global provider of legal noticing services. Our team of recognized noticing experts provide superior notice programs that satisfy due-process requirements and withstand judicial scrutiny. For over 30 years, our notice programs and notices have been approved and upheld by courts.

We have handled over 700 cases, including over 75 MDL case settlements. Our notices have appeared in over 53 languages and in almost every country, territory, and dependency in the world.

Epiq Legal Noticing (a/k/a Hilsoft Notifications) is a business unit of Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. ("Epiq"). www.EpiqLegalNoticing.com.



Case Expertise

In re Juul Labs, Inc. Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation 19-md-02913 (N.D. Cal.)

For two settlements totaling \$300 million involving JUUL Labs, Inc. and Altria, Epiq designed and implemented cutting-edge, companion notice programs. The settlements alleged consumers were misled about JUUL products' addictiveness and safety, causing them to pay more, and that JUUL products were unlawfully marketed to minors. For the notice programs, over 10.7 million email notices and nearly 500,000 postcard notices were sent to potential class members, and a comprehensive media plan was implemented (over 936 million impressions delivered). The notice programs each reached approximately 80% of the class nationwide with combined individual notice and media notice.

10.7M
email notices

836M
digital impressions

80%
of class reached

\$190M
settlement

93.6M
email or mail
notices

96%
of class reached

In re Capital One Consumer Data Security Breach Litigation MDL No. 2915, 1:19-md-02915 (E.D. Va.)

For a \$190 million data breach settlement involving Capital One, Epiq implemented an extensive notice program. Notice was sent to over 93.6 million settlement class members by email or mail. The individual notice efforts reached approximately 96% of the identified settlement class members. In addition, a supplemental media campaign was implemented and enhanced the notice program with digital and social media notices (over 123.4 million impressions delivered), sponsored search listings, and a settlement website.

In re Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Privacy Litigation 3:20-cv-02155 (N.D. Cal.)

Epiq designed and implemented an extensive notice program for a \$85 million privacy settlement involving Zoom, the most popular video-conferencing platform. Notice was sent to over 158 million class members by email or mail, and millions of reminder notices were sent to stimulate claim filings. The individual notice efforts reached approximately 91% of the class. A supplemental media campaign provided notice via regional newspaper and nationally distributed digital and social media notices (over 280 million impressions delivered), along with sponsored search listings, an informational release, and a settlement website.

\$85M
settlement

158M
email or mail
notices

91%
of class reached

Case Expertise

\$5.5B
settlement

36.1M
mail notices

1.45B
digital impressions

In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation MDL No. 1720, 1:05-md-01720, (E.D.N.Y.). Second Circuit affirmed. See *Fikes Wholesale, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.* 62 F.4th 704 (2d Cir. 2023)

For a landmark \$5.5 billion settlement reached by Visa and MasterCard, Epiq implemented an extensive initial notice program with over 19.8 million direct mail notices together with insertions in over 1,500 newspapers, consumer magazines, national business publications, and trade and specialty publications, with notices in multiple languages, and a digital notice campaign that generated over 770 million impressions. Sponsored search listings and a website in eight languages expanded the notice efforts. Subsequently, Epiq implemented a notice program with over 16.3 million direct mail notices, over 354 print publication insertions, and digital notices that generated over 689 million impressions.

In re fairlife Milk Products Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation 1:19-cv-03924 (N.D. Ill.)

For a \$21 million settlement that involved The Coca-Cola Company, fairlife, LLC, and other defendants regarding allegations of false labeling and marketing of fairlife milk products, Epiq designed and implemented a media based notice program. The program included a consumer print publication notice, targeted digital and social media notices (over 620.1 million impressions delivered in English and Spanish nationwide). Combined with individual notice to a small percentage of the class, the notice program reached approximately 80.2% of the class. The reach was further enhanced by sponsored search listings, an informational release, and a settlement website.

\$21M
settlement

620.1M
digital impressions

80.2%
of class reached

\$1.91B
settlements

61.8M
mail notices

95%
reach of notice
program

In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.)

Epiq designed and implemented numerous monumental notice campaigns to notify current or former owners or lessees of certain BMW, Mazda, Subaru, Toyota, Honda, Nissan, Ford, and Volkswagen vehicles as part of \$1.91 billion in settlements regarding Takata airbags. The notice programs included mailed notice to over 61.8 million potential class members and notice via consumer publications, U.S. Territory newspapers, radio, digital notices, mobile notices, and behaviorally targeted digital media. Combined, the notice programs reached over 95% of adults aged 18+ in the U.S. who owned or leased a subject vehicle, 4.0 times each.

Case Expertise

In re Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation 1:20-cv-05914 (S.D.N.Y.)

For a \$60 million settlement for Morgan Stanley Smith Barney's account holders in response to "Data Security Incidents," Epiq designed and implemented an individual notice program. Over 13.8 million email or mailed notices were delivered, reaching approximately 90% of the identified potential settlement class members. The individual notice efforts were supplemented with nationwide newspaper notice and a settlement website.

\$60M
settlement

13.8M
email or mail
notices

\$88M
settlements

7.92M
email or mail
notices

In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.)

Epiq implemented notice programs for retail purchasers of disposable contact lenses in four settlements totaling \$88 million. For each notice program, over 1.98 million email or postcard notices were sent to potential class members and a comprehensive media plan was implemented, with a robust, nationwide consumer publication, digital notices (over 312.9 million – 461.4 million impressions delivered per campaign), sponsored search listings, and a settlement website.

Yamagata et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC 3:17-cv-03529 (N.D. Cal.)

For a \$50 million settlement on behalf of certain purchasers of Schiff Move Free® Advanced glucosamine supplements, nearly 4 million email notices and 1.1 million postcard notices were sent. The individual notice efforts sent by Epiq were delivered to approximately 98.5% of the identified class sent notice. A media campaign with digital notices and sponsored search listings combined with the individual notice efforts reached at least 80% of the class.

\$50M
settlement

5.1M
email or mail
notices

\$63M
settlement

758M
digital impressions

85%
of class reached

In re U.S. Office of Personnel Management Data Security Breach Litigation MDL No. 2664, 15-cv-01394 (D.D.C.)

For a \$63 million settlement, Epiq designed and implemented an extensive, nationwide media notice campaign using magazines, digital and social media notices (over 758 million impressions delivered), traditional and satellite radio, and other forms of media. The media notice reached at least 85% of the class. In addition, over 3.5 million email notices and/or postcard notices were sent to identified class members. The individual notice and media notice were supplemented with outreach to unions and associations, sponsored search listings, an informational release, and a settlement website.

Case Expertise

In re Toll Roads Litigation 8:16-cv-00262 (C.D. Cal.)

Epiq implemented a notice program for several settlements alleging improper collection and sharing of PII of drivers on certain toll roads in the state of California. The settlements provided benefits of over \$175 million, including penalty forgiveness. Combined, over 13.8 million email or postcard notices were sent, reaching approximately 93% - 95% of class members across all settlements. Individual notice was supplemented with digital notices and notices in newspapers, geo-targeted within California. Sponsored search listings and a settlement website further extended the reach of the notice program.

\$175M
settlement
benefits

13.8M
email or mail
notices

93% – 95%
of class reached

geo-targeted
media noticing

95%
of class reached

In re Flint Water Cases 5:16-cv-10444, (E.D. Mich.)

In response to largescale municipal water contamination in Flint, Michigan, Epiq's expertise was relied upon to design and implement a comprehensive notice program that reached over 95% of the class. The program included direct mail notice and reminder email notice sent to identified class members, and a media plan with local newspaper publications, online video and audio ads, local television and radio ads, sponsored search listings, an informational release, a website, and digital and social media notices geo-targeted to Flint, Michigan and the state of Michigan.

Zanca et al. v. Epic Games, Inc. 21-CVS-534 (Sup. Ct. Wake Cnty., N.C.)

For a \$26.5 million settlement, Epiq designed and implemented a notice program to reach individuals 13+ in the U.S. who exchanged or purchased in-game virtual currency in *Fortnite* or *Rocket League*. Over 29 million email notices and 27 million reminder notices were sent to class members. In addition, a targeted media campaign was implemented with digital and social media notices, *Reddit* feed ads, and *YouTube* pre-roll ads, generating over 350.4 million impressions. Combined, the notice efforts reached approximately 93.7% of the class.

\$26.5M
settlement

29M
email notices

93.7%
of class reached

1.8M
mail or email
notice to vehicle
owners

In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices and Product Liability Litigation (Bosch Settlement) MDL No. 2672 (N.D. Cal.)

Epiq executed a comprehensive notice program within the *Volkswagen Emissions Litigation* with individual notice to over 946,000 vehicle owners via first class mail and to over 855,000 vehicle owners via email. A targeted digital notice campaign further enhanced the notice efforts.

Case Expertise

Hale v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company et al. 3:12-cv-00660 (S.D. Ill.)

For a \$250 million settlement with 4.7 million class members, Epiq designed and implemented a notice program with postcard or email notice to over 1.43 million class members and a robust publication program that reached 78.8% of all U.S. adults aged 35+, approximately 2.4 times each.

\$250M
settlement

4.7M
class members

one of the **largest, most complex** cases in **Canadian** history

In re Residential Schools Class Action Litigation 00-cv-192059 (Ont. Super. Ct.)

One of the largest and most complex class actions cases in Canadian history. Epiq handled groundbreaking notice to disparate, remote Indigenous people to provide notice of a multi-billion-dollar settlement.

In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.)

For BP's \$7.8 billion settlement for the Deepwater Horizon oil spill, possibly the most complex class action case in U.S. history, Epiq opined on all forms of notice, and designed and implemented a dual notice program for "Economic and Property Damages" and "Medical Benefits." The notice program reached at least 95% of Gulf Coast region adults with over 7,900 TV spots, 5,200 radio spots, 5,400 print insertions in newspapers, consumer publications and trade journals, digital media, and individual notice. Epiq also implemented one of the largest claim deadline notice campaigns, with paid print, television, radio, and digital notice, reaching over 90% of adults aged 18+ in 26 identified Designated Market Areas ("DMAs") covering the Gulf Coast Areas, an average of 5.5 times each.

\$7.8B
settlement

7,900
tv spots

5,200
radio spots

5,400
print insertions

6.9M
email or mail notices
90%
of class reached

Vergara et al., v. Uber Technologies, Inc. 1:15-cv-06972 (N.D. Ill.)

For a \$20 million Telephone Consumer Protection Act settlement, Epiq sent mail or email notice to over 6.9 million class members and provided media notice via newspaper and digital notices and reached over 90% of the class.

In re Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. et al. 16-cv-31602 (Bankr. W.D. N.C.)

Epiq implemented an extensive notice effort for asbestos personal injury claims with nationwide consumer print, trade and union labor publications, digital notices, an informational release, and a website.

asbestos, personal injury claims
notice program

Legal Noticing Experts

Cameron Azari, Esq., Senior Vice President Epiq, Managing Director Epiq Legal Noticing



Cameron Azari, Esq. is a recognized international notice expert. He has over 24 years of experience in providing expert notice opinions regarding notice adequacy in compliance with Fed R. Civ. P. 23, state class action statutes, or international legal requirements in over 700 class action cases, including over 75 MDLs. He has testified in numerous cases and no notice program has been overturned. Cam is a trusted expert and consults directly with clients to share his extensive knowledge regarding all aspects of class action noticing.

He is an active author and speaker. Cam holds a J.D. from Northwestern School of Law at Lewis and Clark College and a B.S. from Willamette University. He is an active member of the Oregon State Bar. Cam can be reached at caza@epiqglobal.com.

Stephanie Fiereck, Esq., Senior Director Epiq Legal Noticing & Notice Expert Services



Stephanie Fiereck, Esq. leads our Notice Expert Services team. As a notice expert with over 24 years of legal experience, she consults with clients about all aspects of class action noticing. She has written over 1,000 expert notice adequacy declarations, and written or reviewed hundreds of notices, all approved by federal or state courts. Stephanie has a keen understanding of what judges are looking for, how to withstand judicial scrutiny, satisfy due process, and provide plain language notice to class members.

Prior to joining Epiq, she was a Vice President at Wells Fargo Bank for five years where she led the class action services business unit. She is an active author regarding class action notice. Stephanie holds a J.D. from the University of Oregon School of Law and a B.A. from St. Cloud State University. She is an active member of the Oregon State Bar. Stephanie can be reached at sfie@epiqglobal.com.

Kyle Bingham, Senior Director Epiq Legal Noticing & Media Noticing



Kyle Bingham leads the Media Noticing team, an in-house legal noticing advertising agency, and has over 15 years of experience in the advertising industry. He is a pivotal resource for researching, planning, and executing legal notice programs for class action, bankruptcy, and similar legal cases. Kyle's continued success with clients is a direct result of achieving media goals and ensuring that advertising is as efficient and impactful as possible. Kyle has also worked on over 500 CAFA notice mailings.

Prior to Epiq, Kyle worked at Wieden+Kennedy advertising agency for seven years, where he planned and purchased print, digital and broadcast media, managed multiple paid search accounts, and presented strategy and media campaigns to clients for multi-million-dollar branding campaigns. He received his B.A. from Willamette University. Kyle can be reached at kbingham@epiqglobal.com.

Experts' Articles and Presentations

- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Legal Noticing." Hausfeld, Washington, D.C., Sept. 2024.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Increase in Fraudulent Claims in Class Action and Mass Tort." Harris Martin MDL Conference, Portland, Maine, July 24, 2024.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Settlements." Class Action Litigation Forum – Plaintiffs' Bar, Dana Point, CA, May 9, 2024.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Consumer Class Action Notice/Fraud." Mass and Class Conference, Fort Lauderdale, FL, Mar. 6, 2024.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Rising Number of Privacy-Data-Breach Class Actions, including Those Centralized in MDLs, Temporary or Here to Stay? Consideration of Special Case-Management Procedures." Rabiej Litigation Law Center Class Action Conference, Virtual, July 20, 2023.
- **Cameron Azari** Chair, "Panel Discussion: Class Actions Case Management." Global Class Actions Symposium 2022, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Nov. 17, 2022.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Driving Claims in Consumer Settlements: Notice/Claim Filing and Payments in the Digital Age." Mass Torts Made Perfect Bi-Annual Conference, Las Vegas, NV, Oct. 12, 2022.
- **Cameron Azari** Chair, "Panel Discussion: Class Actions Case Management." Global Class Actions Symposium 2021, London, UK, Nov. 16, 2021.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Mass Torts Made Perfect Bi-Annual Conference." Class Actions Abroad, Las Vegas, NV, Oct. 13, 2021.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Virtual Global Class Actions Symposium 2020, Class Actions Case Management Panel." Nov. 18, 2020.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Consumers and Class Action Notices: An FTC Workshop." Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC, Oct. 29, 2019.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "The New Outlook for Automotive Class Action Litigation: Coattails, Recalls, and Loss of Value/Diminution Cases." ACI's Automotive Product Liability Litigation Conference, American Conference Institute, Chicago, IL, July 18, 2019.
- **Cameron Azari** Moderator, "Prepare for the Future of Automotive Class Actions." Bloomberg Next, Webinar-CLE, Nov. 6, 2018.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "The Battleground for Class Certification: Plaintiff and Defense Burdens, Commonality Requirements and Ascertainability." 30th National Forum on Consumer Finance Class Actions and Government Enforcement, Chicago, IL, July 17, 2018.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Recent Developments in Class Action Notice and Claims Administration." PLI's Class Action Litigation 2018 Conference, New York, NY, June 21, 2018.

Experts' Articles and Presentations

- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "One Class Action or 50? Choice of Law Considerations as Potential Impediment to Nationwide Class Action Settlements." 5th Annual Western Regional CLE Program on Class Actions and Mass Torts, Clyde & Co LLP, San Francisco, CA, June 22, 2018.
- **Cameron Azari** and **Stephanie Fiereck** Co-Authors, *A Practical Guide to Chapter 11 Bankruptcy Publication Notice*. E-book, published, May 2017.
- **Cameron Azari** Featured Speaker, "Proposed Changes to Rule 23 Notice and Scrutiny of Claim Filing Rates." DC Consumer Class Action Lawyers Luncheon, Washington, DC, Dec. 6, 2016.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Recent Developments in Consumer Class Action Notice and Claims Administration." Berman DeValerio Litigation Group, San Francisco, CA, June 8, 2016.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "2016 Cybersecurity & Privacy Summit. Moving From 'Issue Spotting' To Implementing a Mature Risk Management Model." King & Spalding, Atlanta, GA, Apr. 25, 2016.
- **Stephanie Fiereck** Author, "Tips for Responding to a Mega-Sized Data Breach." *Law360*, May 2016.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Live Cyber Incident Simulation Exercise." Advisen's Cyber Risk Insights Conference, London, UK, Feb. 10, 2015.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Pitfalls of Class Action Notice and Claims Administration." PLI's Class Action Litigation 2014 Conference, New York, NY, July 9, 2014.
- **Cameron Azari** and **Stephanie Fiereck** Co-Authors, "What You Need to Know About Frequency Capping In Online Class Action Notice Programs." *Class Action Litigation Report*, June 2014.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Class Settlement Update – Legal Notice and Court Expectations." PLI's 19th Annual Consumer Financial Services Institute Conference, New York, NY, Apr. 7-8, 2014.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Class Settlement Update – Legal Notice and Court Expectations." PLI's 19th Annual Consumer Financial Services Institute Conference, Chicago, IL, Apr. 28-29, 2014.
- **Stephanie Fiereck** Author, "Planning For The Next Mega-Sized Class Action Settlement." *Law360*, Feb. 2014.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Legal Notice in Consumer Finance Settlements - Recent Developments." ACI's Consumer Finance Class Actions and Litigation, New York, NY, Jan. 29-30, 2014.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Legal Notice in Building Products Cases." HarrisMartin's Construction Product Litigation Conference, Miami, FL, Oct. 25, 2013.

Experts' Articles and Presentations

- **Cameron Azari** and **Stephanie Fiereck** Co-Authors, "Class Action Legal Noticing: Plain Language Revisited." *Law360*, Apr. 2013.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Legal Notice in Consumer Finance Settlements Getting your Settlement Approved." ACI's Consumer Finance Class Actions and Litigation, New York, NY, Jan. 31-Feb. 1, 2013.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Perspectives from Class Action Claims Administrators: Email Notices and Response Rates." CLE International's 8th Annual Class Actions Conference, Los Angeles, CA, May 17-18, 2012.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Class Action Litigation Trends: A Look into New Cases, Theories of Liability & Updates on the Cases to Watch." ACI's Consumer Finance Class Actions and Litigation, New York, NY, Jan. 26-27, 2012.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Data Breaches Involving Consumer Financial Information: Litigation Exposures and Settlement Considerations." ACI's Consumer Finance Class Actions and Litigation, New York, NY, Jan. 2011.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Notice in Consumer Class Actions: Adequacy, Efficiency and Best Practices." CLE International's 5th Annual Class Action Conference: Prosecuting and Defending Complex Litigation, San Francisco, CA, 2009.
- **Cameron Azari** Author, "Clearing the Five Hurdles of Email - Delivery of Class Action Legal Notices." *Thomson Reuters Class Action Litigation Reporter*, June 2008.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Planning for a Smooth Settlement." ACI: Class Action Defense – Complex Settlement Administration for the Class Action Litigator, Phoenix, AZ, 2007.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Structuring a Litigation Settlement." CLE International's 3rd Annual Conference on Class Actions, Los Angeles, CA, 2007.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Noticing and Response Rates in Class Action Settlements." Class Action Bar Gathering, Vancouver, British Columbia, 2007.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Notice and Response Rates in Class Action Settlements." Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom, LLP, New York, NY, 2006.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Notice and Response Rates in Class Action Settlements." Bridgeport Continuing Legal Education, Class Action and the UCL, San Diego, CA, 2006.
- **Stephanie Fiereck** Author, "Consultant Service Companies Assisting Counsel in Class-Action Suits." *New Jersey Lawyer*, Vol. 14, No. 44, Oct. 2005.
- **Stephanie Fiereck** Author, "Expand Your Internet Research Toolbox." The American Bar Association, *The Young Lawyer*, Vol. 9, No. 10, July/Aug. 2005.

Experts' Articles and Presentations

- **Stephanie Fiereck** Author, "Class Action Reform: Be Prepared to Address New Notification Requirements." BNA, Inc. The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. *Class Action Litigation Report*, Vol. 6, No. 9, May 2005.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Notice and Response Rates in Class Action Settlements." Stoel Rives Litigation Group, Portland, OR / Seattle, WA / Boise, ID / Salt Lake City, UT, 2005.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "Notice and Response Rates in Class Action Settlements." Stroock & Stroock & Lavan Litigation Group, Los Angeles, CA, 2005.
- **Stephanie Fiereck** Author, "Bankruptcy Strategies Can Avert Class Action Crisis." TMA - *The Journal of Corporate Renewal*, Sept. 2004.
- **Cameron Azari** Author, "FRCP 23 Amendments: Twice the Notice or No Settlement." Current Developments – Issue II, Aug. 2003.
- **Cameron Azari** Speaker, "A Scientific Approach to Legal Notice Communication." Weil Gotshal Litigation Group, New York, NY, 2003.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Christine P. O'Hearn, *In re U.S. Vision Data Breach Litigation* (Oct. 15, 2024) 1:22-cv-06558 (D.N.J.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan, set forth in the Settlement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated to provide and did provide due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement, their right to exclude themselves, their right to object to the Settlement and to appear at the final approval hearing, and satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

Judge Madeline Cox Arleo, *In re American Financial Resources, Inc. Data Breach Litigation* (Oct. 2, 2024) 22-cv-01757 (D.N.J.):

The Court finds that Notice of the Settlement was timely and properly disseminated and effectuated pursuant to the approved Notice Plan, and that said Notice constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies all requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process.

Judge Zahid N. Quraishi, *In re Lipitor Antitrust Litigation (End Payor)* (Oct. 1, 2024) MDL 2332; 3:12-cv-02389 (D.N.J.):

The notices of Settlement . . . that was directed to Class Members constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and was timely and properly disseminated and effectuated. Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court hereby finds that the Notice provided Class Members due and adequate notice of the Settlement, the Settlement Agreement, these proceedings, the rights of Class Members to object to the Settlement, and the rights of Class Members to opt out of the Settlement, and satisfied all requirements of Rule 23 and due process.

Judge James B. Clark, III, *Hu et al. v. BMW of North America LLC* (Sept. 25, 2024) 2:18-cv-04363 (D.N.J.):

Notice to the Settlement Class required by Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been provided in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, by sending such Notice by first-class mail and email . . . These individual notice efforts reached approximately 97.9% of the Settlement Class . . . The Settlement Administrator also utilized digital notice and social media and placed the Notice on the settlement website . . . The Court finds that notice (a) constituted the best practicable notice; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, or their right to object or to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing and of their right to seek relief; (c) constituted reasonable, due, adequate and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) met all applicable, requirements of Rule 23(e), due process and any other applicable law. The Court further finds that Settlement Class Members have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice fully satisfies all requirements of law as well as all requirements of due process.

Judge Susan Illston, *Perez et al. v. Discover Bank* (Sept. 23, 2024) 3:20-cv-06896 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the form and means of disseminating notice to the Settlement Class as provided for in the Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and was directed to Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Court's Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement. The notice provided due and adequate notice of these proceedings to all Settlement Class Members entitled to such notice and satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and of constitutional due process.

Judge Allen Price Walker, *Agnew v. Foris DAX, Inc. d/b/a Crypto.com* (Sept. 13, 2023) 2024-CH-00435 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803, applicable law, and the Due Process Clauses of the U.S. Constitution and Illinois Constitution.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Patricia M. DeMaio, *Beauford v. The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Inc. et al.* (Sept. 6, 2024) C-03-CV-23-000501 (Cir. Ct. Baltimore Cnty.):

The notice provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and order granting Preliminary Approval - including: (i) direct notice to the Settlement Class via email and U.S. mail, based on the comprehensive Settlement Class List provided by Defendants; and (ii) the creation of the Settlement Website fully complied with the requirements of Md. R. Civ. P. Cir. Ct. 2-231 and due process, and was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Charles S. Treat, *Doe v. Clinivate, LLC* (Aug. 29, 2024) C22-01620 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Contra Costa, Cal.):

The Court finds that Epiq abided by the terms and conditions of the Agreement that pertain to the Clams Administrator, and has provided appropriate notice to all members of the Settlement Class.

Judge Claude M. Hilton, *Domitrovich et al. v. M.C. Dean, Inc.* (Aug. 27, 2024) 1:23-cv-00210 (E.D. Vir.):

The Court finds and determines that the Notice Program . . . constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth in the notices to all persons entitled to receive such notices, and fully satisfies the requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure . . . and all other applicable laws and rules. The Court finds that all of the notices are written in plain language and are readily understandable by Settlement Class Members.

Judge Susan Illston, *Moradpour et al. v. Velodyne Lidar, Inc. et al.* (Aug. 19, 2024) 3:21-cv-01486 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court hereby finds that the distribution of the Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice as provided for in the Preliminary Approval Order constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances – including individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort – of those proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the requirements of due process, and any other applicable law . . . Pursuant to and in full compliance with Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court finds and concludes that due and adequate notice was directed to all Class Members advising them of the Plan of Allocation and of their right to object, and a full and fair opportunity was given to all Class Members to be heard with respect to the Plan of Allocation.

Judge Christina R. Klineman, *In re Goodman Campbell Brain and Spine Data Incident Litigation* (Aug. 19, 2024) 49D01-2207-PL-024807 (Ind. Comm. Ct.):

The Court finds that the notice program, set forth in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated to provide and did provide due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and their right to object and to appear at the final approval hearing or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and satisfied the requirements of the Indiana Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and other applicable law.

Judge Jeffrey L. Reed, *Doe v. Lima Memorial Hospital et al.* (Aug. 12, 2024) CV2022 0490 (Ct. of Common Pleas Allen Cnty., Ohio):

The Court finds that such Notice constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members.

Judge Alison C. Conlon, *Mikulecky et al. v. Lutheran Social Services of Illinois* (Aug. 8, 2024) 2023-CH-00895 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all materials terms of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803, applicable law, and the due process clauses of both the U.S. and Illinois Constitutions.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Benjamin F. Coats, Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Agak (Aug. 5, 2024) 56-2017-00500587 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Ventura, Cal.):

The form and means of disseminating the Class Notice as provided for in the Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Providing for Notice constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members of the Class who could be identified through reasonable effort. Said Notice provided the best notice practicable under the circumstances of the proceedings and the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said Notice fully satisfied the requirements of California Rules of Civil Procedure and complied with all laws, including, but not limited to, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judge Gretchen Walsh, Finn et al. v. Empress Ambulance Services, LLC (July 31, 2024) 61058/2024 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Westchester, N.Y.):

There was a reach of 87.3% of the identified class members (i.e., 265,863 of the 304,362 notices mailed were successfully mailed and not returned to sender). The Court finds that this notice was in full compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order and in accordance with the requirements of New York law and constitutional due process. Furthermore, the result of reaching 87.3% of the Settlement Class is reasonable.

The Court finds that the dissemination of Notice to Settlement Class Members: (a) was successfully implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) their right to submit a claim (where applicable) by submitting a Claim Form; (iii) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iv) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the releases to be provided thereunder); (v) Class Counsel's motion for a Fee Award and Costs and for Service Awards to the Class Representatives, (vi) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, and/or Class Counsel's motion for Service Awards to the Class Representatives and for a Fee Award and Costs; (vii) their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all natural persons entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of NY CPLR 901, et seq., the Constitution of the United States (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable laws and rules.

Judge James Wesley Hendrix, Lara v. Lubbock Heart Hospital, LLC, dba Lubbock Heart & Surgical Hospital (July 31, 2024) 5:23-cv-00036 (N.D. Tex.):

[T]he Court finds that the notice provided to the class members complied with Rule 23's due process requirements . . . [T]he Court concludes that this notice process comported with due process by providing proper notice to the class members and enabled them to assess whether to object or seek exclusion . . . Almost 90% of class members received direct notice mailed to them of the settlement that identified its key terms, what steps they needed to take to obtain relief, and the consequences of failing to act by certain dates . . . The class members further were given multiple avenues to seek out additional information on the settlement. All of this information was given in plain language, ensuring that the members receiving direct notice were made aware of their rights and the consequences of inaction. Accordingly, the Court concludes that the notice given pursuant to the Court's preliminary approval order provided the class members with the material terms of the settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judge Lindsey Robinson Vaala, Morrow et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union (July 25, 2024) 1:21-cv-00722 (E.D. Va.):

The Notice and Claims Process provided to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, to all persons entitled to notice. The Notice and Claims Process fully satisfied the requirements of due process, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1), and all other applicable law and rules. No Settlement Class Member has objected to the Settlement.

Judge Marsha J. Pechman, Guy et al. v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc. (July 19, 2024) 2:22-cv-01558 (W.D. Wash.):

The Court finds and determines that the Notice Program, preliminarily approved on February 20, 2024, and implemented on March 21, 2024, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth in the notices to all persons entitled to receive such notices, and fully satisfies the requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all other applicable laws and rules. . . The Court further finds that all of the notices are written in plain

Judicial Quotes

language and are readily understandable by Settlement Class Members. The Court further finds that notice has been provided to the appropriate state and federal officials in accordance with the requirements of the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, drawing no objections.

Judge Katherine A. Bacal, *Ward-Howie v. Frontwave Credit Union* (July 18, 2024) 37-2022-00016328 (Sup. Ct. Cal. San Diego Cnty., Cal.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Notice of the Settlement has been completed in conformity with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that the Notice was the most practicable under the circumstances and provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the terms of the Settlement, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Rules of Court, rules 3.766 and 3.769(f), and Due Process.

Judge Catherine C. Eagles, *Farley et al. v. Eye Care Leaders Holding, LLC* (June 27, 2024) 1:22-cv-00468 (M.D.N.C.):

The court-approved notice process was reasonable and provided the class members with adequate notice.

Judge William J. Martini, *Holden et al. v. Guardian Analytics, Inc. et al.* (June 5, 2024) 2:23-cv-2115 (D.N.J.):

The Court finds that such notice as therein ordered constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances, apprised Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the action, gave them an opportunity to opt out or object, complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2), and satisfied due process under the United States Constitution, and other applicable law.

Judge Angelo J. Kappas, *Bobo et al. v. Clover Network, LLC* (May 29, 2024) 2023CH000168 (18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., Dupage Cnty. Ill.):

[T]he Notice provided to the Settlement Class fully complied with the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803 and due process was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Stanley A. Bastian, *Dam v. Perkins Coie, LLP et al.* (May 23, 2024) 2:20-CV-00464 (E.D. Wash.):

The notice afforded to Class Members is adequate and sufficient to inform Class Member of their rights.

Judge Angelo J. Kappas, *Hoover et al. v. Camping World Group, LLC et al.* (May 23, 2024) 2023LA00037 (18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes reasonable notice of the commencement of the action as directed by the Court and meets all applicable requirements of law pursuant to 735 ILCS 5-2/801 and constitutes Due Process under the U.S. and Illinois Constitutions.

Judge Paul L. Maloney, *In re Hope College Data Security Breach Litigation* (May 20, 2024) 1:22-cv-01224 (W.D. Mich.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice, website, and Notice Plan implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order: (a) constituted the best practicable notice; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of this Action, of their right to exclude themselves from or object to the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, of Plaintiffs Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fee and expenses, and of Plaintiffs' application for a Service Award associated with the Action; (c) provided a full and fair opportunity to all Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the foregoing matters; and (d) met all applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, due process, and any other applicable rules or law.

Judge Richard J. Leon, *Shaffer et al. v. George Washington University et al.* (May 13, 2024) 20-1145 (D.D.C.):

[T]he Court concludes that the notice provided to the Settlement Class...complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the action, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the final approval hearing.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Ann M. Donnelly, *In re Canon U.S.A. Data Breach Litigation* (May 9, 2024) 1:20-cv-06239 (E.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the emailed and mailed notice, publication notice, website, and Class Notice plan implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Magistrate Judge Sanket J. Bulsara's Preliminary Approval Order: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of this Action, of the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder), of their right to exclude themselves from or object to the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, of the Claims Process, and of Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees, for reimbursement of expenses associated with the Action, and any Service Award; (d) provided a full and fair opportunity to all Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the foregoing matters; (e) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (f) met all applicable requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, including the Due Process Clause, and any other applicable rules or law.

Judge Christopher R. Cooper, *Qureshi et al. v. American University* (May 7, 2024) 1:20-cv-01141 (D.D.C.):

The Court further finds that the notice program approved in the Court's Preliminary Approval Order and implemented in accordance with that Order was the best practicable under the circumstances. The notice program was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Class of (a) the pendency of the Action; (b) the Court's preliminary certification of the Settlement Class; (c) the terms of the Settlement Agreement and the Settlement Class Members' rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class or to object to the settlement; (d) and the maximum amounts of Class Counsel's expected application for attorneys' fees and request for a Service Award for the Plaintiffs. The notice program provided sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The notice program satisfied all applicable requirements of law, including Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the constitutional requirement of Due Process.

Judge Eric V. Moyé, *Patterson et al. v. DPP II LLC et al.* (April 29, 2024) DC-23-01733 (Dist. Ct of Dallas Cnty., Tex.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members.

Judge Josephine L. Staton, *In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation II* (April 26, 2024) 8:18-cv-02223 (C.D. Cal.):

The Class Notice was disseminated in accordance with the procedures required by the Court's Orders ..., in accordance with applicable law, and satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process and constituted the best notice practicable for the reasons discussed in the Preliminary Approval Order and Final Approval Order.

Judge Elaine P. Lujan, *Briscoe et al. v. First Financial Credit Union* (April 25, 2024) D-202-CV-2022-02974 (2nd. Jud. Dist. Cnty. of Bernalillo, N.M.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material terms of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 1-023, applicable law, and the due process clauses of both the U.S. and New Mexico Constitutions.

Judge Eleanor L. Ross, *Sherwood et al. v. Horizon Actuarial Services, LLC* (April 2, 2024) 1:22-cv-01495 (N.D. Ga.):

The Court's Preliminary Approval Order approved the Short Form Settlement Notice, Long Form Notice, Claim Form, and found the mailing, distribution, and publishing of the various notices as proposed met the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constituting due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Court finds that the distribution of the Notices has been achieved pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order and the Settlement Agreement, and that the Notice to Class Members complied with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Beth Phillips, *Niewinski et al. v. State Farm Life Insurance Company et al.* (April 1, 2024) 23-04159-CV (W.D. Mo.):

[T]he Court confirms the Class Notice was implemented in accordance with the Court's October 18, 2023 Order... The Court further confirms its prior findings that the form and substance of the Class Notice meet, and have met, the requirements of Rule 23(c) and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judge Beth Labson Freeman, *Prescott et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC* (Mar. 28, 2024) 5:20-cv-02101 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that notice has been disseminated to the Classes in compliance with the Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval. The Court further finds that the notice given was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class members of the pendency of the action, the terms of the proposed Settlement, the right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and the right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; fully satisfied due process; and met the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court further finds that notice provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1715 were complied with in this case.

Judge Kimberly Fitzpatrick, *Kaether et al. v. Metropolitan Area EMS Authority D/B/A MedStar Mobile Healthcare* (Mar. 20, 2024) 342-339562-23 (Dist. Ct. Tarrant Cnty., Tex.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members.

Judge Denise L. Cote, *In re Waste Management Data Breach Litigation* (Mar. 15, 2024) 1:21-cv-06199 (S.D. N.Y.):

The Court finds and concludes that the Postcard Notice, Detailed Notice, Claim Form, Settlement Website, and all other aspects of the Notice Program, opt-out, and claims submission procedures set forth in the Settlement Agreement fully satisfied Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process, were the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and support the Court's exercise of jurisdiction over the Settlement Class.

Judge Douglas L. Rayes, *Medina et al. v. PracticeMax, Inc.* (Mar. 14, 2024) CV-22-01261 (D. Ariz.):

The Court's Preliminary Approval Order approved the Short Form Settlement Notice, Long Form Notice, Claim Form, and found the mailing, distribution, and publishing of the various notices as proposed met the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constituting due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice.

Judge William H. Orrick, *In re Juul Labs, Inc., Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation* (Altria Settlement) (Mar. 14, 2024) 19-md-02913 (N.D. Cal.):

Notice of the Altria Settlement was provided by: (1) direct notice via email to those Settlement Class Members for whom an email address was available; (2) direct notice via postcard mailed to those Settlement Class Members for whom a physical mailing address was available but an email address was not available; (3) publication notice of the Settlement, which comprised 409,315,597 impressions, targeted at likely Settlement Class Members served across relevant internet websites and social media platforms; and (4) publication on the settlement website. In total, the Notice Plan is estimated to have reached at least 80% of Settlement Class Members. The Court finds that the Notice Plan provided the best practicable notice to the Settlement Class Members and satisfied the requirements of due process.

Judge Aleta A. Trauger, *Bandy v. TOC Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Tennessee Orthopaedic Clinics, a division of Tennessee Orthopaedic Alliance, P.A.*, (Mar. 14, 2024) 3:23-cv-00598 (M.D. Tenn.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members in compliance with the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2). The Court finds that the notice program was reasonably calculated to, and did, provide due and sufficient notice to the Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and their rights to object to and appear at the Final Fairness Hearing or to exclude themselves from the Settlement, and satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Allen Price Walker, *Sayas et al. v. Biometric Impressions Corp.*, (Mar. 6, 2024) 2020 CH 00201 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill.):

Notice to the Settlement Class was provided in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and the substance of and dissemination program for the Notice which included direct notice via U.S. Mail and email (where available), and by substitute media notification according to a targeted media campaign designed by the Settlement Administrator, and the creation of the Settlement Website... provided the best practicable notice under the circumstances. The Notice was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action and their rights to object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. Therefore, the Notice was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice and fulfilled the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803, due process, and the rules of the Court.

Judge Angel Kelley, *Fiorentino v. Flosports, Inc.*, (Mar. 5, 2024) 1:22-cv-11502 (D. Mass.):

The Court finds that the notice program, as set forth in Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Court's August 23, 2023 Preliminary Approval Order (Doc No. 63) and November 6, 2023 Order Granting Joint Motion for Extension of Time (Doc No. 65), satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c) and due process and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of (i) the pendency of the Action and of the Settlement, including the terms thereof; (ii) class members' rights to object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement, including the procedure for objecting to or opting out of the Settlement, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) contact information for Class Counsel, the Settlement Administrator, the Settlement Website, and a toll-free number to ask questions about the Settlement; (iv) important dates in the settlement approval process, including the date of the Final Approval Hearing; (v) Class Counsel's request for an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses; and (vi) the Class Representative's application for a service award.

Judge David O. Carter, *Nielsen v. Walt Disney Parks and Resorts U.S., Inc.*, (Mar. 4, 2024) 8:21-cv-02055 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice plan provided for in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order: (i) was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated to provide, and did provide, due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class regarding the existence and nature of this case, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the rights of Settlement Class members to exclude themselves from the settlement, to object and appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and to receive benefits under the Settlement Agreement; and (iii) satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

Judge Craig Schwall, *Mayheu et al. v. Chick-fil-A Inc.*, (Feb. 29, 2024) 2022CV365400 (Sup. Ct. Fulton Cnty., Ga.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice and notice methodology was properly implemented in accordance with O.C.G.A. § 9-11-23(c)(2), the terms of the Agreement, and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that the Class Notice was simply written and readily understandable and that the Class Notice (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (b) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class and Settlement Subclasses of the Agreement and their right to exclude themselves or object to the Agreement and to appear at the Fairness Hearing; (c) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (d) meets all applicable requirements of Georgia law, the Uniform Superior Court Rules, and all other applicable law and due process requirements.

Judge Sheila D. Stinson, *Nimsey v. Tinker Federal Credit Union*, (Feb. 23, 2024) CJ-2019-6084 (Dist. Ct. Oklahoma Cnty., Okla.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice given to members of the Settlement Class—individual emailed or mailed notice—were adequate and reasonable constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfied the requirements of 12 Okla. Stat. § 12-2023(C)(4) and (E)(1) and Due Process.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Phillip A. Brimmer, *Beasley et al. v. TTEC Services Corporation; Anderson v. TTEC Services Corporation* (Feb. 21, 2024) 22-cv-00097; 22-cv-00347 (D. Col.):

[T]he Court finds that the notice given to members of the class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise such members of the pendency of this action and to afford them an opportunity to object to, and meets the requirements of Rule 23 (c)(2)(B) and (e)(1).

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *In re PFA Insurance Marketing Litigation* (Feb. 5, 2024) 4:18-cv-03771 YGR (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the relief provided to class members under the SA is fair and reasonable when considering the Rule 23(e)(2)(C) factors...

Judge Charles R. Breyer, *In re McKinsey & Co., Inc. National Prescription Opiate Consultant Litigation Schools* (Feb. 2, 2024) 3:21-md-02996 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement Agreement (ECF No. 599-2) and the Preliminary Approval Order fully complied with Due Process and Rule 23, and was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Charles R. Breyer, *In re McKinsey & Co., Inc. National Prescription Opiate Consultant Litigation Subdivision* (Feb. 2, 2024) 3:21-md-02996 (N.D. Cal.):

[T]he Court has considered each of the Rule 23(e) factors and finds that the Class Representatives and Class Counsel have adequately represented the Class, the settlement agreement was negotiated at arm's length, the relief provided for the Class is adequate, and the plan of allocation treats Class Members equitably relative to one another.

Judge David E Schwartz, *Stauber v. Sudler Property Management* (Jan. 22, 2024) 023LA000411 (18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty., Ill.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members in compliance with the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-801, et seq.

Judge Edward J. Davila, *Harbour et al. v. California Health & Wellness et al.* (Jan. 16, 2024) 5:21-cv-03322 (N.D. Cal.):

[T]he Court finds that the terms of the Settlement, including the awards of attorneys' fees, costs and incentive awards, is fair, adequate, and reasonable that it satisfies Federal Rule of Civil Procedures 23 (e) and the fairness and adequacy factors; and that it should be approved and implemented.

Judge Susan Illston, *Roberts v. Zuora Inc. et al.* (Jan. 16, 2024) 3:19-cv-03422 (N.D. Cal.):

The form and method of notifying the Settlement Class of the motion for attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and a service award satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. § 78u-4(a)(7)), due process, and all other applicable laws and rules, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

Judge Leigh Martin May, *Black v. USAA Casualty Insurance Company* (Dec. 14, 2023) 1:21-cv-01363 (N.D. Ga.):

[T]he Court finds that the notice provided to Settlement Class Members (i) was the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) was calculated to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action and their right to object to or seek exclusion from the Proposed Settlement and to appear at the final Fairness Hearing; and (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Timothy McJoynt, Jackson et al. v. Fandango Media, LLC (Dec. 4 2023) 2023LA000631 (18th Jud. Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the notice provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and order granting Preliminary Approval—including: (i) direct notice in the form of an email to Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Class List, containing an electronic link to the Claim Form; (ii) reminder notice via a second email thirty (30) days prior to the Claims Deadline containing an electronic link to the Claim Form; and (iii) the creation of a Settlement website . . . apprising the Settlement Class of the proposed Settlement and enabling the Settlement Class to submit Claim Forms online—fully complied with the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803 and due process, and was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, the Settlement and Settlement Agreement, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement and Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Nadine Nieto, Arevalo et al. v. USAA Casualty Insurance Company et al. (Nov. 27, 2023) 2020-CI-16240 (Dist. Ct., Bexar County, Tex. 285th Jud. Dist.):

The Court confirms and approves, as to form and content, the Notice delivered to Settlement Class members, and finds that the Notice Program was fair, adequate, and satisfied due process. The Court finds the notice constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances by providing individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort and constituted valid and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto, complying fully with the requirements of due process and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 42 (e)(1)(B).

Judge Todd Taylor, Alexander et al. v. Salud Family Health, Inc. (Nov. 22, 2023) 2023CV030580 (19th Dist. Ct. Greeley Cnty., Col.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members in compliance with the requirements of Colorado Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e). The Court finds that the Claims Administrator's notice fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members about the Litigation and the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement; advised Settlement Class Members of all terms of the Settlement; advised Settlement Class Members of their right to request exclusion from the Settlement and provided sufficient information so Settlement Class Members were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the proposed Settlement; provided procedures for Settlement Class Members to file written objections to the proposed Settlement, to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and to state objections to the proposed Settlement; and provided the time, date, and place of the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge John R. Tunheim, In re Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation (Nov. 21, 2023) 22-3031 (D.Minn.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class, including individual notice to all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable effort, was the most effective and practicable under the circumstances. This notice provided due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and this notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge Lawrence P. Riff, Ross et al. v. Panda Restaurant Group, Inc. (Nov. 20, 2023) 21STCV03662 (Sup. Ct. Cal., Cnty. of Los Angeles):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Notice of the Settlement has been completed in conformity with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that the notice was the most practicable under the circumstances and provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the terms of the Settlement. The Court finds that the notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process. The Court also finds that all Settlement Class Members were given a full and fair opportunity to participate in the Fairness Hearing, all Class Members wishing to be heard have been heard, and all Class Members have had a full and fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Stephen Dries, *Fernandez et al. v. 90 Degree Benefits Wisconsin et al.* (Nov. 17, 2023) 2:22-cv-00799 (E.D. Wis.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action, (ii) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the releases to be provided thereunder), (iii) Class Counsel's motion for a Fee Award and Costs, (iv) Class Representatives' motion for a Service Award Payments, (v) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, Class Counsel's motion for a Fee Award and Costs, and/or Class Representatives' motion for a Service Award Payments, (vi) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class, and (vii) their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable law and rules.

Judge Joseph V. Salvi, *Gudgel et al. v. Reynolds Consumer Products, Inc. et al.* (Nov. 15, 2023) 23LA00000486 (Cir. Ct. 19th Jud. Cir., Lake Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, applicable law, and the due process clauses of the United States and Illinois Constitutions.

Judge Kimberly Dowling, *Sharma et al. v. Accutech Systems Corporation* (Nov. 13, 2023) 18C02-2210-CT-000135 (Cir. Ct. 2, Del. Cnty., Ind.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered was the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members in compliance with the requirements of Indiana Rule of Trial Procedure 23(c)(2).

Judge William T. Ridley, *Julien et al. v. Cash Express, LLC* (Nov. 9, 2023) 2022-CV-221 (Cir. Ct. Putnam Cnty. Tenn.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to members of the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfied the requirements of Due Process.

Judge Jennifer Barron, *Young et al. v. Military Advantage, Inc. d/b/a Military.com* (Nov. 9, 2023) 2023LA00535 (18th Jud. Dist. Cir. Ct. Dupage Cnty. Ill.):

The notice provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and order granting Preliminary Approval - including (i) direct notice to the Settlement Class via email and U.S. mail, based on the comprehensive subscriber list provided by Defendant, and (ii) the creation of the Settlement Website - fully complied with the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803 and due process, and was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Laura Scott, *Lukens v. Utah Imaging Associates, Inc.* (Nov. 8, 2023) 210906618 (3rd Dist., Salt Lake Cnty., Utah):

The Court has determined that the notice given to the Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material terms of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Utah R. Civ. P. 23, applicable law, and the due process clauses of both the U.S. and Utah Constitutions.

Judge Christopher C. Nash, *Gulf Coast Injury Center, LLC, A/A/O Jordan Rimert v. Esurance Property and Casualty Insurance Company* (Nov. 3, 2023) 21-CA-002738 (Cir. Ct. 13th Jud. Cir. Hillsborough Cnty, Fla.):

The Court hereby finds that the Notice Plan (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated to apprise potential Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the Proposed Settlement, and to appear at the final approval hearing; and (iii) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient process and notice to all persons entitled to receive notice.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Robert R. Reed, *Gold et al. v. New York Life Insurance Co. et al.* (Oct. 26, 2023) 653923/2012 (Sup. Ct. N.Y., Cnty., NY):

The Court finds that the procedures for notifying the Class Members about the Settlement, including the Class Settlement Notice, Summary Notice of Settlement, and Advertisement via LinkedIn, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all Class Members, and fully satisfied all necessary requirements of due process. Based on the evidence, arguments and other materials submitted in connection with the Fairness Hearing, the Court finds that the notice provided was adequate, due, sufficient and valid notice to Class Members.

Judge Sidney H. Stein, *Sonterra Capital Master Fund Ltd. v. Credit Suisse Group AG et al.* (Oct. 24, 2023) 1:15-cv-00871 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the mailed notice, publication notice, website, and Class Notice plan implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and approved by the Court in the Order dated February 15, 2023 (ECF No. 426), amended by Order dated May 16, 2023 (ECF No. 458); (a) constituted the best practicable notice; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, of their right to exclude themselves from or object to the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, of the Distribution Plan, and of Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees, Incentive Award(s), and for reimbursement of expenses associated with the Action; (c) provided a full and fair opportunity to all Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the foregoing matters; and (d) met all applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, Due Process, and any other applicable rules or law.

Judge Jennifer P. Wilson, *Banks et al. v. Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Company* (Oct. 23, 2023) 19-cv-01617 (M.D. Penn.):

WHEREAS the Allstate Defendants, through the Notice Agent, have served the notices required under the Class Action Fairness Act on the appropriate state and federal government officials. Id.... due and adequate notice has been given to the Settlement Class Members in satisfaction of the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23 (e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Constitutional Due Process ...

Judge Michael F. Stelzer, *Perry v. Schnuck Markets, Inc.* (Oct. 10, 2023) 2022-CC10425 (Cir. Ct. City of St. Louis, Mo.):

Notice to the Members of the Settlement Class required by Mo. R. Civ. P. 52.08(b)(3) has been provided as directed by this Court in the Preliminary Approval Order, and such notice constituted the best notice practicable, including, but not limited to, the forms of notice and methods of identifying and providing notice to the Settlement Class Members, and satisfied the requirements of the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure, and all other applicable laws. The Court finds that adequate notice was given to all Settlement Class Members pursuant to the terms of the Parties' Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court has further determined that the Notice Plan fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Mo. R. Civ. P. 52.08(b)(3), applicable law, and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judge Eleanor L. Ross, *Dusko v. Delta Airlines, Inc.* (Oct. 5, 2023) 1:20-cv-01664 (N.D. Ga.):

The Court finds the Settlement Class received the best notice practicable under the circumstances in compliance with due process and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e)(1).

Judge Timothy S. Black, *Miranda v. Xavier University* (Oct. 3, 2023) 1:20-cv-00539 (S.D. Ohio):

Considering the notice procedures, nearly all, if not all, Class Members received notice, and the Court finds that the notice issued to class members satisfied (if not exceeded) the requirements of the federal rules and due process.

Judge R. Barclay Surrick, J., *Checchia v. Bank of America, N.A.* (Sept. 21, 2023) 2:21-cv-03585 (E.D. Penn.):

Notice to the Class required by Rule 23(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure' has been provided in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, entered February 16, 2023, and such Notice by mail and publication has been given in an adequate and sufficient manner; constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and satisfies Rule 23(e) and due process. Notice of Settlement was

Judicial Quotes

timely mailed to governmental entities as provided for in 28 U.S.C. § 1715.

Judge William H. Orrick, *In re Juul Labs, Inc., Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation* (Juul Settlement) Sept. 19, 2023) 19-md-02913 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court also approved the appointment of Epiq as the Claims Administrator based on representations of Epiq's qualifications and experience and an outline of administrative and communication services to be provided to class members... The record establishes that the Class Settlement Administrator served the required notices under the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, with the documentation required by 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b)(1)-(8). ECF No. 3742.

Judge Richard G. Stearns, *Ambrose et al v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC* (Sept. 8, 2023) 1:22-cv-10195 (D. Mass.):

The notice provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement Agreement (ECF No. 51) and order granting Preliminary Approval (ECF No. 52)-including (i) direct notice to the Settlement Class via email and U.S. mail, based on the comprehensive subscriber list provided by Defendant, and (ii) the creation of the Settlement Website -fully complied with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process, and was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing... The Court finds that Defendant properly and timely notified the appropriate government officials of the Settlement Agreement, pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1715. The Court has reviewed the substance of Defendant's notice, and finds that it complied with all applicable requirements of CAFA. Further, more than ninety (90) days have elapsed since Defendant provided notice pursuant to CAFA and the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Matthew P. Brookman, *In re Midwestern Pet Foods Marketing, Sales Practices and Product Liability Litigation* (Aug. 21, 2023) 3:21-cv-00007 (S.D. Ind.):

The notice given to the Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Said notice provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process.

Judge David B. Atkins, *King et al. v. PeopleNet Corporation* (Aug. 10, 2023) 2021-CH-01602 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803, applicable law, and the Due Process Clauses of the U.S. Constitution and Illinois Constitution.

Judge William F. Highberger, *Holly Wedding et al. vs. California Public Employees' Retirement System et al.* (July 28, 2023) BC517444 (Sup. Ct. Cnty of Los Angeles, Cal.):

The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate protections to all members of the Settlement Class including those who requested exclusion and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed decision regarding approval of the Second Settlement based on the responses of the Settlement Class. The Court finds and determines that the notice provided in this case was the best notice practicable, which satisfied the requirements of law and due process.

Judge James Donato, *In re Robinhood Outage Litigation* (July 18, 2023) 3:20-cv-01626 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Long Form Notice and the Notice Plan including a combination email and physical mail to Settlement Class Members based on Robinhood's records, a social media campaign, and a dedicated website, was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order and (a) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (b) constituted notice that is appropriate, in a manner, content, and format reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action and the effect of the Settlement (including the releases contained therein); their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or Class Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Service Awards; their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing; (c) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive

Judicial Quotes

notice; and (d) met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court. These combined efforts directly reached approximately 99% of the identified Settlement Class members.

Judge Antonio Arzola, *Hrebenar v. Davis Yulee LLC, d/b/a Davis Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram of Julee* (July 18, 2023) 2023-001405-CA-01 (11th Jud. Cir. Ct. Miami-Dade Cnty., Fla.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement, (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances to Settlement Class Members, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of, among other things, the pendency of the Action, the nature and terms of the proposed Settlement, their right to object or to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice, and (iv) complied fully with the requirements of Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law. (b) The Court finds that the Class Notice and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, and this Final Approval Order (i) constitute the most effective and practicable notice of the Final Approval Order, the relief available to Settlement Class Members pursuant to the Final Approval Order, and applicable time periods; (ii) constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice for all other purposes to all Settlement Class Members; and (iii) comply fully with the requirements of Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable laws.

Judge Rodolfo A. Ruiz II, *Wenston Desue et al. v. 20/20 Eye Care Network, Inc. et al.* (July 8, 2023) 21-CIV-61275 (S.D. Fla.):

The Notice was provided to Class Members in accordance with the plan approved in the Court's Order Certifying Settlement Class and Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Notice Program...Under these circumstances, the Court finds the Notice fairly apprised the Class of the proposed settlement terms and of the options open to them...The Court finds the Notice was the best practical, and the response and claims rates are within the acceptable range for final approval.

Judge William M. Skretny, *Ingram v. Jamestown Import Auto Sales, Inc. d/b/a Kia of Jamestown* (June 13, 2023) 1:22-cv-00309 (W.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement, (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances to Settlement Class Members, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of, among other things, the pendency of the Action, the nature and terms of the proposed Settlement, their right to object or to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice, and (iv) complied fully with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law. (b) The Court finds that the requirements of the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, et seq ("CAFA"), including all notice requirements therein, have been met.

Judge Jesse M. Furman, *Dickens et al. v. Thinx, Inc.* (June 8, 2023) 1:22-cv-04286 (S.D.N.Y.):

The form and methods of notifying the Settlement Class of the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement Agreement met the requirements of Fed R. Civ. P. 23, due process, and any other applicable law, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Further, the settlement administrator, Epiq, on behalf of Defendant, caused timely notice of the Settlement and related materials to be sent to the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorneys General of all U.S. states, territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"). The Court finds that such notification complies fully with the applicable requirements of CAFA.

Judge Ed Kinkeade, *Kostka et al. v. Dickey's Barbecue Restaurants, Inc. et al.* (June 6, 2023) 3:20-cv-03424 (N.D. Tex.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order fully and accurately informed Settlement Class members of all material terms of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, applicable law, and the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Judicial Quotes

Judge James C. Dever, III, *Silva et al v. Connected Investors, Inc.* (June 2, 2023) 7:21-cv-00074 (E.D.N.C.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice... (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances to Settlement Class Members, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of, among other things, the pendency of the Action, the nature and terms of the proposed Settlement, their right to object or to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice, and (iv) complied fully with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law.

Judge Charles S. Treat, *Service et al. v Volkswagen Group of America et al.* (May 31, 2023) c22-01841 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Contra Costa):

Class Notice was provided to the Class in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order and satisfied the requirements of due process, California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and rule 3.766 of the California Rules of Court and: (a) provided the best notice practicable; and (b) was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the settlement, their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, their right to object to the settlement, and their right to exclude themselves from the settlement. The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in the SA and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Settlement Class, the terms of the SA, and the Final Approval Hearing, and satisfies the requirements of California law and due process of law.

Judge Erin B. O'Connell, *McCullough v. True Health New Mexico, Inc.* (May 30, 2023) d-202-cv-2021-06816 (2nd Dist. Ct, N.M.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order fully and accurately informed Settlement Class members of all material terms of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 1-023, applicable law, and the due process clauses of both the U.S. and New Mexico Constitutions.

Judge Greg Hill, *Meier v. Prosperity Bank* (May 23, 2023) 109569-CV (239th Jud. Dist., Brazoria Cnty., Tex.):

The Court finds that Notice to the Settlement Class was the best notice practicable and complied with the requirements of Due Process, and that the Notice Program was completed in compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order and the Agreement.

Judge Thomas L. Ludington, *Thomsen et al. v. Morley Cos, Inc.* (May 12, 2023) 1:22-cv-10271 (E.D. Mich.):

Class notice was sent as ordered, the time for objections passed, and a final-approval hearing was held to determine whether the Agreement is "fair, reasonable, and adequate" under Rule 23(e)(2) on April 19, 2023...In sum, the Settlement Agreement and Class Notice satisfy all the relevant factors.

Judge Roseann A. Ketchmark, *Rogowski et al. v. State Farm Life Insurance Company et al.* (April 18, 2023) 4:22-cv-00203 (W.D. Mo.):

[T]he Court confirms the Class Notice was implemented in accordance with the Court's December 16, 2022 preliminary approval order.... The Court further confirms its prior findings that the form and substance of the notice meet, and have met, the requirements of Rule 23(c) and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judge Gregory W. Pollack, *In re Scripps Health Data Incident Litigation* (April 7, 2023) 37-2021-00024103 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego):

The Court finds that...Notice (i) was reasonable and constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the Settlement including its release of Released Claims, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or object to all or any part of the Settlement, their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either on their own or through counsel

Judicial Quotes

hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of final approval of the Settlement on all persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iii) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and any other applicable law.

Judge Christopher C. Conner, *Chapman v. Insight Global LLC* (April 6, 2023) 1:21-cv-00824 (M.D. Penn.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the mail and publication Notices to Class Members as set forth in the Declaration of Claims Administrator was in compliance with the Court's October 27, 2022 Order approving the proposed class notices and notice plan, and that notice has been given in an adequate and sufficient manner; constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and satisfies Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process...Defendant has provided notice of the settlement to the appropriate government officials pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1715.

Judge William P. Dimitrouleas, *South et al. v. Progressive Select Insurance Company* (March 31, 2023) 19-21760-CIV (S.D. Fla.):

The Notice program was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice program provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice and said Notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution, which include the requirement of due process.

Judge Douglas R. Cole, *Middleton et al. v. Liberty Mutual Personal Insurance Company et al.* (Mar. 15, 2023) 1:20-cv-00668 (S.D. Ohio):

The Court hereby finds that the Notice Plan and the Class Notice constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted valid, due and sufficient notice to members of the Settlement Classes.

Judge Jennifer P. Wilson, *Miller v. Bath Saver, Inc. et al.* (Mar. 6, 2023) 1:21-cv-01072 (M.D. Penn.):

The Notice and the Notice Plan implemented pursuant to the Agreement (1) constitute the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (2) constitute notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Litigation, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (3) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (4) meet all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court.

Judge David O. Carter, *In re California Pizza Kitchen Data Breach Litigation* (Feb. 22, 2023) 8:21-cv-01928 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice plan provided for in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order: (i) was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated to provide, and did provide due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class regarding the existence and nature of the Consolidated Cases, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the rights of Settlement Class members to exclude themselves from the settlement, to object and appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and to receive benefits under the Settlement Agreement; and (iii) satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

Judge David Knutson, *Duggan et al. v. Wings Financial Credit Union* (Feb. 3, 2023) 19AV-cv-20-2163 (Dist. Ct., Dakota Cnty., Minn.):

The Court finds that notice of the Settlement to the Class was the best notice practicable and complied with the requirements of Due Process.

Judge Clarence M. Darrow, *Rivera v. IH Mississippi Valley Credit Union* (Jan. 26, 2023) 2019 CH 299 (Cir. Ct 14th Jud. Cir., Rock Island Cnty., Ill.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Notices and the notice methodology were properly

Judicial Quotes

implemented in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court further finds that the Notice was simply written and readily understandable and Class members have received the best notice practicable under the circumstances of the pendency of this action, their right to opt out, their right to object to the settlement, and all other relevant matters. The notices provided to the class met all requirements of due process, 735 ILCS 5/8-2001, et seq., and any other applicable law.

Judge Andrew M. Lavin, *Brower v. Northwest Community Credit Union* (Jan. 18, 2023) 20CV38608 (Ore. Dist. Ct. Multnomah Cnty.):

This Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice was completed in accordance with the Preliminary Approval/Notice Order, signed September 8, 2022, was made pursuant to ORCP 32 D, and fully met the requirements of the Oregon Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, the United States Constitution, the Oregon Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Gregory H. Woods, *Torretto et al. v. Donnelley Financial Solutions, Inc. and Mediant Communications, Inc.* (Jan. 5, 2023) 1:20-cv-02667 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the notice provided to the Class Members was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that it complies with the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2).

Judge Ledricka Thierry, *Opelousas General Hospital Authority v. Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana* (Dec. 21, 2022) 16-C-3647 (27th Jud. D. Ct. La.):

Notice given to Class Members and all other interested parties pursuant to this Court's order of October 31, 2022, was reasonably calculated to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action, the certification of the Class as defined, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Class Members rights to be represented by private counsel, at their own costs, and Class Members' rights to appear in Court to have their objections heard, and to afford persons or entities within the Class definition an opportunity to exclude themselves from the Class. Such notice complied with all requirements of the federal and state constitutions, including the Due Process Clause, and applicable articles of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Class as defined..."

Judge Dale S. Fischer, *DiFlauro et al. v. Bank of America, N.A.* (Dec. 19, 2022) 2:20-cv-05692 (C.D. Cal.):

The form and means of disseminating the Class Notice as provided for in the Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Providing for Notice constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all Members of the Class who could be identified through reasonable effort. Said Notice provided the best notice practicable under the circumstances of the proceedings and the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said Notice fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and complied with all laws, including, but not limited to, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judge Stephen R. Bough, *Browning et al. v. Anheuser-Busch, LLC* (Dec. 19, 2022) 4:20-cv-00889 (W.D. Mo.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Classes, in accordance with the Notice Plan in the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order, fully and accurately informed members of the Classes of all material elements of the Settlement and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of due process, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and all applicable law. The Court further finds that the Notice given to the Classes was adequate and reasonable.

Judge Robert E. Payne, *Haney et al. v. Genworth Life Insurance Co. et al.* (Dec. 12, 2022) 3:22-cv-00055 (E.D. Va.):

The Court preliminarily approved the Amended Settlement Agreement on July 7, 2022, and directed that notice be sent to the Class. ECF No. 34. The Notice explained the policy election options afforded to class members, how they could communicate with Class Counsel about the Amended Settlement Agreement, their rights and options thereunder, how they could examine certain information on a website that was set up as part of the settlement process, and their right to object to the proposed settlement and opt out

Judicial Quotes

of the proposed case. Class members were also informed that they could contact independent counsel of their choice for advice.

In assessing the adequacy of the Notice, as well as the fairness of the settlement itself, it is important that, according to the record, as of November 1, 2022, the Notice reached more than 99% of the more than 352,000 class members. All things considered, the Notice is adequate under the applicable law....

Judge Danielle Viola, *Dearing v. Magellan Health, Inc. et al.* (Dec. 5, 2022) CV2020-013648 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. Maricopa, Ariz.):

The Court finds that the Notice to the Settlement Class fully complied with the requirements of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure and due process, has constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated to provide, and did provide, due and sufficient notice to Settlement Class Members regarding the existence and nature of the Litigation, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, the rights of Settlement Class Members to exclude themselves from or object to the Settlement, the right to appear at the Final Fairness Hearing, and to receive benefits under the Settlement Agreement.

Judge Michael A. Duddy, *Churchill et al. v. Bangor Savings Bank* (Dec. 5, 2022) BCD-CIV-2021-00027 (Maine Bus. & Consumer Ct.):

The Class Notice provided to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, to all persons entitled to notice.

Judge Andrew Schulman, *Guthrie v. Service Federal Credit Union* (Nov. 22, 2022) 218-2021-CV-00160 (Sup. Ct. Rockingham Cnty., N.H.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class of the Settlement and the other matters set forth therein was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort. Said notice provided due and adequate notice of these proceedings and of the matters set forth in the Agreement, including the proposed Settlement, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of New Hampshire law and due process.

Judge Charlene Edwards Honeywell, *Stoll et al. v. Musculoskeletal Institute, Chartered d/b/a Florida Orthopaedic Institute* (Nov. 14, 2022) 8:20-cv-01798 (M.D. Fla):

The Court finds and determines that the Notice Program, preliminarily approved on May 16, 2022, and implemented on June 15, 2022, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth in the notices to all persons entitled to receive such notices, and fully satisfies the requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all other applicable laws and rules. The Notice Program involved direct notice via e-mail and postal mail providing details of the Settlement, including the benefits available, how to exclude or object to the Settlement, when the Final Fairness Hearing would be held, and how to inquire further about details of the Settlement. The Court further finds that all of the notices are written in plain language and are readily understandable by Class Members. The Court further finds that notice has been provided to the appropriate state and federal officials in accordance with the requirements of the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, drawing no objections.

Judge Thomas W. Thrash, Jr., *Callen v. Daimler AG and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC* (Nov. 7, 2022) 1:19-cv-01411 (N.D. Ga.):

The Court finds that notice was given in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. No. 79), and that the form and content of that Notice, and the procedures for dissemination thereof, afforded adequate protections to Class Members and satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Mark Thomas Bailey, *Snyder et al. v. The Urology Center of Colorado, P.C.* (Oct. 30, 2022) 2021CV33707 (2nd Dist. Ct, Cnty. of Denver Col.):

The Court finds that the Notice Program, set forth in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order: (i) was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated to provide, and did provide, due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class regarding the existence and nature of the Litigation, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the rights of Settlement Class Members to exclude themselves from the Settlement, to object and appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and to receive benefits under the Settlement Agreement; and (iii) satisfied the requirements of the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

Judge Amy Berman Jackson, *In re U.S. Office of Personnel Management Data Security Breach Litigation* (Oct. 28, 2022) MDL No. 2664, 15-cv-01394 (D.D.C.):

The Court finds that notice of the Settlement was given to Class Members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, and that it constituted the best notice practicable of the matters set forth therein, including the Settlement, to all individuals entitled to such notice. It further finds that the notice satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and of due process.

Judge John R. Tunheim, *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Actions - CIIPPs) (Smithfield Foods, Inc.)* (Oct. 19, 2022) 18-cv-01776 (D. Minn.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class, including individual notice to all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable effort, was the most effective and practicable under the circumstances. This notice provided due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and this notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge Harvey E. Schlesinger, *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation (Alcon Laboratories, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson Vision Care, Inc.)* (Oct. 12, 2022) 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Classes of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the Settlement Agreements (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's possible motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (iv) the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement Agreements, the Plan of Distribution, and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (v) the right to opt out of the Settlement Classes; and (vi) the right to appear at the Fairness Hearing; (d) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the Settlement Agreements; and (e) satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause).

Judge George H. Wu, *Hameed-Bolden et al. v. Forever 21 Retail, Inc. et al.* (Oct. 11, 2022) 2:18-cv-03019 (C.D. Cal):

[T]he Court finds that the Notice and notice methodology implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order: (a) constituted methods that were reasonably calculated to inform the members of the Settlement Class of the Settlement and their rights thereunder; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the litigation, their right to object to the Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (c) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (d) met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any other applicable law.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr., *In re fairlife Milk Products Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (Sept. 28, 2022) MDL No. 2909, 1:19-cv-03924 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice Program implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Order preliminarily approving the Settlement ... (i) constituted the best practicable notice, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, of their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, and of their right to seek monetary and other relief, (iii) constituted reasonable, due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and (iv) met all applicable requirements of due process and any other applicable law.

Judge Ethan P. Schulman, *Rodan & Fields LLC; Gorzo et al. v. Rodan & Fields, LLC* (Sept. 28, 2022) CJC-18-004981, CIVDS 1723435 & CGC-18-565628 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of San Bernadino, Cal. & Sup. Ct. Cnty. of San Francisco, Cal.):

The Court finds the Full Notice, Email Notice, Postcard Notice, and Notice of Opt-Out (collectively, the "Notice Packet") and its distribution to Class Members have been implemented pursuant to the Agreement and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court also finds the Notice Packet: a) Constitutes notice reasonably calculated to apprise Class Members of: (i) the pendency of the class action lawsuit; (ii) the material terms and provisions of the Settlement and their rights; (iii) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement; (iv) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement; (v) their right to claim a Settlement Benefit; (vi) their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (vii) the binding effect of the orders and judgment in the class action lawsuit on all Participating Class Members; b) Constitutes notice that fully satisfied the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Rules of Court, rule 3.769, and due process; c) Constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of the class action lawsuit; and d) Constitutes reasonable, adequate, and sufficient notice to Class Members.

Judge Anthony J. Trenga, *In re Capital One Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Sept. 13, 2022) MDL No. 1:19-md-2915, 1:19-cv-02915 (E.D. Va.):

Pursuant to the Court's direction, the Claims Administrator appointed by the Court implemented a robust notice program ... The Notice Plan has been successfully implemented and reached approximately 96 percent of the Settlement Class by the individual notice efforts alone.... Targeted internet advertising and extensive news coverage enhanced public awareness of the Settlement.

The Court finds that the Notice Program has been implemented by the Settlement Administrator and the Parties in accordance with the requirements of the Settlement Agreement, and that such Notice Program, including the utilized forms of Notice, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies due process and the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court finds that the Settlement Administrator and Parties have complied with the directives of the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Directing Notice of Proposed Settlement and the Court reaffirms its findings concerning notice

Judge Evelio Grillo, *Asetine v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.* (Sept. 13, 2022) RG21088118 (Cir. Ct. Cal. Alameda Cnty.):

The proposed class notice form and procedure are adequate. The email notice is appropriate given the amount at issue for each member of the class.

Judge David S. Cunningham, *Muransky et al. v. The Cheesecake Factory et al.* (Sept. 9, 2022) 19 stcv 43875 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Los Angeles):

The record shows that Class Notice has been given to the Settlement Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that such Class Notice: (i) constitutes reasonable and the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the terms of the Agreement and the Class Settlement set forth in the Agreement ("Class Settlement"), and the right of Settlement Class Members to object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement Class and appear at the Fairness Hearing held on May 20, 2022; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all person or entities entitled to

Judicial Quotes

receive notice; and (iv) meets the requirements of due process, California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, and California Rules of Court, Rules 3.760-3.771.

Judge Steven E. McCullough, *Fallis et al. v. Gate City Bank* (Sept. 9, 2022) 09-2019-cv-04007 (East Cent. Dist. Ct. Cass Cnty. N.D.):

The Courts finds that the distribution of the Notices and the Notice Program were properly implemented in accordance with N.D. R. Civ. P. 23, the terms of the Agreement, and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court further finds that the Notice was simply written and readily understandable and that the Notice (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (b) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Classes of the Agreement and their right to exclude themselves or object to the Agreement and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (c) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (d) meets all applicable requirements of North Dakota law and any other applicable law and due process requirements.

Judge Susan N. Burke, *Mayo v. Affinity Plus Federal Credit Union* (Aug. 29, 2022) 27-cv-20-11786 (4th Jud. Dist. Ct. Minn.):

The Court finds that Notice to the Settlement Class was the best notice practicable and complied with the requirements of Due Process, and that the Notice Program was completed in compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order and the Agreement.

Judge Paul A. Engelmayer, *In re Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation* (Aug. 5, 2022) 1:20-cv-05914 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the emailed and mailed notice, publication notice, website, and Class Notice plan implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Judge Analisa Torres' Preliminary Approval Order: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to appraise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of this Action, of the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder), of their right to exclude themselves from or object to the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, of the Claims Process, and of Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees, for reimbursement of expenses associated with the Action, and any Service Award; (d) provided a full and fair opportunity to all Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the foregoing matters; (e) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (f) met all applicable requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, including the Due Process Clause, and any other applicable rules of law.

Judge Denise Page Hood, *Bleachtech L.L.C. v. United Parcel Service Co.* (July 20, 2022) 14-cv-12719 (E.D. Mich.):

The Settlement Class Notice Program, consisting of, among other things, the Publication Notice, Long Form Notice, website, and toll-free telephone number, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution, which include the requirement of due process.

Judge Robert E. Payne, *Skochin et al. v. Genworth Life Insurance Company et al.* (June 29, 2022) 3:21-cv-00019 (E.D. Va.):

The Court finds that the plan to disseminate the Class Notice and Publication Notice the Court previously approved has been implemented and satisfies the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process. The Class Notice, which the Court approved, clearly defined the Class and explained the rights and obligations of the Class Members. The Class Notice explained how to obtain benefits under the Settlement, and how to contact Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator. The Court appointed Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. ("Epiq") to fulfill the Settlement Administrator duties and disseminate the Class Notice and Publication Notice. The Class Notice and Publication Notice permitted Class Members to access information and documents about the case to inform their decision about whether to opt out of or object to the Settlement.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Fernando M. Olguin, *Johnson v. Moss Bros. Auto Group, Inc. et al.* (June 24, 2022) 5:19-cv-02456 (C.D. Cal.):

Here, after undertaking the required examination, the court approved the form of the proposed class notice. (See Dkt. 125, PAO at 18-21). As discussed above, the notice program was implemented by Epiq. (Dkt. 137-3, Azari Decl. at ¶¶ 15-23 & Exhs. 3-4 (Class Notice)). Accordingly, based on the record and its prior findings, the court finds that the class notice and the notice process fairly and adequately informed the class members of the nature of the action, the terms of the proposed settlement, the effect of the action and release of claims, the class members' right to exclude themselves from the action, and their right to object to the proposed settlement....

Judge Harvey E. Schlesinger, *Beiswinger v. West Shore Home, LLC* (May 25, 2022) 3:20-cv-01286 (M.D. Fla.):

The Notice and the Notice Plan implemented pursuant to the Agreement (1) constitute the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (2) constitute notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Litigation, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (3) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (4) meet all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court.

Judge Scott Kording, *Jackson v. UKG Inc., f/k/a The Ultimate Software Group, Inc.* (May 20, 2022) 2020L0000031 (Cir. Ct. of McLean Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803, applicable law, and the Due Process Clauses of the U.S. Constitution and Illinois Constitution.

Judge Denise J. Casper, *Breda v. Celco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* (May 2, 2022) 1:16-cv-11512 (D. Mass.):

The Court hereby finds Notice of Settlement was disseminated to persons in the Settlement Class in accordance with the Court's preliminary approval order, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that the Notice satisfied Rule 23 and due process.

Judge William H. Orrick, *Maldonado et al. v. Apple Inc. et al.* (Apr. 29, 2022) 3:16-cv-04067 (N.D. Cal.):

[N]otice of the Class Settlement to the Certified Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice satisfied due process and provided adequate information to the Certified Class of all matters relating to the Class Settlement, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e)(1).

Judge Laurel Beeler, *In re Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Privacy Litigation* (Apr. 21, 2022) 20-cv-02155 (N.D. Cal.):

Between November 19, 2021, and January 3, 2022, notice was sent to 158,203,160 class members by email (including reminder emails to those who did not submit a claim form) and 189,003 by mail. Of the emailed notices, 14,303,749 were undeliverable, and of that group, Epiq mailed notice to 296,592 class members for whom a physical address was available. Of the mailed notices, efforts were made to ensure address accuracy and currency, and as of March 10, 2022, 11,543 were undeliverable. In total, as of March 10, 2022, notice was accomplished for 144,242,901 class members, or 91% of the total. Additional notice efforts were made by newspaper ... social media, sponsored search, an informational release, and a Settlement Website. Epiq and Class Counsel also complied with the court's prior request that best practices related to the security of class member data be implemented.

[T]he Settlement Administrator provided notice to the class in the form the court approved previously. The notice met all legal prerequisites: it was the best notice practicable, satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2), adequately advised class members of their rights under the settlement agreement, met the requirements of due process, and complied with the court's order regarding court notice. The forms of notice fairly, plainly, accurately, and reasonably provided class members with all required information

Judicial Quotes

Judge Federico A. Moreno, *In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (Volkswagen)* (Mar. 28, 2022) MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.):

[T]he Court finds that the Class Notice has been given to the Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order ... The Court finds that such Class Notice: (i) is reasonable and constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action and the terms of the Settlement Agreement, their right to exclude themselves from the Class or to object to all or any part of the Settlement Agreement, their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense) and the binding effect of the orders and Final Order and Final Judgment in the Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons and entities who or which do not exclude themselves from the Class; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), FED. R. CIV. P. 23 and any other applicable law as well as complying with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judge James Donato, *Pennington et al. v. Tetra Tech, Inc. et al.* (Mar. 28, 2022) 3:18-cv-05330 (N.D. Cal.):

On the Rule 23(e)(1) notice requirement, the Court approved the parties' notice plan, which included postcard notice, email notice, and a settlement website. Dkt. No. 154. The individual notice efforts reached an impressive 100% of the identified settlement class. Dkt. No. 200-223. The Court finds that notice was provided in the best practicable manner to class members who will be bound by the proposal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1).

Judge Edward J. Davila, *Cochran et al. v. The Kroger Co. et al.* (Mar. 24, 2022) 5:21-cv-01887 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notices: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that is appropriate, in a manner, content, and format reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members ...; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Constitution of the United (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable laws and rules.

Judge Sunshine Sykes, *In re Renovate America Finance Cases* (Mar. 4, 2022) RICJCCP4940 (Sup. Ct. of Cal., Riverside Cnty.):

The Court finds that notice previously given to Class Members in the Action was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies the requirements of due process ...The Court further finds that, because (a) adequate notice has been provided to all Class Members and (b) all Class Members have been given the opportunity to object to, and/or request exclusion from, the Settlement, the Court has jurisdiction over all Class Members.

Judge David O. Carter, *Fernandez v. Rushmore Loan Management Services LLC* (Feb. 14, 2022) 8:21-cv-00621 (C. D. Cal.):

Notice was sent to potential Class Members pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the method approved by the Court. The Class Notice adequately describes the litigation and the scope of the involved Class. Further, the Class Notice explained the amount of the Settlement Fund, the plan of allocation, that Plaintiff's counsel and Plaintiff will apply for attorneys' fees, costs, and a service award, and the Class Members' option to participate, opt out, or object to the Settlement. The Class Notice consisted of direct notice via USPS, as well as a Settlement Website where Class Members could view the Long Form Notice.

Judge Otis D. Wright, II, *In re Toll Roads Litigation* (Feb. 11, 2022) 8:16-cv-00262 (C. D. Cal.):

The Class Administrator provided notice to members of the Settlement Classes in compliance with the Agreements, due process, and Rule 23. The notice: (i) fully and accurately informed class members about the lawsuit and settlements; (ii) provided sufficient information so that class members were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the proposed settlements; (iii) provided procedures for class members to file written objections to the proposed settlements, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed settlements; and (iv) provided the time, date, and place of the final fairness hearing. The Court finds that the Notice provided to the Classes

Judicial Quotes

pursuant to the Settlement Agreements and the Preliminary Approval Order and consisting of individual direct postcard and email notice, publication notice, settlement website, and CAFA notice has been successful and (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to the Settlements or exclude themselves from the Classes, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) otherwise met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court.

Judge Virginia M. Kendall, *In re Turkey Antitrust Litigations (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' Action) Sandee's Bakery d/b/a Sandee's Catering Bakery & Deli et al. v. Agri Stats, Inc.* (Feb. 10, 2022) 1:19-cv-08318 (N.D. Ill.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class, including individual notice all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable efforts, was the most effective and practicable under the circumstances. This notice provided due and sufficient notice of proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and this notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge Beth Labson Freeman, *Ford et al. v. [24]7.ai, Inc.* (Jan. 28, 2022) 5:18-cv-02770 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the manner and form of notice (the "Notice Program") set forth in the Settlement Agreement was provided to Settlement Class Members. The Court finds that the Notice Program, as implemented, was the best practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, class certification, the terms of the Settlement, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class and object to the Settlement, Class Counsel's fee request, and the request for Service Award for Plaintiffs. The Notice and notice program constituted sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Notice and notice program satisfy all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the constitutional requirement of due process.

Judge Terrence W. Boyle, *Abramson et al. v. Safe Streets USA LLC et al.* (Jan. 12, 2022) 5:19-cv-00394 (E.D.N.C.):

Notice was provided to Settlement Class Members in compliance with Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement, due process, and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The notice: (a) fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members about the Actions and Settlement Agreement; (b) provided sufficient information so that Settlement Class Members could decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the settlement; (c) provided procedures for Settlement Class Members to submit written objections to the proposed settlement, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed settlement; and (d) provided the time, date, and place of the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Joan B. Gottschall, *Mercado et al. v. Verde Energy USA, Inc.* (Dec. 17, 2021) 1:18-cv-02068 (N.D. Ill.):

Epiq mailed and emailed notice to the Class on October 1, 2021. Therefore, direct notice was sent and delivered successfully to the vast majority of Class Members. The Class Notice, together with all included and ancillary documents thereto, complied with all the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and fairly, accurately, and reasonably informed members of the Class of: (a) appropriate information about the nature of this Litigation, including the class claims, issues, and defenses, and the essential terms of the Settlement Agreement; (b) the definition of the Class; (c) appropriate information about, and means for obtaining additional information regarding, the lawsuit and the Settlement Agreement; (d) appropriate information about, and means for obtaining and submitting, a claim; (e) appropriate information about the right of Class Members to appear through an attorney, as well as the time, manner, and effect of excluding themselves from the Settlement, objecting to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, or objecting to Lead and Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and costs, and the procedures to do so; (f) appropriate information about the consequences of failing to submit a claim or failing to comply with the procedures and deadline for requesting exclusion from, or objecting to, the Settlement; and (g) the binding effect of a class judgment on Class Members under Rule 23(c)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Judicial Quotes

The Court finds that Class Members have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice fully satisfies all requirements of applicable laws and due process.

Judge Patricia M. Lucas, *Wallace v. Wells Fargo* (Nov. 24, 2021) 17CV317775 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Santa Clara):

On August 29, 2021, a dedicated website was established for the settlement at which class members can obtain detailed information about the case and review key documents, including the long form notice, postcard notice, settlement agreement, complaint, motion for preliminary approval . . . As of October 18, 2021, there were 2,639 visitors to the website and 4,428 website pages presented.

On August 30, 2021, a toll-free telephone number was established to allow class members to call for additional information in English or Spanish, listen to answers to frequently asked questions, and request that a long form notice be mailed to them . . . As of October 18, 2021, the telephone number handled 345 calls, representing 1,207 minutes of use, and the settlement administrator mailed 30 long form notices as a result of requests made via the telephone number.

Also, on August 30, 2021, individual postcard notices were mailed to 177,817 class members . . . As of November 10, 2021, 169,404 of those class members successfully received notice.

Judge John R. Tunheim, *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff Action) (JBS USA Food Company, JBS USA Food Company Holdings)* (Nov. 18, 2021) 18-cv-01776 (D. Minn.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class, including individual notice to all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable effort, was the most effective and practicable under the circumstances. This notice provided due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and this notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge H. Russel Holland, *Coleman v. Alaska USA Federal Credit Union* (Nov. 17, 2021) 3:19-cv-00229 (D. Alaska):

The Court approved Notice Program has been fully implemented. The Court finds that the Notices given to the Settlement Class fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and constituted valid, due, and sufficient Notice to Settlement Class Members consistent with all applicable requirements. The Court further finds that the Notice Program satisfies due process.

Judge A. Graham Shirley, *Zanca et al. v. Epic Games, Inc.* (Nov. 16, 2021) 21-CVS-534 (Sup. Ct. Wake Cnty., N.C.):

Notice has been provided to all members of the Settlement Class pursuant to and in the manner directed by the Preliminary Approval Order. The Notice Plan was properly administered by a highly experienced third-party Settlement Administrator. Proof of the provision of that Notice has been filed with the Court and full opportunity to be heard has been offered to all Parties to the Action, the Settlement Class, and all persons in interest. The form and manner of the Notice is hereby determined to have been the best notice practicable under the circumstances and to have been given full compliance with each of the requirements of North Carolina Rule of Civil Procedure 23, due process, and applicable law.

Judge Judith E. Levy, *In re Flint Water Cases* (Nov. 10, 2021) 5:16-cv-10444 (E.D. Mich.):

(1) a “Long Form Notice packet [was] mailed to each Settlement Class member ... a list of over 57,000 addresses— [and] over 90% of [the mailings] resulted in successful delivery;” (2) notices were emailed “to addresses that could be determined for Settlement Class members;” and (3) the “Notice Administrator implemented a comprehensive media notice campaign.” ... The media campaign coupled with the mailing was intended to reach the relevant audience in several ways and at several times so that the class members would be fully informed about the settlement and the registration and objection process.

The media campaign included publication in the local newspaper . . . local digital banners . . . television . . . and radio spots . . . banner notices and radio ads placed on Pandora and SoundCloud; and video ads placed on YouTube . . . [T]his settlement has received widespread media attention from major news outlets nationwide.

Plaintiffs submitted an affidavit signed by Azari that details the implementation of the Notice plan The affidavit is bolstered by several documents attached to it, such as the declaration of Epiq Class Action and Claims Solutions, Inc.’s Legal Notice Manager, Stephanie J. Fiereck. Azari declared that Epiq “delivered individual notice

Judicial Quotes

to approximately 91.5% of the identified Settlement Class” and that the media notice brought the overall notice effort to “in excess of 95%.” The Court finds that the notice plan was implemented in an appropriate manner.

In conclusion, the Court finds that the Notice Plan as implemented, and its content, satisfies due process.

Judge Vince Chhabria, Yamagata et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC (Oct. 28, 2021) 3:17-cv-03529 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court directed that Class Notice be given to the Class Members pursuant to the notice program proposed by the Parties and approved by the Court. In accordance with the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order and the Court-approved notice program, the Settlement Administrator caused the forms of Class Notice to be disseminated as ordered. The Long-form Class Notice advised Class Members of the terms of the Settlement Agreement; the Final Approval Hearing, and their right to appear at such hearing; their rights to remain in, or opt out of, the Settlement Class and to object to the Settlement Agreement; procedures for exercising such rights; and the binding effect of this Order and accompanying Final Judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, to the Settlement Class.

The distribution of the Class Notice pursuant to the Class Notice Program constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the requirements of due process, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and any other applicable law.

Judge Otis D. Wright, II, Silveira v. M&T Bank (Oct. 12, 2021) 2:19-cv-06958 (C.D. Cal.):

Notice was sent to potential class members pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the method approved by the Court. The Class Notice consisted of direct notice via USPS first class mail, as well as a Settlement Website where Class Members could view and request to be sent the Long Form Notice. The Class Notice adequately described the litigation and the scope of the involved class. Further, the Class Notice explained the amount of the Settlement Fund, the plan of allocation, that Plaintiff’s counsel and Plaintiff will apply for attorneys’ fees, costs, and a service award, and the class members’ option to participate, opt out, or object to the settlement.

Judge Timothy J. Korrigan, Smith v. Costa Del Mar, Inc. (Sept. 21, 2021) 3:18-cv-01011 (M.D. Fla.):

Following preliminary approval, the settlement administrator carried out the notice program The settlement administrator sent a summary notice and long-form notice to all class members, sent CAFA notice to federal and state officials ... and established a website with comprehensive information about the settlement Email notice was sent to class members with email addresses, and postcards were sent to class members with only physical addresses Multiple attempts were made to contact class members in some cases, and all notices directed recipients to a website where they could access settlement information A paid online media plan was implemented for class members for whom the settlement administrator did not have data When the notice program was complete, the settlement administrator submitted a declaration stating that the notice and paid media plan reached at least seventy percent of potential class members [N]otices had been delivered via postcards or email to 939,400 of the 939,479 class members to whom the settlement administrator sent notice—a ninety-nine and a half percent deliverable rate....

Notice was disseminated in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) requires that notice be “the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances.” Upon review of the notice materials ... and of Azari’s Declaration ... regarding the notice program, the Court is satisfied with the way in which the notice program was carried out. Class notice fully complied with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and was sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice of the settlement of this lawsuit.

Judge Jose E. Martinez, Kukorinis v. Walmart, Inc. (Sept. 20, 2021) 1:19-cv-20592 (S.D. Fla.):

[T]he Court approved the appointment of Epiq Class Action and Claims Solutions, Inc. as the Claims Administrator with the responsibility of implementing the notice requirements approved in the Court’s Order of Approval The media plan included various forms of notice, utilizing national consumer print publications, internet banner advertising, social media, sponsored search, and a national informational release According to the Azari Declaration, the Court-approved Notice reached approximately seventy-five percent (75%) of the Settlement Class on an average of 3.5 times per Class Member

Pertinently, the Claims Administrator implemented digital banner notices across certain social media platforms, including Facebook and Instagram, which linked directly to the Settlement Website ... the digital banner notices generated approximately 522.6 million adult impressions online [T]he Court finds that notice was “reasonably

Judicial Quotes

calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections."

Judge Steven L. Tiscione, *Fiore et al. v. Ingenious Designs, LLC* (Sept. 10, 2021) 1:18-cv-07124 (E.D.N.Y.):

Following the Court's Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, the Notice Plan was effectuated by the Parties and the appointed Claims Administrator, Epiq Systems. The Notice Plan included a direct mailing to Class members who could be specifically identified, as well as nationwide notice by publication, social media and retailer displays and posters. The Notice Plan also included the establishment of an informational website and toll-free telephone number. The Court finds the Parties completed all settlement notice obligations imposed in the Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement. In addition, Defendants through the Class Administrator, sent the requisite CAFA notices to 57 federal and state officials. The class notices constitute "the best notice practicable under the circumstances," as required by Rule 23(c)(2).

Judge John S. Meyer, *Lozano v. CodeMetro, Inc.* (Sept. 8, 2021) 37-2020-00022701 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego):

The Court finds that Notice has been given to the Settlement Class in the manner directed by the Court in the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that such Notice: (i) was reasonable and constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, the terms of the Settlement, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or object to all or any part of the Settlement, their right to appear at the Final Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of final approval of the Settlement on all persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iii) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and any other applicable law.

Judge Mae A. D'Agostino, *Thompson et al. v. Community Bank, N.A.* (Sept. 8, 2021) 8:19-cv-0919 (N.D.N.Y.):

Prior to distributing Notice to the Settlement Class members, the Settlement Administrator established a website, ... as well as a toll-free line that Settlement Class members could access or call for any questions or additional information about the proposed Settlement, including the Long Form Notice. Once Settlement Class members were identified via Defendant's business records, the Notices attached to the Agreement and approved by the Court were sent to each Settlement Class member. For Current Account Holders who have elected to receive bank communications via email, Email Notice was delivered. To Past Defendant Account Holders, and Current Account Holders who have not elected to receive communications by email or for whom the Defendant does not have a valid email address, Postcard Notice was delivered by U.S. Mail. The Settlement Administrator mailed 36,012 Postcard Notices and sent 16,834 Email Notices to the Settlement Class, and as a result of the Notice Program, 95% of the Settlement Class received Notice of the Settlement.

Judge Anne-Christine Massullo, *UFCW & Employers Benefit Trust v. Sutter Health et al.* (Aug. 27, 2021) CGC 14-538451 consolidated with CGC-18-565398 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of San Francisco, Cal.):

The notice of the Settlement provided to the Class constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice and the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and meets the requirements of due process, the laws of the State of California, and Rule 3.769(f) of the California Rules of Court.

Judge Graham C. Mullen, *In re Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. et al.* (July 27, 2021) 16-cv-31602 (W.D.N.C.):

[T]he Declaration of Cameron R. Azari, Esq. on Implementation of Notice Regarding the Joint Plan of Reorganization of Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. and Hanson Permanente Cement, Inc. ... (the "Notice Declaration") was filed with the Bankruptcy Court on July 1, 2020, attesting to publication notice of the Plan.

[T]he Court has reviewed the Plan, the Disclosure Statement, the Disclosure Statement Order, the Voting Agent Declaration, the Affidavits of Service, the Publication Declaration, the Notice Declaration, the Memoranda of Law, the Declarations, the Truck Affidavits and all other pleadings before the Court in connection with the Confirmation of the Plan, including the objections filed to the Plan. The Plan is hereby confirmed in its entirety ...

Judicial Quotes

Judge Anne-Christine Massullo, *Morris v. Provident Credit Union* (June 23, 2021) CGC-19-581616 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Fran.):

The Notice approved by this Court was distributed to the Classes in substantial compliance with this Court's Order Certifying Classes for Settlement Purposes and Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement

("Preliminary Approval Order") and the Agreement. The Notice met the requirements of due process and California Rules of Court, rules 3.766 and 3.769(f). The notice to the Classes was adequate.

Judge Esther Salas, *Sager et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. et al.* (June 22, 2021) 18-cv-13556 (D.N.J.):

The Court further finds and concludes that Class Notice was properly and timely disseminated to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Class Notice Plan set forth in the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. No. 69). The Class Notice Plan and its implementation in this case fully satisfy Rule 23, the requirements of due process and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judge Josephine L. Staton, *In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation and Flaherty v. Hyundai Motor Company, Inc. et al.* (June 10, 2021) 8:17-cv-00838 and 18-cv-02223 (C.D. Cal.):

The Class Notice was disseminated in accordance with the procedures required by the Court's Orders ... in accordance with applicable law and satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process and constituted the best notice practicable for the reasons discussed in the Preliminary Approval Order and Final Approval Order.

Judge Harvey Schlesinger, *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation (ABB Concise Optical Group, LLC)* (May 31, 2021) 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the Settlement Agreement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's possible motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (iv) the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement Agreement, the Plan of Distribution, and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (v) the right to opt out of the Settlement Class; (vi) the right to appear at the Fairness Hearing; and (vii) the fact that Plaintiffs may receive incentive awards; (d) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the Settlement Agreement; and (e) satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause).

Judge Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. *Richards et al. v. Chime Financial, Inc.* (May 24, 2021) 4:19-cv-06864 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice and notice plan previously approved by the Court was implemented and complies with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) ... The Court ordered that the third-party settlement administrator send class notice via email based on a class list Defendant provided ... Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc., the third-party settlement administrator, represents that class notice was provided as directed Epiq received a total of 527,505 records for potential Class Members, including their email addresses If the receiving email server could not deliver the message, a "bounce code" was returned to Epiq indicating that the message was undeliverable Epiq made two additional attempts to deliver the email notice As of March 1, 2021, a total of 495,006 email notices were delivered, and 32,499 remained undeliverable In light of these facts, the Court finds that the parties have sufficiently provided the best practicable notice to the Class Members.

Judge Henry Edward Autrey, *Pearlstone v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* (Apr. 22, 2021) 4:17-cv-02856 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that adequate notice was given to all Settlement Class Members pursuant to the terms of the Parties' Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court has further determined that the Notice Plan fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1), applicable law, and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Lucy H. Koh, *Grace v. Apple, Inc.* (Mar. 31, 2021) 17-cv-00551 (N.D. Cal.):

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) requires that the settling parties provide class members with “the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort. The notice must clearly and concisely state in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the class certified; (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses; (iv) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Rule 23(c)(3).” The Court finds that the Notice Plan, which was direct notice sent to 99.8% of the Settlement Class via email and U.S. Mail, has been implemented in compliance with this Court’s Order (ECF No. 426) and complies with Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge Gary A. Fenner, *In re Pre-Filled Propane Tank Antitrust Litigation* (Mar. 30, 2021) MDL No. 2567, 14-cv-02567 (W.D. Mo.):

Based upon the Declaration of Cameron Azari, on behalf of Epiq, the Administrator appointed by the Court, the Court finds that the Notice Program has been properly implemented. That Declaration shows that there have been no requests for exclusion from the Settlement, and no objections to the Settlement. Finally, the Declaration reflects that AmeriGas has given appropriate notice of this settlement to the Attorney General of the United States and the appropriate State officials under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and no objections have been received from any of them.

Judge Richard Seeborg, *Bautista v. Valero Marketing and Supply Company* (Mar. 17, 2021) 3:15-cv-05557 (N.D. Cal.):

The Notice given to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Notice Order was the best notice practicable under the circumstances of these proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process.

Judge James D. Peterson, *Fox et al. v. Iowa Health System d.b.a. UnityPoint Health* (Mar. 4, 2021) 18-cv-00327 (W.D. Wis.):

The approved Notice plan provided for direct mail notice to all class members at their last known address according to UnityPoint’s records, as updated by the administrator through the U.S. Postal Service. For postcards returned undeliverable, the administrator tried to find updated addresses for those class members. The administrator maintained the Settlement website and made Spanish versions of the Long Form Notice and Claim Form available upon request. The administrator also maintained a toll-free telephone line which provides class members detailed information about the settlement and allows individuals to request a claim form be mailed to them.

The Court finds that this Notice (i) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class members of the Settlement, the effect of the Settlement (including the release therein), and their right to object to the terms of the settlement and appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) constituted due and sufficient notice of the Settlement to all reasonably identifiable persons entitled to receive such notice; (iv) satisfied the requirements of due process, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1) and the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all applicable laws and rules.

Judge Larry A. Burns, *Trujillo et al. v. Ametek, Inc. et al.* (Mar. 3, 2021) 3:15-cv-01394 (S.D. Cal.):

The Class has received the best practicable notice under the circumstances of this case. The Parties’ selection and retention of Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. (“Epiq”) as the Claims Administrator was reasonable and appropriate. Based on the Declaration of Cameron Azari of Epiq, the Court finds that the Settlement Notices were published to the Class Members in the form and manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. See Dkt. 181-6. The Settlement Notices provided fair, effective, and the best practicable notice to the Class of the Settlement’s terms. The Settlement Notices informed the Class of Plaintiffs’ intent to seek attorneys’ fees, costs, and incentive payments, set forth the date, time, and place of the Fairness Hearing, and explained Class Members’ rights to object to the Settlement or Fee Motion and to appear at the Fairness Hearing The Settlement Notices fully satisfied all notice requirements under the law, including the Federal

Judicial Quotes

Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of the California Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1781, and all due process rights under the U.S. Constitution and California Constitutions.

Judge Sherri A. Lydon, *Fitzhenry v. Independent Home Products, LLC* (Mar. 2, 2021) 2:19-cv-02993 (D.S.C.):

Notice was provided to Class Members in compliance with Section VI of the Settlement Agreement, due process, and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The notice: (i) fully and accurately informed

Settlement Class Members about the lawsuit and settlement; (ii) provided sufficient information so that Settlement Class Members could decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the settlement; (iii) provided procedures for Class Members to file written objections to the proposed settlement, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed settlement; and (iv) provided the time, date, and place of the final fairness hearing.

Judge James V. Selna, *Alvarez v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.* (Feb. 9, 2021) 2:18-cv-08605 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notices attached as Exhibits to the Settlement Agreement: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Notice Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) their right to submit a claim (where applicable) by submitting a Claim Form; (iii) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iv) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (v) Named Plaintiffs' application for the payment of Service Awards; (vi) Class Counsel's motion for an award an attorneys' fees and expenses; (vii) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses (including a Service Award to the Named Plaintiffs and Mr. Wright); and (viii) their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Constitution of the United States (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable laws and rules.

Judge Jon S. Tigar, *Elder v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc.* (Feb. 4, 2021) 16-cv-00278 (N.D. Cal.):

"Epiq implemented the notice plan precisely as set out in the Settlement Agreement and as ordered by the Court." ECF No. 162 at 9-10. Epiq sent initial notice by email to 8,777 Class Members and by U.S. Mail to the remaining 1,244 Class members. Id. at 10. The Notice informed Class Members about all aspects of the Settlement, the date and time of the fairness hearing, and the process for objections. ECF No. 155 at 28-37. Epiq then mailed notice to the 2,696 Class Members whose emails were returned as undeliverable. Id. "Of the 10,021 Class Members identified from Defendants' records, Epiq was unable to deliver the notice to only 35 Class Members. Accordingly, the reach of the notice is 99.65%." Id. (citation omitted). Epiq also created and maintained a settlement website and a toll-free hotline that Class Members could call if they had questions about the settlement . . . The Court finds that the parties have complied with the Court's preliminary approval order and, because the notice plan complied with Rule 23, have provided adequate notice to class members.

Judge Michael W. Jones, *Wallace et al. v. Monier Lifetile LLC et al.* (Jan. 15, 2021) SCV-16410 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

The Court also finds that the Class Notice and notice process were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, providing the best practicable notice under the circumstances.

Judge Kristi K. DuBose, *Drazen v. GoDaddy.com, LLC and Bennett v. GoDaddy.com, LLC* (Dec. 23, 2020) 1:19-cv-00563 (S.D. Ala.):

The Court finds that the Notice and the claims procedures actually implemented satisfy due process, meet the requirements of Rule 23(e)(1), and the Notice constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judge Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr., *Izor v. Abacus Data Systems, Inc.* (Dec. 21, 2020) 19-cv-01057 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice plan previously approved by the Court was implemented and that the notice thus satisfied Rule 23(c)(2)(B). [T]he Court finds that the parties have sufficiently provided the best practicable notice to the class members.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Christopher C. Conner, *Al's Discount Plumbing et al. v. Viega, LLC* (Dec. 18, 2020) 19-cv-00159 (M.D. Pa.):

The Court finds that the notice and notice plan previously approved by the Court was implemented and complies with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process. Specifically, the Court ordered that the third-party Settlement Administrator, Epiq, send class notice via email, U.S. mail, by publication in two recognized industry magazines, Plumber and PHC News, in both their print and online digital forms, and to implement a digital media campaign. (ECF 99). Epiq represents that class notice was provided as directed. See Declaration of Cameron R. Azari, ¶¶ 12-15 (ECF 104-13).

Judge Naomi Reice Buchwald, *In re Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation* (Dec. 16, 2020) MDL No. 2262, 1:11-md-02262 (S.D.N.Y.):

Upon review of the record, the Court hereby finds that the forms and methods of notifying the members of the Settlement Classes and their terms and conditions have met the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and all other applicable law and rules; constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and constituted due and sufficient notice to all members of the Settlement Classes of these proceedings and the matters set forth herein, including the Settlements, the Plan of Allocation and the Fairness Hearing. Therefore, the Class Notice is finally approved.

Judge Larry A. Burns, *Cox et al. Ametek, Inc. et al.* (Dec 15, 2020) 3:17-cv-00597 (S.D. Cal.):

The Class has received the best practicable notice under the circumstances of this case. The Parties' selection and retention of Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. ("Epiq") as the Claims Administrator was reasonable and appropriate. Based on the Declaration of Cameron Azari of Epiq, the Court finds that the Settlement Notices were published to the Class Members in the form and manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. See Dkt. 129-6. The Settlement Notices provided fair, effective, and the best practicable notice to the Class of the Settlement's terms. The Settlement Notices informed the Class of Plaintiffs' intent to seek attorneys' fees, costs, and incentive payments, set forth the date, time, and place of the Fairness Hearing, and explained Class Members' rights to object to the Settlement or Fee Motion and to appear at the Fairness Hearing ... The Settlement Notices fully satisfied all notice requirements under the law, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of the California Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1781, and all due process rights under the U.S. Constitution and California Constitutions.

Judge Timothy J. Sullivan, *Robinson v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC* (Dec. 11, 2020) 8:14-cv-03667 (D. Md.):

The Class Notice provided to the Settlement Class conforms with the requirements of Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 23, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the other Settlement Class Members. The Class Notice fully satisfied the requirements of Due Process.

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation* (Dec. 10, 2020) MDL No. 2420, 4:13-md-02420 (N.D. Cal.):

The proposed notice plan was undertaken and carried out pursuant to this Court's preliminary approval order prior to remand, and a second notice campaign thereafter. (See Dkt. No. 2571.) The class received direct and indirect notice through several methods – email notice, mailed notice upon request, an informative settlement website, a telephone support line, and a vigorous online campaign. Digital banner advertisements were targeted specifically to settlement class members, including on Google and Yahoo's ad networks, as well as Facebook and Instagram, with over 396 million impressions delivered. Sponsored search listings were employed on Google, Yahoo and Bing, resulting in 216,477 results, with 1,845 clicks through to the settlement website. An informational release was distributed to 495 media contacts in the consumer electronics industry. The case website has continued to be maintained as a channel for communications with class members. Between February 11, 2020 and April 23, 2020, there were 207,205 unique visitors to the website. In the same period, the toll-free telephone number available to class members received 515 calls.

Judge Katherine A. Bacal, *Garvin v. San Diego Unified Port District* (Nov. 20, 2020) 37-2020-00015064 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

Notice was provided to Class Members in compliance with the Settlement Agreement, California Code of Civil Procedure §382 and California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States

Judicial Quotes

Constitutions, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing notice to all individual Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the other Class Members. The Notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process.

Judge Catherine D. Perry, Pirozzi et al. v. Massage Envy Franchising, LLC (Nov. 13, 2020) 4:19-cv-807 (E.D. Mo.):

The COURT hereby finds that the CLASS NOTICE given to the CLASS: (i) fairly and accurately described the ACTION and the proposed SETTLEMENT; (ii) provided sufficient information so that the CLASS MEMBERS were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered by the SETTLEMENT, exclude themselves from the SETTLEMENT, or object to the SETTLEMENT; (iii) adequately described the time and manner by which CLASS MEMBERS could submit a CLAIM under the SETTLEMENT, exclude themselves from the SETTLEMENT, or object to the SETTLEMENT and/or appear at the FINAL APPROVAL HEARING; and (iv) provided the date, time, and place of the FINAL APPROVAL HEARING. The COURT hereby finds that the CLASS NOTICE was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constituted a reasonable manner of notice to all class members who would be bound by the SETTLEMENT, and complied fully with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23, due process, and all other applicable laws.

Judge Robert E. Payne, Skochin et al. v. Genworth Life Insurance Company et al. (Nov. 12, 2020) 3:19-cv-00049 (E.D. Va.):

For the reasons set forth in the Court's Memorandum Opinion addressing objections to the Settlement Agreement, ... the plan to disseminate the Class Notice and Publication Notice, which the Court previously approved, has been implemented and satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process.

Judge Jeff Carpenter, Eastwood Construction LLC et al. v. City of Monroe (Oct. 27, 2020) 18-cvs-2692 and **The Estate of Donald Alan Plyler Sr. et al. v. City of Monroe** (Oct. 27, 2020) 19-cvs-1825 (Sup. Ct. N.C.):

The Settlement Agreement and the Settlement Notice are found to be fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, and are hereby approved pursuant to North Carolina Rule of Civil Procedure 23. The Parties are hereby authorized and directed to comply with and to consummate the Settlement Agreement in accordance with the terms and provisions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and the Clerk of the Court is directed to enter and docket this Order and Final Judgement in the Actions.

Judge M. James Lorenz, Walters et al. v. Target Corp. (Oct. 26, 2020) 3:16-cv-1678 (S.D. Cal.):

The Court has determined that the Class Notices given to Settlement Class members fully and accurately informed Settlement Class members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and constituted valid, due, and sufficient notice to Settlement Class members consistent with all applicable requirements. The Court further finds that the Notice Program satisfies due process and has been fully implemented.

Judge Maren E. Nelson, Harris et al. v. Farmers Insurance Exchange and Mid Century Insurance Company (Oct. 26, 2020) BC 579498 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

Distribution of Notice directed to the Settlement Class Members as set forth in the Settlement has been completed in conformity with the Preliminary Approval Order, including individual notice to all Settlement Class members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice, which reached 99.9% of all Settlement Class Members, provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement, to all persons entitled to Notice, and the Notice and its distribution fully satisfied the requirements of due process.

Judge Vera M. Scanlon, Lashambae v. Capital One Bank, N.A. (Oct. 21, 2020) 1:17-cv-06406 (E.D.N.Y.):

The Class Notice, as amended, contained all of the necessary elements, including the class definition, the identifies of the named Parties and their counsel, a summary of the terms of the proposed Settlement, information regarding the manner in which objections may be submitted, information regarding the opt-out procedures and deadlines, and the date and location of the Final Approval Hearing. Notice was successfully delivered to approximately 98.7% of the Settlement Class and only 78 individual Settlement Class Members did not receive notice by email or first class mail.

Judicial Quotes

Having reviewed the content of the Class Notice, as amended, and the manner in which the Class Notice was disseminated, this Court finds that the Class Notice, as amended, satisfied the requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and all other applicable law and rules. The Class Notice, as amended, provided to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and provided this Court with jurisdiction over the absent Settlement Class Members. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).

Chancellor Walter L. Evans, K.B., by and through her natural parent, Jennifer Qassis, and Lillian Knox-Bender v. Methodist Healthcare - Memphis Hospitals (Oct. 14, 2020) CH-13-04871-1 (30th Jud. Dist. Tenn.):

Based upon the filings and the record as a whole, the Court finds and determines that dissemination of the Class Notice as set forth herein complies with Tenn. R. Civ. P. 23.03(3) and 23.05 and (i) constitutes the best practicable notice under the circumstances, (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of Class Settlement, their rights to object to the proposed Settlement, (iii) was reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, (iv) meets all applicable requirements of Due Process; (v) and properly provides notice of the attorney's fees that Class Counsel shall seek in this action. As a result, the Court finds that Class Members were properly notified of their rights, received full Due Process

Judge Sara L. Ellis, Nelson v. Roadrunner Transportation Systems, Inc. (Sept. 15, 2020) 1:18-cv-07400 (N.D. Ill.):

Notice of the Final Approval Hearing, the proposed motion for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses, and the proposed Service Award payment to Plaintiff have been provided to Settlement Class Members as directed by this Court's Orders.

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members in compliance with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge George H. Wu, Lusnak v. Bank of America, N.A. (Aug. 10, 2020) 14-cv-01855 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Notice program for disseminating notice to the Settlement Class, provided for in the Settlement Agreement and previously approved and directed by the Court, has been implemented by the Settlement Administrator and the Parties. The Court finds that such Notice program, including the approved forms of notice: (a) constituted the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances; (b) included direct individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the nature of the Lawsuit, the definition of the Settlement Class certified, the class claims and issues, the opportunity to enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; the opportunity, the time, and manner for requesting exclusion from the Settlement Class, and the binding effect of a class judgment; (d) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (e) met all applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, due process under the U.S. Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge James Lawrence King, Dasher v. RBC Bank (USA) predecessor in interest to PNC Bank, N.A. (Aug. 10, 2020) 1:10-cv-22190 (S.D. Fla.) as part of **In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the members of the Settlement Class were provided with the best practicable notice; the notice was "reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." Shutts, 472 U.S. at 812 (quoting Mullane, 339 U.S. at 314-15). This Settlement was widely publicized, and any member of the Settlement Class who wished to express comments or objections had ample opportunity and means to do so.

Judge Jeffrey S. Ross, Lehman v. Transbay Joint Powers Authority et al. (Aug. 7, 2020) CGC-16-553758 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

The Notice approved by this Court was distributed to the Settlement Class Members in compliance with this Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, dated May 8, 2020. The Notice provided to the Settlement Class Members met the requirements of due process and constituted the best notice practicable in the circumstances. Based on evidence and other material submitted in conjunction with the final approval hearing, notice to the class was adequate.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Jean Hoefler Toal, Cook et al. v. South Carolina Public Service Authority et al. (July 31, 2020) 2019-CP-23-6675 (Ct. of Com. Pleas. 13th Jud. Cir. S.C.):

Notice was sent to more than 1.65 million Class members, published in newspapers whose collective circulation covers the entirety of the State, and supplemented with internet banner ads totaling approximately 12.3 million impressions. The notices directed Class members to the settlement website and toll-free line for additional inquiries and further information. After this extensive notice campaign, only 78 individuals (0.0047%) have opted-out, and only nine (0.00054%) have objected. The Court finds this response to be overwhelmingly favorable.

Judge Peter J. Messitte, Jackson et al. v. Viking Group, Inc. et al. (July 28, 2020) 8:18-cv-02356 (D. Md.):

[T]he Court finds, that the Notice Plan has been implemented in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order as amended. The Court finds that the Notice Plan: (i) constitutes the best notice practicable to the Settlement Class under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of this Lawsuit and the terms of the Settlement, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement, or to object to any part of the Settlement, their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of the Final Approval Order and the Final Judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all Persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class, (iii) due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) notice that fully satisfies the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, and any other applicable law.

Judge Michael P. Shea, Grayson et al. v. General Electric Company (July 27, 2020) 3:13-cv-01799 (D. Conn.):

Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Notice was mailed, emailed and disseminated by the other means described in the Settlement Agreement to the Class Members. This Court finds that this notice procedure was (i) the best practicable notice; (ii) reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Class Members of the pendency of the Civil Action and of their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement; and (iii) reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all entities and persons entitled to receive notice.

Judge Gerald J. Pappert, Rose v. The Travelers Home and Marine Insurance Company et al. (July 20, 2020) 19-cv-00977 (E.D. Pa.):

The Class Notice ... has been given to the Settlement Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. Such Class Notice (i) constituted the best notice practicable to the Settlement Class under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency and nature of this Action, the definition of the Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the rights of the Settlement Class to exclude themselves from the settlement or to object to any part of the settlement, the rights of the Settlement Class to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement on all persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class, (iii) provided due, adequate, and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class; and (iv) fully satisfied all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the due process requirements of the United States Constitution.

Judge Christina A. Snyder, Waldrup v. Countrywide Financial Corporation et al. (July 16, 2020) 2:13-cv-08833 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that mailed and publication notice previously given to Class Members in the Action was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfies the requirements of due process and FED. R. Civ. P. 23. The Court further finds that, because (a) adequate notice has been provided to all Class Members and (b) all Class Members have been given the opportunity to object to, and/or request exclusion from, the Settlement, it has jurisdiction over all Class Members. The Court further finds that all requirements of statute (including but not limited to 28 U.S.C. § 1715), rule, and state and federal constitutions necessary to effectuate this Settlement have been met and satisfied.

Judicial Quotes

Judge James Donato, *Coffeng et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.* (June 10, 2020) 17-cv-01825 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that, as demonstrated by the Declaration and Supplemental Declaration of Cameron Azari, and counsel's submissions, Notice to the Settlement Class was timely and properly effectuated in accordance with FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e) and the approved Notice Plan set forth in the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that said Notice constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfies all requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process.

Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald, *Behfarin v. Pruco Life Insurance Company et al.* (June 3, 2020) 17-cv-05290 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure and other laws and rules applicable to final settlement approval of class actions have been satisfied . . . This Court finds that the Claims Administrator caused notice to be disseminated to the Class in accordance with the plan to disseminate Notice outlined in the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order, and that Notice was given in an adequate and sufficient manner and complies with Due Process and Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

Judge Nancy J. Rosenstengel, *First Impressions Salon, Inc. et al. v. National Milk Producers Federation et al.* (Apr. 27, 2020) 3:13-cv-00454 (S.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Notice given to the Class Members was completed as approved by this Court and complied in all respects with the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process. The settlement Notice Plan was modeled on and supplements the previous court-approved plan and, having been completed, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances. In making this determination, the Court finds that the Notice provided Class members due and adequate notice of the Settlement, the Settlement Agreement, the Plan of Distribution, these proceedings, and the rights of Class members to opt-out of the Class and/or object to Final Approval of the Settlement, as well as Plaintiffs' Motion requesting attorney fees, costs, and Class Representative service awards.

Judge Harvey Schlesinger, *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation (CooperVision, Inc.)* (Mar. 4, 2020) 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Orders; (b) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Classes of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the Settlement Agreements (including the Releases to the provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's possible motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (iv) the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement Agreements, the Plan of Distribution, and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (v) the right to opt out of the Settlement Classes; (vi) the right to appear at the Fairness Hearing; and (vii) the fact that Plaintiffs may receive incentive awards; (d) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the Settlement Agreement and (e) satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause).

Judge Amos L. Mazzant, *Stone et al. v. Porcelana Corona De Mexico, S.A. DE C.V f/k/a Sanitarios Lamosa S.A. DE C.V. a/k/a Vortens* (Mar. 3, 2020) 4:17-cv-00001 (E.D. Tex.):

The Court has reviewed the Notice Plan and its implementation and efficacy, and finds that it constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action and their right to object to the proposed settlement in full compliance with the requirements of applicable law, including the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and Rules 23(c) and (e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

In addition, Class Notice clearly and concisely stated in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the certified Equitable Relief Settlement Class; (iii) the claims and issues of the Equitable Relief Settlement Class; (iv) that a Settlement Class Member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(3).

Judicial Quotes

Judge Michael H. Simon, *In re Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Mar. 2, 2020) MDL No. 2633, 3:15-md-2633 (D. Ore.):

The Court confirms that the form and content of the Summary Notice, Long Form Notice, Publication Notice, and Claim Form, and the procedure set forth in the Settlement for providing notice of the Settlement to the Class, were in full compliance with the notice requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) and 23(e), fully, fairly, accurately, and adequately advised members of the Class of their rights under the Settlement, provided the best notice practicable under the circumstances, fully satisfied the requirements of due process and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and afforded Class Members with adequate time and opportunity to file objections to the Settlement and attorney's fee motion, submit Requests for Exclusion, and submit Claim Forms to the Settlement Administrator.

Judge Maxine M. Chesney, *McKinney-Drobnis et al. v. Massage Envy Franchising* (Mar. 2, 2020) 3:16-cv-06450 (N.D. Cal.):

The COURT hereby finds that the individual direct CLASS NOTICE given to the CLASS via email or First Class U.S. Mail (i) fairly and accurately described the ACTION and the proposed SETTLEMENT; (ii) provided sufficient information so that the CLASS MEMBERS were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered by the SETTLEMENT, exclude themselves from the SETTLEMENT, or object to the SETTLEMENT; (iii) adequately described the manner in which CLASS MEMBERS could submit a VOUCHER REQUEST under the SETTLEMENT, exclude themselves from the SETTLEMENT, or object to the SETTLEMENT and/or appear at the FINAL APPROVAL HEARING; and (iv) provided the date, time, and place of the FINAL APPROVAL HEARING. The COURT hereby finds that the CLASS NOTICE was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and complied fully with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23, due process, and all other applicable laws.

Judge Harry D. Leinenweber, *Albrecht v. Oasis Power, LLC d/b/a Oasis Energy* (Feb. 6, 2020) 1:18-cv-01061 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement, (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances to Settlement Class Members, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of, among other things, the pendency of the Action, the nature and terms of the proposed Settlement, their right to object or to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice, and (iv) complied fully with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law.

The Court finds that the Class Notice and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, and this Final Approval Order (i) constitute the most effective and practicable notice of the Final Approval Order, the relief available to Settlement Class Members pursuant to the Final Approval Order, and applicable time periods; (ii) constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice for all other purposes to all Settlement Class Members; and (iii) comply fully with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable laws.

Judge Robert Scola, Jr., *Wilson et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. et al.* (Jan. 28, 2020) 17-cv-23033 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice, in the form approved by the Court, was properly disseminated to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Notice Plan and constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances. The forms and methods of the Notice Plan approved by the Court met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Code, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and any other applicable law.

Judge Michael Davis, *Garcia v. Target Corporation* (Jan. 27, 2020) 16-cv-02574 (D. Minn.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of this case, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement

Judicial Quotes

Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing, and satisfies the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks, *In re TD Bank, N.A. Debit Card Overdraft Fee Litigation* (Jan. 9, 2020) MDL No. 2613, 6:15-MN-02613 (D.S.C.):

The Classes have been notified of the settlement pursuant to the plan approved by the Court. After having reviewed the Declaration of Cameron R. Azari (ECF No. 220-1) and the Supplemental Declaration of Cameron R. Azari . . . , the Court hereby finds that notice was accomplished in accordance with the Court's directives. The Court further finds that the notice program constituted the best practicable notice to the Settlement Classes under the circumstances and fully satisfies the requirements of due process and Federal Rule 23.

Judge Margo K. Brodie, *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation* (Dec. 13, 2019) MDL No. 1720, 05-md-01720 (E.D.N.Y.):

The notice and exclusion procedures provided to the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class, including but not limited to the methods of identifying and notifying members of the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class, were fair, adequate, and sufficient, constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances, and were reasonably calculated to apprise members of the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class of the Action, the terms of the Superseding Settlement Agreement, and their objection rights, and to apprise members of the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class of their exclusion rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any other applicable laws or rules of the Court, and due process.

Judge Steven Logan, *Knapper v. Cox Communications, Inc.* (Dec. 13, 2019) 2:17-cv-00913 (D. Ariz.):

The Court finds that the form and method for notifying the class members of the settlement and its terms and conditions was in conformity with this Court's Preliminary Approval Order (Doc. 120). The Court further finds that the notice satisfied due process principles and the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c), and the Plaintiff chose the best practicable notice under the circumstances. The Court further finds that the notice was clearly designed to advise the class members of their rights.

Judge Manish Shah, *Prather v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.* (Dec. 10, 2019) 1:17-cv-00481 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in Section VIII of the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of this case, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing, and satisfies the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Liam O'Grady, *Liggio v. Apple Federal Credit Union* (Dec. 6, 2019) 1:18-cv-01059 (E.D. Va.):

The Court finds that the manner and form of notice (the "Notice Plan") as provided for in this Court's July 2, 2019 Order granting preliminary approval of class settlement, and as set forth in the Parties' Settlement Agreement was provided to Settlement Class Members by the Settlement Administrator The Notice Plan was reasonably calculated to give actual notice to Settlement Class Members of the right to receive benefits from the Settlement, and to be excluded from or object to the Settlement. The Notice Plan met the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judge Brian McDonald, *Armon et al. v. Washington State University* (Nov. 8, 2019) 17-2-23244-1 (consolidated with 17-2-25052-0) (Sup. Ct. Wash.):

The Court finds that the Notice Program, as set forth in the Settlement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, satisfied CR 23(c)(2), was the best Notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated to provide-and did provide-due and sufficient Notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Litigation; certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only; the existence and terms of the Settlement; the identity of Class Counsel and appropriate information about Class Counsel's then-forthcoming application for attorneys' fees and incentive awards to the Class Representatives; appropriate information about how to participate in the Settlement; Settlement Class Members' right to exclude themselves; their right to object to the Settlement and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, through counsel if they

Judicial Quotes

desired; and appropriate instructions as to how to obtain additional information regarding this Litigation and the Settlement. In addition, pursuant to CR 23(c)(2)(B), the Notice properly informed Settlement Class Members that any Settlement Class Member who failed to opt-out would be prohibited from bringing a lawsuit against Defendant based on or related to any of the claims asserted by Plaintiffs, and it satisfied the other requirements of the Civil Rules.

Judge Andrew J. Guilford, *In re Wells Fargo Collateral Protection Insurance Litigation* (Nov. 4, 2019) 8:17-ml-02797 (C.D. Cal.):

Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. ("Epiq"), the parties' settlement administrator, was able to deliver the court-approved notice materials to all class members, including 2,254,471 notice packets and 1,079,408 summary notices.

Judge Paul L. Maloney, *Burch v. Whirlpool Corporation* (Oct. 16, 2019) 1:17-cv-00018 (W.D. Mich.):

[T]he Court hereby finds and concludes that members of the Settlement Class have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice satisfies all requirements of federal and applicable state laws and due process.

Judge Gene E.K. Pratter, *Tashica Fulton-Green et al. v. Accolade, Inc.* (Sept. 24, 2019) 2:18-cv-00274 (E.D. Pa.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members in compliance with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge Edwin Torres, *Burrow et al. v. Forjas Taurus S.A. et al.* (Sept. 6, 2019) 1:16-cv-21606 (S.D. Fla.):

Because the Parties complied with the agreed-to notice provisions as preliminarily approved by this Court, and given that there are no developments or changes in the facts to alter the Court's previous conclusion, the Court finds that the notice provided in this case satisfied the requirements of due process and of Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge Amos L. Mazzant, *Fessler v. Porcelana Corona De Mexico, S.A. DE C.V f/k/a Sanitarios Lamosa S.A. DE C.V. a/k/a Vortens* (Aug. 30, 2019) 4:19-cv-00248 (E.D. Tex.):

The Court has reviewed the Notice Plan and its implementation and efficacy, and finds that it constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action and their right to object to the proposed settlement or opt out of the Settlement Class in full compliance with the requirements of applicable law, including the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and Rules 23(c) and (e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

In addition, Class Notice clearly and concisely stated in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the certified 2011 Settlement Class; (iii) the claims and issues of the 2011 Settlement Class; (iv) that a Settlement Class Member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the Court will exclude from the Settlement Class any member who requests exclusions; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(3).

Judge Karon Owen Bowdre, *In re Community Health Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Aug. 22, 2019) MDL No. 2595, 2:15-cv-00222 (N.D. Ala.):

The court finds that the Notice Program: (1) satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process; (2) was the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (3) reasonably apprised Settlement Class members of the pendency of the Action and their right to object to the settlement or opt-out of the Settlement Class; and (4) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice. Approximately 90% of the 6,081,189 individuals identified as Settlement Class members received the Initial Postcard Notice of this Settlement Action.

The court further finds, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B), that the Class Notice adequately informed Settlement Class members of their rights with respect to this action.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Christina A. Snyder, *Zaklit et al. v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC et al.* (Aug. 21, 2019) 5:15-cv-02190 (C.D. Cal.):

The Class Notice provided to the Settlement Class conforms with the requirements of Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 23, the California and United States Constitutions, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the other Settlement Class Members. The notice fully satisfied the requirements of Due Process. No Settlement Class Members have objected to the terms of the Settlement.

Judge Brian M. Cogan, *Luib v. Henkel Consumer Goods Inc.* (Aug. 19, 2019) 1:17-cv-03021 (E.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan, set forth in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order: (i) was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated to provide, and did provide, due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class regarding the existence and nature of the Action, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the rights of Settlement Class members to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, to object and appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and to receive benefits under the Settlement Agreement; and (iii) satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation* (Aug. 16, 2019) MDL No. 2420, 4:13-md-02420 (N.D. Cal.):

The proposed notice plan was undertaken and carried out pursuant to this Court's preliminary approval order. [T]he notice program reached approximately 87 percent of adults who purchased portable computers, power tools, camcorders, or replacement batteries, and these class members were notified an average of 3.5 times each. As a result of Plaintiffs' notice efforts, in total, 1,025,449 class members have submitted claims. That includes 51,961 new claims, and 973,488 claims filed under the prior settlements.

Judge Jon Tigar, *McKnight et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.* (Aug. 13, 2019) 3:14-cv-05615 (N.D. Cal.):

The settlement administrator, Epiq Systems, Inc., carried out the notice procedures as outlined in the preliminary approval. ECF No. 162 at 17-18. Notices were mailed to over 22 million class members with a success rate of over 90%. Id. at 17. Epiq also created a website, banner ads, and a toll free number. Id. at 17-18. Epiq estimates that it reached through mail and other formats 94.3% of class members. ECF No. 164 ¶ 28. In light of these actions, and the Court's prior order granting preliminary approval, the Court finds that the parties have provided adequate notice to class members.

Judge Gary W.B. Chang, *Robinson v. First Hawaiian Bank* (Aug. 8, 2019) 17-1-0167-01 (Cir. Ct. of First Cir. Haw.):

This Court determines that the Notice Program satisfies all of the due process requirements for a class action settlement.

Judge Karin Crump, *Hyder et al. v. Consumers County Mutual Insurance Company* (July 30, 2019) D-1-GN-16-000596 (D. Ct. of Travis Cnty. Tex.):

Due and adequate Notice of the pendency of this Action and of this Settlement has been provided to members of the Settlement Class, and this Court hereby finds that the Notice Plan described in the Preliminary Approval Order and completed by Defendant complied fully with the requirements of due process, the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, and the requirements of due process under the Texas and United States Constitutions, and any other applicable laws.

Judge Wendy Bettlestone, *Underwood v. Kohl's Department Stores, Inc. et al.* (July 24, 2019) 2:15-cv-00730 (E.D. Pa.):

The Notice, the contents of which were previously approved by the Court, was disseminated in accordance with the procedures required by the Court's Preliminary Approval Order in accordance with applicable law.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Andrew G. Ceresia, J.S.C., Denier et al. v. Taconic Biosciences, Inc. (July 15, 2019) 00255851 (Sup Ct. N.Y.):

The Court finds that such Notice as therein ordered, constitutes the best possible notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members in compliance with the requirements of the CPLR.

Judge Vince G. Chhabria, Parsons v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLC (July 11, 2019) 3:16-cv-05387 (N.D. Cal.):

Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, the notice documents were sent to Settlement Class Members by email or by first-class mail, and further notice was achieved via publication in People magazine, internet banner notices, and internet sponsored search listings. The Court finds that the manner and form of notice (the "Notice Program") set forth in the Settlement Agreement was provided to Settlement Class Members. The Court finds that the Notice Program, as implemented, was the best practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, class certification, the terms of the Settlement, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class and object to the Settlement, Class Counsel's fee request, and the request for Service Award for Plaintiff. The Notice and Notice Program constituted sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Notice and Notice Program satisfy all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the constitutional requirement of due process.

Judge Daniel J. Buckley, Adlouni v. UCLA Health Systems Auxiliary et al. (June 28, 2019) BC589243 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order was appropriate, adequate, and sufficient, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all Persons within the definition of the Settlement Class to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the Action, the nature of the claims, the definition of the Settlement Class, and the opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or present objections to the settlement. The notice fully complied with the requirements of due process and all applicable statutes and laws and with the California Rules of Court.

Judge John C. Hayes III, Lightsey et al. v. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of SCANA et al. (June 11, 2019) 2017-CP-25-335 (Ct. of Com. Pleas., S.C.):

These multiple efforts at notification far exceed the due process requirement that the class representative provide the best practical notice.... Following this extensive notice campaign reaching over 1.6 million potential class member accounts, Class counsel have received just two objections to the settlement and only 24 opt outs.

Judge Stephen K. Bushong, Scharfstein v. BP West Coast Products, LLC (June 4, 2019) 1112-17046 (Ore. Cir., Cnty. of Multnomah):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan ... fully met the requirements of the Oregon Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, the United States Constitution, the Oregon Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Cynthia Bashant, Lloyd et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union (May 28, 2019) 17-cv-1280 (S.D. Cal.):

This Court previously reviewed, and conditionally approved Plaintiffs' class notices subject to certain amendments. The Court affirms once more that notice was adequate.

Judge Robert W. Gettleman, Cowen v. Lenny & Larry's Inc. (May 2, 2019) 1:17-cv-01530 (N.D. Ill.):

Notice to the Settlement Class and other potentially interested parties has been provided in accordance with the elements specified by the Court in the preliminary approval order. Adequate notice of the amended settlement and the final approval hearing has also been given. Such notice informed the Settlement Class members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and of their opportunity to object or comment thereon or to exclude themselves from the Settlement; provided Settlement Class Members adequate instructions and a means to obtain additional information; was adequate notice under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class [M]embers; and complied fully with the laws of the State of Illinois, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, due process, and other applicable law.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Edward J. Davila, *In re HP Printer Firmware Update Litigation* (Apr. 25, 2019) 5:16-cv-05820 (N.D. Cal.):

Due and adequate notice has been given of the Settlement as required by the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that notice of this Settlement was given to Class Members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order and constituted the best notice practicable of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, including the Settlement, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and that this notice satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and of due process.

Judge Claudia Wilken, *Naiman v. Total Merchant Services, Inc. et al.* (Apr. 16, 2019) 4:17-cv-03806 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court also finds that the notice program satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process. The notice approved by the Court and disseminated by Epiq constituted the best practicable method for informing the class about the Final Settlement Agreement and relevant aspects of the litigation.

Judge Paul Gardephe, *37 Besen Parkway, LLC v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.)* (Mar. 31, 2019) 15-cv-9924 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Notice given to Class Members complied in all respects with the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process and provided due and adequate notice to the Class.

Judge Alison J. Nathan, *Pantelyat et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. et al.* (Jan. 31, 2019) 16-cv-08964 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Class Notice provided to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, to all persons entitled to notice. The notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and all other applicable law and rules.

Judge Kenneth M. Hoyt, *Al's Pals Pet Card, LLC et al. v. Woodforest National Bank, N.A. et al.* (Jan. 30, 2019) 4:17-cv-3852 (S.D. Tex.):

[T]he Court finds that the class has been notified of the Settlement pursuant to the plan approved by the Court. The Court further finds that the notice program constituted the best practicable notice to the class under the circumstances and fully satisfies the requirements of due process, including Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1) and 28 U.S.C. § 1715.

Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr., *In re Dealer Management Systems Antitrust Litigation* (Jan. 23, 2019) MDL No. 2817, 18-cv-00864 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Settlement Administrator fully complied with the Preliminary Approval Order and that the form and manner of providing notice to the Dealership Class of the proposed Settlement with Reynolds was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members of the Dealership Class who could be identified through the exercise of reasonable effort. The Court further finds that the notice program provided due and adequate notice of these proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the terms of the Agreement, to all parties entitled to such notice and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b), and constitutional due process.

Judge Federico A. Moreno, *In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (Ford)* (Dec. 20, 2018) MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.):

The record shows and the Court finds that the Class Notice has been given to the Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that such Class Notice: (i) is reasonable and constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action and the terms of the Settlement Agreement, their right to exclude themselves from the Class or to object to all or any part of the Settlement Agreement, their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense) and the binding effect of the orders and Final Order and Final Judgment in the Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons and entities who or which do not exclude themselves from the Class; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), FED. R. Civ. P. 23 and any other applicable law as well as complying with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Herndon, *Hale v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company et al.* (Dec. 16, 2018) 3:12-cv-00660 (S.D. Ill.):

The Class here is estimated to include approximately 4.7 million members. Approximately 1.43 million of them received individual postcard or email notice of the terms of the proposed Settlement, and the rest were notified via a robust publication program “estimated to reach 78.8% of all U.S. Adults Aged 35+ approximately 2.4 times.” Doc. 966-2 ¶¶ 26, 41. The Court previously approved the notice plan (Doc. 947), and now, having carefully reviewed the declaration of the Notice Administrator (Doc. 966-2), concludes that it was fully and properly executed, and reflected “the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort.” See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). The Court further concludes that CAFA notice was properly effectuated to the attorneys general and insurance commissioners of all 50 states and District of Columbia.

Judge Jesse M. Furman, *Alaska Electrical Pension Fund et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. et al.* (Nov. 13, 2018) 14-cv-07126 (S.D.N.Y.):

The mailing and distribution of the Notice to all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable effort, the publication of the Summary Notice, and the other Notice efforts described in the Motion for Final Approval, as provided for in the Court's June 26, 2018 Preliminary Approval Order, satisfy the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitute due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to notice.

Judge William L. Campbell, Jr., *Ajose et al. v. Interline Brands, Inc.* (Oct. 23, 2018) 3:14-cv-01707 (M.D. Tenn.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan, as approved by the Preliminary Approval Order: (i) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(3) and due process; (ii) was reasonable and the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (iii) reasonably apprised the Settlement Class of the pendency of the action, the terms of the Agreement, their right to object to the proposed settlement or opt out of the Settlement Class, the right to appear at the Final Fairness Hearing, and the Claims Process; and (iv) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all those entitled to receive notice.

Judge Joseph C. Spero, *Abante Rooter and Plumbing v. Pivotal Payments Inc., d/b/a/ Capital Processing Network and CPN* (Oct. 15, 2018) 3:16-cv-05486 (N.D. Cal.):

[T]he Court finds that notice to the class of the settlement complied with Rule 23(c)(3) and (e) and due process. Rule 23(e)(1) states that “[t]he court must direct notice in a reasonable manner to all class members who would be bound by” a proposed settlement, voluntary dismissal, or compromise. Class members are entitled to the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances” of any proposed settlement before it is finally approved by the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) ... The notice program included notice sent by first class mail to 1,750,564 class members and reached approximately 95.2% of the class.

Judge Marcia G. Cooke, *Dipuglia v. US Coachways, Inc.* (Sept. 28, 2018) 1:17-cv-23006 (S.D. Fla.):

The Settlement Class Notice Program was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution, which include the requirement of due process.

Judge Beth Labson Freeman, *Gergetz v. Telenav, Inc.* (Sept. 27, 2018) 5:16-cv-04261 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Notice and Notice Plan implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, which consists of individual notice sent via first-class U.S. Mail postcard, notice provided via email, and the posting of relevant Settlement documents on the Settlement Website, has been successfully implemented and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and: (1) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (2) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (3) met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause, and the Rules of this Court.

Judicial Quotes

Judge M. James Lorenz, *Farrell v. Bank of America, N.A.* (Aug. 31, 2018) 3:16-cv-00492 (S.D. Cal.):

The Court therefore finds that the Class Notices given to Settlement Class members adequately informed Settlement Class members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and constituted valid, due, and sufficient notice to Settlement Class members. The Court further finds that the Notice Program satisfies due process and has been fully implemented.

Judge Dean D. Pregerson, *Falco et al. v. Nissan North America, Inc. et al.* (July 16, 2018) 2:13-cv-00686 (C.D. Cal.):

Notice to the Settlement Class as required by Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been provided in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and such Notice by first-class mail was given in an adequate and sufficient manner, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfies all requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process.

Judge Lynn Adelman, *In re Windsor Wood Clad Window Product Liability Litigation* (July 16, 2018) MDL No. 2688, 16-md-02688 (E.D. Wis.):

The Court finds that the Notice Program was appropriately administered, and was the best practicable notice to the Class under the circumstances, satisfying the requirements of Rule 23 and due process. The Notice Program, constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons, entities, and/or organizations entitled to receive notice; fully satisfied the requirements of the Constitution of the United States (including the Due Process Clause), Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any other applicable law; and is based on the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judge Stephen K. Bushong, *Surrett et al. v. Western Culinary Institute et al.* (June 18, 2018) 0803-03530 (Ore. Cir. Cnty. of Multnomah):

This Court finds that the distribution of the Notice of Settlement ... fully met the requirements of the Oregon Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, the United States Constitution, the Oregon Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Jesse M. Furman, *Alaska Electrical Pension Fund et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. et al.* (June 1, 2018) 14-cv-07126 (S.D.N.Y.):

The mailing of the Notice to all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable effort, the publication of the Summary Notice, and the other Notice distribution efforts described in the Motion for Final Approval, as provided for in the Court's October 24, 2017 Order Providing for Notice to the Settlement Class and Preliminarily Approving the Plan of Distribution, satisfy the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitute due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to notice.

Judge Brad Seligman, *Larson v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.)* (May 8, 2018) RG16813803 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice and dissemination of the Class Notice as carried out by the Settlement Administrator complied with the Court's order granting preliminary approval and all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to California Rules of Court, rule 3.769(f) and the Constitutional requirements of due process, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice of the Settlement.

[T]he dissemination of the Class Notice constituted the best notice practicable because it included mailing individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who are reasonably identifiable using the same method used to inform class members of certification of the class, following a National Change of Address search and run through the LexisNexis Deceased Database.

Judge Federico A. Moreno, *Masson v. Tallahassee Dodge Chrysler Jeep, LLC* (May 8, 2018) 17-cv-22967 (S.D. Fla.):

The Settlement Class Notice Program was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution, which include the requirement of due process.

Judicial Quotes

Chancellor Russell T. Perkins, *Morton v. GreenBank* (Apr. 18, 2018) 11-135-IV (20th Jud. Dist. Tenn.):

The Notice Program as provided or in the Agreement and the Preliminary Amended Approval Order constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all Settlement Class members who could be identified through reasonable effort. The Notice Plan fully satisfied the requirements of Tennessee Rule of Civil Procedure 23.03, due process and any other applicable law.

Judge James V. Selna, *Callaway v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC* (Mar. 8, 2018) 8:14-cv-02011 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice given to the Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances of this case, and that the notice complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process.

The notice given by the Class Administrator constituted due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class, and adequately informed members of the Settlement Class of their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class so as not to be bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement and how to object to the Settlement.

The Court has considered and rejected the objection ... [regarding] the adequacy of the notice plan. The notice given provided ample information regarding the case. Class members also had the ability to seek additional information from the settlement website, from Class Counsel or from the Class Administrator.

Judge Thomas M. Durkin, *Vergara et al., v. Uber Technologies, Inc.* (Mar. 1, 2018) 1:15-cv-06972 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in Section IX of the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Classes of the pendency of this case, certification of the Settlement Classes for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing, and satisfies the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law. Further, the Court finds that Defendant has timely satisfied the notice requirements of 28 U.S.C. Section 1715.

Judge Federico A. Moreno, *In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (Honda & Nissan)* (Feb. 28, 2018) MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice has been given to the Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that such Class Notice: (i) is reasonable and constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action and the terms of the Settlement Agreement, their right to exclude themselves from the Class or to object to all or any part of the Settlement Agreement, their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense) and the binding effect of the orders and Final Order and Final Judgment in the Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons and entities who or which do not exclude themselves from the Class; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), FED R. CIV. R. 23 and any other applicable law as well as complying with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judge Susan O. Hickey, *Larey v. Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company* (Feb. 9, 2018) 4:14-cv-04008 (W.D. Kan.):

Based on the Court's review of the evidence submitted and argument of counsel, the Court finds and concludes that the Class Notice and Claim Form was mailed to potential Class Members in accordance with the provisions of the Preliminary Approval Order, and together with the Publication Notice, the automated toll-free telephone number, and the settlement website: (i) constituted, under the circumstances, the most effective and practicable notice of the pendency of the Lawsuit, this Stipulation, and the Final Approval Hearing to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort; and (ii) met all requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of due process under the United States Constitution, and the requirements of any other applicable rules or law.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Muriel D. Hughes, *Glasko v. Independent Bank Corporation* (Jan. 11, 2018) 13-009983 (Cir. Ct. Mich.):

The Court-approved Notice Plan satisfied due process requirements ... The notice, among other things, was calculated to reach Settlement Class Members because it was sent to their last known email or mail address in the Bank's files.

Judge Naomi Reice Buchwald, *Orlander v. Staples, Inc.* (Dec. 13, 2017) 13-cv-00703 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Notice of Class Action Settlement ("Notice") was given to all Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order. The form and method of notifying the Class of the pendency of the Action as a class action and the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement met the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the Constitution of the United States (including the Due Process Clause); and any other applicable law, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

Judge Lisa Godbey Wood, *T.A.N. v. PNI Digital Media, Inc.* (Dec. 1, 2017) 2:16-cv-132 (S.D. Ga.):

Notice to the Settlement Class Members required by Rule 23 has been provided as directed by this Court in the Preliminary Approval Order, and such notice constituted the best notice practicable, including, but not limited to, the forms of notice and methods of identifying and providing notice to the Settlement Class Members, and satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, and all other applicable laws.

Judge Robin L. Rosenberg, *Gottlieb v. Citgo Petroleum Corporation* (Nov. 29, 2017) 9:16-cv-81911 (S.D. Fla.):

The Settlement Class Notice Program was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution, which include the requirement of due process.

Judge Donald M. Middlebrooks, *Mahoney v. TT of Pine Ridge, Inc.* (Nov. 20, 2017) 9:17-cv-80029 (S.D. Fla.):

Based on the Settlement Agreement, Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement Agreement, and upon the Declaration of Cameron Azari, Esq. (DE 61-1), the Court finds that Class Notice provided to the Settlement Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that it satisfied the requirements of due process and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1).

Judge Gerald Austin McHugh, *Sobiech v. U.S. Gas & Electric, Inc., i/t/d/b/a Pennsylvania Gas & Electric et al.* (Nov. 8, 2017) 2:14-cv-04464 (E.D. Pa.):

Notice has been provided to the Settlement Class of the pendency of this Action, the conditional certification of the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement, and the preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement and the Settlement contemplated thereby. The Court finds that the notice provided was the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all persons entitled to such notice and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge Federico A. Moreno, *In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (BMW, Mazda, Toyota, & Subaru)* (Nov. 1, 2017) MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.):

[T]he Court finds that the Class Notice has been given to the Class in the manner approved in the Preliminary Approval Order. The Class Notice: (i) is reasonable and constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action and the terms of the Settlement Agreement, their right to exclude themselves from the Class or to object to all or any part of the Settlement Agreement, their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of the orders and Final Order and Final Judgment in the Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons and entities who or which do not exclude themselves from the Class; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and any other applicable law as well as complying with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Charles R. Breyer, *In re Volkswagen “Clean Diesel” Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation* (May 17, 2017) MDL No. 2672 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court is satisfied that the Notice Program was reasonably calculated to notify Class Members of the proposed Settlement. The Notice “appris[e] interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford[ed] them an opportunity to present their objections.” Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950). Indeed, the Notice Administrator reports that the notice delivery rate of 97.04% “exceed[ed] the expected range and is indicative of the extensive address updating and re-mailing protocols used.”

Judge Rebecca Brett Nightingale, *Ratzlaff et al. v. BOKF, NA d/b/a Bank of Oklahoma et al.* (May 15, 2017) CJ-2015-00859 (Dist. Ct. Okla.):

The Court-approved Notice Plan satisfies Oklahoma law because it is “reasonable” (12 O.S. § 2023(E)(I)) and it satisfies due process requirements because it was “reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.” Shutts, 472 U.S. at 812 (quoting Mullane, 339 U.S. at 314-15).

Judge Joseph F. Bataillon, *Klug v. Watts Regulator Company* (Apr. 13, 2017) 8:15-cv-00061 (D. Neb.):

The court finds that the notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Class Action and of this settlement, as provided by the Settlement Agreement and by the Preliminary Approval Order dated December 7, 2017, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all persons and entities within the definition of the Settlement Class, and fully complied with the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 23 and due process. Due and sufficient proof of the execution of the Notice Plan as outlined in the Preliminary Approval Order has been filed.

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *Bias v. Wells Fargo & Company et al.* (Apr. 13, 2017) 4:12-cv-00664 (N.D. Cal.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice of Settlement given to the Settlement Class was adequate and reasonable and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including both individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort and publication notice.

Notice of Settlement, as given, complied with the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, satisfied the requirements of due process, and constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth herein.

Notice of the Settlement was provided to the appropriate regulators pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715(c)(1).

Judge Carlos Murguia, *Whitton v. Deffenbaugh Industries, Inc. et al.* (Dec. 14, 2016) 2:12-cv-02247 and ***Gary, LLC v. Deffenbaugh Industries, Inc. et al.*** 2:13-cv-02634 (D. Kan.):

The Court determines that the Notice Plan as implemented was reasonably calculated to provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances and contained all required information for members of the proposed Settlement Class to act to protect their interests. The Court also finds that Class Members were provided an adequate period of time to receive Notice and respond accordingly.

Judge Yvette Kane, *In re Shop-Vac Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (Dec. 9, 2016) MDL No. 2380 (M.D. Pa.):

The Court hereby finds and concludes that members of the Settlement Class have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice satisfies all requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all other applicable laws.

Judge Timothy D. Fox, *Miner v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.* (Nov. 21, 2016) 60CV03-4661 (Ark. Cir. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Settlement Notice provided to potential members of the Class constituted the best and most practicable notice under the circumstances, thereby complying fully with due process and Rule 23 of the Arkansas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Eileen Bransten, *In re HSBC Bank USA, N.A.*, as part of *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation* (Oct. 13, 2016) 650562/2011 (Sup. Ct. N.Y.):

This Court finds that the Notice Program and the Notice provided to Settlement Class members fully satisfied the requirements of constitutional due process, the N.Y. C.P.L.R., and any other applicable laws, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

Judge Jerome B. Simandle, *In re Caterpillar, Inc. C13 and C15 Engine Products Liability Litigation* (Sept. 20, 2016) MDL No. 2540 (D.N.J.):

The Court hereby finds that the Notice provided to the Settlement Class constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Said Notice provided due and adequate notice of these proceedings and the matters set forth herein, including the terms of the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, requirements of due process and any other applicable law.

Judge Marcia G. Cooke, *Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co. and Abercrombie & Fitch Co.* (Apr. 11, 2016) 14-cv-23120 (S.D. Fla.):

Pursuant to the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator, Epiq Systems, Inc., has complied with the approved notice process as confirmed in its Declaration filed with the Court on March 23, 2016. The Court finds that the notice process was designed to advise Class Members of their rights. The form and method for notifying Class Members of the settlement and its terms and conditions was in conformity with this Court's Preliminary Approval Order, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B), the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and due process under the United States Constitution and other applicable laws.

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation* (Mar. 22, 2016) MDL No. 2420, 4:13-md-02420 (N.D. Cal.):

From what I could tell, I liked your approach and the way you did it. I get a lot of these notices that I think are all legalese and no one can really understand them. Yours was not that way.

Judge Christopher S. Sontchi, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp et al.* (July 30, 2015) 14-cv-10979 (Bankr. D. Del.):

Notice of the Asbestos Bar Date as set forth in this Asbestos Bar Date Order and in the manner set forth herein constitutes adequate and sufficient notice of the Asbestos Bar Date and satisfies the requirements of the Bankruptcy Code, the Bankruptcy Rules, and the Local Rules.

Judge David C. Norton, *In re MI Windows and Doors Inc. Products Liability Litigation* (July 22, 2015) MDL No. 2333, 2:12-mn-00001 (D.S.C.):

The court finds that the Notice Plan, as described in the Settlement and related declarations, has been faithfully carried out and constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of this Action, and was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to be provided with Notice.

The court also finds that the Notice Plan was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of: (1) the pendency of this class action; (2) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class and the proposed Settlement; (3) their right to object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement (including final certification of the Settlement Class, the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the proposed Settlement, the adequacy of the Settlement Class's representation by Named Plaintiffs or Class Counsel, or the award of attorney's and representative fees); (4) their right to appear at the fairness hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense); and (5) the binding and preclusive effect of the orders and Final Order and Judgment in this Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all Persons who do not request exclusion from the Settlement Class. As such, the court finds that the Notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process

Judicial Quotes

Clause), the rules of this court, and any other applicable law, and provided sufficient notice to bind all Class Members, regardless of whether a particular Class Member received actual notice.

Judge Robert W. Gettleman, Adkins et al. v. Nestlé Purina PetCare Company et al. (June 23, 2015) 1:12-cv-02871 (N.D. Ill.):

Notice to the Settlement Class and other potentially interested parties has been provided in accordance with the notice requirements specified by the Court in the Preliminary Approval Order. Such notice fully and accurately informed the Settlement Class members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and of their opportunity to object or comment thereon or to exclude themselves from the Settlement; provided Settlement Class Members adequate instructions and a variety of means to obtain additional information; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of Illinois, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, due process, and other applicable law.

Judge James Lawrence King, Steen v. Capital One, N.A. (May 22, 2015) 2:10-cv-01505 (E.D. La.) and 1:10-cv-22058 (S.D. Fla.) as part of **In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation**, MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the Settlement Class Members were provided with the best practicable notice; the notice was reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections . . . This Settlement with Capital One was widely publicized, and any Settlement Class Member who wished to express comments or objections had ample opportunity and means to do so.

Judge Rya W. Zobel, Gulbankian et al. v. MW Manufacturers, Inc. (Dec. 29, 2014) 1:10-cv-10392 (D. Mass.):

This Court finds that the Class Notice was provided to the Settlement Class consistent with the Preliminary Approval Order and that it was the best notice practicable and fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, and applicable law. The Court finds that the Notice Plan that was implemented by the Claims Administrator satisfies the requirements of FED. R. CIV. P. 23, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and Due Process, and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Plan constituted due and sufficient notice of the Settlement, the Final Approval Hearing, and the other matters referred to in the notices. Proof of the giving of such notices has been filed with the Court via the Azari Declaration and its exhibits.

Judge Edward J. Davila, Rose v. Bank of America Corporation et al. (Aug. 29, 2014) 5:11-cv-02390 & 5:12-cv-00400 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of this action, all material elements of the Settlement, the opportunity for Settlement Class Members to exclude themselves from, object to, or comment on the settlement and to appear at the final approval hearing. The notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, satisfying the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B); provided notice in a reasonable manner to all class members, satisfying Rule 23(e)(1)(B); was adequate and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and, complied fully with the laws of the United States and of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process and any other applicable rules of court.

Judge James A. Robertson, II, Wong et al. v. Alacer Corp. (June 27, 2014) CGC-12-519221 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

Notice to the Settlement Class has been provided in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order. Based on the Declaration of Cameron Azari dated March 7, 2014, such Class Notice has been provided in an adequate and sufficient manner, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies the requirements of California Civil Code Section 1781, California Civil Code of Civil Procedure Section 382, Rules 3.766 of the California Rules of Court, and due process.

Judge John Gleeson, In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation (Dec. 13, 2013) MDL No. 1720, 05-md-01720 (E.D.N.Y.):

The Class Administrator notified class members of the terms of the proposed settlement through a mailed notice and publication campaign that included more than 20 million mailings and publication in more than 400 publications. The notice here meets the requirements of due process and notice standards . . . The objectors' complaints provide no reason to conclude that the purposes and requirements of a notice to a class were not met here.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Lance M. Africk, *Evans et al. v. TIN, Inc. et al.* (July 7, 2013) 2:11-cv-02067 (E.D. La.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice... as described in Notice Agent Lauran Schultz's Declaration: (a) constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances...; (c) constituted notice that was reasonable, due, adequate, and sufficient; and (d) constituted notice that fully satisfied all applicable legal requirements, including Rules 23(c)(2)(B) and (e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process Clause), the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law, as well as complied with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judge Edward M. Chen, *Marolda v. Symantec Corporation* (Apr. 5, 2013) 3:08-cv-05701 (N.D. Cal.):

Approximately 3.9 million notices were delivered by email to class members, but only a very small percentage objected or opted out ... The Court ... concludes that notice of settlement to the class was adequate and satisfied all requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e) and due process. Class members received direct notice by email, and additional notice was given by publication in numerous widely circulated publications as well as in numerous targeted publications. These were the best practicable means of informing class members of their rights and of the settlement's terms.

Judge Ann D. Montgomery, *In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Products Liability Litigation* (Feb. 27, 2013) MDL No. 1958, 08-md-01958 (D. Minn.):

*The form and content of the notices provided to the class were direct, understandable, and consistent with the "plain language" principles advanced by the Federal Judicial Center . . . The notice plan's multi-faceted approach to providing notice to settlement class members whose identity is not known to the settling parties constitutes "the best notice [*26] that is practicable under the circumstances" consistent with Rule 23(c)(2)(B).*

Magistrate Judge Stewart, *Gessele et al. v. Jack in the Box, Inc.* (Jan. 28, 2013) 3:10-cv-00960 (D. Ore.):

Moreover, plaintiffs have submitted [a] declaration from Cameron Azari, a nationally recognized notice expert, who attests that fashioning an effective joint notice is not unworkable or unduly confusing. Azari also provides a detailed analysis of how he would approach fashioning an effective notice in this case.

Judge Carl J. Barbier, *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (Medical Benefits Settlement)* (Jan. 11, 2013) MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.):

Through August 9, 2012, 366,242 individual notices had been sent to potential [Medical Benefits] Settlement Class Members by postal mail and 56,136 individual notices had been e-mailed. Only 10,700 mailings—or 3.3%—were known to be undeliverable. (Azari Decl. ¶¶ 8, 9.) Notice was also provided through an extensive schedule of local newspaper, radio, television and Internet placements, well-read consumer magazines, a national daily business newspaper, highly-trafficked websites, and Sunday local newspapers (via newspaper supplements). Notice was also provided in non-measured trade, business and specialty publications, African-American, Vietnamese, and Spanish language publications, and Cajun radio programming. The combined measurable paid print, television, radio, and Internet effort reached an estimated 95% of adults aged 18+ in the Gulf Coast region an average of 10.3 times each, and an estimated 83% of all adults in the United States aged 18+ an average of 4 times each. (Id. ¶¶ 8, 10.) All notice documents were designed to be clear, substantive, and informative. (Id. ¶ 5.)

The Court received no objections to the scope or content of the [Medical Benefits] Notice Program. (Azari Supp. Decl. ¶ 12.) The Court finds that the Notice and Notice Plan as implemented satisfied the best notice practicable standard of Rule 23(c) and, in accordance with Rule 23(e)(1), provided notice in a reasonable manner to Class Members who would be bound by the Settlement, including individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort. Likewise, the Notice and Notice Plan satisfied the requirements of Due Process. The Court also finds the Notice and Notice Plan satisfied the requirements of CAFA.

Judge Carl J. Barbier, *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (Economic and Property Damages Settlement)* (Dec. 21, 2012) MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice and Class Notice Plan satisfied and continue to satisfy the applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(b) and 23(e), the Class Action Fairness Act (28 U.S.C. § 1711 et seq.), and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution (U.S. Const., amend. V), constituting the best notice

Judicial Quotes

that is practicable under the circumstances of this litigation. The notice program surpassed the requirements of Due Process, Rule 23, and CAFA. Based on the factual elements of the Notice Program as detailed below, the Notice Program surpassed all of the requirements of Due Process, Rule 23, and CAFA.

The Notice Program, as duly implemented, surpasses other notice programs ... executed with court approval. The Notice Program included notification to known or potential Class Members via postal mail and e-mail; an extensive schedule of local newspaper, radio, television and Internet placements, well-read consumer magazines, a national daily business newspaper, and Sunday local newspapers. Notice placements also appeared in non-measured trade, business, and specialty publications, African-American, Vietnamese, and Spanish language publications, and Cajun radio programming. The Notice Program met the objective of reaching the greatest possible number of class members and providing them with every reasonable opportunity to understand their legal rights. See Azari Decl. ¶¶ 8, 15, 68. The Notice Program was substantially completed on July 15, 2012, allowing class members adequate time to make decisions before the opt-out and objections deadlines.

The media notice effort alone reached an estimated 95% of adults in the Gulf region an average of 10.3 times each, and an estimated 83% of all adults in the United States an average of 4 times each. These figures do not include notice efforts that cannot be measured, such as advertisements in trade publications and sponsored search engine listings. The Notice Program fairly and adequately covered and notified the class without excluding any demographic group or geographic area, and it exceeded the reach percentage achieved in most other court-approved notice programs.

Judge Alonzo Harris, *Opelousas General Hospital Authority, A Public Trust, D/B/A Opelousas General Health System and Arklamiss Surgery Center, L.L.C. v. FairPay Solutions, Inc.* (Aug. 17, 2012) 12-C-1599 (27th Jud. D. Ct. La.):

Notice given to Class Members and all other interested parties pursuant to this Court's order of April 18, 2012, was reasonably calculated to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action, the certification of the Class as Defined for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Class Members rights to be represented by private counsel, at their own costs, and Class Members rights to appear in Court to have their objections heard, and to afford persons or entities within the Class Definition an opportunity to exclude themselves from the Class. Such notice complied with all requirements of the federal and state constitutions, including the Due Process Clause, and applicable articles of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Class as Defined.

Judge James Lawrence King, *Sachar v. Iberiabank Corporation* (Apr. 26, 2012) as part of ***In re Checking Account Overdraft*** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla):

The Court finds that the Notice previously approved was fully and properly effectuated and was sufficient to satisfy the requirements of due process because it described "the substantive claims ... [and] contained information reasonably necessary to [allow Settlement Class Members to] make a decision to remain a class member and be bound by the final judgment."... The Notice, among other things, defined the Settlement Class, described the release as well as the amount and method and manner of proposed distribution of the Settlement proceeds, and informed Settlement Class Members of their rights to opt-out or object, the procedures for doing so, and the time and place of the Final Approval Hearing. The Notice also informed Settlement Class Members that a class judgment would bind them unless they opted out, and told them where they could obtain more information, such as access to a full copy of the Agreement. Further, the Notice described in summary form the fact that Class Counsel would be seeking attorneys' fees of up to 30 percent of the Settlement. Settlement Class Members were provided with the best practicable notice "reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise them of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." Mullane, 339 U.S. at 314. The content of the Notice fully complied with the requirements of Rule 23.

Judge Bobby Peters, *Vereen v. Lowe's Home Centers* (Apr. 13, 2012) SU10-cv-2267B (Ga. Super. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Notice and the Notice Plan was fulfilled, in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Amendment, and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order and that this Notice and Notice Plan constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of this action, constituted due and sufficient Notice of the proposed Settlement to all persons entitled to

Judicial Quotes

participate in the proposed Settlement, and was in full compliance with Ga. Code Ann § 9-11-23 and the constitutional requirements of due process. Extensive notice was provided to the class, including point of sale notification, publication notice and notice by first-class mail for certain potential Class Members.

The affidavit of the notice expert conclusively supports this Court's finding that the notice program was adequate, appropriate, and comported with Georgia Code Ann. § 9-11-23(b)(2), the Due Process Clause of the Constitution, and the guidance for effective notice articulate in the FJC's Manual for Complex Litigation, 4th.

Judge Lee Rosenthal, *In re Heartland Payment Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Mar. 2, 2012) MDL No. 2046 (S.D. Tex.):

*The notice that has been given clearly complies with Rule 23(e)(1)'s reasonableness requirement... the notice plan after its implementation and conservatively estimated that notice reached 81.4 percent of the class members. (Docket Entry No. 106, ¶ 32). Both the summary notice and the detailed notice provided the information reasonably necessary for the presumptive class members to determine whether to object to the proposed settlement. See Katrina Canal Breaches, 628 F.3d at 197. Both the summary notice and the detailed notice "were written in easy-to-understand plain English." In re Black Farmers Discrimination Litig., — F. Supp. 2d —, 2011 WL 5117058, at *23 (D.D.C. 2011); accord AGGREGATE LITIGATION § 3.04(c).15 The notice provided "satisf[ies] the broad reasonableness standards imposed by due process" and Rule 23. Katrina Canal Breaches, 628 F.3d at 197.*

Judge John D. Bates, *Trombley v. National City Bank* (Dec. 1, 2011) 1:10-cv-00232 (D.D.C.) as part of ***In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation*** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice given to the Settlement Class were in full compliance with the Court's January 11, 2011 Order, the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), and due process. The notice was adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. In addition, adequate notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to participate in the final fairness hearing were provided to the Settlement Class.

Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr., *Schulte v. Fifth Third Bank* (July 29, 2011) 1:09-cv-06655 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court has reviewed the content of all of the various notices, as well as the manner in which Notice was disseminated, and concludes that the Notice given to the Class fully complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, as it was the best notice practicable, satisfied all constitutional due process concerns, and provided the Court with jurisdiction over the absent Class Members.

Judge Ellis J. Daigle, *Williams v. Hammerman & Gainer Inc.* (June 30, 2011) 11-C-3187-B (27th Jud. D. Ct. La.):

Notices given to Settlement Class members and all other interested parties throughout this proceeding with respect to the certification of the Settlement Class, the proposed settlement, and all related procedures and hearings—including, without limitation, the notice to putative Settlement Class members and others... were reasonably calculated under all the circumstances and have been sufficient, as to form, content, and manner of dissemination, to apprise interested parties and members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the action, the certification of the Settlement Class, the Settlement Agreement and its contents, Settlement Class members' right to be represented by private counsel, at their own cost, and Settlement Class members' right to appear in Court to have their objections heard, and to afford Settlement Class members an opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class. Such notices complied with all requirements of the federal and state constitutions, including the due process clause, and applicable articles of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedures, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Settlement Class.

Judge Stefan R. Underhill, *Mathena v. Webster Bank, N.A.* (Mar. 24, 2011) 3:10-cv-01448 (D. Conn.) as part of ***In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation*** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice given to the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Ted Stewart, *Miller v. Basic Research, LLC* (Sept. 2, 2010) 2:07-cv-00871 (D. Utah):

Plaintiffs state that they have hired a firm specializing in designing and implementing large scale, unbiased, legal notification plans. Plaintiffs represent to the Court that such notice will include: 1) individual notice by electronic mail and/or first-class mail sent to all reasonably identifiable Class members; 2) nationwide paid media notice through a combination of print publications, including newspapers, consumer magazines, newspaper supplements and the Internet; 3) a neutral, Court-approved, informational press release; 4) a neutral, Court-approved Internet website; and 5) a toll-free telephone number. Similar mixed media plans have been approved by other district courts post class certification. The Court finds this plan is sufficient to meet the notice requirement.

Judge Sara Loi, *Pavlov v. Continental Casualty Co.* (Oct. 7, 2009) 5:07-cv-02580 (N.D. Ohio):

[T]he elaborate notice program contained in the Settlement Agreement provides for notice through a variety of means, including direct mail to each class member, notice to the United States Attorney General and each State, a toll free number, and a website designed to provide information about the settlement and instructions on submitting claims. With a 99.9% effective rate, the Court finds that the notice program constituted the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B), and clearly satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge James Robertson, *In re Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litigation* (Sept. 23, 2009) MDL No. 1796 (D.D.C.):

The Notice Plan, as implemented, satisfied the requirements of due process and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Plan was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the action, the terms of the Settlement, and their right to appear, object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement. Further, the notice was reasonable and constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice.

Legal Noticing Cases

Epiq Legal Noticing has served as a notice expert for planning, implementation and/or analysis in the following cases (this is a partial list of cases):

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Beauford v. The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Inc. et al.</i> (Pixel)	Cir. Ct. Baltimore Cnty., No. C-03-CV-23-000501
<i>Doe v. Clinivate, LLC</i>	Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Contra Costa, Cal., No. C22-01620
<i>Barletti et al. v. Connexin Software, Inc. d/b/a Office Practicum</i> (Data Breach)	E.D. Penn., No. 2:22-cv-04676
<i>Guy et al. v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	W.D. Wash., No. 2:22-cv-01558
<i>Farley et al. v. Eye Care Leaders Holding, LLC</i> (Data Breach)	M.D.N.C., No. 1:22-cv-00468
<i>In re Wright & Filippis, LLC Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	E.D. Mich., No. 2:22-cv-12908
<i>Holden et al. v. Guardian Analytics, Inc. et al.</i> (Data Breach)	D.N.J., No. 2:23-cv-2U5
<i>Bobo et al. v. Clover Network, LLC</i> (TCPA)	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., Dupage Cnty. Ill., No. 2023CH000168
<i>Dam v. Perkins Coie, LLP et al.</i> (Crypto)	E.D. Wash., No. 2:20-CV-00464
<i>Hoover et al. v. Camping World Group, LLC et al.</i> (Data Breach)	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill., No. 2023LA00037
<i>In re Hope College Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	W.D. Mich., No. 1:22-cv-01224
<i>Shaffer et al. v. George Washington University et al.</i> (Tuition Fees)	D.D.C., No. 20-1145
<i>In re U.S. Vision Data Breach Litigation</i>	D.N.J., No. 1:22-cv-06558
<i>Qureshi et al. v. American University</i> (Tuition Fees)	D.D.C., No. 1:20-cv-01141
<i>In re Canon U.S.A. Data Breach Litigation</i>	E.D.N.Y., No. 1:20-cv-06239
<i>Patterson et al. v. DPP II LLC et al.</i> (Data Breach)	Dist. Ct of Dallas Cnty., Tex., No. DC-23-01733
<i>In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation II</i>	C.D. Cal, No. 8:18-cv-02223
<i>Perez et al. v. Discover Bank</i> (Alienage & Immigration Status Discrimination - Civil Rights for Loans)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:20-cv-06896
<i>In re Google Location History Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 5:18-cv-05062
<i>Finn and Contristano v. Empress Ambulance Services, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. N.Y., Cnty. of Westchester, No. 61058/2023
<i>Ward-Howie v. Frontwave Credit Union</i> (Bank Fees)	Sup. Ct. Cal. San Diego Cnty., Cal., No. 37-2022-00016328
<i>Morrow et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union</i> (Bank Fees)	E.D. Va., No. 1:21-cv-00722
<i>In re Goodman Campbell Brain and Spine Data Incident Litigation</i>	Ind. Comm. Ct., No. 49D01-2207-PL-024807
<i>Healy et al. v. Reiter Affiliated Companies, LLC</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. Cal., Cnty. of Monterey, No. 22-cv-003056
<i>Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Agak</i> (Bank Fees)	Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Ventura, Cal., No. 56-2017-00500587-CL-CL-VTA

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Crema v. Apple Inc. and Apple Canada Inc.</i> (Apple iPhone 6, 6 Plus, 6s, 6s Plus, SE, 7 or 7 Plus Smartphone, iPhone Power Management Settlement; Product Defect)	Sup. Ct. of B.C., No. S188008
<i>Lara v. Lubbock Heart Hospital, LLC, dba Lubbock Heart & Surgical Hospital</i> (Data Breach)	N.D. Tex., No. 5:23-cv-00036
<i>Hu et al. v. BMW of North America LLC et al.</i> (Product Liability Auto Emissions)	D.N.J., No. 2:18-cv-04363
<i>Williams et al. v. Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	2nd Jud. Cir. Ct., Leon Cnty. Fla., No. 2023 CA 001430
<i>Doe v. Lima Memorial Hospital et al.</i> (Pixel)	Ct. of Common Pleas Allen Cnty. Ohio, No. CV2022 0490
<i>Mikulecky et al. v. Lutheran Social Services of Illinois</i> (Data Breach)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill., No. 2023-CH-00895
<i>In re Lipitor Antitrust Litigation</i> (End Payors - TPPs & Consumers) (Antitrust)	D.N.J., No. 3:12-cv-2389; MDL 2332
<i>In re American Financial Resources, Inc. Data Breach Litigation</i>	D.N.J., No. 2:22-cv-01757
<i>Lemar Agnew v. Foris DAX, Inc. d/b/a Crypto.com</i> (Cryptocurrency BIPA)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill., No. 2024-CH-00435
<i>Domitrovich et al. v. M.C. Dean, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	E.D. Vir., No. 1:23-cv-00210
<i>Moradpour v. Velodyne Lidar, Inc. et al.</i> (Securities)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:21-cv-01486
<i>Guy et al. v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	W.D. Wash., No. 2:22-cv-01558
<i>Briscoe et al. v. First Financial Credit Union</i> (Data Breach)	2nd. Jud. Dist. Cnty. of Bernalillo, N.M., No. D-202-CV-2022-02974
<i>Niewinski et al. v. State Farm Life Insurance Company et al.</i> (Universal Life Insurance Policies)	W.D. Mo., No. 23-04159-CV
<i>Sherwood et al. v. Horizon Actuarial Services, LLC</i> (Data Breach)	N.D. Ga., No. 1:22-cv-01495
<i>Prescott et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC</i> (False Advertising)	N.D. Cal, No. 5:20-cv-02101
<i>Kaether et al. v. Metropolitan Area EMS Authority D/B/A MedStar Mobile Healthcare</i> (Data Breach)	Dist. Ct. Tarrant Cnty., Tex. No. 342-339562-23
<i>In re Waste Management Data Breach Litigation</i>	S.D. N.Y., No. 1:21-cv-06199
<i>Medina et al. v. PracticeMax, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	D. Ariz., No. CV-22-01261
<i>Cavanaugh et al. v. Grenville Christian College et al.</i>	Sup. Ct. of Justice – Ontario, No. 08-CV-347100-00
<i>Bandy v. TOC Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Tennessee Orthopaedic Clinics, a division of Tennessee Orthopaedic Alliance, P.A.</i> (Data Breach)	M.D. Tenn., No. 3:23-cv-00598
<i>Sayas et al. v. Biometric Impressions Corp.</i> (BIPA)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill., No. 2020 CH 00201
<i>Nimsey v. Tinker Federal Credit Union</i> (Overdraft Fees)	Dist. Ct. Oklahoma Cnty., Okla., No. CJ-2019-6084
<i>Fiorentino v. Flosports, Inc.</i> (VPPA)	D. Mass., No. 1:22-cv-11502
<i>Nielsen v. Walt Disney Parks and Resorts U.S., Inc.,</i> (Consumer False Advertising)	C.D. Cal, No. 8:21-cv-02055

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Mayheu et al. v. Chick-fil-A Inc. (Delivery Fees & Menu Prices)</i>	Sup. Ct. Fulton Cnty., Ga., No.2022CV365400
<i>Arevalo et al. v. USAA Casualty Insurance Company et al. (Consumer)</i>	Dist. Ct., Bexar County, Tex. 285th Jud. Dist, No. 202-CI-16240
<i>In re McKinsey & Co., Inc. National Prescription Opiate Consultant Litigation All School District</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:21-md-02996-CRB
<i>In re McKinsey & Co., Inc. National Prescription Opiate Consultant Litigation Subdivision</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:21-md-02996-CRB
<i>Beasley et al. v. TTEC Services Corporation; Anderson v. TTEC Services Corporation (Data Breach)</i>	D. Col, No. 22-cv-00097; No. 22-cv-00347
<i>In re PFA Insurance Marketing Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal, No. 4:18-cv-03771 YGR
<i>Stauber v. Sudler Property Management (Data Breach)</i>	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill, No. 2023LA000411
<i>In re Accellion, Inc. Data Breach Litigation Accellion; Harbour et al. v. California Health & Wellness et al. (Health Net)</i>	N.D. Cal., MDL 3002, No. 5:21-CV-01155; 5:21-cv-03322-EJD
<i>Roberts et al. v. Zuora Inc. et al. (Securities)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:19-cv-03422
<i>Black v. USAA Casualty Insurance (Auto Insurance)</i>	N.D. Ga., No. 1:21-cv-01363
<i>Alexander et al. v. Salud Family Health, Inc.</i>	19th Dist. Ct. Greeley Cnty., Col., No. 2023CV030580
<i>Jackson et al. v. Fandango Media, LLC (VPPA)</i>	18 th Jud. Cir. Ct. Dupage Cnty., Ind., No. 2023LA000631
<i>In re Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation</i>	D.Minn., No. 22-3031
<i>Ross et al. v. Panda Restaurant Group, Inc.</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., Cnty of Los Angeles, No. 21STCV03662
<i>Fernandez et al. v. 90 Degree Benefits Wisconsin et al.</i>	E.D. Wis., No. 2:22-cv-00799
<i>Gudgel et al. v. Reynolds Consumer Products, Inc. et al.</i>	Cir. Ct. 19th Jud. Cir., Lake Cnty, Ill., No. 23LA00000486
<i>Julien et al. v. Cash Express, LLC (Data Breach)</i>	Cir. Ct. Putnam Cnty., Tenn., No. 2022-CV-221
<i>Sharma et al. v. Accutech Systems Corporation (Data Breach)</i>	Cir. Ct. 2, Del. Cnty, Ind., No. 18C02-2210-CT-000135
<i>Young et al. v. Military Advantage, Inc. d/b/a Military.com</i>	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill., No. 2023LA00535
<i>Lukens v. Utah Imaging Associates, Inc.</i>	3 rd Dist. Ct., Salt Lake Cnty., Utah, No. 210906618
<i>Miranda v. Xavier University (Tuition)</i>	S.D. Ohio, No. 1:20-cv-00539
<i>Holly Wedding et al. vs. California Public Employees' Retirement System et al. (Calpers II Settlement)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cnty of Los Angeles, Cal., No. BC517444
<i>Hrebenar v. Davis Yulee LLC, d/b/a Davis Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram of Yulee (Florida Telephone Solicitation Act)</i>	11th Jud. Cir. Ct. Miami-Dade Cnty., Fla., No. 2023-001405-CA-01
<i>Gulf Coast Injury Center, LLC, A/A/O Jordan Rimert v. Esurance Property and Casualty Insurance Company (Property and Casualty Insurance)</i>	Cir. Ct. 13th Jud. Cir. Hillsborough Cnty, Fla., No. 21-CA-002738
<i>Perry v. Schnuck Markets, Inc. (Consumer Product)</i>	Cir. Ct. City of St. Louis, Mo., No. 2022-CC10425

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Gold et al. v. New York Life Insurance Co. et al.</i> (FLSA Wage / Overtime)	Sup. Ct. N.Y., Cnty of New York, No. 653923/2012
<i>Banks et al. v. Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Company</i> (Auto Insurance PIP)	M.D. Penn., No. 19-cv-01617
<i>Dyck v. Tahoe Resources, Inc.</i> (Securities)	Sup. Ct. of Justice – Ontario, No. CV-18-00606411-00CP
<i>Ambrose et al. v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC.</i> (VPPA)	D. Mass., No. 1:22-cv-10195
<i>King et al. v. PeopleNet Corporation</i> (Undisclosed Data Collection)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty., Ill., No. 2021-CH-01602
<i>South et al. v. Progressive Select Insurance Company</i> (Automobile Total Loss)	S.D.Fla., No. 19-21760-CIV
<i>Paris et al. v. Progressive American Insurance Company et al.</i> (Automobile Total Loss)	S.D.Fla., No. 19-21761-CIV
<i>Silva et al. v. Connected Investors, Inc.</i> (TCPA)	E.D.N.C., No. 7:21-cv-00074
<i>In re Juul Labs, Inc., Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation</i> (Juul and Altria Settlements)	N.D. Cal., No. 19-md-02913
<i>Dusko v. Delta Airlines, Inc.</i> (Airline Ticket Refunds)	N.D. Ga., 1:20-cv-01664
<i>Rogowski et al. v. State Farm Life Insurance Company et al.</i> (Whole Life or Universal Life Insurance)	W.D. Mo., No. 4:22-cv-00203
<i>Ingram v. Jamestown Import Auto Sales, Inc. d/b/a Kia of Jamestown</i> (TCPA)	W.D.N.Y., No. 1:22-cv-00309
<i>In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation II</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 8:18-cv-02223
<i>In re Midwestern Pet Foods Marketing, Sales Practices and Product Liability Litigation</i>	S.D. Ind., No. 3:21-cv-00007
<i>Meier v. Prosperity Bank</i> (Bank Fees & Overdraft)	239th Jud. Dist., Brazoria Cnty, Tex., No. 109569-CV
<i>Middleton et al. v. Liberty Mutual Personal Insurance Company et al.</i> (Auto Insurance Claims Sales Tax)	S.D. Ohio, No. 1:20-cv-00668
<i>Checchia v. Bank of America, N.A.</i> (Bank Fees)	E.D. Penn., No. 2:21-cv-03585
<i>McCullough v. True Health New Mexico, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	2nd Dist. Ct, N.M., No. D-202-CV-2021-06816
<i>Sonterra Capital Master Fund Ltd. v. Credit Suisse Group AG et al.</i> (Swiss Franc LIBOR-Based Derivatives)	S.D.N.Y., No. 1:15-cv-00871
<i>Duggan et al. v. Wings Financial Credit Union</i> (Bank Fees)	Dist. Ct., Dakota Cnty., Minn., No. 19AV-cv-20-2163
<i>Miller v. Bath Saver, Inc. et al.</i> (TCPA)	M.D. Penn., No. 1:21-cv-01072
<i>Chapman v. Insight Global LLC.</i> (Data Breach)	M.D. Penn., No. 1:21-cv-00824
<i>Thomsen et al. v. Morley Cos., Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	E.D. Mich., No. 1:22-cv-10271
<i>Walker v Highmark BCBSD Health</i> (TCPA)	W.D. Penn., No. 20-cv-01975
<i>In re Scripps Health Data Incident Litigation</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego, No. 37-2021-00024103
<i>In re Robinhood Outage Litigation</i> (Trading Outage)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:20-cv-01626

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Dickens et al. v. Thinx, Inc.</i> (Consumer Product)	S.D.N.Y., No. 1:22-cv-04286
<i>Service et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America et al.</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Contra Costa, No. C22-01841
<i>Paris et al. v. Progressive American et al. & South v. Progressive Select Insurance Company</i> (Automobile Total Loss)	S.D. Fla., No. 19-cv-21761 & 19-cv-21760
<i>Wenston Desue et al. v. 20/20 Eye Care Network, Inc. et al.</i> (Data Breach)	S.D. Fla., No. 21-cv-61275
<i>Rivera v. IH Mississippi Valley Credit Union</i> (Overdraft)	Cir. Ct 14th Jud. Cir., Rock Island Cnty., Ill., No. 2019 CH 299
<i>Guthrie v. Service Federal Credit Union</i> (Overdraft)	Sup. Ct. Rockingham Cnty, N.H., No. 218-2021-CV-00160
<i>Churchill et al. v. Bangor Savings Bank</i> (Overdraft)	Maine Bus. & Consumer Ct., No. BCD-CIV-2021-00027
<i>Opelousas General Hospital Authority v. Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Louisiana</i> (Medical Insurance)	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 16-C-3647
<i>Brower v. Northwest Community Credit Union</i> (Bank Fees)	Ore. Dist. Ct. Multnomah Cnty., No. 20CV38608
<i>Kent et al. v. Women's Health USA, Inc. et al.</i> (IVF Antitrust Pricing)	Sup. Ct. Jud. Dist. of Stamford/Norwalk, Conn., No. FST-CV-21-6054676-S
<i>In re U.S. Office of Personnel Management Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	D.D.C., No. MDL No. 2664, 15-cv-01394
<i>In re fairlife Milk Products Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation</i> (False Labeling & Marketing)	N.D. Ill., No. MDL No. 2909, No. 1:19-cv-03924
<i>In re Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Privacy Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:20-cv-02155
<i>Browning et al. v. Anheuser-Busch, LLC</i> (False Advertising)	W.D. Mo., No. 20-cv-00889
<i>Callen v. Daimler AG and Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC</i> (Interior Trim)	N.D. Ga., No. 1:19-cv-01411
<i>In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation</i> (Alcon Laboratories, Inc. and Johnson & Johnson Vision Care, Inc.) (Unilateral Pricing Policies)	M.D. Fla., No. 3:15-md-02626
<i>Ford et al. v. [24]7.ai, Inc.</i> (Data Breach - Best Buy Data Incident)	N.D. Cal., MDL No. 2863, No. 5:18-cv-02770
<i>In re Takata Airbag Class Action Settlement - Australia Settlement</i> <i>Louise Haselhurst v. Toyota Motor Corporation Australia Limited</i> <i>Kimley Whisson v. Subaru (Aust) Pty Limited</i> <i>Akuratiya Kularathne v. Honda Australia Pty Limited</i> <i>Owen Brewster v. BMW Australia Ltd</i> <i>Jaydan Bond v. Nissan Motor Co (Australia) Pty Limited</i> <i>Camilla Coates v. Mazda Australia Pty Limited</i>	Australia; NSWSC, No. 2017/00340824 No. 2017/00353017 No. 2017/00378526 No. 2018/00009555 No. 2018/00009565 No. 2018/00042244
<i>In re Pork Antitrust Litigation (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Actions - CIIPPs)</i> (Smithfield Foods, Inc.)	D. Minn., No. 0:18-cv-01776
<i>Jackson v. UKG Inc., f/k/a The Ultimate Software Group, Inc.</i> (Biometrics)	Cir. Ct. of McLean Cnty., Ill., No. 2020L31
<i>In re Capital One Consumer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	E.D. Va., MDL No. 2915, No. 1:19-md-02915
<i>Aseltine v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.</i> (Food Ordering Fees)	Cir. Ct. Cal. Alameda Cnty., No. RG21088118

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>In re Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 1:20-cv-05914
<i>DiFlauro et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. (Mortgage Bank Fees)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 2:20-cv-05692
<i>In re California Pizza Kitchen Data Breach Litigation</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 8:21-cv-01928
<i>Breda v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (TCPA)</i>	D. Mass., No. 1:16-cv-11512
<i>Snyder et al. v. The Urology Center of Colorado, P.C. (Data Breach)</i>	2nd Dist. Ct, Cnty. of Denver Col., No. 2021CV33707
<i>Dearing v. Magellan Health Inc. et al. (Data Breach)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Maricopa, Ariz., No. CV2020-013648
<i>Torretto et al. v. Donnelley Financial Solutions, Inc. and Mediant Communications Inc. (Data Breach)</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 1:20-cv-02667
<i>In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (Volkswagen)</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2599, No. 1:15-md-02599
<i>Beiswinger v. West Shore Home, LLC (TCPA)</i>	M.D. Fla., No. 3:20-cv-01286
<i>Cochran et al. v. The Kroger Co. et al. (Data Breach)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 5:21-cv-01887
<i>Arthur et al. v. McDonald's USA, LLC et al.; Lark et al. v. McDonald's USA, LLC et al. (Biometrics)</i>	Cir. Ct. St. Clair Cnty., Ill., Nos. 20-L-0891; 1-L-559
<i>Kostka et al. v. Dickey's Barbecue Restaurants, Inc. et al. (Data Breach)</i>	N.D. Tex., No. 3:20-cv-03424
<i>Scherr v. Rodan & Fields, LLC; Gorzo et al. v. Rodan & Fields, LLC (Lash Boost Mascara Product)</i>	Sup. Ct. of Cal., Cnty. San Bernadino, No. CJC-18-004981; Sup. Ct. of Cal., Cnty. of San Francisco, Nos. CIVDS 1723435 and CGC-18-565628
<i>Fernandez v. Rushmore Loan Management Services LLC (Mortgage Loan Fees)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 8:21-cv-00621
<i>Abramson v. Safe Streets USA LLC (TCPA)</i>	E.D.N.C., No. 5:19-cv-00394
<i>Stoll et al. v. Musculoskeletal Institute, Chartered d/b/a Florida Orthopaedic Institute (Data Breach)</i>	M.D. Fla., No. 8:20-cv-01798
<i>Mayo v. Affinity Plus Federal Credit Union (Overdraft)</i>	4th Jud. Dist. Ct. Minn., No. 27-cv-11786
<i>Johnson v. Moss Bros. Auto Group, Inc. et al. (TCPA)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 5:19-cv-02456
<i>Muransky et al. v. The Cheesecake Factory, Inc. et al. (FACTA)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Los Angeles, No. 19 stcv43875
<i>Haney v. Genworth Life Ins. Co. (Long Term Care Insurance)</i>	E.D. Va., No. 3:22-cv-00055
<i>Halcom v. Genworth Life Ins. Co. (Long Term Care Insurance)</i>	E.D. Va., No. 3:21-cv-00019
<i>Mercado et al. v. Verde Energy USA, Inc. (Variable Rate Energy)</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:18-cv-02068
<i>Fallis et al. v. Gate City Bank (Overdraft)</i>	East Cent. Dist. Ct. Cass Cnty. N.D., No. 09-2019-cv-04007
<i>Sanchez et al. v. California Public Employees' Retirement System et al. (Long Term Care Insurance)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Los Angeles, No. BC 517444
<i>Hameed-Bolden et al. v. Forever 21 Retail, Inc. et al. (Data Breach for Payment Cards)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 2:18-cv-03019

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Wallace v. Wells Fargo</i> (Overdraft Fees on Uber and Lyft One-Time Transactions)	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Santa Clara, No. 17-cv-317775
<i>In re Turkey Antitrust Litigations</i> (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' Action – CIIPPs) <i>Sandee's Bakery d/b/a Sandee's Catering Bakery & Deli et al. v. Agri Stats, Inc.</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:20-cv-02295
<i>Coleman v. Alaska USA Federal Credit Union</i> (Retry Bank Fees)	D. Alaska, No. 3:19-cv-00229
<i>Fiore et al. v. Ingenious Designs, L.L.C. and HSN, Inc.</i> (My Little Steamer)	E.D.N.Y., No. 1:18-cv-07124
<i>In re Pork Antitrust Litigation</i> (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Actions - CIIPPs) (JBS USA Food Company, JBS USA Food Company Holdings)	D. Minn., No. 0:18-cv-01776
<i>Lozano v. CodeMetro Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego, No. 37-2020-00022701
<i>Yamagata et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC</i> (Schiff Move Free® Advanced Glucosamine Supplements)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:17-cv-03529
<i>Cin-Q Automobiles, Inc. et al. v. Buccaneers Limited Partnership</i> (TCPA)	M.D. Fla., No. 8:13-cv-01592
<i>Thompson et al. v. Community Bank, N.A.</i> (Overdraft)	N.D.N.Y., No. 8:19-cv-00919
<i>Bleachtech L.L.C. v. United Parcel Service Co.</i> (Declared Value Shipping Fees)	E.D. Mich., No. 2:14-cv-12719
<i>Silveira v. M&T Bank</i> (Mortgage Fees)	C.D. Cal., No. 2:19-cv-06958
<i>In re Toll Roads Litigation; Borsuk et al. v. Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency et al.</i> (OCTA Settlement - Collection & Sharing of Personally Identifiable Information)	C.D. Cal., No. 8:16-cv-00262
<i>In re Toll Roads Litigation</i> (3M/TCA Settlement - Collection & Sharing of Personally Identifiable Information)	C.D. Cal., No. 8:16-cv-00262
<i>Pearlstone v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> (Sales Tax)	C.D. Cal., No. 4:17-cv-02856
<i>Zanca et al. v. Epic Games, Inc.</i> (Fortnite or Rocket League Video Games)	Sup. Ct. Wake Cnty. N.C., No. 21-CVS-534
<i>In re Flint Water Cases</i>	E.D. Mich., No. 5:16-cv-10444
<i>Kukorinis v. Walmart, Inc.</i> (Weighted Goods Pricing)	S.D. Fla., No. 1:19-cv-20592
<i>Grace v. Apple, Inc.</i> (Apple iPhone 4 and iPhone 4S Devices)	N.D. Cal., No. 17-cv-00551
<i>Alvarez v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 2:18-cv-08605
<i>In re Pre-Filled Propane Tank Antitrust Litigation</i>	W.D. Mo., No. MDL No. 2567, No. 14-cv-02567
<i>In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation</i> (ABB Concise Optical Group, LLC) (Unilateral Pricing Policies)	M.D. Fla., No. 3:15-md-02626
<i>Morris v. Provident Credit Union</i> (Overdraft)	Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Fran., No. CGC-19-581616
<i>Pennington v. Tetra Tech, Inc. et al.</i> (Property)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:18-cv-05330
<i>Maldonado et al. v. Apple Inc. et al.</i> (Apple Care iPhone)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:16-cv-04067

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>UFCW & Employers Benefit Trust v. Sutter Health et al.</i> (Self-Funded Payors)	Sup. Ct. of Cal., Cnty. of San Fran., No. CGC 14-538451 Consolidated with CGC-18-565398
<i>Fitzhenry v. Independent Home Products, LLC</i> (TCPA)	D.S.C., No. 2:19-cv-02993
<i>In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation and Flaherty v. Hyundai Motor Company, Inc. et al.</i>	C.D. Cal., Nos. 8:17-cv-00838 & 18-cv-02223
<i>Sager et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. et al.</i>	D.N.J., No. 18-cv-13556
<i>Bautista v. Valero Marketing and Supply Company</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:15-cv-05557
<i>Richards et al. v. Chime Financial, Inc.</i> (Service Disruption)	N.D. Cal., No. 4:19-cv-06864
<i>In re Health Insurance Innovations Securities Litigation</i>	M.D. Fla., No. 8:17-cv-02186
<i>Fox et al. v. Iowa Health System d.b.a. UnityPoint Health</i> (Data Breach)	W.D. Wis., No. 18-cv-00327
<i>Smith v. Costa Del Mar, Inc.</i> (Sunglasses Warranty)	M.D. Fla., No. 3:18-cv-01011
<i>Al's Discount Plumbing et al. v. Viega, LLC</i> (Building Products)	M.D. Pa., No. 19-cv-00159
<i>Rose v. The Travelers Home and Marine Insurance Company et al.</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 19-cv-00977
<i>Eastwood Construction LLC et al. v. City of Monroe The Estate of Donald Alan Plyler Sr. et al. v. City of Monroe</i>	Sup. Ct. N.C., Nos. 18-CVS-2692 & 19-CVS-1825
<i>Garvin v. San Diego Unified Port District</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. 37-2020-00015064
<i>Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Siringoringo Law Firm</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 8:14-cv-01155
<i>Robinson v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC</i>	D. Md., No. 8:14-cv-03667
<i>Drazen v. GoDaddy.com, LLC and Bennett v. GoDaddy.com, LLC</i> (TCPA)	S.D. Ala., No. 1:19-cv-00563
<i>In re Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation</i>	S.D.N.Y., MDL No. 2262, No. 1:11-md-2262
<i>Izor v. Abacus Data Systems, Inc.</i> (TCPA)	N.D. Cal., No. 19-cv-01057
<i>Ciuffitelli et al. v. Deloitte & Touche LLP et al.</i>	D. Ore., No. 3:16-cv-00580
<i>In re Wells Fargo Collateral Protection Insurance Litigation</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 8:17-ml-02797
<i>In re Roman Catholic Diocese of Harrisburg</i>	Bank. Ct. M.D. Pa., No. 1:20-bk-00599
<i>Denier et al. v. Taconic Biosciences, Inc.</i>	Sup Ct. N.Y., No. 00255851
<i>Robinson v. First Hawaiian Bank</i> (Overdraft)	Cir. Ct. of First Cir. Haw., No. 17-1-0167-01
<i>Burch v. Whirlpool Corporation</i>	W.D. Mich., No. 1:17-cv-00018
<i>Armon et al. v. Washington State University</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. Wash., No. 17-2-23244-1 consolidated with No. 17-2-25052-0
<i>Wilson et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. et al.</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 17-cv-23033
<i>Prather v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> (TCPA)	N.D. Ill., No. 1:17-cv-00481

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Cook et al. v. South Carolina Public Service Authority et al.</i>	Ct. of Com. Pleas. 13 th Jud. Cir. S.C., No. 2019-CP-23-6675
<i>K.B., by and through her natural parent, Jennifer Qassis, and Lillian Knox-Bender v. Methodist Healthcare - Memphis Hospitals</i>	30th Jud. Dist. Tenn., No. CH-13-04871-1
<i>Coffeng et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 17-cv-01825
<i>Audet et al. v. Garza et al.</i>	D. Conn., No. 3:16-cv-00940
<i>In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation (CooperVision, Inc.) (Unilateral Pricing Policies)</i>	M.D. Fla., No. 3:15-md-02626
<i>Hyder et al. v. Consumers County Mutual Insurance Company</i>	D. Ct. of Travis Cnty. Tex., No. D-1-GN-16-000596
<i>Fessler v. Porcelana Corona De Mexico, S.A. DE C.V f/k/a Sanitarios Lamosa S.A. DE C.V. a/k/a Vortens</i>	E.D. Tex., No. 4:19-cv-00248
<i>In re TD Bank, N.A. Debit Card Overdraft Fee Litigation</i>	D.S.C., MDL No. 2613, No. 6:15-MN-02613
<i>Liggio v. Apple Federal Credit Union</i>	E.D. Va., No. 1:18-cv-01059
<i>Garcia v. Target Corporation (TCPA)</i>	D. Minn., No. 16-cv-02574
<i>Albrecht v. Oasis Power, LLC d/b/a Oasis Energy</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:18-cv-01061
<i>McKinney-Drobnis et al. v. Massage Envy Franchising</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:16-cv-06450
<i>In re Optical Disk Drive Products Antitrust Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal., MDL No. 2143, No. 3:10-md-02143
<i>Stone et al. v. Porcelana Corona De Mexico, S.A. DE C.V f/k/a Sanitarios Lamosa S.A. DE C.V. a/k/a Vortens</i>	E.D. Tex., No. 4:17-cv-00001
<i>In re Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. et al. (Asbestos)</i>	Bankr. W.D. N.C., No. 16-31602
<i>Kuss v. American HomePatient, Inc. et al. (Data Breach)</i>	M.D. Fla., No. 8:18-cv-02348
<i>Lusnak v. Bank of America, N.A.</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 14-cv-01855
<i>In re Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	D. Ore., MDL No. 2633, No. 3:15-md-02633
<i>Elder v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc. (Hotel Stay Promotion)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 16-cv-00278
<i>Grayson et al. v. General Electric Company (Microwaves)</i>	D. Conn., No. 3:13-cv-01799
<i>Behfarin v. Pruco Life Insurance Company et al.</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 17-cv-05290
<i>Lashambae v. Capital One Bank, N.A. (Overdraft)</i>	E.D.N.Y., No. 1:17-cv-06406
<i>Trujillo et al. v. Ametek, Inc. et al. (Toxic Leak)</i>	S.D. Cal., No. 3:15-cv-01394
<i>Cox et al. v. Ametek, Inc. et al. (Toxic Leak)</i>	S.D. Cal., No. 3:17-cv-00597
<i>Pirozzi et al. v. Massage Envy Franchising, LLC</i>	E.D. Mo., No. 4:19-cv-00807
<i>Lehman v. Transbay Joint Powers Authority et al. (Millennium Tower)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. GCG-16-553758
<i>In re FCA US LLC Monostable Electronic Gearshift Litigation</i>	E.D. Mich., MDL No. 2744 & No. 16-md-02744

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Dasher v. RBC Bank (USA) predecessor in interest to PNC Bank, N.A., as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 1:10-cv-22190, as part of MDL No. 2036
<i>Harris et al. v. Farmers Insurance Exchange and Mid Century Insurance Company</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. BC 579498
<i>In re Renovate America Finance Cases (Tax Assessment Financing)</i>	Sup. Ct., Cal., Cnty. of Riverside, No. RICJCCP4940
<i>Nelson v. Roadrunner Transportation Systems, Inc. (Data Breach)</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:18-cv-07400
<i>Skochin et al. v. Genworth Life Insurance Company et al.</i>	E.D. Va., No. 3:19-cv-00049
<i>Walters et al. v. Target Corp. (Overdraft)</i>	S.D. Cal., No. 3:16-cv-01678
<i>Jackson et al. v. Viking Group, Inc. et al.</i>	D. Md., No. 8:18-cv-02356
<i>Waldrup v. Countrywide Financial Corporation et al.</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 2:13-cv-08833
<i>Burrow et al. v. Forjas Taurus S.A. et al.</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 1:16-cv-21606
<i>Henrikson v. Samsung Electronics Canada Inc.</i>	Ontario Super. Ct., No. 2762-16cp
<i>In re Comcast Corp. Set-Top Cable Television Box Antitrust Litigation</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 2:09-md-02034
<i>Lightsey et al. v. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, a Wholly Owned Subsidiary of SCANA et al.</i>	Ct. of Com. Pleas., S.C., No. 2017-CP-25-335
<i>Rabin v. HP Canada Co. et al.</i>	Quebec Ct., Dist. of Montreal, No. 500-06-000813-168
<i>Di Filippo v. The Bank of Nova Scotia et al. (Gold Market Instrument)</i>	Ontario Sup. Ct., No. CV-15-543005-00CP & No. CV-16-551067-00CP
<i>Zaklit et al. v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC et al. (TCPA)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 5:15-cv-02190
<i>Adlouni v. UCLA Health Systems Auxiliary et al.</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. BC589243
<i>Lloyd et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union</i>	S.D. Cal., No. 17-cv-01280
<i>Luib v. Henkel Consumer Goods Inc.</i>	E.D.N.Y., No. 1:17-cv-03021
<i>McIntosh v. Takata Corporation et al.; Vitoratos et al. v. Takata Corporation et al.; and Hall v. Takata Corporation et al.</i>	Ontario Sup Ct., No. CV-16-543833-00CP; Quebec Sup. Ct. of Justice, No. 500-06-000723-144; & Court of Queen's Bench for Saskatchewan, No. QBC. 1284 or 2015
<i>In re HP Printer Firmware Update Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 5:16-cv-05820
<i>In re Dealer Management Systems Antitrust Litigation</i>	N.D. Ill., MDL No. 2817, No. 18-cv-00864
<i>Mosser v. TD Bank, N.A. and Mazzadra et al. v. TD Bank, N.A., as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 2:10-cv-00731, S.D. Fla., No. 10-cv-21386 and S.D. Fla., No. 1:10-cv-21870, as part of S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Naiman v. Total Merchant Services, Inc. et al. (TCPA)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 4:17-cv-03806
<i>In re Valley Anesthesiology Consultants, Inc. Data Breach Litigation</i>	Sup. Ct. of Maricopa Ariz., No. CV2016-013446
<i>Parsons v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLC (Data Breach)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:16-cv-05387

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Stahl v. Bank of the West</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. BC673397
<i>37 Besen Parkway, LLC v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.)</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 15-cv-09924
<i>Tashica Fulton-Green et al. v. Accolade, Inc.</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 2:18-cv-00274
<i>In re Community Health Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	N.D. Ala., MDL No. 2595, No. 2:15-cv-00222
<i>Al's Pals Pet Card, LLC et al. v. Woodforest National Bank, N.A. et al.</i>	S.D. Tex., No. 4:17-cv-03852
<i>Cowen v. Lenny & Larry's Inc.</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:17-cv-01530
<i>Martin v. Trott (MI - Foreclosure)</i>	E.D. Mich., No. 2:15-cv-12838
<i>Knapper v. Cox Communications, Inc. (TCPA)</i>	D. Ariz., No. 2:17-cv-00913
<i>Dipuglia v. US Coachways, Inc. (TCPA)</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 1:17-cv-23006
<i>Abante Rooter and Plumbing v. Pivotal Payments Inc., d/b/a/ Capital Processing Network and CPN (TCPA)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:16-cv-05486
<i>First Impressions Salon, Inc. et al. v. National Milk Producers Federation et al.</i>	S.D. Ill., No. 3:13-cv-00454
<i>Raffin v. Medicredit, Inc. et al.</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 15-cv-04912
<i>Gergetz v. Telenav, Inc. (TCPA)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 5:16-cv-04261
<i>Ajose et al. v. Interline Brands Inc. (Plumbing Fixtures)</i>	M.D. Tenn., No. 3:14-cv-01707
<i>Underwood v. Kohl's Department Stores, Inc. et al.</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 2:15-cv-00730
<i>Surrett et al. v. Western Culinary Institute et al.</i>	Ore. Cir., Ct. Cnty. of Multnomah, No. 0803-03530
<i>Watson v. Bank of America Corporation et al.;</i> <i>Bancroft-Snell et al. v. Visa Canada Corporation et al.;</i> <i>Bakopoulos v. Visa Canada Corporation et al.;</i> <i>Macaronies Hair Club and Laser Center Inc. operating as Fuze Salon v. BofA Canada Bank et al.;</i> <i>Hello Baby Equipment Inc. v. BofA Canada Bank and others (Visa and Mastercard Canadian Interchange Fees)</i>	Sup. Ct. of B.C., No. VLC-S-S-112003; Ontario Sup. Ct., No. CV-11-426591; Sup. Ct. of Quebec, No. 500-06-00549-101; Ct. of QB of Alberta, No. 1203-18531; Ct. of QB of Saskatchewan, No. 133 of 2013
<i>In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (OEMs – BMW, Mazda, Subaru, and Toyota)</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2599
<i>Vergara et al., v. Uber Technologies, Inc. (TCPA)</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:15-cv-06972
<i>In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (OEMs – Honda and Nissan)</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2599
<i>In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (OEM – Ford)</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2599
<i>Poseidon Concepts Corp. et al. (Canadian Securities Litigation)</i>	Ct. of QB of Alberta, No. 1301-04364
<i>Callaway v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC (Seat Heaters)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 8:14-cv-02011
<i>Hale v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company et al.</i>	S.D. Ill., No. 3:12-cv-00660

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Farrell v. Bank of America, N.A. (Overdraft)</i>	S.D. Cal., No. 3:16-cv-00492
<i>In re Windsor Wood Clad Window Products Liability Litigation</i>	E.D. Wis., MDL No. 2688, No. 16-md-02688
<i>Wallace et al. v. Monier Lifetile LLC et al.</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. SCV-16410
<i>In re Parking Heaters Antitrust Litigation</i>	E.D.N.Y., No. 15-MC-00940
<i>Pantelyat et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. et al. (Overdraft / Uber)</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 16-cv-08964
<i>Falco et al. v. Nissan North America, Inc. et al. (Engine - CA & WA)</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 2:13-cv-00686
<i>Alaska Electrical Pension Fund et al. v. Bank of America N.A. et al. (ISDAfix Instruments)</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 14-cv-07126
<i>Larson v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. RG16813803
<i>Larey v. Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company</i>	W.D. Kan., No. 4:14-cv-04008
<i>Orlander v. Staples, Inc.</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 13-cv-00703
<i>Masson v. Tallahassee Dodge Chrysler Jeep, LLC (TCPA)</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 1:17-cv-22967
<i>Gordon et al. v. Amadeus IT Group, S.A. et al.</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 1:15-cv-05457
<i>Alexander M. Rattner v. Tribe App., Inc., and Kenneth Horsley v. Tribe App., Inc.</i>	S.D. Fla., Nos. 1:17-cv-21344 & 1:14-cv-02311
<i>Sobiech v. U.S. Gas & Electric, Inc., i/t/d/b/a Pennsylvania Gas & Electric et al.</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 2:14-cv-04464
<i>Mahoney v. TT of Pine Ridge, Inc.</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 9:17-cv-80029
<i>Ma et al. v. Harmless Harvest Inc. (Coconut Water)</i>	E.D.N.Y., No. 2:16-cv-07102
<i>Reilly v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 1:15-cv-23425
<i>The Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico as representative of Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority ("PREPA") (Bankruptcy)</i>	D. Puerto Rico, No. 17-cv-04780
<i>In re Syngenta Litigation</i>	4th Jud. Dist. Minn., No. 27-cv-15-3785
<i>T.A.N. v. PNI Digital Media, Inc.</i>	S.D. Ga., No. 2:16-cv-00132
<i>Lewis v. Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative Stabilization Corporation (n/k/a United States Tobacco Cooperative, Inc.)</i>	N.C. Gen. Ct. of Justice, Sup. Ct. Div., No. 05 CVS 188, No. 05 CVS 1938
<i>McKnight et al. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 14-cv-05615
<i>Gottlieb v. Citgo Petroleum Corporation (TCPA)</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 9:16-cv-81911
<i>Farnham v. Caribou Coffee Company, Inc. (TCPA)</i>	W.D. Wis., No. 16-cv-00295
<i>Jacobs et al. v. Huntington Bancshares Inc. et al. (FirstMerit Overdraft Fees)</i>	Ohio C.P., No. 11CV000090
<i>Morton v. Greenbank (Overdraft Fees)</i>	20th Jud. Dist. Tenn., No. 11-135-IV

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Ratzlaff et al. v. BOKF, NA d/b/a Bank of Oklahoma et al.</i> (Overdraft Fees)	Dist. Ct. Okla., No. CJ-2015-00859
<i>Klug v. Watts Regulator Company</i> (Product Liability)	D. Neb., No. 8:15-cv-00061
<i>Bias v. Wells Fargo & Company et al.</i> (Broker's Price Opinions)	N.D. Cal., No. 4:12-cv-00664
<i>Greater Chautauqua Federal Credit Union v. Kmart Corp. et al.</i> (Data Breach)	N.D. Ill., No. 1:15-cv-02228
<i>Hawkins v. First Tennessee Bank, N.A. et al.</i> (Overdraft Fees)	13th Jud. Cir. Tenn., No. CT-004085-11
<i>In re Volkswagen "Clean Diesel" Marketing, Sales Practices and Product Liability Litigation</i> (Bosch Settlement)	N.D. Cal., MDL No. 2672
<i>In re HSBC Bank USA, N.A.</i>	Sup. Ct. N.Y., No. 650562/11
<i>Glasko v. Independent Bank Corporation</i> (Overdraft Fees)	Cir. Ct. Mich., No. 13-009983
<i>MSPA Claims 1, LLC v. IDS Property Casualty Insurance Company</i>	11th Jud. Cir. Fla, No. 15-27940-CA-21
<i>In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal., MDL No. 2420, No. 4:13-md-02420
<i>Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co. and Abercrombie & Fitch Co.</i>	S.D. Fla., No. 14-cv-23120
<i>Small v. BOKF, N.A.</i>	D. Colo., No. 13-cv-01125
<i>Forgione v. Webster Bank N.A.</i> (Overdraft Fees)	Sup. Ct. Conn., No. X10-UWY-cv-12-6015956-S
<i>Swift v. BancorpSouth Bank, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	N.D. Fla., No. 1:10-cv-00090, as part of S.D. Fla, MDL No. 2036
<i>Whitton v. Deffenbaugh Industries, Inc. et al.</i> <i>Gary, LLC v. Deffenbaugh Industries, Inc. et al.</i>	D. Kan., No. 2:12-cv-02247 D. Kan., No. 2:13-cv-02634
<i>In re Citrus Canker Litigation</i>	11th Jud. Cir., Fla., No. 03-8255 CA 13
<i>In re Caterpillar, Inc. C13 and C15 Engine Products Liability Litigation</i>	D.N.J., MDL No. 2540
<i>In re Shop-Vac Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation</i>	M.D. Pa., MDL No. 2380
<i>Opelousas General Hospital Authority, A Public Trust, D/B/A Opelousas General Health System and Arklamiss Surgery Center, L.L.C. v. FairPay Solutions, Inc.</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 12-C-1599
<i>Opelousas General Hospital Authority v. PPO Plus, L.L.C. et al.</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 13-C-5380
<i>Russell Minoru Ono v. Head Racquet Sports USA</i>	C.D. Cal., No. 2:13-cv-04222
<i>Kerry T. Thibodeaux, M.D. (A Professional Medical Corporation) v. American Lifecare, Inc.</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 13-C-3212
<i>Gattinella v. Michael Kors (USA), Inc. et al.</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 14-cv-05731
<i>In re Energy Future Holdings Corp. et al.</i> (Asbestos Claims Bar Notice)	Bankr. D. Del., No. 14-10979
<i>Dorothy Williams d/b/a Dot's Restaurant v. Waste Away Group, Inc.</i>	Cir. Ct., Lawrence Cnty., Ala., No. 42-cv-2012- 900001.00
<i>Adkins et al. v. Nestlé Purina PetCare Company et al.</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 1:12-cv-02871

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Steen v. Capital One, N.A.</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	E.D. La., No. 2:10-cv-01505 and 1:10-cv-22058, as part of S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Childs et al. v. Synovus Bank et al.</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Kota of Sarasota, Inc. v. Waste Management Inc. of Florida</i>	12th Jud. Cir. Ct., Sarasota Cnty., Fla., No. 2011-CA-008020NC
<i>In re MI Windows and Doors Inc. Products Liability Litigation (Building Products)</i>	D.S.C., MDL No. 2333
<i>Given v. Manufacturers and Traders Trust Company a/k/a M&T Bank</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Scharfstein v. BP West Coast Products, LLC</i>	Ore. Cir., Cnty. of Multnomah, No. 1112-17046
<i>Smith v. City of New Orleans</i>	Civil D. Ct., Parish of Orleans, La., No. 2005-05453
<i>Hawthorne v. Umpqua Bank (Overdraft Fees)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 11-cv-06700
<i>Gulbankian et al. v. MW Manufacturers, Inc.</i>	D. Mass., No. 1:10-cv-10392
<i>Costello v. NBT Bank (Overdraft Fees)</i>	Sup. Ct. Del Cnty., N.Y., No. 2011-1037
<i>In re American Express Anti-Steering Rules Antitrust Litigation (II) (Italian Colors Restaurant)</i>	E.D.N.Y., MDL No. 2221, No. 11-md-2221
<i>Wong et al. v. Alacer Corp. (Emergen-C)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. CGC-12-519221
<i>Mello et al. v. Susquehanna Bank</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>In re Plasma-Derivative Protein Therapies Antitrust Litigation</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 09-cv-07666
<i>Simpson v. Citizens Bank (Overdraft Fees)</i>	E.D. Mich., No. 2:12-cv-10267
<i>George Raymond Williams, M.D., Orthopedic Surgery, a Professional Medical, LLC et al. v. Bestcomp, Inc. et al.</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 09-C-5242-B
<i>Simmons v. Comerica Bank, N.A.</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>McGann et al., v. Schnuck Markets, Inc. (Data Breach)</i>	Mo. Cir. Ct., No. 1322-CC00800
<i>Rose v. Bank of America Corporation et al. (TCPA)</i>	N.D. Cal., Nos. 5:11-cv-02390 & 5:12-cv-00400
<i>Johnson v. Community Bank, N.A. et al. (Overdraft Fees)</i>	M.D. Pa., No. 3:12-cv-01405
<i>National Trucking Financial Reclamation Services, LLC et al. v. Pilot Corporation et al.</i>	E.D. Ark., No. 4:13-cv-00250
<i>Price v. BP Products North America</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 12-cv-06799
<i>Yarger v. ING Bank</i>	D. Del., No. 11-154-LPS
<i>Glube et al. v. Pella Corporation et al. (Building Products)</i>	Ont. Super. Ct., No. CV-11-4322294-00CP
<i>Miner v. Philip Morris Companies, Inc. et al. (Light Cigarettes)</i>	Ark. Cir. Ct., No. 60CV03-4661
<i>Fontaine v. Attorney General of Canada (Mistassini Hostels Residential Schools)</i>	Qué. Super. Ct., No. 500-06-000293-056 & No. 550-06-000021-056

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Williams v. SIF Consultants of Louisiana, Inc. et al.</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 09-C-5244-C
<i>Opelousas General Hospital Authority v. Qmedtrix Systems, Inc.</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 12-C-1599-C
<i>Evans et al. v. TIN, Inc. et al. (Environmental)</i>	E.D. La., No. 2:11-cv-02067
<i>Casayuran v. PNC Bank, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Anderson v. Compass Bank, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Eno v. M & I Marshall & Ilsley Bank as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Blahut v. Harris, N.A., as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Products Liability Litigation</i>	D. Minn., MDL No. 1958, No. 08-md-1958
<i>Saltzman v. Pella Corporation (Building Products)</i>	N.D. Ill., No. 06-cv-04481
<i>In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation (Mastercard & Visa)</i>	E.D.N.Y., MDL No. 1720, No. 05-md-01720
<i>RBS v. Citizens Financial Group, Inc., as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Gessele et al. v. Jack in the Box, Inc.</i>	D. Ore., No. 3:10-cv-00960
<i>Vodanovich v. Boh Brothers Construction (Hurricane Katrina Levee Breaches)</i>	E.D. La., No. 05-cv-04191
<i>Marolda v. Symantec Corporation (Software Upgrades)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:08-cv-05701
<i>In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (Medical Benefits Settlement)</i>	E.D. La., MDL No. 2179
<i>In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (Economic & Property Damages Settlement)</i>	E.D. La., MDL No. 2179
<i>Opelousas General Hospital Authority v. FairPay Solutions</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 12-C-1599-C
<i>Fontaine v. Attorney General of Canada (Stirland Lake and Cristal Lake Residential Schools)</i>	Ont. Super. Ct., No. 00-cv-192059 CP
<i>Nelson v. Rabobank, N.A. (Overdraft Fees)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., No. RIC 1101391
<i>Case v. Bank of Oklahoma, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Harris v. Associated Bank, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Wolfgeher v. Commerce Bank, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>McKinley v. Great Western Bank, as part of In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Lawson v. BancorpSouth (Overdraft Fees)</i>	W.D. Ark., No. 1:12-cv-01016
<i>LaCour v. Whitney Bank (Overdraft Fees)</i>	M.D. Fla., No. 8:11-cv-01896
<i>Gwiazdowski v. County of Chester (Prisoner Strip Search)</i>	E.D. Pa., No. 2:08-cv-04463

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Williams v. S.I.F. Consultants</i> (CorVel Corporation)	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 09-C-5244-C
<i>Sachar v. Iberiabank Corporation</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Williams v. Hammerman & Gainer, Inc.</i> (SIF Consultants)	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 11-C-3187-B
<i>Williams v. Hammerman & Gainer, Inc.</i> (Risk Management)	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 11-C-3187-B
<i>Williams v. Hammerman & Gainer, Inc.</i> (Hammerman)	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 11-C-3187-B
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assocs., Inc.</i> (First Health)	14th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 2004-002417
<i>Delandro v. County of Allegheny</i> (Prisoner Strip Search)	W.D. Pa., No. 2:06-cv-00927
<i>Mathena v. Webster Bank, N.A.</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	D. Conn, No. 3:10-cv-01448, as part of S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Vereen v. Lowe's Home Centers</i> (Defective Drywall)	Ga. Super. Ct., No. SU10-cv-2267B
<i>Trombley v. National City Bank</i> , as part of <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft</i>	D.D.C., No. 1:10-cv-00232, as part of S.D. Fla., MDL No. 2036
<i>Schulte v. Fifth Third Bank</i> (Overdraft Fees)	N.D. Ill., No. 1:09-cv-06655
<i>Satterfield v. Simon & Schuster, Inc.</i> (Text Messaging)	N.D. Cal., No. 06-cv-02893
<i>Coyle v. Hornell Brewing Co.</i> (Arizona Iced Tea)	D.N.J., No. 08-cv-02797
<i>Holk v. Snapple Beverage Corporation</i>	D.N.J., No. 3:07-cv-03018
<i>In re Heartland Data Payment System Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	S.D. Tex., MDL No. 2046
<i>Weiner v. Snapple Beverage Corporation</i>	S.D.N.Y., No. 07-cv-08742
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assocs., Inc.</i> (Cambridge)	14th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 2004-002417
<i>Miller v. Basic Research, LLC</i> (Weight-loss Supplement)	D. Utah, No. 2:07-cv-00871
<i>In re Countrywide Customer Data Breach Litigation</i>	W.D. Ky., MDL No. 1998
<i>Boone v. City of Philadelphia</i> (Prisoner Strip Search)	E.D. Pa., No. 05-cv-01851
<i>Little v. Kia Motors America, Inc.</i> (Braking Systems)	N.J. Super. Ct., No. UNN-L-0800-01
<i>Opelousas Trust Authority v. Summit Consulting</i>	27th Jud. D. Ct. La., No. 07-C-3737-B
<i>Steele v. Pergo</i> (Flooring Products)	D. Ore., No. 07-cv-01493
<i>Pavlov v. Continental Casualty Co.</i> (Long Term Care Insurance)	N.D. Ohio, No. 5:07-cv-02580
<i>Dolen v. ABN AMRO Bank N.V.</i> (Callable CD's)	Ill. Cir. Ct., Nos. 01-L-454 & 01-L-493
<i>In re Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litigation</i>	D.D.C., MDL No. 1796
<i>In re Katrina Canal Breaches Consolidated Litigation</i>	E.D. La., No. 05-cv-04182

Attachment 2

From: The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement Administrator
<HYAttractionsSettlement@e.epiqnotice.com>

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Legal Notice of Class Action Settlement

Unique ID: [REDACTED]

PIN: [REDACTED]

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC, Index No. 631543/2024
(Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk)

Our Records Indicate You Purchased Electronic Tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website from February 16, 2024, to and Through July 6, 2024, and May Be Entitled to a Payment from a Class Action Settlement.

A court authorized this Notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

This notice is to inform you that a settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, HY Attractions Manager LLC ("Defendant"), failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC, in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law ("ACAL") § 25.07(4). Defendant denies that it violated any law but has agreed to the Settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

Am I a Class Member? Our records indicate you may be a Class Member. Class Members are all individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website (www.edgenyc.com) from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

What Does the Settlement Provide? A Settlement Fund of \$250,000.00 has been established to pay the Settlement Class, together with notice and administration expenses, approved attorneys' fees and costs, and a service award to the Class Representative.¹ Additionally, as part of the Settlement, Defendant has represented that it is no longer charging processing fees for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC and has agreed not to reinstate those processing fees unless: (i) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior to the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated.

How Do I Get a Payment? To receive a pro rata share of the Settlement Fund, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, you **must** submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than June 23, 2025**. You can file a claim by clicking [here](#). Your payment will be by PayPal, Venmo, Zelle, or check, at your election. Claim Forms must be submitted

online by **11:59 p.m. EST on June 23, 2025**, or postmarked and mailed by **June 23, 2025** (the "Claims Deadline"). Failure to submit a timely claim by the Claims Deadline will prevent you from receiving a settlement payment from the Settlement Fund.

What are My Other Options? You may exclude yourself from the Settlement Class by sending a letter to the Settlement Administrator no later than **June 23, 2025**. If you exclude yourself, you cannot get a settlement payment, but you keep any rights you may have to sue the Defendant over the legal issues in the lawsuit. If you start your own lawsuit against Defendant after you exclude yourself, you'll have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you'll have to prove your claims. If you do exclude yourself so you can start or continue your own lawsuit against Defendant, you should talk to your own lawyer.

You and/or your lawyer have the right to appear before the Court and/or object to the proposed Settlement. Your written objection must be filed no later than **June 23, 2025**. Specific instructions about how to object to or exclude yourself from the Settlement are available at www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com. If you file a claim or do nothing, and the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by all of the Court's orders and judgments. In addition, your alleged claims relating to the collection of ticket processing fees in connection with electronic ticket sales from February 16, 2024, through and including July 6, 2024, by Defendant will be released.

Who Represents Me? The Court has appointed lawyers Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to represent the Settlement Class. These attorneys are called Class Counsel. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

When Will the Court Consider the Proposed Settlement? The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at **11:00 a.m. on July 2, 2025**, in Courtroom 203 at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, 1 Court Street, Riverhead, NY 11901. At that hearing, the Court will: hear any objections concerning the fairness of the Settlement; determine the fairness of the Settlement; decide whether to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs; and decide whether to award Class Representative Joshua Homer \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his service in helping to bring and settle this case. Defendant has agreed that Class Counsel may be paid reasonable attorneys' fees from the Settlement Fund in an amount to be determined by the Court. Class Counsel will seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, but the Court may award less than this amount.

How Do I Get More Information? For more information, including the full Notice and Settlement Agreement, go to www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com, contact the Settlement Administrator at 1-888-840-5013, info@HYAttractionsSettlement.com, or The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement Administrator, P.O. Box 2180, Portland, OR 97208-2180, or call Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150.

¹ Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms shall have the meaning set forth in the Settlement Agreement which can be viewed at www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com.

If [REDACTED] should not be subscribed or if you need to change your subscription information for Homer v. HY Attractions Manager, LLC, [please use this preferences page](#).

Attachment 3

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COUNTY OF SUFFOLK*Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024

If You Purchased Electronic Tickets to The Edge NYC from the Defendant's Website from February 16, 2024, Through July 6, 2024, You May Be Entitled to a Payment from a Class Action Settlement.

A court authorized this Notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that the Defendant, HY Attractions Manager LLC, failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law ("ACAL") § 25.07(4). Defendant denies that it violated any law but has agreed to the Settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.
- You are included if you purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website, EdgeNYC.com, from February 16, 2024, through July 6, 2024.
- Read this Notice carefully. Your legal rights will be affected whether you act or not.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT

SUBMIT A CLAIM FORM BY JUNE 23, 2025	This is the only way to receive a payment.
EXCLUDE YOURSELF BY JUNE 23, 2025	You will receive no benefits, but you will retain any rights you currently have to sue the Defendant about the claims in this case. If you want to sue the Defendant on your own, you will have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you will have to prove your claims.
OBJECT BY JUNE 23, 2025	If you do not want the Settlement to be approved, you may write to the Court explaining why you do not like the Settlement.
GO TO THE HEARING ON JULY 2, 2025	If you object to the Settlement, you may ask to speak in Court about your opinion of the Settlement.
DO NOTHING	You will not get a share of the Settlement benefits and will give up your rights to sue the Defendant about the claims in the case.

These rights and options—and the deadlines to exercise them—are explained in this Notice.

BASIC INFORMATION**1. Why was this Notice issued?**

A court authorized this Notice because you have a right to know about a proposed settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your options before the Court decides whether to give final approval to the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, and your legal rights.

The case is called *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024. The person who sued is called "Plaintiff." The Defendant is HY Attractions Manager LLC.

2. What is a class action?

In a class action, one or more people called class representatives (in this case, Joshua Homer) sue on behalf of a group, or a "class," of people who have similar claims. In a class action, a court resolves the issues for all Class Members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Settlement class.

QUESTIONS? VISIT HYATTRACTIONSETTLEMENT.COM
OR CALL 1 (888) 840-5013 TOLL-FREE.

3. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit claims that the Defendant failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC in alleged violation of ACAL § 25.07(4). The Defendant denies that it violated any law but has agreed to the Settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

4. Why is there a settlement?

The Court has not decided whether Plaintiff or the Defendant should win this case. Instead, both sides agreed to a settlement. This way, they avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with ongoing litigation, and Settlement Class Members will get compensation sooner rather than, if at all, after the completion of a trial.

WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT

5. How do I know if I am part of the Settlement Class?

The Court decided that everyone who fits the following description is a member of the Settlement Class:

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website from February 16, 2024, through July 6, 2024

"Defendant's Website" means EdgeNYC.com.

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

6. What does the Settlement provide?

Monetary Relief. A Settlement Fund has been created totaling \$250,000. Payments to Settlement Class Members, the cost to administer the Settlement, the cost to inform people about the Settlement, attorneys' fees (inclusive of litigation costs), and an award to the Class Representative will also come out of this fund (*see* Question 12).

Prospective Relief. Additionally, as part of the Settlement, the Defendant has represented that it is no longer charging processing fees for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC and has agreed not to reinstate those processing fees unless (i) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior to the ticket being selected for purchase or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated.

A detailed description of the Settlement benefits can be found in the Settlement Agreement, a copy of which is accessible on the Settlement Website at HYAttractionsSettlement.com.

7. How much will my payment be?

To receive a pro rata share of the Settlement Fund, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, you **must** submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than June 23, 2025**. You can file a claim on the Settlement Website, HYAttractionsSettlement.com. Your payment will be made by PayPal, Venmo, Zelle, or check, at your election. Claim Forms must be submitted online by 11:59 p.m. ET on **June 23, 2025**, or mailed and postmarked by **June 23, 2025**. You can contact Class Counsel at 1 (646) 837-7150 to inquire as to the number of claims and/or requests for exclusion that have been received to date.

8. When will I get my payment?

The hearing to consider the fairness of the Settlement is scheduled for **July 2, 2025**. If the Court approves the Settlement, eligible Settlement Class Members whose claims are approved by the Settlement Administrator will receive their payment within 90 calendar days after entry of Final Judgment. The payment will be made in the form of a check, unless you elect to receive payment by PayPal, Zelle, or Venmo, and all checks will expire and become void 180 days after they are issued.

QUESTIONS? VISIT HYATTRACTIONSETTLEMENT.COM
OR CALL 1 (888) 840-5013 TOLL-FREE.

HOW TO GET BENEFITS

9. How do I get a payment?

If you are a Settlement Class Member and you want to receive a payment, you **must** complete and submit a Claim Form by **June 23, 2025**. Claim Forms can be submitted on the Settlement Website, HYAttractionsSettlement.com, or by printing a copy of a Claim Form from the Settlement Website and mailing it to the Settlement Administrator. Failure to submit a timely claim by the Claims Deadline will disqualify you from receiving a payment from the Settlement Fund.

You are encouraged to submit your claim online. Filing online is easier, faster, and more secure.

REMAINING IN THE SETTLEMENT

10. What am I giving up if I stay in the Settlement Class?

If the Settlement becomes final, you will give up your right to sue the Defendant and other Released Parties for the claims being resolved by this Settlement. The specific claims you are giving up against the Defendant are described in the Settlement Agreement. You will be “releasing” the Defendant and its affiliates, employees, and representatives as described in Section 1.32 of the Settlement Agreement unless you exclude yourself (*see* Question 13), regardless of whether you claim your electronic payment or not. The Settlement Agreement is available through the “Documents” page on the Settlement Website.

The Settlement Agreement describes the Released Claims with specific descriptions, so read it carefully. If you have any questions, you can talk to the lawyers listed in Question 11 for free, or you can, of course, talk to your own lawyer.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

11. Do I have a lawyer in the case?

The Court has appointed Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A., to be the attorneys representing the Settlement Class. They are called “Class Counsel.” They believe, after conducting an extensive investigation, that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your own expense.

12. How will the lawyers be paid?

The Defendant has agreed that Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs may be paid out of the Settlement Fund in an amount to be determined by the Court. The fee petition will seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, inclusive of reimbursement of their costs and expenses, though the Court may award less than this amount. Under the Settlement Agreement, any amount awarded to Class Counsel will be paid out of the Settlement Fund. Class Counsel will file with the Court and post on the Settlement Website its request for attorneys’ fees by **June 30, 2025**.

Subject to approval by the Court, Defendant has agreed that the Class Representative may be paid a service award of \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his services in helping to bring and resolve this case.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

13. How do I get out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must submit a request for exclusion by 11:59 p.m. ET on **June 23, 2025**. Requests for exclusion may be submitted either on the Settlement Website (via the online form) or by mailing or otherwise delivering a letter, or request for exclusion, stating that you want to be excluded from the Settlement in *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024. Your request for exclusion must also include your name, your address, a statement that you purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant’s Website, EdgeNYC.com, from February 16, 2024, through July 6, 2024, and paid a processing fee in connection with such

QUESTIONS? VISIT HYATTRACTIONSETTLEMENT.COM
OR CALL 1 (888) 840-5013 TOLL-FREE.

purchase, your signature, the name and number of this case, and a statement that you wish to be excluded. If you choose to submit a request for exclusion by mail, you must mail or otherwise send your exclusion request so that it is postmarked or delivered no later than **June 23, 2025**. Requests for exclusion may be delivered to the following address:

The Edge NYC Ticket Fee
Settlement Administrator
P.O. Box 2180
Portland, OR 97208-2180

14. If I don't exclude myself, can I sue the Defendant for the same thing later?

No, unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue the Defendant for the claims being resolved by this Settlement.

15. If I exclude myself, can I get anything from this Settlement?

No, if you exclude yourself, you will not receive any payment from the Settlement Fund.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

16. How do I object to the Settlement?

If you are a member of the Settlement Class and you do not like any part of the Settlement, you can object to the Settlement. You can give reasons why you think the Court should not approve it, and the Court will consider your views.

To object, you must file with the Court a letter or brief stating that you object to the Settlement in *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024. In your objection, you must identify all of your reasons for objecting (including citations and supporting evidence) and attach any materials you rely on for your objections. Your letter or brief must also include your name; your address; the basis upon which you claim to be a member of the Settlement Class; the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting you in connection with your objection; and your signature. If you or an attorney assisting you with your objection have ever objected to any class action settlement where you or the objecting attorney has asked for or received payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection (or any related appeal) without modification to the Settlement, you must include a statement in your objection identifying each such case by full case caption. You must also mail or deliver a copy of your letter or brief to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel listed below.

If you want to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing to object to the Settlement, with or without a lawyer (explained below in answer to Question 20), you must say so in your letter or brief. File the objection with the Court (or mail the objection to the Court) and mail a copy of the objection to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel at the addresses below, postmarked no later than **June 23, 2025**.

Court	Class Counsel	Defendant's Counsel
Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk 1 Court Street Courtroom 203 Riverhead, NY 11901	Philip L. Fraietta Bursor & Fisher P.A. 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor New York, NY 10019	Sean Haran Walden Macht Haran & Williams LLP 250 Vesey Street, 27th Floor New York, NY 10281

17. What's the difference between objecting to and excluding myself from the Settlement?

Objecting means telling the Court that you do not like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Settlement Class. Excluding yourself from the Settlement Class is telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the Settlement Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you.

QUESTIONS? VISIT HYATTRACTIONSETTLEMENT.COM
OR CALL 1 (888) 840-5013 TOLL-FREE.

THE COURT'S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

18. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?

The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at **11 a.m. on July 2, 2025**, in Courtroom 203 at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, 1 Court Street, Riverhead, NY 11901. The purpose of the hearing will be for the Court to determine whether to approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class; to consider Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and expenses; and to consider the request for an incentive award for the Class Representative. At that hearing, the Court will be available to hear any objections and arguments concerning the fairness of the Settlement.

The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time without notice, so it is a good idea to check for updates by visiting the Settlement Website at HYAttractionsSettlement.com or calling 1 (888) 840-5013. If, however, you timely object to the Settlement and advise the Court that you intend to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing, you will receive notice of any change in the date of the Final Approval Hearing.

19. Do I have to come to the hearing?

No, Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. However, you are welcome to come at your own expense. If you send an objection or comment, you do not have to come to Court to talk about it. As long as you file and mail your written objection on time, the Court will consider it. You may also pay another lawyer to attend, but it is not required.

20. May I speak at the hearing?

Yes, you may ask the Court for permission to speak at the Final Approval Hearing. To do so, you must include in your letter or brief objecting to the Settlement a statement saying that it is your "Notice of Intent to Appear in *Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC*, Index No. 631543/2024." Your letter must include your name, address, telephone number, and signature, as well as the name and address of your lawyer, if one is appearing for you. Your objection and notice of intent to appear must be filed with the Court by **June 23, 2025**, and sent to the addresses for Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel listed in Question 16, postmarked by **June 23, 2025**.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

21. How can I get more information?

This Notice summarizes the Settlement. More details can be found in the Settlement Agreement. You can download a copy of the Settlement Agreement at HYAttractionsSettlement.com. You can call the Settlement Administrator at 1 (888) 840-5013 or Class Counsel at 1 (646) 837-7150, if you have any questions. You may also write with questions to The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement Administrator, P.O. Box 2180, Portland, OR 97208-2180 or via email to info@HYAttractionsSettlement.com. Before doing so, however, please read this Notice carefully.

QUESTIONS? VISIT HYATTRACTIONSSSETTLEMENT.COM
OR CALL 1 (888) 840-5013 TOLL-FREE.

Attachment 4

Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC
Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk
Index No. 631543/2024

Claim Form

If you are a Settlement Class Member and wish to receive a payment, your completed Claim Form must be postmarked or submitted online by June 23, 2025.

Please read the included Notice carefully before filling out this Claim Form.

To be eligible to receive a payment from the Settlement obtained in this class action lawsuit, you must submit a Claim Form online or by mail.

ONLINE: HYAttractionsSettlement.com, "Submit a Claim" page

MAIL: The Edge NYC Ticket Fee
Settlement Administrator
P.O. Box 2180
Portland, OR 97208-2180

PART ONE: CLAIMANT INFORMATION & PAYMENT METHOD ELECTION

Provide your name and contact information below. It is your responsibility to notify the Settlement Administrator of any changes to your contact information after the submission of your Claim Form.

First Name MI Last Name

Street Address

City State ZIP Code

Email Address

Unique ID

POTENTIAL CASH PAYMENT: You may be eligible to receive a pro rata cash payment, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, if you purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website, EdgeNYC.com, from February 16, 2024, through July 6, 2024.

PREFERRED PAYMENT METHOD:

Venmo Venmo Username:
PayPal PayPal Email:
Zelle Zelle Email:
Check

PART TWO: ATTESTATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that (i) from February 16, 2024, through July 6, 2024, I purchased one or more electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website, EdgeNYC.com, and paid a processing fee in connection with such purchase; (ii) all of the information on this Claim Form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge; and (iii) I am authorized to submit this Claim Form and have not assigned or transferred any rights, claims, or remedies I may be entitled to as a Settlement Class Member. I understand that my Claim Form may be subject to audit, verification, and court review.

[Signature box]

Signature

Date:

--	--

 -

--	--

 -

--	--	--	--

MM DD YYYY

Please keep a copy of your Claim Form for your records.

Attachment 5



Homer v HY Attractions
Exclusion Report

Number	First Name	Last Name
1	Robin	Khadka
2	Claudio	Balacco

Attachment 6

From: The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement Administrator
<HYAttractionsSettlement@e.epiqnotice.com>

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: Reminder Notice of Class Action Settlement

Unique ID: [REDACTED]

PIN: [REDACTED]

REMINDER NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Homer v. HY Attractions Manager LLC, Index No. 631543/2024
(Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk)

Our Records Indicate You Purchased Electronic Tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's Website from February 16, 2024, to and Through July 6, 2024, and May Be Entitled to a Payment from a Class Action Settlement.

A court authorized this Notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

This reminder notice is to inform you that a settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, HY Attractions Manager LLC ("Defendant"), failed to properly disclose a ticket processing fee for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC, in alleged violation of New York Arts and Cultural Affairs Law ("ACAL") § 25.07(4). Defendant denies that it violated any law but has agreed to the Settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

Am I a Class Member? Our records indicate you may be a Class Member. Class Members are all individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website (www.edgenyc.com) from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.

What Does the Settlement Provide? A Settlement Fund of \$250,000.00 has been established to pay the Settlement Class, together with notice and administration expenses, approved attorneys' fees and costs, and a service award to the Class Representative.¹ Additionally, as part of the Settlement, Defendant has represented that it is no longer charging processing fees for electronic tickets to The Edge NYC and has agreed not to reinstate those processing fees unless (i) it clearly and conspicuously discloses the total cost of the tickets, inclusive of all processing fees, prior to the ticket being selected for purchase; or (ii) ACAL § 25.07(4) is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated.

How Do I Get a Payment? To receive a pro rata share of the Settlement Fund, which will be based on the total amount of processing fees you paid, you **must** submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than June 23, 2025**. You can file a claim by clicking [here](#). Your payment will be by PayPal, Venmo, Zelle, or check, at your election. Claim Forms must be submitted online by **11:59 p.m. EST on June 23, 2025**, or postmarked and mailed by **June 23, 2025** (the “Claims Deadline”). Failure to submit a timely claim by the Claims Deadline will prevent you from receiving a settlement payment from the Settlement Fund.

What are My Other Options? You may exclude yourself from the Settlement Class by sending a letter to the Settlement Administrator no later than **June 23, 2025**. If you exclude yourself, you cannot get a settlement payment, but you keep any rights you may have to sue the Defendant over the legal issues in the lawsuit. If you start your own lawsuit against Defendant after you exclude yourself, you’ll have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you’ll have to prove your claims. If you do exclude yourself so you can start or continue your own lawsuit against Defendant, you should talk to your own lawyer.

You and/or your lawyer have the right to appear before the Court and/or object to the proposed Settlement. Your written objection must be filed no later than **June 23, 2025**. Specific instructions about how to object to or exclude yourself from the Settlement are available at www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com. If you file a claim or do nothing, and the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by all of the Court’s orders and judgments. In addition, your alleged claims relating to the collection of ticket processing fees in connection with electronic ticket sales from February 16, 2024, through and including July 6, 2024, by Defendant will be released.

Who Represents Me? The Court has appointed lawyers Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to represent the Settlement Class. These attorneys are called Class Counsel. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

When Will the Court Consider the Proposed Settlement? The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at **11:00 a.m. on July 2, 2025**, in Courtroom 203 at the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Suffolk, 1 Court Street, Riverhead, NY 11901. At that hearing, the Court will: hear any objections concerning the fairness of the Settlement; determine the fairness of the Settlement; decide whether to approve Class Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees and costs; and decide whether to award Class Representative Joshua Homer \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his service in helping to bring and settle this case. Defendant has agreed that Class Counsel may be paid reasonable attorneys’ fees from the Settlement Fund in an amount to be determined by the Court. Class Counsel will seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, but the Court may award less than this amount.

How Do I Get More Information? For more information, including the full Notice and Settlement Agreement, go to www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com, contact the Settlement Administrator at 1-888-840-5013, info@HYAttractionsSettlement.com, or The Edge NYC Ticket Fee Settlement Administrator, P.O. Box 2180, Portland, OR 97208-2180, or call Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150.

¹ Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms shall have the meaning set forth in the Settlement Agreement which can be viewed at www.HYAttractionsSettlement.com.

If [REDACTED] should not be subscribed or if you need to change your subscription information for Homer v. HY Attractions Manager, LLC, [please use this preferences page](#).

AL353_v03

**SUPREME COURT FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK**

JOSHUA HOMER, individually and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

HY ATTRACTIONS MANAGER, LLC,

Defendant.

Index No. 631543/2024

Motion Seq. No. 004

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT
CLASS, FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, PLAINTIFF’S
SERVICE AWARD, ATTORNEYS’ FEES AND EXPENSES, AND ENTERING FINAL
JUDGMENT**

THIS CAUSE is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion For Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, Expenses, And Named Plaintiff’s Service Award and Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion For Final Certification Of The Settlement Class, And Final Approval Of The Class Action Settlement. Having considered the motions, the Settlement Agreement and all exhibits attached thereto, the complete record in this case, and oral argument presented at the Final Approval Hearing, and for good cause shown:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, DECREED, AND ADJUDGED AS FOLLOWS:

Certification of the Settlement Class

1. For purposes of effectuating the Settlement described in the Class Action Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”), only, the Court reaffirms its prior findings, pursuant to New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (“CPLR”) § 901, certifying the following settlement class (the “Settlement Class”):

All individuals who purchased electronic tickets to The Edge NYC from Defendant's website from February 16, 2024, to and through July 6, 2024.¹

Preliminary Approval Order at 3 (NYSCEF Doc. No. 23).

2. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, and for Settlement purposes only, the Court confirms its prior finding as to the Settlement Class that:

- a. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable;
- b. there are questions of law or fact common to the Settlement Class;
- c. the claims of the named Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class;
- d. the named Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Settlement Class;
- e. questions of law and fact common to Settlement Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual Settlement Class Members; and,
- f. a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

3. The Court reaffirms its appointment of Plaintiff Joshua Homer as Representative of the Settlement Class.

4. The Court reaffirms its appointment of Philip L. Fraietta and Stefan Bogdanovich of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to act as Class Counsel to the Settlement Class.

¹ Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, Defendant's subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; (4) Class Counsel; and (5) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons.

Notice To Potential Settlement Class Members

5. The Court finds, based on the Affirmation of the Claims Administrator Cameron R. Azari dated June 27, 2025 (“Azari Affirmation”), that the Court-approved Settlement Notice and Claim Form (“Notice”), attached as Attachments 3 and 4 to the Azari Affirmation, has been provided to the members of the Settlement Class in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order, and that Notice to the Settlement Class constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances as well as valid, due, and sufficient notice to all those entitled thereto and complies fully with the requirements of due process and CPLR §§ 904 and 908.

Final Approval of the Settlement

6. The terms of the Settlement Agreement are incorporated by reference herein.

7. The Court grants final approval of the Settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement (including all releases), finding it fair, reasonable and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class given, *inter alia*, the Settlement Fund as stated in the Settlement Agreement; the likelihood that Plaintiff will succeed on the merits; the extent of support from the parties, including the lack of any objections by any Settlement Class Members to the Settlement; the judgment of counsel; the presence of good faith bargaining; and the complexity and nature of the issues of law and fact.

8. The Court further determines that the Settlement is binding on all Settlement Class Members. All Settlement Class Members are forever bound by this Order and Final Judgment, have fully and forever released and discharged all Released Claims against all Released Parties, and are permanently enjoined and barred from asserting, instituting, commencing, or prosecuting any Released Claims, in any action or proceeding, either directly,

individually, representatively, derivatively, or in any other capacity.

9. The Court directs that payments be made pursuant to the Settlement Agreement to all Settlement Class Members who have submitted a timely and valid Claim form pursuant to the Settlement Agreement as soon as practicable.

Service Award, Attorneys' Fees and Expenses

10. Plaintiff's request for a Named Plaintiff Service Award is granted. Consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay \$5,000 to Named Plaintiff Joshua Homer, in addition to his respective allocated share of the Settlement. This Named Plaintiff Service Award shall be paid separate and apart from the attorneys' fees and expense award.

11. The Court finds Plaintiff's request for attorneys' fees and expenses reasonable for the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's unopposed motion and it is therefore granted. Consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Defendant will pay \$83,333.33 to Class Counsel for their attorneys' fees and expenses.

Further Matters

12. The Court hereby dismisses this action with prejudice, with each party to bear their own costs, except as provided in this Order or in the Settlement Agreement.

13. Neither the Settlement Agreement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Settlement: (i) is or may be deemed to be or may be used as an admission of, or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claims, or of any wrongdoing or liability of the Released Parties; or (ii) is or may be deemed to be or may be used as an admission of, or evidence of, any fault or omission of the Released Parties in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal. The Released

Parties may file the Settlement Agreement and/or the Judgment from this litigation in any other action that may be brought against them in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of res judicata, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, or any theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.

14. If for any reason the Effective Date does not occur, then (1) the certification of the Settlement Class shall be deemed vacated, (2) the certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes shall not be considered as a factor in connection with any subsequent class certification issues, and (3) the Parties and Releasing Parties shall return to the status quo ante in the litigation as it existed on January 7, 2025, without prejudice to the right of any of the Parties and Releasing Parties to assert any right or position that could have been asserted if the Settlement had never been reached or proposed to the Court.

15. Each and every Settlement Class Member, and any Person actually or purportedly acting on behalf of any Settlement Class Member, is hereby permanently barred and enjoined from commencing, instituting, continuing, pursuing, maintaining, prosecuting, or enforcing any Released Claims (including, without limitation, in any individual, class or putative class, representative or other action or proceeding), directly or indirectly, in any judicial, administrative, arbitral, or other forum, against the Released Parties. This permanent bar and injunction is necessary to protect and effectuate the Settlement Agreement, this Order and Final Judgment, and this Court's authority to effectuate the Settlement Agreement, and is ordered in aid of this Court's jurisdiction and to protect its judgments.

Reservation of Jurisdiction

16. Without affecting the finality of this Order and Final Judgment, the Court hereby reserves exclusive jurisdiction to consider any matters that may arise concerning the administration, interpretation, consummation, and enforcement of the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this _____ day of _____, 2025.

The Honorable Christopher Modelewski, J.S.C.