

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

GINA LETIZIO, EDUARDO GUILLEN,
ISABEL REEVES, PAUL COONS, as executor CASE NO.: CACE-25-011999
of the Estate of ELIZABETH BISSELL, JOHN
CRERAR, and CHRISTOPHER SHARP,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP. f/k/a
AKUMIN CORP.,

Defendant.

_____ /

**PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL
OF CLASS SETTLEMENT AND APPLICATION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

Plaintiffs,¹ individually, and on behalf of the Settlement Class, and Class Counsel respectfully move this Court for an order granting Final Approval of the Parties' Settlement Agreement, an attorneys' fees and costs award to Class Counsel, and Service Awards to the Class Representatives. This Motion for Final Approval is made pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220(e), and is based on the memorandum of law contained in this motion, the Joint Declaration of Class Counsel ("Joint Decl."), attached as *Exhibit B*, and the Declaration of Cameron R. Azari ("Admin. Decl."), attached as *Exhibit C*.

The Court granted Preliminary Approval of the Settlement on September 16, 2025, which provides for substantial Settlement Class Member Benefits, including: (1) up to \$2,500.00 per

¹ All capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as those defined in Section II of the Settlement Agreement, attached as *Exhibit A*.

Settlement Class Member for documented losses related to the Data Incident; and (2) one year of Medical Data Monitoring with up to \$1,000,000.00 in insurance for each Settlement Class Member. In addition to those benefits, the Defendant is also obligated to separately pay \$200,000.00 in Settlement Administration Costs, and Court-approved attorneys' fees, costs, and Service Awards, none of which will reduce the value of the Settlement Class Members' benefits. When the Court granted Preliminary Approval, it found the Settlement to be within the range of reasonableness for Final Approval and finding the class certification requirements were met.

Plaintiffs and Class Counsel now move the Court for Final Approval and apply for attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel and for Service Awards to the Class Representatives. The Settlement meets all the criteria for Final Approval. As of the filing of this motion, there are no objections, and only four Settlement Class members have opted-out. Admin Decl. ¶ 41. This overwhelmingly positive response from the Settlement Class affirms the Court's initial conclusion that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Preliminary Approval Order ¶ 3. The Parties' counsel fully evaluated the strengths, weaknesses, and equities of the Parties' respective positions and they believe the proposed Settlement fairly resolves their differences. Joint Decl. ¶ 3. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court should grant Final Approval of the Settlement and the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards.

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendant is a radiology and oncology service provider based in Florida. *Id.* ¶ 4. In the ordinary course of operating its business, Defendant collects, maintains, and stores Private Information pertaining to current and former employees and patients, including confidential personally identifiable information and protected health information. *Id.*

On October 11, 2023, a cyberattack occurred on Defendant's computer systems. *Id.* ¶ 5. In

response, Defendant immediately launched an investigation revealing that on that date, an unauthorized third party accessed and encrypted files for the purpose of extortion. *Id.* This included temporary access to certain files from Defendant's system, which may have included the Private Information entrusted to Defendant. *Id.*

Following the Data Incident, Defendant was named in several court class action lawsuits in the Southern District of Florida, all related to the Data Incident, and all alleging similar claims on behalf of overlapping putative classes. *Id.* ¶ 6. On December 30, 2024, Plaintiffs in the related actions filed a Motion to Consolidate Actions and Appoint Interim Class Counsel. *Id.* ¶ 7. On February 27, 2025, the Court entered an order consolidating the Related Actions into the first-filed action and set a deadline for applications for interim class counsel for Plaintiffs to file a consolidated complaint following the appointment of interim class counsel. *Id.* ¶ 8. On March 3, 2025, Plaintiffs renewed their motion to appoint Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as interim class counsel, expressly noting the consent of all Plaintiffs, and the motion was granted on March 5, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 9. On April 14, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a consolidated complaint alleging negligence and negligence *per se*, breach of implied contract, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of confidence, unjust enrichment, and declaratory judgment. *Id.* ¶ 10. On April 30, 2025, the Parties filed a joint discovery report pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), and on May 7, 2025, the Court entered a trial and pre-trial schedule. *Id.* ¶ 11. On May 14, 2025, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint. *Id.* ¶ 12.

Thereafter, the Parties decided to explore early resolution and scheduled a mediation for August 7, 2025, with experienced data breach class action mediator Rodney A. Max, Esq., of Upchurch Watson White & Max. *Id.* ¶ 13. On May 19, 2025, to conserve resources in anticipation of mediation, the Parties jointly moved to stay the case pending mediation, which the Court

granted. *Id.* ¶ 14. In advance of the mediation, the Parties exchanged detailed informal discovery related to the cause and scope of the Data Incident, the number of individuals involved, the type of personal information impacted, and Plaintiffs' claimed damages. *Id.* The Parties attended mediation on August 7, 2025. *Id.* After a full day of negotiating, the Parties reached an agreement. During mediation, the Parties determined that jurisdiction was proper in state court. *Id.*

Consequently, on August 11, 2025, Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the federal action and filed the Action in this Court. *Id.* ¶ 15. The Parties then interviewed settlement administrators, negotiated the full terms of the Settlement Agreement, drafted the Notices and Claim Form, and ultimately signed the Settlement Agreement on September 10, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 16. Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Preliminary Approval on September 11, 2025, and the Court granted the motion on September 16, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 17.

II. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT

A. Settlement Class - Plaintiffs seek Final Approval of the Settlement on behalf of the following Settlement Class:

All living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

Agreement ¶ 63.

B. Settlement Class Member Benefits

1. Cash Payment for Documented Losses - All Settlement Class Members may submit a Claim Form to receive a Cash Payment for Documented Losses related to fraud, identity theft, or misuse of their Personal Information under the Agreement for a maximum of \$2,500.00 per Settlement Class Member. To receive payment for Documented Losses, a Settlement Class Member must complete and submit a Claim Form and include detailed documentation in support of the Claim. Examples of detailed documentation include (but are not

limited to): telephone records, correspondence including emails, or receipts. Except as expressly provided under the Agreement, personal certifications, declarations, or affidavits from the Settlement Class Member do not constitute proper documentation but may be included to provide clarification, context, or support for other submitted reasonable documentation.. *Id.* ¶ 68a. As there are approximately 1,200,000 Settlement Class Members, conceptionally the potential recovery value of the benefit to the Settlement Class overall is in the hundreds of millions of dollars. *See* Joint Decl. ¶ 18.

2. Medical Data Monitoring - In addition to a Cash Payment for Documented Losses, all Settlement Class Members will be entitled to one year of CyEx's Medical Shield Complete. Agreement ¶ 69b. This includes credit monitoring with one bureau, with additional monitoring of: (a) healthcare insurance plan IDs, healthcare beneficiary identifier ID; (b) medical records; (c) national provider identifier; (d) international classification of disease; (e) health savings account; (f) high-risk transactions; and (g) the dark web. *Id.* The product also provides for \$1,000,000.00 of identity theft insurance and contains real-time alerts and victim assistance. *Id.* Medical Data Monitoring will be paid for by the Defendant for the entire Settlement Class and has an annual retail cost of \$155.40 per individual. Joint Decl. ¶ 21. The market value of this benefit is \$186,480,000.00 (1,200,000 Settlement Class Members x \$155.40). *Id.*

C. Release of Claims – In consideration for the Settlement Class Member Benefits, Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members agree to release Defendant from claims related to the Data Incident. Agreement ¶¶ 101-03. The Releases are narrowly tailored to the claims made in the Action. Joint Decl. ¶ 22. Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members who do not timely and validly opt-out of the Settlement Class will be bound by the terms of the Settlement, including the Releases that discharge the Released Claims against the Released Parties. Agreement ¶¶ 101-03.

D. Notice Program

Following Preliminary Approval, the Settlement Administrator, Epiq, effectuated the Notice Program in accordance with the Parties' Agreement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. Admin. Decl. ¶¶ 18-40. The Notice Program consisted of direct Email Notice to those Settlement Class Members for which email addresses could be identified, Publication Notice to create awareness for those without email addresses, and a Long Form Notice that contained detailed information about the Settlement. *Id.*; Agreement ¶ 45.

On September 22, 2025, Epiq received the Class List from Defendant containing records for 1,165,790 Settlement Class Members. Admin Decl. ¶ 22. After analysis of the list that included deduplication of records, on October 2, 2025, and again on October 20, 2025, Epiq sent a combined email to 764,159 Settlement Class Members. *Id.* ¶ 23. From October 1, 2025, through October 30, 2025, Epiq initiated Publication Notice that consisting of a robust digital campaign and a comprehensive sponsored search listing program. *Id.* ¶¶ 27-37. The digital notice campaign consisted of advertising on Google Display Network, which represents thousands of digital properties across all major content categories. *Id.* ¶ 28. Digital Publication Notices were targeted to selected audiences and designed to encourage Settlement Class Member participation by directing them to the Settlement Website to learn about the Settlement. *Id.* Digital Publication Notices were also placed on the leading social media platforms, including *Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and X.* *Id.* ¶ 34. The digital notice campaigns were highly successful and resulted in over 61.8 million impressions. *Id.* ¶ 35. In addition to the digital notices, the Settlement Administrator placed sponsored search listings on *Google, Yahoo!, and Bing.* *Id.* ¶ 36. The listings ran from October 1, 2025, through October 30, 2025, and were displayed 16,886 times resulting in 2,158 clicks that displayed the Settlement Website. *Id.* ¶ 37. All told, the campaigns were extremely

successful in increasing the notice reach. Joint Decl. ¶ 23.

Moreover, a Long Form Notice and/or Claim Form were mailed to all persons who requested one via the toll-free telephone number or other means. *Id.* ¶ 26. As of November 6, 2025, Epiq mailed 24 packages with Long Form Notices and Claim Forms as a result of such requests. *Id.*

Also, following Preliminary Approval, Epiq established the Settlement Website, a toll-free telephone number, and postal address for Settlement Class Member inquiries. Admin Decl. ¶¶ 38-39. The Settlement Website was established on September 30, 2025, and contains key documents, including the Settlement Agreement, Long Form Notice, Preliminary Approval Order, and Claim Form where Settlement Class Members can easily submit Claims. *Id.* ¶ 38. This Motion for Final Approval will be posted after it is filed. As of November 6, 2025, there have been 20,632 website visits and 33,898 page views. *Id.* The toll-free Settlement telephone line (877.657.8732) went live on September 30, 2025. *Id.* ¶ 39. The telephone line has been active 24 hours a day / seven days a week and provides Settlement Class Members with answers to frequently asked questions and allows them to request Long Form Notices or Claim Forms. *Id.* As of November 6, 2025, there have been 152 calls for 397 minutes. *Id.* These additional forms of notice further buttressed the highly successful direct Notice Program. Joint Decl. ¶ 24.

Overall, the Notice Program was highly effective. *Id.* ¶ 25. It was the best notice under the circumstances, satisfied the requirements of due process, and conformed with all aspects of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220. Admin Decl. ¶¶ 49-50. The result of the Notice Program, consisting of direct Email Notice and Publication Notice, combined with the Settlement Website and toll-free telephone, was that greater than 70% of the Settlement Class received actual notice of the Settlement. *Id.* ¶ 49. The rate exceeds the Federal Judicial Center's guidelines concerning

appropriate reach, which state that a notice plan that reaches a minimum of 70% of targeted class members is reasonable. Joint Decl. ¶ 25.

E. Claim Submission Process - To receive Settlement Class Member Benefits, Settlement Class Members are required to accurately and timely submit Claims through the Court-approved Claim Form by the Claim Form Deadline, which is November 30, 2025. Agreement ¶ 23. Claim Forms may be submitted online through the Settlement Website or through U.S. Mail sent to the Settlement Administrator at the address designated on the Claim Form. *Id.* ¶ 83. As of November 6, 2025, there have been 839 Claim Forms submitted online by mail. Admin Decl. ¶ 43. The number of Claim Form submissions will increase as there is still another three weeks before the Claim Form Deadline. Joint Decl. ¶ 29. The Settlement Administrator will review all Claim Forms to determine their validity, eligibility, and the type and amount of Settlement Class Member Benefit to which the Settlement Class Member may be entitled. Agreement ¶ 84. The Settlement Administrator will provide Settlement Class Members who submitted Valid Claims with their Cash Payment for Documented Losses no later than 75 days after the Effective Date. *Id.* ¶ 92. All Medical Data Monitoring codes shall be emailed by CyEx to Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims within the same period. *Id.* Cash Payments will be made electronically or by paper check by sending Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims an email to select from alternative forms of electronic payment or by paper check. *Id.* ¶ 93. Class Counsel will update the Court at the Final Approval Hearing with the total number of Claims filed.

F. Opt-Outs and Objections - The deadline to opt-out or object is November 30, 2025. Admin. Decl. ¶ 41. As of November 6, 2025, there have been no objections and only four opt-outs. *Id.*

G. Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards – After the Parties agreed on all

material terms of the Settlement, they discussed attorneys' fees, costs, and Service Awards. Joint Decl. ¶ 39. The Parties negotiated and Defendant agreed to separately pay attorneys' fees, including all litigation costs and expenses, in the amount of \$2.85 million. *Id.*; Agreement ¶ 98. The Notices all advised the Settlement Class that Class Counsel would be seeking attorneys' fees and costs in that amount. Agreement, Exhibits 1-2. Payment of attorneys' fees and costs will neither impact the amount paid to Settlement Class Members who claim a Cash Payment for Documented Losses nor the Medical Data Monitoring. Joint Decl. ¶ 41. Further, the Parties agreed Class Counsel would request Service Awards for the Class Representatives in an amount of up to \$2,500 each. Agreement ¶ 97. Likewise, the Notices advised the Settlement Class about the amount of the Service Awards. *Id.*, Exhibits 1-2. As indicated above, there have been no objections by any of the Settlement Class Members to the amounts requested.

III. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT

To finally approve the Settlement on a classwide basis, the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure require notice to the Settlement Class, a fairness hearing, and this Court's final approval. "Settlement has special importance in class actions with their notable uncertainty, difficulties of proof, and length. Settlements of complex cases contribute greatly to the efficient utilization of scarce judicial resources and achieve the speedy resolution of justice[.]" *Turner v. Gen. Elec. Co.*, No. 2:05-CV-186-FTM-99DNF, 2006 WL 2620275, at *2 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 13, 2006) (internal quotation omitted). "There is a strong judicial policy favoring the pretrial settlement of class actions." *Lee v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*, 2015 WL 5449813, at *4 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 14, 2015); *see also In re U.S. Oil & Gas Litig.*, 967 2d 489, 493 (11th Cir. 1992) ("Public policy strongly favors the pretrial settlement of class action Actions"); *Cotton v. Hinton*, 559 F.2d 1326, 1331 (5th Cir. 1977) ("Particularly in class action suits, there is an overriding public interest in favor of

settlement”).²

A. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate

The Court previously found the Settlement to be sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to warrant providing Notice to the Settlement Class. Preliminary Approval Order ¶ 3. At the Final Approval Hearing, after Notice to the Settlement Class and time and opportunity for absent class members to object or otherwise be heard, the Court considers whether the Settlement “is fair, adequate, and reasonable and is not the product of collusion between the parties.” *Bennett v. Behring Corp.*, 737 F.2d 982, 986 (11th Cir. 1984) (citation omitted). *See also Nelson v. Wakulla Cnty.*, 985 So. 2d 564, 570 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008); *Barnhill v. Florida Microsoft Anti-Trust Litig.*, 905 So. 2d 195, 199-200 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005); *Altamonte Springs Imaging, L.C. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 12 So. 3d 850, 854 (Fla. 3d DCA 2009). The court is “not called upon to determine whether the settlement reached by the parties is the best possible deal, nor whether class members will receive as much from a settlement as they might have recovered from victory at trial.” *Roubert v. Capital One Fin. Corp.*, No. 8:21-cv-2852-TPB-TGW, 2023 WL 5916714, at *5 (M.D. Fla. Jul. 10, 2023) (quotation omitted).

The factors a trial court should consider when determining whether to approve a class action settlement include: (1) the likelihood of success at trial; (2) the range of possible recovery; (3) the point over or below the range of possible recovery at which a settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable; (4) the complexity, expense, and duration of the litigation; (5) the substance and amount of opposition to the settlement; and (6) the stage of the proceedings at which the settlement was achieved. *Nelson*, 985 So. 2d at 57; *Silva v. U.S. Century Bank*, 2014 Fla. Cir. LEXIS 48275

² “Florida’s class action rule, Rule 1.220, is based on Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and this court may look to federal cases as persuasive authority in the interpretation of rule 1.220.” *Bawtinheimer v. D.R. Horton, Inc.*, 161 So. 3d 539, 540 (Fla. 5th DCA 2014).

(Fla. 11th Jud. Cir. Nov. 10, 2014). The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals has also identified factors used by Florida courts to evaluate settlements,³ which again favor the settlement here. *See Leverso v. Southtrust Bank*, 18 F.3d 1527, 1530 n.6 (11th Cir. 1994). Each of these factors favors granting Final Approval here.

1. The Likelihood of Success at Trial

While Plaintiffs and Class Counsel firmly believe Plaintiffs' claims would have resulted in class certification and favorable adjudication on the merits, Plaintiffs faced significant risks had they continued to litigate the Action,⁴ which include Defendant successfully: (i) moving for dismissal of Plaintiffs' claims; (ii) opposing class certification; (iii) appealing a class certification order; (iv) prevailing on a post-certification summary judgment motion; (v) prevailing at trial; or (vi) appealing a post-certification summary judgment or post-trial judgment. Joint Decl. ¶ 31.

³ The factors are: (1) the existence of fraud or collusion behind the settlement; (2) the complexity, expense, and likely duration of the litigation; (3) the stage of the proceedings and the amount of discovery completed; (4) the probability of plaintiffs' success on the merits; (5) the range of possible recovery; and (6) the opinions of the class counsel, class representatives, and the substance and amount of opposition to the settlement. *See Leverso*, 18 F.3d at 1530 n.6.

⁴ "Data breach cases . . . are particularly risky, expensive and complex" due at least in part to the cutting-edge, innovative nature of data breach litigation and the rapidly evolving law. *Gordon v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.*, No. 17-cv-01415- CMA-SKC, 2019 WL 6972701, at *1 (D. Colo. Dec. 16, 2019); *see also In re Wawa, Inc. Data Sec. Litig.*, No. 19-6019, 2024 WL 1557366, at *20 (E.D. Pa. April 9, 2024) ("Data breach litigation is inherently complex."); *In re Equifax Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 17-MD-2800, 2020 WL 256132, *15 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 17, 2020) (in data breach "[t]he law . . . remains uncertain and the applicable legal principles have continued to evolve"). For these reasons, data breach cases like this one have been dismissed at the pleading stage and generally face substantial class certification hurdles. *See, e.g., In re Blackbaud, Inc., Customer Data Breach Litigation*, No. 3:20-mn-02972-JFA, 2024 WL 21555221 (D.S.C. May 14, 2024) (denying class certification in a data breach action after concluding proposed class and sub-classes were not ascertainable); *In re TD Ameritrade Account Holder Litig.*, No. C 07-2852 SBA, 2011 WL 4079226, at *14 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 13, 2011) ("many [data breach class actions] have been dismissed at the pleading stage."); *In re TJX Cos. Retail Sec. Breach Litig.*, 246 F.R.D. 389 (D. Mass. 2007) (denying class certification in cybersecurity incident class action litigation). Maintaining class certification is often an equally challenging hurdle. *See e.g., Marriott Int'l Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 78 F.4th 677 (4th Cir. Aug. 18, 2023) (decertifying classes).

Moreover, even if a litigation class were certified and Plaintiffs prevailed on the merits, it would still take years to litigate the Action through trial and the various appeals. *Id.* ¶ 32. The Settlement eliminates all of those risks and the years of delays by getting the Settlement Class Members their money and the non-monetary security enhancements now. *Id.* ¶ 33.

Thus, the uncertainty of a trial and the expense and delay of prolonged litigation weigh in favor of a finding that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *See In re the Home Depot, Inc., Cust. Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 1:14-md-02583, 2016 WL 6902351, at *6 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 23, 2016) (“[I]t is unclear whether future recovery at trial could achieve more than the relief made available in the Settlement. The early settlement of this case benefits the Settlement Class and weighs strongly in favor of final approval.”); *Bennett v. Behring Corp.*, 96 F.R.D. 343, 349–50 (S.D. Fla. 1982) (stating that it would have been “unwise [for plaintiffs] to risk the substantial benefits which the settlement confers . . . to the vagaries of a trial”), *aff’d*, 737 F.2d 982 (11th Cir. 1984).

2. The Range of Possible Recovery and the Point over or Below the Range of Possible Recovery at Which a Settlement is Fair, Adequate, and Reasonable

In determining whether a settlement is fair given the potential range of recovery, the Court should be guided by “the fact that a proposed settlement amounts to only a fraction of the potential recovery does not mean the settlement is unfair or inadequate.” *Behrens v. Wometco Enters., Inc.*, 118 F.R.D. 534, 542 (S.D. Fla. 1988), *aff’d*, 899 F.2d 21 (11th Cir. 1990). Indeed, “[a] settlement can be satisfying even if it amounts to a hundredth or even a thousandth of a single percent of the potential recovery.” *Id.* This is because a settlement must be evaluated “in light of the attendant risks with litigation.” *Thompson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 216 F.R.D. 55, 64 (S.D.N.Y. 2003); *see also Bennett*, 737 F.2d at 986 (“[C]ompromise is the essence of settlement.”).

The risk of establishing damages in this Action was not insignificant. Joint Decl. ¶ 34.

Indeed, there is no assurance that a jury or the Court would find in favor of the Settlement Class and awarded the full amounts claimed as owed. *Id. See, e.g., Southern Independent Bank v. Fred's, Inc.*, No. 2:15-CV-799-WKW, 2019 WL 1179396, at *8 (M.D. Ala. Mar. 13, 2019) (ruling under *Daubert* that causation not satisfied for class certification purposes in data breach action). Indeed, the damages methodologies, while theoretically sound in Plaintiffs' view, remain untested in a disputed class certification setting and unproven in front of a jury.

Class Counsel vigorously advocated for the Settlement Class Members in this Action and believe the Settlement is in the best interest of the Settlement Class. Joint Decl. ¶ 35. These benefits include a Cash Payment for Documented Losses up to \$2,500.00 per Settlement Class Member, as well as Medical Data Monitoring for each and every Settlement Class Member. Agreement ¶ 69a. The potential recovery value of these benefits is highly substantial. Joint Decl. ¶ 36. The Settlement offers substantial Settlement Class Member Benefits that favorably compare with similar data breach class actions. *Id.* ¶ 37.

The Settlement will provide certain, substantial, and immediate relief to the Settlement Class. *Id.* ¶ 38. It ensures Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims will receive guaranteed compensation now and provides Settlement Class Members with access to Settlement Class Member Benefits that may not have been available at trial. *Id.* Accordingly, the Court should find the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable and within the range of possible recovery.

3. The Complexity, Expense, and Duration of Litigation

Given the “particularly risky, expensive and complex” nature of data breach cases, *see* footnote 5, *supra*, litigating these claims further would have undoubtedly proven difficult and consumed even more significant time, money, and judicial resources. Even if Plaintiffs ultimately prevailed in the Action, that success would likely benefit the class only after years of trial and

appellate proceedings and substantial expense to both sides. *Id.* ¶ 17; *Lee*, 2015 WL 5449813, at *9 (citing *In re Oil Spill by Oil Rig Deepwater Horizon in Gulf of Mex.*, 910 F. Supp. 2d 891, 932 (E.D. La. 2012) (“Even assuming litigation could obtain the results that this Settlement provides, years of litigation would stand between the class and any such recovery. Hence, this...factor weighs strongly in favor of granting final approval to the Settlement Agreement.”)). In contrast, the Settlement saves the Court and the Parties’ resources and provides immediate relief to the Settlement Class. These benefits come without the expense, uncertainty, and delay of continued and indefinite litigation.

The Court should consider the vagaries of litigation and compare the significance of immediate recovery by way of the compromise to the mere possibility of relief in the future, after protracted and expensive litigation. In this respect, it has been held proper to take the bird in the hand instead of a prospective flock in the bush.

Lipuma v. American Express Co., 406 F. Supp. 2d 1298, 1323 (S.D. Fla. 2005); *In re U.S. Oil & Gas Litig.*, 967 F.2d at 493 (complex litigation “can occupy a court’s docket for years on end, depleting the resources of the parties and taxpayers while rendering meaningful relief increasingly elusive”). In light of the costs, uncertainties, and delays of litigating through trial—to say nothing of an appeal— “the benefits to the class of the present settlement become all the more apparent.” *See Ressler v. Jacobson*, 822 F. Supp. 1551, 1555 (M.D. Fla. 1992).

4. The Substance and Amount of Opposition to the Settlement

The Settlement Class fully endorses and supports the Settlement. Joint Decl. ¶ 27. Following the successful Notice Program, the Settlement Class had ample opportunity to opt-out or object to the Settlement. *Id.* As of the date of the filing of this motion, there are no objections, and only four Settlement Class Members have opted-out. *Id.* ¶ 28; Admin. Decl. ¶ 41. The deadline to opt-out or object to the Settlement is November 30, 2025 (15 days before the Final Approval Hearing). Joint Decl. ¶ 28. Should any objections be timely and properly submitted, Class Counsel

will notify the Court before the Final Approval Hearing. *Id.* The same is true if anyone else opts-out. *Id.*

5. *The Stage of the Proceedings at Which the Settlement Was Achieved*

Courts consider “the degree of case development that class counsel have accomplished prior to settlement” to ensure that “counsel had an adequate appreciation of the merits of the case before negotiating.” *In re Gen. Motors Pick-up Truck Fuel Tank Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 55 F.3d 768, 813 (3d Cir. 1995). At the same time, “[t]he law is clear that early settlements are to be encouraged, and accordingly, only some reasonable amount of discovery should be required to make these determinations.” *Ressler*, 822 F. Supp. at 1555. The Action settled after a thorough exchange of informal discovery, between parties that litigated the same issues in parallel in federal court. Joint Decl. ¶ 47. Based upon Class Counsel’s experience, this was an appropriate time to negotiate a classwide settlement. *Id.* ¶ 46.

Based on the foregoing, it is Class Counsel’s well-informed opinion that, given the uncertainty and further substantial risk and expense of pursuing the Action through contested dispositive motions, class certification proceedings, trial, and appeal, the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. *Id.* ¶ 31.

B. The Notice Program Was the Best Notice Practicable

The Rule 1.220(c) notice requirements must be designed to provide sufficient due process to class members by informing them of the action’s pendency and providing an opportunity to be heard or opt-out and must be the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances.” *Nelson*, 985 So. 2d at 576. To satisfy this requirement, individual notice should be provided to class members who can be identified through reasonable effort. *See Cordell v. World Ins. Co.*, 355 So. 2d 479, 481 (Fla. 1st DCA 1978) (citing *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 173-75

(1974)). The best practicable notice is that which “is reasonably calculated, under all of the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.” *Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Tr. Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950). Here, the Notice Program, consisting of direct Email Notice and Publication Notice, was the best notice practicable. Admin. Decl. ¶ 49. Furthermore, the Notice Program was timely commenced and properly completed in full compliance with Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220, the Court’s instructions in the Preliminary Approval Order, and the requirements in the Settlement Agreement. Joint Decl. ¶ 26; Admin. Decl. ¶ 50.

IV. CLASS ACTION CERTIFICATION SHOULD BE GRANTED

Plaintiffs and Class Counsel jointly request entry of a Final Approval Order certifying the Settlement Class pursuant to Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220(a)(2) and (3). The Court has already preliminarily certified the Settlement Class. Preliminary Approval Order ¶ 4. For the reasons discussed below, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel urge the Court to make a final determination that the Settlement Class meets the standards for class certification for settlement purposes. Defendant also supports certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only.

Class actions in Florida state courts are governed by Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220. The Florida Supreme Court has held that all proponents of class certification must satisfy the four prerequisites detailed in Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220(a) (i.e., numerosity, commonality, typicality, adequacy) as well as one of the three subdivisions of Rule 1.220(b). *Sosa v. Safeway Premium Fin. Co.*, 73 So. 3d 91, 106-07 (Fla. 2011) (interpreting Rule 1.220(a) and (b)). It also held that “[a] trial court should resolve doubts with regard to certification in favor of certification.” *Id.* at 105. Plaintiffs meet each of the Rule 1.220(b)(2) and (3) class certification requirements.

Numerosity: The movant must demonstrate the members of the class are so numerous that

separate joinder of each member is impractical. *See* Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220(a)(1). “No specific number and no precise count are needed to sustain the numerosity requirement. Rather, class certification is proper if the class representative does not base the projected class size on mere speculation.” *Sosa*, 73 So. 3d at 114 (internal citations omitted). Here, numerosity is easily satisfied. There are nearly 1.2 million members of the Settlement Class. *See* Joint Decl. ¶ 18. It would be impossible and/or impractical to (i) separately join each of the members of the Settlement Class in the Action or (ii) have each Settlement Class Member file suit and move to consolidate their suits into this Action concerning the same legal issues. *Id.*

Commonality: The movant must demonstrate the representative party’s claim(s) raises questions of law or fact common to the questions of law or fact raised by the claim of each member of the class. *See* Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220(a)(2).

The primary concern in the consideration of commonality is whether the representative’s claim arises from the same practice or course of conduct that gave rise to the remaining claims and whether the claims are based on the same legal theory. The threshold of the commonality requirement is not high. A mere factual difference between class members does not necessarily preclude satisfaction of the commonality requirement. Individualized damage inquiries will also not preclude class certification. Rather, the commonality requirement is aimed at determining whether there is a need for, and benefit derived from, class treatment. More specifically, the commonality prong only requires that resolution of a class action affect all or a substantial number of the class members, and that the subject of the class action presents a question of common or general interest. Furthermore, the commonality requirement is satisfied if the common or general interest of the class members is in the object of the action, the result sought, or the general question implicated in the action. This core of the commonality requirement is satisfied if the questions linking the class members are substantially related to the resolution of the litigation, even if the individuals are not identically situated.

Sosa, 73 So. 3d at 107-08 (internal citations omitted).

Commonality is easily satisfied. Plaintiffs’ claims all turn on whether Defendant’s security environment was adequate to protect the Settlement Class Members’ Private Information, the resolution of which revolves around evidence that does not vary between members and so can be

fairly resolved for all Settlement Class Members at once.

Typicality: The movant must demonstrate the claim(s) of the representative party is typical of the claim of each member of the class. *See* Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220(a)(3). The key inquiry for a trial court when it determines whether a proposed class:

satisfies the typicality requirement is whether the class representative possesses the same legal interest and has endured the same legal injury as the class members. The test for typicality is not demanding and focuses generally on the similarities between the class representative and the putative class members. Mere factual differences between the class representative's claims and the claims of the class members will not defeat typicality. Rather, the typicality requirement is satisfied when there is a strong similarity in the legal theories upon which those claims are based and when the claims of the class representative and class members are not antagonistic to one another.

Sosa, 73 So. 3d at 114-15 (Fla. 2011) (internal citations omitted). Typicality is satisfied because there is a nexus between Plaintiffs' and other Settlement Class Members' claims since they each concern Defendant's alleged failure to protect sensitive Private Information in connection with the Data Incident and are thus based on the same legal theories and underlying events. Therefore, Plaintiffs possess similar legal interests and experienced the same legal injury as the Settlement Class Members. Plaintiffs' claims are not antagonistic in any way to the claims of the Settlement Class Members.

Adequacy: The movant must demonstrate the representative party can fairly and adequately protect and represent the interests of each member of the class. *See* Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.220(a)(4).

This inquiry serves to uncover conflicts of interest between the presumptive class representative and the class he or she seeks to represent. A trial court's inquiry concerning whether the adequacy requirement is satisfied contains two prongs. The first prong concerns the qualifications, experience, and ability of class counsel to conduct the litigation. The second prong pertains to whether the class representative's interests are antagonistic to the interests of the class members.

Sosa, 73 So. 3d at 115 (internal citations omitted). Adequacy is satisfied here because the Class

Representatives and Class Counsel have zealously litigated Plaintiffs' claims, secured substantial relief, and have no interests antagonistic to the Settlement Class. *See* Joint Decl. ¶ 46. Further, Class Counsel are highly qualified and have a great deal of experience litigating consumer class actions, including in the data privacy context. *Id.*

Predominance: “To meet the requirements of rule 1.220(b)(3), the party moving for class certification must establish that the class members’ common questions of law and fact predominate over individual class member claims.” *Sosa*, 73 So. 3d at 111 (quoting Rule 1.220(b)(3)). “Florida courts have held that common questions of fact predominate when the defendant acts toward the class members in a similar or common way.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted). Here, the questions of law and fact common to all members of the Settlement Class substantially outweigh any possible issues that are individual to each member of the Settlement Class.

Superiority: Finally, Rule 1.220(b)(3) superiority requirement is met. “[C]lass representation is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.” *Id.* Resolution of over a million claims in one action is far superior to individual lawsuits because it promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication. Joint Decl. ¶ 19. Given the small value of their individual claims, and their support for the Settlement, it can be inferred that Settlement Class Members are not interested in prosecuting their own claims. *Id.* Class Counsel is unaware of any other litigation against Defendant arising from the Data Incident. *Id.* It is desirable to litigate the claims in this Court given Defendant’s substantial business activity in Florida and because the causes of action accrued in Florida, and manageability is no concern in the context of class settlement approval. *Id.*

For these reasons, the Court should finally certify the Settlement Class.

V. APPLICATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARDS

Class Counsel respectfully requests \$2,500 in Service Awards for each of the Class Representatives to compensate them for their work in filing the Action and facing the risks associated with serving as representatives. *Id.* ¶ 42. The Service Awards are to be paid by Defendant separate and apart from the Settlement Class Member Benefits. *Id.* In prosecuting this action, the Class Representatives expended time and effort and took significant financial and reputational risks for the benefit of the putative class. *Id.* ¶ 52. This imposed a burden on them out of proportion to their individual stakes in the matter. No objections have been asserted to the Service Awards. Admin. Decl. ¶ 41.

Class Counsel also respectfully requests the Court award \$2.85 million in attorneys' fees and costs.⁵ Similar to the Service Awards, the attorneys' fees and costs are to be paid by Defendant separate and apart from the Settlement Class Member Benefits. Joint Decl. ¶ 39. The attorneys' fees and costs are based upon the total value of the Settlement Class Member Benefits made available as a direct result of Class Counsel's efforts. *Id.* ¶ 40. Following receipt of Notice, no Settlement Class Member has objected to the amount of attorneys' fees and costs requested. Admin. Decl. ¶ 41.

A. Service Awards for the Class Representatives

The Court should approve \$2,500.00 Service Awards for each of the Class Representatives, as the amount is just, fair, and reasonable, and Defendant does not oppose such awards. Under Florida law, service awards in class actions are appropriate as compensation for the fact that class

⁵ Class Counsel advanced \$22,325.00 in litigation costs and expenses related to filing, service, experts, and mediation. They are not seeking reimbursement of their costs. This Action settled early in the litigation; however, Class Counsel were prepared to litigate through trial, if necessary, which would have resulted in hundreds of thousands, if not more than a million dollars of additional costs. *Id.*

representatives are “identified as a class litigant in public records...[are] subject to fiduciary duties [and] may be deposed and required to produce records” and must engage in the litigation proceedings. *Altamonte Springs Imaging, L.C. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 12 So. 3d 850, 857 (Fla. 3d DCA 2009) (affirming \$10,000 award because being a class representative “is less an honor than a headache”). *See also Holt v. HHH Motors, LLP*, No. 16-2012-CA-010179, 2015 WL 14085461, at *2 (Fla. 4th Jud. Cir. June 17, 2015) (approving the payment of \$5,000.00 to both of the named plaintiffs as an incentive award for their actions and contributions to the litigation.).

The Class Representatives have actively followed this matter even prior to the complaint being filed and have made significant efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, including maintaining contact with Class Counsel, participating in client interviews, providing relevant documents, assisting in the investigation of the Action, remaining available for consultation throughout settlement negotiations, reviewing relevant pleadings and the Settlement Agreement, and answering Class Counsel’s many questions. Joint Decl. ¶ 44. The requested Service Awards are justified in light of the Class Representatives’ willingness to devote their time and energy to prosecuting this Action and is reasonable in consideration of the overall benefit conferred on the Settlement Class and should be approved. *Id.* ¶ 45.

B. The Court Should Award the Requested Attorneys’ Fees

The award of attorneys’ fees in Florida is controlled by *Kuhnlein v. Dep’t of Revenue*, 662 So. 2d 309 (Fla. 1995), and *Standard Guar. Ins. Co. v. Quanstrom*, 555 So. 2d 828 (Fla. 1990). “[U]nder the ‘common fund doctrine’ lawyers who recover a common fund for the benefit of others are entitled to reasonably attorney fees from the fund.” *Kuhnlein*, 662 So. 2d at 314. To calculate the attorneys’ fee to be awarded out of the common fund, the Court should examine Class Counsel’s lodestar (the hours reasonably expended at appropriate hourly rates), enhanced by a

contingency risk and/or results achieved multiplier. In *Kuhnlein*, the Court identified the various factors for determining the reasonableness of the attorneys' fees:

1. the time and labor required, the novelty, complexity, and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly;
2. the likelihood that the acceptance of the particular employment will preclude other employment by the lawyer;
3. the fee, or rate of fee, customarily charged in the locality for legal services of a comparable or similar nature;
4. the significance of, or amount involved in, the subject matter of the representation, the responsibility involved in the representation, and the results obtained;
5. the time limitations imposed by the client or by the circumstances and, as between attorney and client, any additional or special time demands or requests of the attorney by the client;
6. the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client;
7. the experience, reputation, diligence, and ability of the lawyer or lawyers performing the service and the skill, expertise, or efficiency of effort reflected in the actual providing of such services; and
8. whether the fee is fixed or contingent, and, if fixed as to the amount or rate, then whether the client's ability to pay rested to any significant degree on the outcome of the representation.

Id. at 323 n.5; *see also Nelson*, 985 So. 2d at 573. As discussed below, these factors support the \$2.85 million requested in this Action, apply a contingency risk multiplier of approximately 5.0, which the Florida Supreme Court recognized in *Kuhnlein* should be applied "in recognition of the substantial benefit class counsel conferred upon the class members." 662 So. 2d at 315. The Court has full discretion on approving a multiplier. A multiplier of five, although on the higher end of the range, is typically approved in common fund cases, with the *Kuhnlein* court reasoning that an "increased maximum multiplier . . . is appropriate in common-fund cases . . . to place greater emphasis on the monetary results achieved. Furthermore, a multiplier which increases fees to five

times the accepted hourly rate is sufficient to alleviate the contingency risk factor involved and attract high level counsel to common fund cases while producing a fee which remains within the bounds of reasonableness.” *Id.* See also *Ramos v. Phillip Morris Cos.*, 743 So. 2d 24, 32 (Fla. 3d DCA 1999) (recognizing a multiplier of five was justified).

1. *The Time and Labor Required, the Novelty, Complexity, and Difficulty of the Questions Involved, and the Skill Requisite to Perform the Legal Service Properly*

Prosecuting and settling the Action demanded considerable time, labor, and skill. Joint Decl. ¶ 45. Class Counsel’s work on this matter includes: investigating the cause and effects of alleged unlawful sharing of Plaintiffs’ and Settlement Class Members’ information, interviewing potential clients, evaluating the potential class representatives, contributing to the evaluation of the merits of the Action before filing of the federal complaint, conducting legal research, drafting the federal complaint and litigating there, drafting the Complaint in this Action, working with experts, preparing discovery requests in advance of mediation, drafting the mediation statement, attending mediation, negotiating the terms of the Settlement, drafting a settlement term sheet, negotiating and drafting the Settlement Agreement, interviewing and selecting the Settlement Administrator, creating the relevant notices of settlement, drafting the Motion for Preliminary Approval and Motion for Final Approval including Class Counsel’s Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards and multiple declarations, communicating with defense counsel, providing updates to and handling questions from the Class Representatives, and preparing for the Final Approval Hearing. *Id.* ¶ 47.

Further, as explained *supra*, the Action presented complex questions of law and fact. See footnote 5, *supra*. As a result, the Settlement Class may never have secured relief, financial or otherwise, absent this Settlement. Joint Decl. ¶ 48. Without reaching a swift settlement, Plaintiffs

would have otherwise endured lengthy, expensive, and arduous litigation, during which they would still be exposed to the risk of identity theft. *Id.* Accordingly, the requested attorneys' fee award considers the novel, complex, and difficult nature of data breach class action cases and appropriately compensates Class Counsel's ability to resolve this matter efficiently while recovering the maximum amount available to the Settlement Class in a timely manner.

Indeed, Class Counsel's skill and experience in complex class action litigation weigh in favor of the requested attorneys' fee award. Joint Decl. ¶ 46. Class Counsel's background demonstrates that Class Counsel is experienced in the highly specialized field of class action litigation – particularly data breach class action litigation – and are well-credentialed and equal to the difficult and novel tasks at hand. *Id.* Class Counsel's attorneys' fee request is commensurate with that experience, which was leveraged here to procure the Settlement via early resolution of the Action.

2. The Likelihood that the Acceptance of the Particular Employment Will Preclude other Employment by the Lawyer

This Action required substantial time and labor from the attorneys. *Id.* ¶ 54. Accepting a putative class action of this difficulty and magnitude with over a million putative class members, and the inherent and substantial risk involved, substantially impeded Class Counsel's ability to work on other fee-generating and/or lower risk cases from the time the Action was being investigated throughout the litigation. *Id.*

3. The Fee, or Rate of Fee, Customarily Charged in the Locality for Legal Services of a Comparable or Similar Nature

Class Counsel have significant and unique legal experience in consumer class action litigation, and data breach litigation specifically. *Id.* ¶ 56. The hourly rates charged by Class Counsel range from \$900.00 to \$1,175.00 per hour for attorneys. *Id.* ¶ 61. These hourly rates are

within the range of hourly rates approved by Florida courts and elsewhere in the United States for legal services in class actions of a similar nature, considering the type of matter, level of experience, training, and education. *Id.* In *United States Sugar Corp. v. Commerce and Indus. Ins. Co.*, No. 22-cv-21737-Scola, 2022 WL 4953191 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 3, 2023), the Court noted: “The South Florida legal market has changed drastically in the last several years. Miami in particular has developed into a national legal market. That top-end firms will be able to charge national hourly rates in South Florida, now, is an inevitable consequence of that development.” The Court approved hourly rates ranging between nine hundred dollars and just over a thousand dollars per hour for senior attorneys. *Id.*; *see also, e.g., Sos v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No. 6:17-cv-890-PGB-LRH, 2021 WL 1186811, at *4 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 19, 2021). With inflation, rates have increased even further. Joint Decl. Given the experience, reputation, and skills of Class Counsel, these hourly rates are reasonable and are well within those customarily charged in this locale for services of a similar nature. *Id.* ¶ 62. Courts around the country have approved Class Counsel’s rates. *Id.*

Based on 514 hours of work, Class Counsel’s currently lodestar (hours x hourly rates) is approximately \$540,000. *Id.* ¶ 49. This amount does not include an estimated 40 hours that Class Counsel will spend preparing for and attending the Final Approval Hearing and assisting the Settlement Administrator following Final Approval. *Id.* This additional time will increase the lodestar to approximately \$580,000, which will result in a multiplier of approximately 4.9. *Id.*

As noted above, a multiplier of five times the lodestar amount is not unreasonable for Class Counsel to seek as an attorneys’ fee. *See Kuhnlein*, 662 So. 2d at 313-15; *Ramos*, 743 So. 2d at 32. The requested award is justified in light of the fact that Class Counsel rendered services without compensation, achieved an outstanding result with a highly substantial value, and billed at rates

commensurate with their unique experience. *See* Joint Decl. ¶ 50. The requested attorneys' fee is also fair in view of the complicated nature of the Action and the time, effort, and skill required. *Id.* The financial risks borne by Class Counsel fully support the fee requested. *Id.*

Though Florida state courts are instructed to assess fees using the lodestar with multiplier analysis in common fund cases, Class Counsel believe it is also helpful for the Court to consider that historically courts approving fee requests in other data breach settlements have approved awards amounting up to 35% of the non-reversionary all cash settlement fund, applying the percentage of the fund approach. *See, e.g., Garza v. HealthAlliance, Inc.*, No. 72450/2023 (NY Sup. Ct., Westchester Cty. Dec. 9, 2024) (approving 35% of common fund); *In re Fortra File Transfer Software Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 24-MD-03090, 2025 WL 2675178 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 17, 2025) (one-third of settlement fund); *In re Fortra File Transfer Software Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 24-MD-03090, 2025 WL 457896 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 11, 2025) (same); *Cravens v. Garda CL Se., Inc.*, No. 9:24-cv-80400-BER, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 178343 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 11, 2025) (same); *Kondo, et al. v. Creative Services, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-10438-DJC, ECF No. 39 (D. Mass. Sept. 7, 2023) (same); *Ford v. Takeda Pharms. U.S.A., Inc.*, No. 1:21-cv-10090-WGY, 2023 WL 3679031 at *3 (D. Mass. Mar. 31, 2023) (same); *Abrams, et al. v. The Savannah College of Art and Design Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-04297-LMM, ECF No. 29 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 23, 2023) (same); *Phelps, et al. v. Toyotetsu North America*, No. 6:22-cv-00106-CHB-HA, ECF No. 47 (E.D. Ken. Oct. 25, 2023) (same); *In re: Forefront Data Breach Litigation*, Case No. 1:21-cv-000887-LA, 2023 WL 6215366, at *9 (E.D. Wis. Mar. 22, 2023) (same); *Davidson v. Healthgrades Operating Company, Inc.*, Case No. 1:21-cv-01250-RBJ, ECF No. 50 (D. Colo. Aug. 22, 2022) (same). Indeed, “[c]ourts routinely hold that one-third of a common fund is an appropriate attorneys’ fees award in [a] class action settlement[.]” *Koszyk v. Country Fin.*, No. 16-cv-3571, 2016 WL 5109196, at *4 (N.D. Ill.

Sept. 16, 2016). The 35% requested attorneys' fee award sought here is squarely in line with fee awards approved in other settled class actions. *Wolfgeher v. Commerce Bank, N.A.*, No. 1:09-MD-02036-JLK (S.D. Fla.) (Dkt. 3574) (awarding 38% of common fund); *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.*, No. 1:09-MD-02036-JLK, 2020 WL 4586398 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 10, 2020) (awarding 35% of common fund); *Swift v BancorpSouth*, No. 1:10-cv-00090-GRJ (N.D. Fla.) (same).

4. The Significance of, or Amount Involved in the Subject Matter of the Representation, the Responsibility Involved in the Representation, and the Results Obtained

This Action raises issues of genuine importance to over a million people who were affected by the Data Incident. Because of the significant risks associated with this Action and potential barriers faced by the Plaintiffs, Class Counsel achieved a solid recovery for the Settlement Class that included substantial monetary benefits. *See* Joint Decl. ¶ 37. The Settlement structure and corresponding benefits are well within the range of other recent data breach settlements when you compare the size of the class and benefits obtained. *Id.* ¶ 38.

Indeed, the result here demonstrates why the requested fee award is reasonable. The result achieved is a major factor to consider in making a fee award. *Kuhnlein*, 662 So. 2d at 315. *See also Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 436, (1983) (“critical factor is the degree of success obtained”); *Pinto v. Princess Cruise Lines*, 513 F. Supp. 2d 1334, 1342 (S.D. Fla. 2007); *Behrens*, 118 F.R.D. at 547-48 (“The quality of work performed in a case that settles before trial is best measured by the benefit obtained.”).

5. The Time Limitations Imposed by the Client or by the Circumstances and, as Between Attorney and Client, Any Additional or Special Time Demands or Requests of the Attorney by the Client

Class Counsel incorporate by reference the previous discussion regarding their inability to

work on other cases because of the time burdens of this Action and its importance. *See* Joint Decl. ¶ 57. With respect to demands imposed by the client, the representation of the Settlement Class does not end with Final Approval of the Settlement. *Id.* ¶ 58. Ultimately, Class Counsel are responsible for seeing that the terms of the Settlement are followed, which will involve a substantial time commitment. *Id.* ¶ 59.

6. *The Nature and Length of the Professional Relationship with the Client*

Class Counsel and Plaintiffs have had a relationship from well before filing the Complaint in this Action and will continue to work with one another for a few more months, including time after Final Approval. *Id.* ¶ 52. The investigation, prosecution, and settlement of this Action has required a substantial amount of Class Counsel's time and effort. *Id.* Class Counsel spent significant time working with the Plaintiffs—investigating the Action and keeping them informed of the progress of the Action. *Id.*

7. *The Experience, Reputation, Diligence and Ability of the Lawyer or Lawyers Performing the Service and the Skill, Expertise or Efficiency of Effort Reflected in the Actual Providing of Such Services*

Class Counsel have demonstrated their skills, experience, and reputation. Class Counsel have extensive experience in the litigation, certification, trial, and settlement of consumer class-action litigation, and specifically in data breach litigation. *Id.* ¶ 46. There are few, if any, firms in the nation with the expertise of Class Counsel in these types of cases. *Id.* Class Counsel have collectively recovered billions of dollars for the classes they represented in hundreds of cases. *Id.* In negotiating this Settlement, Class Counsel had the benefit of years of experience and a familiarity with the facts of this Action as well as with other data breach cases. *Id.*

Class Counsel's reputation, diligence, expertise, and skills are reflected in the work they performed and the results they achieved. The fact that Class Counsel were able to successfully

resolve the Action that will pay up to \$2,500 per person for documented losses and valuable Medical Data Monitoring for the entire Settlement Class is testament to their skill, expertise, and efficiency of effort despite the potential hurdles presented, including appellate proceedings.

8. *Whether the Fee Is Fixed or Contingent, and if Fixed as to the Amount or Rate, Then Whether the Client's Ability to Pay Rested to Any Significant Degree on the Outcome of the Representation*

The fee arrangement in this matter was fully contingent, meaning that Class Counsel have not received any compensation for their services in this Action after rendering the services described above. *Id.* ¶ 60. The fully contingent nature of this representation further supports the requested fee award, applying the requested multiplier.

Indeed, “[a] contingency fee arrangement often justifies an increase in the award of attorney’s fees.” *Behrens*, 118 F.R.D. at 548; *see also In re Continental Ill. Sec. Litig.*, 962 F.2d 566 (7th Cir. 1992) (holding that when a common fund case has been prosecuted on a contingent basis, plaintiffs’ counsel must be compensated adequately for the risk of non-payment); *Ressler*, 149 F.R.D. at 656 (“Numerous cases recognize that the attorney’s contingent fee risk is an important factor in determining the fee award”); *Walters v. Atlanta*, 652 F. Supp. 755, 759 (N.D. Ga. 1985), *modified*, 803 F.2d 1135 (11th Cir. 1986); *York v. Alabama Senate Bd. of Ed.*, 631 F. Supp. 78, 86 (M.D. Ala. 1986). As the *Behrens* court observed:

Generally, the contingency retainment must be promoted to assure representation when a person could not otherwise afford the services of a lawyer. . . . A contingency fee arrangement often justifies an increase in the award of attorney’s fees. This rule helps assure that the contingency fee arrangement endures. If this “bonus” methodology did not exist, very few lawyers could take on the representation of a class client given the investment of substantial time, effort, and money, especially in light of the risks of recovering nothing.

Behrens, 118 F.R.D. at 548.

That multiplier specifically addresses the contingent nature of Class Counsel’s

representation of Plaintiffs, the putative class, and now the Settlement Class and the results Class Counsel obtained for them. *Kuhnlein*, 662 So. 2d at 315. Class Counsel received no compensation during the course of this Action and have incurred expenses litigating on behalf of the Settlement Class before this Court, which they risked losing had Defendant prevailed at the motion to dismiss, summary judgment, class certification, trial, or appellate stages. From the time Class Counsel filed the Action, there existed a real possibility they would achieve no recovery and, hence, no compensation. Joint Decl. ¶ 60.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel respectfully request this Court enter an order: (a) granting Final Approval of the Settlement; (b) affirming certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes; (c) reaffirming the appointment of Plaintiffs as Class Representatives; (d) reaffirming the appointments of Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as Class Counsel; (e) awarding Class Counsel \$2.85 million in attorneys' fees and costs; (f) awarding Service Awards to the Class Representatives in the amount of \$2,500 each; (g) overruling timely objections, if any; and (h) entering final judgment dismissing the Action with prejudice and reserving jurisdiction over Settlement implementation. Plaintiffs attach a proposed Final Approval Order as *Exhibit D*.

Dated: November 14, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Ostrow

Jeff Ostrow (FBN 121452)

KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.

One West Las Olas Blvd., Suite 500

Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

Tele: 954.332-4200

ostrow@kolawyers.com

Mariya Weekes
Florida Bar No. 56299
MILBERG PLLC
333 SE 2nd Ave., Suite 2000
Miami, FL, 33131
Tel: (786) 879-8200
mweekes@milberg.com

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERRAL PURSUANT TO FLA. R. CIV. P. 1.202

I certify that prior to filing this motion, I discussed the relief requested in this motion via email with Defendant's counsel who, consistent with the Settlement Agreement, represented that Defendant agrees to the Final Approval of the Settlement and does not oppose the amount of attorneys' fees and costs and Service Awards sought herein.

/s/ Jeff Ostrow
Jeff Ostrow (FBN 121452)
KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.
One West Las Olas Blvd., Suite 500
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Tel: (954) 332-4200
ostrow@kolawyers.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 14, 2025, the foregoing document was filed via the Court's ECF system, which will cause a true and correct copy of the same to be served electronically on all ECF-registered counsel of record.

/s/ Jeff Ostrow
Jeff Ostrow (FBN 121452)
KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.
One West Las Olas Blvd., Suite 500
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Tel: 954-332-4200
ostrow@kolawyers.com

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND
FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

GINA LETIZIO, EDUARDO GUILLEN,
ISABEL REEVES, PAUL COONS, as executor
of the Estate of ELIZABETH BISSELL, JOHN
CRERAR, and CHRISTOPHER SHARP,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

CASE NO.: CACE-25-011999

Plaintiffs,

v.

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP. f/k/a
AKUMIN CORP.,

Defendant.

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASES

This Settlement Agreement¹ is entered into between Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, and Defendant, as of the date last signed below. The Parties hereby agree to the following terms in full settlement of the Action, subject to a Final Approval Order entered by the Court.

I. Procedural History

1. Defendant is a radiology and oncology service provider based in Florida. Defendant collects, maintains, and stores information pertaining to current and former employees and patients, including confidential personally identifiable information and protected health information.

2. On October 11, 2023, a Data Incident occurred on Defendant's computer systems.

¹ All capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as those defined in Section II herein.

In response, Defendant immediately launched an investigation revealing that on that date, an unauthorized third party accessed and encrypted files for the purpose of extortion. This included temporary access to certain files from Defendant's system, which may have involved the following information entrusted to Defendant for either treatment or employment, or both: names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, driver's license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID, other patient identifier, other unique individual identifier, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information, and/or electronic signatures.

3. On October 12, 2023, Defendant released a statement about the attack on its website and further updated its patients via the website on December 20, 2024. Additionally, Defendant filed a Form-8-K with the Securities and Exchange Commission further alerting the public about the breach on October 16, 2023. Defendant updated its public filings with the SEC on October 20, 2023, and November 2, 2023. Initial direct notice was sent to 7,125 individuals on December 29, 2023.

4. On December 23, 2024, Defendant began sending notice letters to additional affected individuals regarding the Data Incident.

5. Thereafter, on December 26, 2024, the first complaint against Defendant asserting several causes of action related to its role in the Data Incident was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida. *Zayat v. Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp.*, No. 0:24-cv-62439 (S.D. Fla.).

6. Following the filing of that complaint, Defendant was named in other putative related class actions, defined below as the Related Actions, that were materially and substantively identical, as they had overlapping claims, sought to represent the same putative class members, and arose out of the Data Incident.

7. On December 30, 2024, Plaintiffs in the Related Actions filed a Motion to Consolidate Actions and Appoint Interim Class Counsel.

8. On February 27, 2025, the court entered an order consolidating the Related Actions into the first-filed action and set a deadline for applications for interim class counsel for Plaintiffs to file a consolidated complaint following the appointment of interim class counsel.

9. On March 3, 2025, Plaintiffs renewed their motion to appoint Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as interim class counsel, expressly noting the consent of all Plaintiffs, and the motion was granted on March 5, 2025.

10. On April 14, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a consolidated complaint alleging negligence and negligence *per se*, breach of implied contract, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of confidence, unjust enrichment, and declaratory judgment.

11. On April 30, 2025, the Parties filed a joint discovery report pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), and on May 7, 2025, the court entered a trial and pre-trial schedule.

12. On May 14, 2025, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss the consolidated complaint.

13. Thereafter, the Parties decided to explore early resolution and scheduled a mediation for August 7, 2025, with experienced data breach class action mediator Rodney A. Max, Esq., of Upchurch Watson White & Max.

14. On May 19, 2025, to conserve resources in anticipation of mediation, the Parties jointly moved to stay the case pending mediation, which the court granted.

15. In advance of the mediation, Plaintiffs consulted with their damage and liability experts, propounded informal discovery requests on Defendant to which Defendant responded by providing information related to, among other things, the nature and cause of the Data Incident, the number and geographic location of victims impacted by the Data Incident, and the specific type of information breached. Defendant also propounded discovery requests on Plaintiffs, and they provided documentation supporting their allegations of actual fraud and mitigation of the risk of fraud following the Data Incident.

16. The Parties attended mediation on August 7, 2025. After a full day of negotiating, the Parties reached an agreement on the material terms of this Settlement. During those negotiations, the Parties determined that jurisdiction was proper in state court.

17. Consequently, on August 11, 2025, Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the *Zayatz* case without prejudice. Plaintiffs then filed the Action in this Court. On August 15, 2025, Judge Raag Singhal entered an Order of Dismissal, closing the case.

18. The Parties now agree to settle the Action (including all allegations made in the Related Actions) entirely, without any admission of liability or wrongdoing, with respect to all Released Claims of the Releasing Parties. Defendant has entered into this Agreement to resolve all controversies and disputes arising out of or relating to the allegations made in the Complaint, and to avoid the litigation costs and expenses, distractions, burden, expense, and disruption to its business operations associated with further litigation. Defendant does not in any way acknowledge, admit to, or concede any of the allegations made in any of the Complaints (and similarly does not concede any of the allegations in the other complaints in the Related Actions), and expressly disclaims and denies any fault or liability, or any charges of wrongdoing that have been or could have been asserted in the Complaint. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall be used or

construed as an admission of liability, and this Agreement shall not be offered or received in evidence in any action or proceeding in any court or other forum as an admission or concession of liability or wrongdoing of any nature or for any other purpose other than to enforce the terms of this Agreement. Plaintiffs have entered into this Agreement to recover on the claims asserted in the Complaint, and to avoid the risk, delay, and uncertainty of continued litigation. Plaintiffs do not in any way concede that the claims alleged in the Complaint lack merit or are subject to any defenses. The Parties intend this Agreement to bind Plaintiffs, Defendant, and all Settlement Class Members.

NOW, THEREFORE, in light of the foregoing, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby mutually acknowledged, the Parties agree, subject to approval by the Court, as follows:

II. Definitions

19. “**Action**” means the consolidated class action lawsuit titled: *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp.*, Case No. CACE-25-011999 (Fla. Cir. Ct., Broward Cnty.).

20. “**Agreement**” or “**Settlement Agreement**” or “**Settlement**” means this agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendant, including all exhibits.

21. “**Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs and Service Awards**” means the application made with the Motion for Final Approval seeking Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs, and Service Awards for the Class Representatives.

22. “**Attorneys’ Fees and Costs**” means such funds as may be awarded by the Court consistent with the terms of this Agreement to Plaintiffs’ Counsel for their past, present, and future work, efforts, and expenditures in connection with this Action and settlement, including fees, costs,

and expenses of any co-counsel, local counsel, experts, consultants, or other individuals retained by, or who assisted Plaintiffs' Counsel in connection with this Action and settlement, as described more particularly in Section XI of this Agreement.

20. **"Cash Payment for Documented Losses"** means the Settlement Class Member Benefit consisting of a maximum payment of \$2,500.00, that Settlement Class members, who incurred Documented Losses, may elect pursuant to Section V herein.

21. **"Claim"** means the submission of a Claim Form by a Claimant for Settlement Class Member Benefits.

22. **"Claim Form"** means the proof of claim, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit 4*, which may be modified, subject to the Parties' approval, to meet the requirements of the Settlement Administrator.

23. **"Claim Form Deadline"** shall be 15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing and is the last day by which a Claim Form may be submitted to the Settlement Administrator for a Settlement Class member to be eligible for a Cash Payment and/or Medical Data Monitoring.

24. **"Claimant"** means an individual who submits a Claim Form.

25. **"Claims Process"** means the process by which Claimants may submit Claim Forms online at the Settlement Website or by mail to the Settlement Administrator, including the procedure to approve or reject Claims.

26. **"Class Counsel"** means Jeff Ostrow of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. and Mariya Weekes of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, PLLC.

27. **"Class List"** means the list of Settlement Class Members' names and postal addresses and/or email addresses, if maintained by the Defendant, that Defendant shall prepare

and provide to the Settlement Administrator following Preliminary Approval.

28. “**Class Representatives**” means the Plaintiffs approved by the Court to serve as representatives of the Settlement Class.

29. “**Complaint**” means the Class Action Complaint filed by Plaintiffs in this Action on August 11, 2025.

30. “**Court**” means the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit Court in and for Broward County, Florida, and the Judge(s) assigned to the Action.

31. “**Data Incident**” means the cybersecurity incident involving Defendant resulting in the unauthorized access to or acquisition of Settlement Class Members’ Private Information on or about October 11, 2023.

32. “**Defendant**” means Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp, the defendant in this Action.

33. “**Defendant’s Counsel**” means Sidley Austin LLP.

34. “**Documented Losses**” means actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary losses due to fraud or identity theft resulting directly from fraud or identity theft caused by the Data Incident, if the loss: (i) is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss due to fraud or identity theft; (ii) is fairly traceable to the Data Incident; (iii) occurred after the Data Incident and before the Claim Form Deadline; and (iv) the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all available credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance.

35. “**Effective Date**” means the day after the entry of the Final Approval Order, provided there are no objections to the Settlement. If there are objections to the Settlement, then the Effective Date shall be the later of: (a) 30 days after entry of the Final Approval Order if no

appeals are taken from the Final Approval Order; or (b) if appeals are taken from the Final Approval Order, the termination of such appeal, on terms that affirm the Final Approval or dismiss the appeal with no material modification to the Final Approval. As used in this paragraph, the phrase “termination of such appeal,” means the date upon which the relevant appellate court issues its remittitur.”

36. “**Email Notice**” means the email form of Notice of the Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit 1*, distributed to Settlement Class members for which email addresses are maintained by Defendant.

37. “**Final Approval**” means the final approval of the Settlement, which occurs when the Court enters the Final Approval Order, substantially in the form attached to the Motion for Final Approval.

38. “**Final Approval Hearing**” means the hearing held before the Court during which the Court will consider granting Final Approval of the Settlement and the Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs and Service Awards.

39. “**Final Approval Order**” means the final order, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit 6*, that the Court enters granting Final Approval of the Settlement. Final Approval Order also includes the orders, which may be entered separately, determining the amount of attorneys’ fees and costs awarded to Class Counsel and Service Awards to the Class Representatives.

40. “**Long Form Notice**” means the long form notice of the Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit 2*, that shall be posted on the Settlement Website and shall be available to Settlement Class members by mail on request made to the Settlement Administrator.

41. **“Medical Data Monitoring”** means the one year of CyEx, LLC’s (“CyEx”) Medical Shield Complete service that Settlement Class members may elect to receive pursuant to Section V herein.

42. **“Motion for Final Approval”** means the motion that Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file with the Court seeking Final Approval of the Settlement, including Class Counsel’s Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards.

43. **“Motion for Preliminary Approval”** means the motion that Plaintiffs shall file with the Court seeking Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

44. **“Notice”** means the Email Notice, Publication Notice, and Long Form Notice that Plaintiffs will ask the Court to approve in connection with the Motion for Preliminary Approval.

45. **“Notice Program”** means the methods provided for in this Agreement for giving Notice to the Settlement Class and consists of the Email Notice, Publication Notice, and Long Form Notice.

46. **“Notice of Deficiency”** means the notice sent by the Settlement Administrator to a Settlement Class member who has submitted an invalid Claim.

47. **“Objection Deadline”** means 15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing.

48. **“Opt-Out Deadline”** means 15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing.

49. **“Party”** means each of the Plaintiffs and Defendant, and **“Parties”** means Plaintiffs and Defendant, collectively.

50. **“Plaintiffs”** means Gina Letizio, Eduardo Guillen, Isabel Reeves, Paul Coons as executor of the Estate of Elizabeth Bissell, John Crerar, and Christopher Sharp.

51. “**Preliminary Approval**” means the preliminary approval of the Settlement, which occurs when the Court enters the Preliminary Approval Order, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit 5*.

52. “**Preliminary Approval Order**” means the order preliminarily approving the Settlement and proposed Notice Program, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit 5*.

53. “**Private Information**” means the information collected by Defendant, pertaining to current and former employees and patients, that was impacted in the Data Incident, which may include, depending on the impacted individual, names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, driver’s license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID, other patient identifier, other unique individual identifier, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information, and/or electronic signatures.

54. “**Publication Notice**” means the publication notice of the Settlement, substantially in the form attached as *Exhibit 3*, that the Settlement Administrator shall publish notifying Settlement Class Members about the Settlement.

55. “**Related Actions**” means the lawsuits titled: *Gina Letizio v. Akumin Operating Corp.*, No. 0:24-cv-62440; *Michele Mariano Guerra v. Akumin Operating Corp.*, No. 0:24-cv-60067; *Zayatz v. Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp.*, No. 0:24-cv-62439 (S.D. Fla.); and *Eduardo Guillen v. Akumin Operating Corp.*, No. 0:24-cv-60088.

56. “**Releases**” means the releases and waiver set forth in Section XI of this Agreement.

57. **“Released Claims”** means any and all actual, potential, filed or unfiled, known or unknown, fixed or contingent, claimed or unclaimed, suspected or unsuspected claims, demands, liabilities, rights, causes of action, damages, punitive, exemplary or multiplied damages, expenses, costs, indemnities, attorneys’ fees and/or obligations, whether in law or in equity, accrued or unaccrued, direct, individual or representative, of every nature and description whatsoever, based on any federal, state, local, statutory or common law or any other law, against the Released Parties, or any of them, arising out of or relating to actual or alleged facts, transactions, events, matters, occurrences, acts, disclosures, statements, representations, omissions or failures to act relating to the Data Incident.

58. **“Released Parties”** means Defendant and each entity which is controlled by, controlling or under common control with Defendant and its past, present, and future direct and indirect heirs, assigns, associates, corporations, investors, owners, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, divisions, officers, directors, shareholders, members, agents, servants, employees, partners, attorneys, insurers, reinsurers, benefit plans, predecessors, successors, managers, administrators, executors, and trustees.

59. **“Releasing Parties”** means Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members and their respective past, present, and future heirs, devisees, beneficiaries, conservators, executors, estates, administrators, assigns, trustees, receivers, agents, attorneys, accountants, financial and other advisors, and any other representatives of any of these persons and entities.

60. **“Settlement Administrator”** means Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. or Epiq, unless another third-party administrator is later agreed to by the Parties in writing and approved by the Court.

61. **“Service Awards”** means the awards that Class Counsel will request the Court

approve for the Plaintiffs for serving as Class Representatives.

62. “**Settlement Administration Costs**” means all costs and fees of the Settlement Administrator regarding Notice and Settlement administration.

63. “**Settlement Class**” means all living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant; (b) governmental entities; and (c) the Judge assigned to the Action, that Judge’s immediate family, and Court staff.

64. “**Settlement Class Member**” means any member of the Settlement Class who has not opted-out of the Settlement.

65. “**Settlement Class Member Benefits**” means the Cash Payment and/or Medical Data Monitoring that Settlement Class members may elect to Claim pursuant to Section V herein.

66. “**Settlement Website**” means the website the Settlement Administrator will establish as a means for the Settlement Class members to submit Claim Forms and obtain notice and information about the Settlement, including hyperlinked access to this Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, Long Form Notice, Claim Form, Motion for Final Approval and Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards, and Final Approval Order, as well as other documents as the Parties agree to post or the Court orders posted. The Settlement Website shall remain online and operable for at least six months after Final Approval.

67. “**Valid Claim**” means a Claim Form submitted by a Settlement Class member that is: (a) submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Settlement; (b) accurately, fully, and truthfully completed and executed, with all of the information requested in the Claim Form, by a Settlement Class Member; (c) signed physically or by e-signature by a Settlement Class Member

personally, subject to the penalty of perjury; (d) returned via mail and postmarked by the Claim Form Deadline, or, if submitted online, submitted by 11:59 p.m. Eastern time on the Claim Form Deadline; and (e) determined to be valid by the Settlement Administrator after the Settlement Administrator confirms the accuracy of all information and documentation requested in the Claim Form. The Settlement Administrator may require additional information from the Claimant to validate the Claim, including, but not limited to, answers related to questions regarding the validity or legitimacy of the physical or e-signature. Failure to respond to the Settlement Administrator's Notice of Deficiency may result in a determination that the Claim is not a Valid Claim.

III. Certification of the Settlement Class

68. In the Motion for Preliminary Approval, Plaintiffs shall propose and request to the Court that the Settlement Class be certified for Settlement purposes only. Defendant agrees solely for purposes of the Settlement provided for in this Agreement, and the implementation of such Settlement, that this case shall proceed as a class action; provided however, that if a Final Approval Order is not issued or the Effective Date for any reason does not occur, then any certification shall be null and void and, for the avoidance of doubt, Defendant shall retain all rights to object to any future requests to certify a class and, in such instance, the action will continue as if the Settlement Class was never certified. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall not reference this Agreement in support of any subsequent motion for class certification of any class in the Action in such event. The fact that Defendants conditionally consented herein to certification of the Settlement Class shall not be used against Defendants by any Party or non-party for any purpose in this Litigation or any other action, lawsuit, or proceeding of any kind.

IV. Settlement Consideration

69. The Settlement includes the following benefits all of which will be paid by the

Defendants: (a) Cash Payments for Documented Losses; (b) one year of Medical Data Monitoring; Settlement Administration Costs; and (c) any Court-awarded Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Service Awards. Settlement Class Members who do not file a Valid Claim or those members who opt-out of the Settlement will not receive a Cash Payment and/or Medical Data Monitoring

a. Cash Payment for Documented Losses

All Settlement Class Members are eligible to submit a claim for a Cash Payment for Documented Losses for up to a maximum \$2,500.00 per Settlement Class Member upon presentment of reasonable documentation of losses related to the Data Incident. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in no event shall Defendant be obligated to fund more than \$1,500,000 in Documented Losses. Should claimed amounts exceed the \$1,500,000 Documented Loss funding maximum, Administrator shall determine proportional allocation of funds among valid claims. To receive payment for Documented Losses, a Settlement Class Member must complete and submit a Claim Form and include documentation in support of the Claim. Except as expressly provided herein, personal certifications, declarations, or affidavits from the Settlement Class Member do not constitute proper documentation, but may be included to provide clarification, context, or support for other submitted reasonable documentation. Settlement Class Members shall not be reimbursed for expenses if they have been reimbursed for the same expenses by another source, including compensation provided in connection with any credit monitoring and identity theft protection product or through a financial institution's consumer fraud policies. If a Settlement Class Member does not submit documentation supporting a loss, or if the Settlement Administrator rejects for any reason the Settlement Class Member's Claim and the Settlement Class Member fails to cure the Claim, the Claim will be rejected.

b. Medical Data Monitoring

In addition to a Cash Payment for Documented Losses, Settlement Class Members may also make a Claim for one year of Medical Data Monitoring. This includes credit monitoring with one bureau, with additional monitoring of: (a) healthcare insurance plan IDs; (b) healthcare beneficiary identifier ID; (c) medical records; (d) national provider identifier; (e) international classification of disease; (f) health savings account; (g) high-risk transactions; and (h) the dark web. The product also provides for \$1,000,000 of identity theft insurance and contains real-time alerts and victim assistance.

c. Settlement Administration Costs

Defendant shall be solely responsible for the payment of all Settlement Administration Costs, which in no event shall be more than \$250,000.00. Defendant shall pay the Settlement Administration Costs to the Settlement Administrator within 10 days of Preliminary Approval.

V. Settlement Approval

70. Within ten days following execution of this Agreement, Plaintiffs shall file the Motion for Preliminary Approval. The Motion for Preliminary Approval shall, among other things, request the Court: (1) preliminarily approve the terms of the Settlement as being within the range of fair, adequate, and reasonable; (2) provisionally certify the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only; (3) approve the Notice Program set forth herein and approve the form and content of the Notices of the Settlement; (4) approve the Claim Process set forth herein and approve the Claim Form; (5) approve the procedures for Settlement Class Members to opt-out of the Settlement or for Settlement Class Members to object to the Settlement; (6) appoint Plaintiffs as Class Representatives, and Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as Class Counsel for Settlement purposes; (7) stay the Action pending Final Approval of the Settlement; and (8) schedule a Final Approval

Hearing for a time and date mutually convenient for the Court, the Parties, Class Counsel, and Defendant's Counsel.

VI. Settlement Administrator

71. The Parties agree that, subject to Court approval, Epiq shall be the Settlement Administrator. Plaintiffs shall oversee the Settlement Administrator, and Defendant will provide information to the Settlement Administrator about the Settlement Class as the Settlement Administrator may require. The Settlement Administrator shall fulfill the requirements set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order and the Agreement and comply with all applicable laws, including, but not limited to, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

72. The Settlement Administrator shall administer various aspects of the Settlement as described in the next paragraph and perform such other functions as are specified for the Settlement Administrator elsewhere in this Agreement, including, but not limited to, effectuating the Notice Program, handling the Claims Process, and overseeing the distribution of Settlement Class Member Benefits.

73. The Settlement Administrator's duties include:

- a. Completing the Court-approved Notice Program by noticing the Settlement Class by Email Notice and/or Publication Notice, sending out Long Form Notices and paper Claim Forms on request from Settlement Class members, reviewing Claim Forms, notifying Claimants of deficient Claim Forms using the Notice of Deficiency, and sending Settlement Class Member Benefits to Settlement Class Members who submit Valid Claims;
- b. Establishing and maintaining a post office box to receive opt-out requests from the Settlement Class, objections from Settlement Class Members, and Claim Forms;
- c. Establishing and maintaining the Settlement Website to provide important

information and to receive electronic Claim Forms;

d. Establishing and maintaining an automated toll-free telephone line for Settlement Class Members to call with Settlement-related inquiries, and answering the frequently asked questions of Settlement Class Members who call with or otherwise communicate such inquiries;

e. Responding to any mailed Settlement Class Member inquiries;

f. Processing all opt-out requests from Settlement Class Members;

g. Providing weekly reports to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel that summarize the number of Claims submitted, Claims approved and rejected, Notice of Deficiency sent, opt-out requests and objections received that week, the total number of opt-out requests and objections received to date, and other pertinent information;

h. In advance of the Final Approval Hearing, preparing a declaration for the Parties confirming that the Notice Program was completed in accordance with the terms of this Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order, describing how the Notice Program was completed, indicating the number of Claim Forms received and the amount of each benefit claimed, providing the names of each Settlement Class Member who timely and properly requested to opt-out from the Settlement Class, indicating the number of objections received, and other information as may be necessary to allow the Parties to seek and obtain Final Approval;

i. Reviewing Claim Forms submitted by Settlement Class Members to determine whether they are eligible for a Cash Payment for Documented Losses and/or Medical Data Monitoring;

j. Collecting from Defendant the cash necessary to pay Valid Claims for Cash Payments for Documented Losses and to pay for Medical Data Monitoring;

k. Distributing Cash Payments for Documented Losses and ensuring Medical Data Monitoring codes are sent to Settlement Class Members who submit Valid Claims; and

l. Any other Settlement administration function at the instruction of Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel including, but not limited to, verifying that the Settlement Fund has been properly administered and that the Cash Payments have been properly distributed.

VII. Notice to the Settlement Class, Opt-Out Procedures, and Objection Procedures

74. Defendant will make available to Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator the Class List no later than five days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order. To the extent necessary, Defendant will cooperate with updating the Class List to accomplish the Notice Program and otherwise administer the Settlement.

75. Within 15 days following entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator shall commence the Notice Program using the forms of Notice approved by the Court. This includes Email Notice to those Settlement Class Members for which email addresses are available and Publication Notice for the remainder of the Settlement Class. The Publication Notice will be viewable by Settlement Class Members on their desktop, mobile and tablet devices, and will be distributed on the Internet and on social media and other platforms such as: Google Display Network, Facebook, Instagram, Reddit, and X. The Settlement Administrator will also place sponsored search listings on Google, Yahoo!, and Bing.

76. The Publication Notice shall direct Settlement Class Members to the Settlement Website where they can learn about the Settlement, inquire as to whether they are a Settlement Class Member, and submit a Claim. The Email Notice shall include, among other information: a description of the material terms of the Settlement; how to submit a Claim Form; the Claim Form Deadline; the Opt-Out Deadline for Settlement Class members to opt-out of the Settlement Class;

the Objection Deadline for Settlement Class Members to object to the Settlement and/or the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards; the Final Approval Hearing date; and the Settlement Website address at which Settlement Class members may access this Agreement and other related documents and information. Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel shall insert the correct dates and deadlines in the Notice before the Notice Program commences, based upon those dates and deadlines set by the Court in the Preliminary Approval Order. If the date or time for the Final Approval Hearing changes, the Settlement Administrator shall update the Settlement Website to reflect the new date. No additional notice to the Settlement Class is required if the date or time for the Final Approval Hearing changes.

77. The Settlement Administrator shall establish the Settlement Website no later than the day before Notice is first initiated. The Settlement Administrator shall ensure the Settlement Website makes available the Court-approved online Claim Form that can be submitted directly on the Settlement Website or in printable version that can be sent by U.S. Mail to the Settlement Administrator.

78. The Long Form Notice also shall include a procedure for Settlement Class Members to opt-out of the Settlement Class, and the Email Notice and Publication Notice shall direct Settlement Class Members to the Settlement Website where they may review the Long Form Notice or the Settlement Agreement to obtain the opt-out instructions. A Settlement Class Member may opt-out of the Settlement Class at any time before the Opt-Out Deadline by mailing a request to opt-out to the Settlement Administrator postmarked no later than the Opt-Out Deadline. The opt-out request must be personally signed by the Settlement Class Member and contain the requestor's name, address, telephone number, and email address (if any), and include a statement indicating a request to be excluded from the Settlement Class. Any Settlement Class Member who

does not timely and validly request to opt-out shall be bound by the terms of this Agreement even if that Settlement Class Member does not submit a Valid Claim.

79. The Long Form Notice also shall include a procedure for Settlement Class Members to object to the Settlement and/or the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards, and the Email Notice and Publication Notice shall direct Settlement Class Members to review the Long Form Notice to obtain the objection instructions. Objections must be filed with the Court, and sent by U.S. Mail to Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator. For an objection to be considered by the Court, the relevant Settlement Class Member must submit the objection no later than the Objection Deadline, as specified in the Notice, and the relevant Settlement Class Member must not have excluded herself from the Settlement Class. If submitted by mail, an objection shall be deemed to have been submitted when posted if received with a postmark date indicated on the envelope if mailed first-class postage prepaid. In other words, objections by mail postmarked later than the Objection Deadline are late and will not be considered by the Court. If submitted by courier (e.g., Federal Express), an objection shall be deemed to have been submitted on the shipping date reflected on the shipping label.

80. For an objection to be considered by the Court, the objection must also set forth:

- a. the objector's full name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
- b. all grounds for the objection, accompanied by any legal support for the objection known to the objector or objector's counsel;
- c. the number of times the objector has objected to a class action settlement within the 5 years preceding the date that the objector files the objection, the caption of each case in which the objector has made such objection, and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon

the objector's prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case;

d. the identity of all counsel who represent the objector, including any former or current counsel who may be entitled to compensation for any reason related to the objection to the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards;

e. the number of times in which the objector's counsel and/or counsel's law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date of the filed objection, the caption of each case in which counsel or the firm has made such objection and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon counsel's or the counsel's law firm's prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case in which the objector's counsel and/or counsel's law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the preceding five years;

f. the identity of all counsel (if any) representing the objector, and whether they will appear at the Final Approval Hearing;

g. a list of all persons who will be called to testify at the Final Approval Hearing in support of the objection (if any);

h. a statement confirming whether the objector intends to personally appear and/or testify at the Final Approval Hearing; and

i. the objector's signature (an attorney's signature is not sufficient).

Class Counsel and/or Defendant's Counsel may conduct limited discovery on any objector or objector's counsel. This includes taking depositions and requesting documents.

81. The Notice Program shall be completed no later than 30 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing.

VIII. Claim Process and Disbursement of Settlement Class Member Benefits

82. The Notice and the Settlement Website will explain to Settlement Class Members

that they may be entitled to a Settlement Class Member Benefit and how to submit a Claim Form.

83. Claim Forms may be submitted online through the Settlement Website or through U.S. Mail by sending them to the Settlement Administrator at the address designated on the Claim Form.

84. The Settlement Administrator shall collect, review, and address each Claim Form received to determine whether the Claim Form meets the requirements set forth in this Settlement and is thus a Valid Claim. The Settlement Administrator shall examine the Claim Form before designating the Claim as a Valid Claim to determine that the information on the Claim Form is reasonably complete. The Settlement Administrator shall have the sole authority to determine whether a Claim by any Claimant is a Valid Claim.

85. The Settlement Administrator shall use all reasonable efforts and means to identify and reject duplicate claims. No Settlement Class Member may submit more than one Claim Form. The Settlement Administrator shall identify any Claim Forms that appear to seek relief on behalf of the same Settlement Class Member. If the Settlement Administrator identifies any Claim Form that appears to be a duplication, the Settlement Administrator shall contact the Settlement Class Member in an effort to determine which Claim Form is the appropriate one for consideration.

86. The Settlement Administrator shall exercise, in its discretion, all usual and customary steps to prevent fraud and abuse and take any reasonable steps to prevent fraud and abuse in the Claim process. The Settlement Administrator may, in its discretion, deny in whole or in part any Claim Form to prevent actual or possible fraud or abuse. By agreement, the Parties can instruct the Settlement Administrator to take whatever steps it deems appropriate if the Settlement Administrator identifies actual or possible fraud or abuse relating to the submission of claims, including, but not limited to, denying in whole or in part any Claim to prevent actual or possible

fraud or abuse. If any fraud is detected or reasonably suspected, the Settlement Administrator and Parties may require information from Claimants or deny Claims, subject to the supervision of the Parties and ultimate oversight by the Court.

87. Claim Forms that do not meet the terms and conditions of this Settlement shall be promptly rejected by the Settlement Administrator and the Settlement Administrator shall advise the Claimant or Settlement Class Member of the reason(s) why the Claim Form was rejected. However, if the Claim Form is rejected for containing incomplete or inaccurate information, and/or omitting required information, the Settlement Administrator may send a Notice of Deficiency explaining what information is missing or inaccurate and needed to validate the Claim and have it submitted for consideration. The Settlement Administrator shall notify the Claimant using the contact information provided in the Claim Form. The additional information and/or documentation can include, for example, answers to questions regarding the validity of the Claimant's physical or e-signature. A Claimant shall have until the Claim Form Deadline, or 10 days from the date the Notice of Deficiency is sent to the Claimant via mail and postmarked or via email, whichever is later, to reply to the Notice of Deficiency and provide the required information. If the Claimant timely and adequately provides the requested information and/or documentation, the Claim shall be deemed a Valid Claim and processed by the Settlement Administrator. If the Claimant does not timely and completely provide the requested information and/or documentation, the Settlement Administrator shall reduce or deny the Claim unless Defendant and Class Counsel otherwise agree.

88. Where a good faith basis exists, the Settlement Administrator may reduce or reject a Claim for, among other reasons, the following:

- a. Failure to fully complete and/or sign the Claim Form;
- b. Illegible Claim Form;

- c. The Claim Form is fraudulent;
- d. The Claim Form is duplicative of another Claim Form;
- e. The Claimant is not a Settlement Class member;
- f. The Claimant submitted a timely and valid request to opt out of the Settlement Class.
- g. The person submitting the Claim Form requests that payment be made to a person or entity other than the Claimant for whom the Claim Form is submitted;
- h. Failure to submit a Claim Form by the Claim Form Deadline; and/or
- i. The Claim Form otherwise does not comply with the requirements of this Settlement.

89. The Settlement Administrator's reduction or denial of a Claim is final, subject to the following dispute resolution procedures:

- a. The Settlement Administrator shall have 30 days from the Claim Form Deadline to approve or reject Claims.
- b. A request for additional information by sending a Notice of Deficiency shall not be considered a denial for purposes of this Paragraph.
- c. If a Claim is rejected, the Settlement Administrator shall notify the Claimant using the contact information provided in the Claim Form. Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel shall be provided with copies of all such notifications to Claimants.
- d. The Settlement Administrator's determination as to whether to approve, deny, or reduce a Claim shall be final and binding.

90. The Settlement Administrator shall provide all information gathered in investigating Claims, including, but not limited to, copies of all correspondence and email and all

notes of the Settlement Administrator, the decision reached, and all reasons supporting the decision, if requested by Class Counsel or Defendant's Counsel. Additionally, Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel shall have the right to inspect the Claim Forms and supporting documentation received by the Settlement Administrator at any time upon reasonable notice.

91. No person or entity shall have any claim against Defendant, Defendant's Counsel, Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class, Class Counsel, and/or the Settlement Administrator based on any eligibility determinations, distributions, or awards made in accordance with this Settlement.

92. The Settlement Administrator shall send an invoice to the Defendant for the collection of funds necessary to pay for the Cash Payments for Documented Losses and for Medical Data Monitoring no later than 45 days after the Effective Date. The Defendant must pay the Settlement Administrator the amount on the invoice within 10 days of receipt. The Settlement Administrator shall distribute Cash Payments to Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims no later than 75 days after the Effective Date. All Medical Data Monitoring codes shall be emailed by CyEx to Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims no later than 75 days after the Effective Date.

93. Cash Payments to Settlement Class Members will be made by electronic payment or by paper check, by sending Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims an email to select from alternative forms of electronic payment or by paper check. Settlement Class Members will have a period of 180 days to select their electronic payment. In the event of any complications arising in connection with the issuance of an electronic payment, the Settlement Administrator shall provide written notice to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel. Absent specific instructions from Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel, the Settlement Administrator shall proceed to resolve the dispute using its best practices and procedures to ensure that the funds are

fairly and properly distributed to the person or persons who are entitled to receive them. In the event the Settlement Administrator is unable to distribute funds to the person or persons entitled to receive them due to incorrect or incomplete information provided to the Settlement Administrator, the Settlement Class Member shall forfeit their entitlement right to the funds.

94. Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims that elected to receive Medical Data Monitoring will receive an email on how to activate the monitoring,

IX. Final Approval Order and Final Judgment

95. Plaintiffs shall file their Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, inclusive of the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards, no later than 30 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will hear argument on Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement and Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards. In the Court's discretion, the Court will also hear argument at the Final Approval Hearing from any Settlement Class Members (or their counsel) who object to the Settlement and/or to the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards provided the objectors submitted timely objections that meet all of the requirements listed in this Agreement.

96. At or following the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will determine whether to enter the Final Approval Order and final judgment thereon, and whether to grant the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards. Such proposed Final Approval Order shall, among other things:

- a. Determine that the Settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable;
- b. Finally certify the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only;
- c. Determine that the Notice Program satisfies Due Process requirements;

d. Bar and enjoin all Releasing Parties from asserting or otherwise pursuing any of the Released Claims at any time and in any jurisdiction, including during any appeal from the Final Approval Order; and retain jurisdiction over the enforcement of the Court's injunctions;

e. Release Defendant and the other Released Parties from the Released Claims; and

f. Reserve the Court's continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Parties to this Agreement, including Defendant, Plaintiffs, all Settlement Class Members, and all objectors, to administer, supervise, construe, and enforce this Agreement in accordance with its terms.

X. Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards

97. *Service Awards* – In recognition of the time and effort Class Representatives expended in pursuing this Action and in fulfilling their obligations and responsibilities to the Class, and of the relief conferred on all Settlement Class Members by the Settlement, Class Counsel shall request a Service Award for Class Representatives in the amount not to exceed \$2,500.00 each. The Service Award payments to Class Representatives shall be separate and apart from their entitlement to Settlement Class Member Benefits. Defendant shall pay or cause to be paid the Court-approved Service Awards to Class Counsel by wire within fourteen days of Final Approval.

98. *Attorneys' Fees and Costs* – As part of the Motion for Final Approval, Plaintiffs will move the Court for an order awarding reasonable attorneys' fees and litigation costs of up to \$2,850,000.00. Defendant will not oppose Plaintiffs' request for attorneys' fees and costs up to that amount. Defendant shall pay or cause to be paid the Court-approved attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel by wire within fourteen days of Final Approval.

99. The Parties did not discuss the payment of attorneys' fees, costs, or Service Awards

until after the substantive terms of the Settlement had been agreed upon.

100. This Settlement is not contingent on approval of the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards, and if the Court denies the request or grants amounts less than what was requested, the remaining provisions of the Agreement shall remain in force.

XI. Releases

101. Upon the Effective Date, and in consideration of the settlement relief and other consideration described herein, the Releasing Parties shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Final Approval Order shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, acquitted, relinquished, and completely discharged the Released Parties from any and all Released Claims, including but not limited to any state law or common law claims arising out of or relating to the Data Incident that the Releasing Parties may have or had, such as under California's Consumer Privacy Act, California Civil Code section 1798.100, *et seq.* and/or California's Unfair Competition Law, California Civil Code section 17200 *et seq.* Each Party expressly waives all rights under California Civil Code section 1542, which provides:

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

The Releasing Parties also waive the provisions and rights of any law(s) that are comparable in effect to California Civil Code section 1542 (including, without limitation, Montana Code Ann. § 28-1-1602; North Dakota Cent. Code § 9-13-02; and South Dakota Codified Laws § 20-7-11). The Releasing Parties agree that, once this Agreement is executed, they will not, directly or indirectly, individually or in concert with another, maintain, cause to be maintained, or voluntarily assist in maintaining any further demand, action, claim, lawsuit, arbitration, or similar proceeding, in any

capacity whatsoever, against any of the Released Parties based on any of the Released Claims.

102. The Parties agree that the Released Claims contemplated in this Section XIII shall not be construed to release any causes of action brought to enforce the terms of the Agreement.

103. Settlement Class members who opt-out of the Settlement prior to the Opt-Out Deadline do not release their claims and will not obtain any benefits, including any Settlement Class Member Benefit, under the Settlement.

104. Upon the Effective Date: (a) this Settlement shall be the exclusive remedy for any and all Released Claims of Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members; and (b) Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members stipulate to be and shall be permanently barred and enjoined by Court order from initiating, asserting, or prosecuting any Released Claim against the Released Parties, whether on behalf of Plaintiffs, any Settlement Class Member or others, in any jurisdiction, including in any federal, state, or local court or tribunal.

XII. Termination of Settlement

105. This Agreement shall be subject to and is expressly conditioned on the occurrence of all of the following events:

a. Court approval of the Settlement consideration set forth in Section V and the Releases set forth in Section XIII of this Agreement;

b. The Court has entered the Preliminary Approval Order;

c. The Court has entered the Final Approval Order, and all objections, if any, are overruled, and all appeals taken from the Final Approval Order are resolved in favor of Final Approval; and

d. The Effective Date has occurred.

106. If any of the conditions specified in the preceding paragraph are not met, or if the

Court otherwise imposes any modification to or condition to approval of the Settlement to which the Parties do not consent, then this Agreement shall be cancelled and terminated, and will be of no force or effect, and will not be referred to or utilized for any purpose. Should the Court not enter the Preliminary Approval or the Final Approval Order, Defendant does not waive, and expressly reserves, all rights to defend this Action and oppose certification of any class in this action.

107. Defendant shall have the option to terminate this Agreement if more than 5% of the Settlement Class opt-out of the Settlement. Defendant shall notify Class Counsel and the Court of its intent to terminate this Agreement pursuant to this paragraph within 10 days after the end of the Opt-Out Period, or the option to terminate shall be considered waived.

108. In the event this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective, then the Parties shall return to the *status quo ante* in the Action as if the Parties had not entered into this Agreement, and the Parties shall jointly file a status report in the Court seeking to reopen the Action and all papers filed. In such event, the terms and provisions of this Agreement shall have no further force and effect with respect to the Parties and shall not be used in this Action or in any other action or proceeding for any other purpose, and any order entered by this Court in accordance with the terms of this Agreement shall be treated as vacated, *nunc pro tunc*.

XIII. Effect of Termination

109. The grounds upon which this Agreement may be terminated are set forth in Section XII. In the event of a termination, this Agreement shall be considered null and void; all of Plaintiffs', Class Counsel's, Defendant's, Defendant's Counsel's obligations under the Settlement shall cease to be of any force and effect; and the Parties shall return to the *status quo ante* in the Action as if the Parties had not entered into this Agreement. In addition, in the event of such a

termination, all of the Parties' respective pre-Settlement rights, claims, and defenses will be retained and preserved.

110. In the event the Settlement is terminated in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement, any discussions, offers, or negotiations associated with this Settlement shall not be discoverable or offered into evidence or used in the Action or any other action or proceeding for any purpose. In such event, all Parties to the Action shall stand in the same position as if this Agreement had not been negotiated, made, or filed with the Court.

XIV. No Admission of Liability

111. This Agreement reflects the Parties' compromise and settlement of disputed claims. This Agreement shall not be construed as or deemed to be evidence of an admission or concession of any point of fact or law. Defendant has denied and continues to deny each of the claims and contentions alleged in the Complaint. Defendant specifically denies that a class could or should be certified in the Action for litigation purposes. Defendant does not admit any liability or wrongdoing of any kind, by this Agreement or otherwise. Defendant has agreed to enter into this Agreement to avoid the further expense, inconvenience, and distraction of burdensome and protracted litigation, and to be completely free of any further claims that were asserted or could possibly have been asserted in the Action.

112. Class Counsel believe the claims asserted in the Action have merit, and they have examined and considered the benefits to be obtained under the proposed Settlement set forth in this Agreement, the risks associated with the continued prosecution of this complex, costly, and time-consuming litigation, and the likelihood of success on the merits of the Action. Class Counsel have investigated the facts and law relevant to the merits of the claims, conducted informal discovery, and conducted independent investigation of the alleged claims. Class Counsel

concluded that the proposed Settlement set forth in this Agreement is fair, adequate, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class.

113. This Agreement constitutes a compromise and settlement of disputed claims. No action taken by the Parties in connection with the negotiations of this Agreement shall be deemed or construed to be an admission of the truth or falsity of any claims or defenses heretofore made, or an acknowledgment or admission by any party of any fault, liability, or wrongdoing of any kind whatsoever.

114. Neither the Settlement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Settlement (a) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used as, an admission of, or evidence of, the validity of any claim made by the Plaintiffs or Settlement Class Members, or of any wrongdoing or liability of the Released Parties; or (b) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used as, an admission of, or evidence of, any fault or omission of any of the Released Parties, in the Action or in any proceeding in any court, administrative agency, or other tribunal.

115. In addition to any other defenses Defendant or the Released Parties may have at law, in equity, or otherwise, to the extent permitted by law, this Agreement may be pleaded as a full and complete defense to and may be used as the basis for an injunction against, any action, suit, or other proceeding that may be instituted, prosecuted, or attempted in breach of this Agreement or the Releases contained herein.

116. Upon the Effective Date, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, each Settlement Class Member shall, either directly, indirectly, representatively, as a member of or on behalf of the general public, or in any capacity, be permanently barred and enjoined from commencing, prosecuting, or participating in any recovery in any action in this or any other forum (other than the participation in the Agreement as provided herein) in which any of the Released Claims are

asserted.

117. Further, upon entry of the Final Approval Order, each Settlement Class Member shall be barred from initiating, asserting, or prosecuting against any Released Parties any claims that are released by operation of this Agreement and the Final Approval Order.

XV. Miscellaneous Provisions

118. *Confidentiality.* To the extent permitted by ethics rules, the Parties and their counsel agree that all drafts, discussions, negotiations, documentation or other information prepared in relation to this Agreement, and the Parties' settlement discussions, shall be treated as strictly confidential and may not, absent a court order, be disclosed to any Person other than the Parties' counsel, and only for purposes of the Action and Settlement. The Parties will not make any public statement about the settlement that has not been approved by the other side, except as required or authorized by law. Approval of any proposed public statement of the other side will not be unreasonably withheld. The Parties will cooperate with each other regarding public statements about the settlement and may issue a joint statement / press release if they mutually agree to do so. The Parties agree and covenant that they will not at any time make, publish, or communicate to any person or entity or in any public forum any defamatory or disparaging remarks, comments, or statements concerning the Parties or this Agreement. This paragraph shall not be construed to limit or impede the Notice requirements contained in this Agreement, nor shall this paragraph be construed to prevent Class Counsel or Defendant's Counsel from notifying or explaining that the Action has settled or limit the representations that the Parties or their counsel may make to the Court to assist in the Court's evaluation of the Settlement, Preliminary Approval, Final Approval, and any objection to the Settlement's terms. Defendant may also provide information about the Settlement to its attorneys, members, partners, insurers, brokers, agents, and

other persons or entities as required by securities laws or other applicable laws and regulations.

119. ***Gender and Plurals.*** As used in this Agreement, the masculine, feminine or neuter gender, and the singular or plural number, shall each be deemed to include the others whenever the context so indicates.

120. ***Binding Effect.*** This Agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to and for the benefit of, the successors and assigns of the Releasing Parties and the Released Parties.

121. ***Cooperation of Parties.*** The Parties to this Agreement agree to cooperate in good faith to prepare and execute all documents, seek Court approval, uphold Court approval, and do all things reasonably necessary to complete and effectuate the Settlement described in this Agreement.

122. ***Obligation to Meet and Confer.*** Before filing any motion in the Court raising a dispute arising out of or related to this Agreement, the Parties shall consult with each other and certify to the Court that they have met and conferred in an attempt to resolve the dispute.

123. ***No Reliance.*** This Agreement is executed without reliance on any oral covenant, agreement, representation, or warranty by any Party or any Party's representative other than those expressly set forth in this Agreement. No oral covenants, agreements, representations, or warranties of any kind whatsoever have been made by any Party hereto, except as provided for herein.

124. ***No Conflict Intended.*** Any inconsistency between the headings used in this Agreement and the text of the paragraphs of this Agreement shall be resolved in favor of the text.

125. ***Governing Law.*** Except as otherwise provided herein, the Agreement shall be construed in accordance with, and be governed by, the laws of the state of Florida, without regard to the principles thereof regarding choice of law.

126. **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument, even though all Parties do not sign the same counterparts. Original signatures are not required. Any signature submitted by facsimile or through email of a PDF shall be deemed an original.

127. **Jurisdiction.** The Court shall retain jurisdiction over the implementation, enforcement, and performance of this Agreement, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any suit, action, proceeding, or dispute arising out of or relating to this Agreement that cannot be resolved by negotiation and agreement by counsel for the Parties. The Court shall also retain jurisdiction over all questions and/or disputes related to the Notice Program and the Settlement Administrator. As part of the agreement to render services in connection with this Settlement, the Settlement Administrator shall consent to the jurisdiction of the Court for this purpose. The Court shall retain jurisdiction over the enforcement of the Court's injunction barring and enjoining all Releasing Parties from asserting any of the Released Claims and from pursuing any Released Claims against the Released Parties at any time and in any jurisdiction, including during any appeal from the Final Approval Order.

128. **Court Modifications to Agreement.** The Parties understand and agree that the time periods and/or dates described in this Agreement with respect to the giving of notices and hearings are subject to approval and change by the Court or by the written agreement of both Parties' counsel, without notice to Settlement Class Members except that the Claim Administrator shall ensure that such dates are posted on the Settlement Website. Except for changes to the time periods as set forth in the prior paragraph, all other terms and limitations set forth in this Agreement and in the documents referred to or incorporated herein (including but not limited to the Long Form

Notice, Short Form Notice, and the Claim Form) shall be deemed material to the Parties' agreement, and in the event any such other term is altered or amended by the Court (including if the Court refuses to certify the Settlement Class and/or modifies the definition of the class), or any other court, or if any federal or state authority objects to or requires modifications to the Agreement, any Party whose rights or obligations are affected by the alteration or amendment may terminate this Agreement upon written notice to the other Party. The termination of the Agreement shall be deemed effective five (5) days after the provision of notice pursuant to this paragraph, or at any later date agreed in writing by the Parties.

129. *Notices.* All notices provided for herein, shall be sent by email with a hard copy sent by overnight mail to:

If to Plaintiffs or Class Counsel:

Jeff Ostrow
Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A.
1 West Las Olas Blvd., Ste. 500
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
ostrow@kolawyers.com

Mariya Weekes
**Milberg Coleman Bryson
Phillips Grossman PLLC**
333 SE 2nd Avenue, Suite 2000
Miami, FL 33131
mweekes@milberg.com

If to Defendant or Defendant's Counsel:

Ian Ross
Sidley Austin LLP
1001 Brickell Bay Drive, Suite 900
Miami, FL 33131
iross@sidley.com

The notice recipients and addresses designated above may be changed by written notice. Upon the request of any of the Parties, the Parties agree to promptly provide each other with copies of

objections, requests for exclusion, or other filings received as a result of the Notice Program.

130. ***Modification and Amendment.*** This Agreement may not be amended or modified, except by a written instrument signed by Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel and, if the Settlement has been approved preliminarily by the Court, approved by the Court.

131. ***No Waiver.*** The waiver by any Party of any breach of this Agreement by another Party shall not be deemed or construed as a waiver of any other breach, whether prior, subsequent, or contemporaneous, of this Agreement. Likewise, the failure of a Party hereto to insist upon strict performance of any provision of this Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of such Party's rights or remedies or a waiver by such Party of any default by another Party in the performance or compliance of any of the terms of this Agreement.

132. ***Authority.*** Class Counsel (for the Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members), and Defendant's Counsel, represent and warrant that the persons signing this Agreement on their behalf have full power and authority to bind every person, partnership, corporation, or entity included within the definitions of Plaintiffs and Defendant respectively to all terms of this Agreement. Any person executing this Agreement in a representative capacity represents and warrants that he or she is fully authorized to do so and to bind the Party on whose behalf he or she signs this Agreement to all of the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

133. ***Agreement Mutually Prepared.*** Neither Plaintiffs nor Defendant shall be considered to be the drafter of this Agreement or any of its provisions for the purpose of any statute, case law, or rule of interpretation or construction that would or might cause any provision to be construed against the drafter of this Agreement.

134. ***Independent Investigation and Decision to Settle.*** The Parties understand and acknowledge they: (a) have performed an independent investigation of the allegations of fact and

law made in connection with this Action; and (b) that even if they may hereafter 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 the Action as reflected in this Agreement, that will not affect or in any respect limit the binding nature of this Agreement. All Parties recognize and acknowledge they reviewed and analyzed data that they and their experts used to make certain determinations, arguments, and settlement positions. The Parties agree this Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and will not attempt to renegotiate or otherwise void or invalidate or terminate the Settlement irrespective of what any unexamined data later shows. It is the Parties' intention to resolve their disputes in connection with this Action pursuant to the terms of this Agreement now and thus, in furtherance of their intentions, the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect notwithstanding the discovery of any additional facts or law, or changes in law, and this Agreement shall not be subject to rescission or modification by reason of any changes or differences in facts or law, subsequently occurring or otherwise.

135. ***Receipt of Advice of Counsel.*** Each Party acknowledges, agrees, and specifically warrants that he, she, or it has fully read this Agreement and the Releases contained herein, received independent legal advice with respect to the advisability of entering into this Agreement and the Releases, and the legal effects of this Agreement and the Releases, and fully understands the effect of this Agreement and the Releases.

Signature Page to Follow

CLASS COUNSEL (for Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class)

Jeffrey Ostrow

Jeffrey Ostrow (Sep 10, 2025 08:33:30 EDT)

Jeff Ostrow
KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.

Mariya Weekes

Mariya Weekes (Sep 10, 2025 08:35:27 EDT)

Mariya Weekes
MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON
PHILLIPS GROSSMAN PLLC

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP.

Signed by:

Chandra Westergaard

736680C63E02496

By: Chandra Westergaard
Its: General Counsel

**COUNSEL FOR AKUMIN
OPERATING CORP.**

Ian M. Ross
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

CLASS COUNSEL (for Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class)

Jeffrey Ostrow
Jeffrey Ostrow (Sep 10, 2025 08:33:30 EDT)

Jeff Ostrow
KOPELOWITZ OSTROW P.A.

Mariya Weekes
Mariya Weekes (Sep 10, 2025 08:35:27 EDT)

Mariya Weekes
MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON
PHILLIPS GROSSMAN PLLC

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP.

By: Chandra Westergaard
Its: General Counsel

**COUNSEL FOR AKUMIN
OPERATING CORP.**



Ian M. Ross
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

EXHIBIT 1
(EMAIL NOTICE)

FROM: SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

TO: EMAIL ADDRESS

RE: Akumin Operating Corp. Class Action Settlement Notice

<<Unique ID>>

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
In the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit for Broward County, Florida**

***Gina Letizio et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp.*
A Court authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.**

If you are residing in the United States and your Private Information was impacted in the Data Incident involving Akumin Operating Corp., f/k/a Akumin Corp. on or about October 11, 2023, you may be entitled to Settlement Class Member Benefits from a Settlement.

You can file your Claim Form [here](#).

What Happened? A proposed Settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit against Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp. (“Defendant”) related to a cybersecurity incident (“Data Incident”) involving the Defendant and resulting in unauthorized access to or acquisition of Settlement Class Members’ Private Information on October 11, 2023. Private Information means the information collected by Defendant for its current and former employees and patients that was impacted in the Data Incident, which may include, depending on the impacted individual names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, driver’s license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID, other patient identifier, other unique individual identifiers, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information, and/or electronic signatures.

WHY ARE YOU RECEIVING THIS NOTICE?

Records show you are a Settlement Class Member, defined as: all living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident. The purpose of this Notice is to inform you of the class action lawsuit and the proposed Settlement so you may decide whether to file a Claim Form, opt-out, object, or do nothing.

WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AND OPTIONS?

Submit a Claim Form. As a Settlement Class Member, you can submit a Claim Form [here](#) or by mail postmarked by **Month XX, 20YY** for the following Settlement Class Member Benefits:

1. **Cash Payment for Documented Losses:** You may submit a Claim Form and provide reasonable documentation for losses related to the Data Incident for up to **two thousand five hundred dollars** per Settlement Class Member. Please refer to the [Long Form Notice](#) on the Settlement Website for a description of the type of reasonable documentation you must provide to support a claim for a cash payment for documented losses.

AND

2. **Medical Data Monitoring:** In addition to a Cash Payment, you may also submit a Claim Form to receive up to one year of free **Medical Data Monitoring**, which also includes up to \$1 million in medical identity theft insurance, from CyEx. This Medical Shield Complete service from CyEx has a retail cost of \$12.95 a month per person when purchased on an individual basis.

Opt-out or Object. If you do not want to be legally bound by the proposed Settlement, you must submit an opt-out, **postmarked** by **MONTH DD, 20YY**. If you do not opt-out, you will give up the right to sue and will release the Defendant and the Released Parties from the legal claims in this lawsuit. If you do not opt-out, you may object to the proposed Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards by **MONTH DD, 20YY**. The [Long Form Notice](#) on the Settlement Website explains how to opt-out or object.

Do Nothing. If you do nothing, you will get no Settlement Class Member Benefits, and you will be bound by the proposed Settlement, the releases therein, and any judgments and orders.

Attend the Final Approval Hearing. The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on **MONTH DD, 20YY** to consider whether to approve the proposed Settlement, Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs of **two million eight hundred thousand dollars** and Service Awards of up to **two thousand five hundred dollars** to the Class Representatives (all of which are paid by the Defendant separate and apart from the Settlement Class Member Benefits), and to consider any objections. You or your lawyer may attend and ask to appear at the hearing if you object, but you are not required to do so.

This Notice is a summary of the proposed Settlement. Learn more about the proposed Settlement [here](#), or by calling toll free 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

EXHIBIT 2
(LONG FORM NOTICE)

If you are residing in the United States and your Private Information was impacted in the Data Incident involving Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp. that occurred on or about October 11, 2023, you may be entitled to Settlement Class Member Benefits from a Settlement.

A Court authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A proposed Settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit against Akumin Operating Corp, (“Defendant”) involving a Data Incident that occurred on October 11, 2023, involving Defendant and resulting in unauthorized access to or acquisition of Settlement Class members’ Private Information. The Private Information involved was, depending on the impacted individual, some combination of names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, driver’s license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID, other patient identifier, other unique individual identifier, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information, and/or electronic signatures.
- The Settlement Class includes: all living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.
- If you are a member of the Settlement Class, you can submit a Claim Form for the following Settlement Class Member Benefits:
 - **Cash Payment for Documented Losses:** You may submit a Claim Form and provide reasonable documentation for losses related to the Data Incident for up to \$2,500 per Settlement Class Member; **AND**
 - **Medical Data Monitoring:** In addition to a Cash Payment For Document Losses, you may also submit a Claim Form to receive one year of free Medical Data Monitoring, which also includes up to \$1 million in medical identity theft insurance, from CyEx. This Medical Shield Complete service from CyEx has a retail cost of \$12.95 a month per person when purchased on an individual basis.

This Notice may affect your rights. Please read it carefully.

Your Legal Rights & Options		Deadline
Submit a Claim Form	The only way to get Settlement Class Member Benefits is to submit a timely and valid Claim Form.	Submitted or Postmarked by: MONTH DD, 20YY
Exclude Yourself	Get no Settlement Class Member Benefits. Keep your right to file your own lawsuit against the Released Parties about the Released Claims that are released by the Settlement in this lawsuit.	Postmarked by: MONTH DD, 20YY
Object to the Settlement	Stay in the Settlement but tell the Court why you do not agree with the Settlement. You will still be bound by the Settlement if the Court approves it.	Filed by: MONTH DD, 20YY
Do Nothing	Get no Settlement Class Member Benefits. Give up your legal rights.	

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

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

- The Court must decide whether to approve the Settlement, Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Service Awards. No Settlement Class Member Benefits will be provided unless the Court approves the Settlement.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why is this Notice being provided?

A court authorized this Notice because you have the right to know about the Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your rights and options before the Court decides whether to grant final approval to the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, your legal rights, what Settlement Class Member Benefits are available, who is eligible for the Settlement Class Member Benefits, and how to get them.

The Honorable Michele Towbin Singer of the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County, Florida is overseeing this class action. The lawsuit is known *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp., f/k/a Akumin Corp.*, Case No. CACE-25-011999 ("lawsuit"). The individuals who filed this lawsuit are called the "Plaintiffs" and/or "Class Representatives" and the company sued, Akumin Operating Corp., is called the "Defendant."

2. What is this lawsuit about?

The Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit against the Defendant on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated related to a cybersecurity incident ("Data Incident") discovered on October 11, 2023, involving Defendant and resulting in unauthorized access to or acquisition of Settlement Class members' Private Information. Private Information means the information collected by Defendant for its current and former employees and patients that was impacted in the Data Incident, which may include, depending on the impacted individual names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, Social Security numbers, driver's license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID, other patient identifiers, other unique individual identifiers, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information and/or electronic signatures.

Defendant denies the legal claims and denies any wrongdoing or liability. The Court has not made any determination of any wrongdoing by Defendant, or that any law has been violated. Instead, the Plaintiffs and Defendant have agreed to a settlement to avoid the risk, cost, and time of continuing the lawsuit.

3. Why is there a Settlement?

The Plaintiffs and Defendant do not agree about the legal claims made in this lawsuit. The lawsuit has not gone to trial, and the Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiffs or Defendant. Instead, the Plaintiffs and Defendant have agreed to settle the lawsuit. The Class Representatives, Defendant, and their lawyers believe the Settlement is best for the Settlement Class because of the Settlement Class Member Benefits available and the risks and uncertainty associated with continuing the lawsuit.

4. Why is this lawsuit a class action?

In a class action, one or more people (called Class Representatives) sue on behalf of all people who have similar legal claims. Together, all of these people are called a class or class members, and now

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

that there is a settlement, “Settlement Class Members.” One court resolves the issues for all class members, except for those class members who timely exclude themselves (opt-out) from the Settlement Class.

WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

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

You are included in the Settlement Class if you are a living individual residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

6. Are there exceptions to being included in the Settlement?

Yes. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (1) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant; (2) governmental entities; and (3) the Judge assigned to the lawsuit, that Judge’s immediate family, and Court staff; and (d) any Settlement Class Member who timely and validly opts-out of the Settlement.

7. What if I am still not sure whether I am part of the Settlement?

If you are still not sure whether you are a Settlement Class Member, you may go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call toll-free 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

8. What does this Settlement provide?

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you can submit a Claim Form for the following Settlement Class Member Benefits:

Cash Payment for Documented Losses

You may submit a Claim Form with reasonable documentation for losses related to the Data Incident for up to \$2,500 per Settlement Class Member.

Examples of expenses incurred as a result of the Data Incident include (but are not limited to): unreimbursed losses relating to fraud or identity theft; costs associated with freezing or unfreezing credit with any credit reporting agency; and miscellaneous expenses such as notary, fax, postage, copying, mileage, and long-distance telephone charges.

Examples of reasonable documentation include (but are not limited to): telephone records, correspondence including emails, or receipts. Personal certifications, declarations, or affidavits from the Settlement Class Member do not constitute reasonable documentation but may be included to provide clarification, context, or support for other submitted reasonable documentation.

Your reasonable documentation must show: (i) the loss is an actual, documented, and unreimbursed monetary loss; (ii) the loss was more likely than not caused by the Data Incident; and (iii) the loss was incurred after the date of the Data Incident and before the claims date.

You will not be reimbursed for expenses if you have been reimbursed for the same expenses by another source, including compensation provided in connection with the identity protection and credit monitoring services offered as part of the notification letter provided by Defendant or otherwise.

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

If you do not submit reasonable documentation supporting a loss, or if your Claim Form is invalid as determined by the Settlement Administrator, and you do not cure your Claim Form, your Claim will be denied.

Medical Data Monitoring: In addition to a Cash Payment for Documented Losses, you also may submit a Claim Form to receive one year of free Medical Data Monitoring.

9. What am I giving up to receive Settlement Class Member Benefits or stay in the Settlement?

Unless you exclude yourself (opt-out), you will remain in the Settlement Class. If the Settlement is approved and becomes final, all Court orders and any judgments will apply to you and legally bind you. You will not be able to sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Released Parties about the Released Claims in this lawsuit. The specific rights you are giving up are called “Released Claims.”

10. What are the Released Claims?

Section XI of the Settlement Agreement describes the Releases, Released Claims, and Released Parties, in necessary legal terminology, so please read this section carefully. The Settlement Agreement is available at www.XXXXXXXXXXX.com. For questions regarding the Releases, Released Claims, or Released Parties and what the language in the Settlement Agreement means, you can also contact Class Counsel listed below for free, or you can talk to your own lawyer at your own expense.

HOW TO GET BENEFITS FROM THE SETTLEMENT

11. How do I submit a Claim Form?

You must submit a timely and valid Claim Form to receive any Settlement Class Member Benefits. Please read the instructions carefully, fill out the Claim Form, provide the required documentation, and submit it according to the instructions on the Claim Form. Your Claim Form must contain your personal physical or e-signature and be submitted online at www.XXXXXXXXX.com by **MONTH DD, 20YY**, or mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address on the Claim Form, **postmarked by Month DD, 20YY**. Paper Claim Forms are available for download at www.XXXXXXXXX.com or by calling 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX or by writing to:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box XXXX
Portland, OR 972XX-XXXX

12. What happens if my contact information changes after I submit a Claim Form?

If you change your mailing address or email address after you submit a Claim Form, it is your responsibility to inform the Settlement Administrator of your updated information. You may notify the Settlement Administrator of any changes by writing to:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box XXXX
Portland, OR 972XX-XXXX

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

13. When will I receive my Settlement Class Member Benefits?

If you file a timely and valid Claim Form, the Settlement Class Member Benefits will be provided after the Settlement is approved by the Court and becomes final.

It may take time for the Settlement to be approved and become final. Please be patient and check www.XXXXXXXXXXX.com for updates.

EXCLUDE YOURSELF OR OPT-OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT

If you are a member of the Settlement Class and want to keep any right you may have to sue or continue to sue the Released Parties on your own about the legal claims in this lawsuit or the Released Claims, then you must take steps to get out of the Settlement. This is called excluding yourself from—or “opting-out” of—the Settlement.

14. How do I opt-out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must mail a written request for exclusion, which includes the following:

- 1) Your name, address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
- 2) Your personal physical signature; and
- 3) A statement that you want to be excluded from the Settlement Class, such as “I hereby request to be excluded from the Settlement Class in *“Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp.”*”

The exclusion request must be **mailed** to the Settlement Administrator at the following address, and be **postmarked** by **MONTH DD, 20YY**:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box XXXX
Portland, OR 972XX-XXXX

You cannot opt-out (exclude yourself) by telephone or by email.

“Mass” or “class” requests for exclusion filed by third parties on behalf of a “mass” or “class” of Settlement Class Members or multiple Settlement Class Members where the opt-out has not been signed by each and every individual Settlement Class Member will not be allowed.

15. If I opt-out can I still get anything from the Settlement?

No. If you opt-out, you will not be able to receive Settlement Class Member Benefits, and you will not be bound by the Settlement or any judgments in this lawsuit. You can only get Settlement Class Member Benefits if you stay in the Settlement and submit a timely and valid Claim Form.

16. If I do not opt-out, can I sue the Defendant for the same thing later?

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

No. Unless you opt-out, you give up any right to sue any of the Defendant and Released Parties for the legal claims this Settlement resolves and Releases, and you will be bound by all the terms of the Settlement, proceedings, orders, and judgments in the lawsuit. You must opt-out of this lawsuit to start or continue your own lawsuit or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant and Released Parties about the Released Claims in this Settlement. If you have a pending lawsuit, speak to your lawyer in that lawsuit immediately.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

17. How do I tell the Court I do not like the Settlement?

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you can tell the Court you do not agree with all or any part of the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Service Awards.

To object, you must file your timely written objection with the Court as provided below by **MONTH DD, 20YY** and send copies by U.S. mail to Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator stating that you object to the Settlement in: *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp., f/k/a Akumin Corp.*, Case No. CACE-2025-011999.

To file an objection, you cannot exclude yourself from the Settlement Class. Your objection must include all of the following information:

- 1) Your full name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
- 2) All grounds for the objection, accompanied by any legal support for the objection known to you as the objector or your own lawyer;
- 3) The number of times you have objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date that you file the objection, the caption of each case in which you have made such objection, and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon your prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case;
- 4) The identity of all lawyers representing you, including any former or current lawyers who may be entitled to compensation for any reason related to the objection to the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys' Fees, and Costs and Service Awards;
- 5) The number of times in which your lawyer and/or your lawyer's law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date of the filed objection, the caption of each case in which your lawyer or the firm has made such objection and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon your lawyer's or the lawyer's law firm's prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case in which the your lawyer and/or lawyer's law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the preceding five years;
- 6) The identity of all lawyers (if any) representing you, and whether they will appear at the Final Approval Hearing;
- 7) A list of all persons who will be called to testify at the Final Approval Hearing in support of your objection (if any);
- 8) A statement confirming whether you intend to personally appear and/or testify at the Final Approval Hearing; and
- 9) Your signature (an attorney's signature is not sufficient).

Class Counsel and/or Defendant's Counsel may conduct limited discovery on any objector or objector's lawyer, including the taking of depositions and requesting documents.

To object, you must file your timely written objection with the Court by **Month DD, 20YY**, and send it by U.S. mail or shipped by courier (such as Federal Express) to Class Counsel, Defendant's

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator postmarked by **Month DD, 20YY**, at the following addresses:

COURT	CLASS COUNSEL	DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL	SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR
Clerk of Court Circuit Court 17 th Judicial Circuit Broward County 201 SE 6 th St. Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301	Jeff Ostrow Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. 1 West Las Olas Blvd. Suite 500 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301 Mariya Weekes Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC 201 Sevilla Ave., Ste. 200 Coral Gables, FL 33134	Ian Ross Sidley Austin LLP 1001 Brickell Bay Dr. Miami, FL 33131	<i>Akumin</i> <i>Data Incident</i> Settlement Administrator PO Box xxxx Portland, OR 972xx-xxxx

Any Settlement Class Member who does not make an objection in the manner provided herein shall be deemed to have waived the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement and/or to the Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs and, if Final Judgment is entered, shall forever be barred and foreclosed from raising such objections in this or any other proceeding and from challenging or opposing, or seeking to reverse, vacate, or modify, the Final Judgment or any aspect thereof.

18. What is the difference between objecting and asking to be excluded?

Objecting is simply telling the Court that you do not like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Settlement Class. Opting-out is telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the Settlement Class. If you opt-out, you cannot object because you are no longer part of the Settlement.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

19. Do I have a lawyer in the lawsuit?

Yes. The Court has appointed Jeff Ostrow of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. and Mariya Weekes of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC as Class Counsel to represent you and the Settlement Class for the purposes of this Settlement. You may hire your own lawyer at your own cost if you want someone other than Class Counsel to represent you in this lawsuit.

20. How will Class Counsel be paid?

Class Counsel will file a motion asking the Court to award attorneys' fees of up to \$2,850,000 plus reimbursement of reasonable costs. Class Counsel will also ask the Court to approve the Service Awards for the Class Representatives of up to \$2,500 each for their efforts. If awarded by the Court, the attorneys' fees and costs and the Service Awards will be paid by the Defendant. The Court may award less than these amounts.

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a “Final Approval Hearing” to decide whether to approve the Settlement and Application for Attorneys’ Fees, and Costs and Service Awards. You may attend and you may ask to speak if you file an objection by the deadline, but you do not have to.

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

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on **MONTH DD, 20YY, at XX:XX a.m./p.m.** before the Honorable Michele Towbin Singer at the Broward County Courthouse, 201 Southeast 6th Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301. At this hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and decide whether to approve the Settlement and Class Counsel’s Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards.

If there are objections that were filed by the deadline, the Court will consider them. If you file a timely objection, and you (or your lawyer) ask to speak at the hearing, the Court, at its discretion, may hear objections at the hearing.

Note: The date and time of the Final Approval Hearing are subject to change without further notice to the Settlement Class. The Court may also decide to hold the hearing via video conference or by telephone. You should check the Settlement Website www.XXXXXXXXXX.com to confirm the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing have not changed.

22. Do I have to attend the Final Approval Hearing?

No. Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. However, you are welcome to attend at your own expense. If you file an objection, you do not have to attend the Final Approval Hearing to speak about it. As long as you file your written objection by the deadline, the Court will consider it.

23. May I speak at the Final Approval Hearing?

If there are objections that were filed by the deadline, the Court will consider them. If you file a timely objection, and you (or your lawyer) ask to speak at the hearing, the Court, at its discretion, may hear objections at the hearing.

GET MORE INFORMATION

24. How do I get more information about the Settlement?

This Notice summarizes the Settlement. Complete details about the Settlement are provided in the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement and other related documents are available at www.XXXXXXXXXX.com. You may get additional information at www.XXXXXXXXXX.com, by calling toll-free 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX, or by writing to:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box XXXX
Portland, OR 972XX-XXXX

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

**PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE COURT'S
CLERK OFFICE REGARDING THIS NOTICE.**

Questions? Go to www.XXXXXXXXXX.com or call 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

EXHIBIT 3
(PUBLICATION NOTICE)

Banner Advertisement

300x250 Online Display Banner

Frame 1 (Visible 8 seconds):



Frame 2 (Visible 6 seconds):



**EXHIBIT 4
(CLAIM FORM)**

**Must be postmarked
or submitted online
NO LATER THAN
Month DD, 20YY**

**Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
P.O. BOX #####
Portland, OR 97208-####
www.XXXXXXXXXX.com**

Akumin Data Incident Claim Form

SETTLEMENT BENEFITS – WHAT YOU MAY GET

If you were a patient of Akumin whose Private Information was compromised in the Data Incident that occurred on October 11, 2023, you may submit a Claim.

The easiest way to submit a Claim is online at www.XXXXXXXXXX.com, or you can print out, complete, and mail this entire Claim Form (with any required documentation) to the mailing address above.

**All Settlement Class Members are eligible to file a Claim for both
Medical Data Monitoring and a Cash Payment for Documented Losses.**

You may submit a Claim for one or both of the following

- 1. Medical Data Monitoring:** Use this Claim Form to request one year of free Medical Data Monitoring.
- 2. Cash Payment for Documented Losses:** If you incurred financial losses from fraud or identity theft that you believe is fairly traceable to the Data Incident, you can be reimbursed up to \$2,500.00. You must submit documents supporting your Claim.

More information about the Settlement Class Member Benefits above may be found in the Settlement Agreement which is located on the Settlement Website (www.XXXXXXXX.com).

Claims must be submitted online or postmarked by Month DD, 20YY. Use the website address above for online Claims or the physical address above for mailed claims.

The Settlement Administrator may contact you to request additional documentation to process your Claim.

Please note that Settlement Class Member Benefits will be distributed only after the Settlement is approved by the Court and becomes final.

If the Settlement is approved and your Claim for a Cash Payment is accepted, you will receive an email at the email address you provide below prompting you to select how you would like to be paid. You can receive your Cash Payment via a variety of digital options, or you can elect to receive a paper check.

If the Settlement is approved and you file a Valid Claim for Medical Data Monitoring, you will receive an email with a code and activation instructions at the email address you provide below.

If you want to submit a Claim online go to: www.XXXXXXXX.com. Otherwise, if you are going to submit your Claim by mail, please complete the section below.

Your Information

We will use this information to contact you and process your Claim. It will not be used for any other purpose. If any of the following information changes, you must promptly notify the Settlement Administrator.

First Name: <input style="width: 95%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	MI: <input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	Last Name: <input style="width: 95%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
---	--	--

Alternative Name(s) (If Any):

Unique ID (As shown on the notice you received):

Mailing Address (Required):

City: <input style="width: 98%; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	State: <input style="width: 20px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	ZIP: <input style="width: 95%; height: 25px;" type="text"/>
---	---	--

Phone Number:
 - -

Email Address:

Year of Birth:

Medical Data Monitoring

You may be eligible to receive free Medical Data Monitoring services.

You can elect to submit a Claim for **Medical Data Monitoring**. This benefit includes one year of CyEx Medical Shield Complete with one-bureau of monitoring and at least \$1,000,000.00 of identity theft insurance and real time alerts.

The one-year period will commence when you use your code to activate the Medical Data Monitoring.

Medical Data Monitoring: I want to receive free Medical Data Monitoring.

If you select Medical Data Monitoring, you will be sent instructions and an activation code after the Settlement is final to your email address.

Cash Payment for Documented Losses: Money You Lost or Spent

If you incurred financial losses from fraud or identity theft that you believe are fairly traceable to the Data Incident and have not been reimbursed for that money, you may be entitled to receive reimbursement for up to \$2,500.00 if you provide the documentation or information requested herein and that documentation is verified.

It is important for you to send documents that show what happened and how much you lost or spent, so that you can be reimbursed. Documentation must be mailed along with this Claim Form.

Cash Payment for Documented Losses: I have experienced a documented out-of-pocket loss related to fraud or identity theft as a result of the Akumin Data Incident. I am providing the necessary information and documentation. I understand that if appropriate documentation is not provided, my claim may be denied.

To look up more details about Cash Payments for Documented Losses, visit **www.XXXXXXXXXX.com** or call toll-free 1-###-###-####. You will find more information about the types of losses that can be paid back to you, what documents you need to attach, and how the Settlement Administrator decides whether to approve your payment.

By filling out the boxes on the next page of this form, you are certifying that the money you spent does not relate to other data breaches.

You may make as many copies of the Claim Form pages as necessary to list all of your expenses. If you need more space to list your losses, please submit additional pages of this Claim Form to provide that information.

Loss Type	Approximate Date Loss	Amount of Loss
Costs for freezing or unfreezing your credit report on or after 10/11/2023 if related to fraud or identity theft and fairly traceable to the Data Incident.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div>
<p>Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching, and why it is related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Receipts, notices, or account statements reflecting payment for a credit freeze.</i></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		
Credit monitoring and identity theft protection purchased between 10/11/2023 and the date of your Claim submission are related to fraud or identity theft and fairly traceable to the Data Incident.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div>
<p>Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching, and why it is related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Receipts or statements for credit monitoring services.</i></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		
	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div>	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div>
Costs, expenses, and losses due to identity theft, fraud, or misuse of your Private Information on or after 10/11/2023 and that you believe are fairly traceable to the Data Incident	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . </div>
<p>Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching, and why it is related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Account statement with unauthorized charges highlighted, police reports, IRS documents, FTC Identity Theft Reports, letters refusing to refund fraudulent charges, credit monitoring services you purchased</i></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		

Loss Type	Approximate Date Loss	Amount of Loss
Professional fees paid to address identity theft, fraud or misuse of your Private Information on or after 10/11/2023 and that you believe are fairly traceable to the Data Incident	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: center; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> • <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px; margin-right: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 20px; height: 20px;"></div> </div>
<p>Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching, and why it is related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Receipts, bills, and invoices from accountants, lawyers, or others.</i></p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		

Signature

I affirm under the laws of the United States that the information I have supplied in this form and any copies of documents that I am sending to support my claim are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I understand that I may be asked to provide more information by the Settlement Administrator before my claim is complete.

Print Name

Signature

Date: - -
MM DD YYYY

EXHIBIT 5
(PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER)

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

GINA LETIZIO, EDUARDO GUILLEN,
ISABEL REEVES, PAUL COONS, as executor
of the Estate of ELIZABETH BISSELL, JOHN
CRERAR, and CHRISTOPHER SHARP,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

CASE NO.: CACE-25-011999

Plaintiffs,

v.

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP. f/k/a
AKUMIN CORP.,

Defendant.

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

WHEREAS, this Action is a putative class action before the Court;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs, individually, and on behalf of the Settlement Class, and Defendant have agreed, subject to Court approval under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, to settle this Action upon the terms and conditions stated in the Agreement, which, among other things and together with its exhibits, provides for a complete dismissal on the merits and with prejudice of the claims asserted in the Action against Defendant should the Court grant Final Approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed an unopposed motion requesting entry of an order to: (1) conditionally certify the Settlement Class; (2) appoint Plaintiffs as Class Representatives; (3) appoint counsel listed in the Agreement as Class Counsel; (4) preliminarily approve the Settlement; (5) approve the Notice Program and Notices and direct that Notice be sent to the Settlement Class members; (6) approve the Claim Form and Claims process; (7) order the Settlement's opt-out and

objection procedures; (8) appoint the Settlement Administrator; (9) stay all deadlines in the Action pending Final Approval of the Settlement; (10) enjoin and bar all members of the Settlement Class from initiating or continuing in any litigation or asserting any claims against Defendants and the Released Parties arising out of, relating to, or in connection with the Released Claims prior to the Court's decision to grant Final Approval of the Settlement; and (11) set a date for the Final Approval Hearing;

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the Agreement, all the files, records, and proceedings herein, statements of counsel, and it appearing to the Court that a Final Approval Hearing should be held to determine whether the proposed settlement described in the Agreement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. All capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as those defined in Section II of the Settlement Agreement.
2. This Court has personal jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Action and the Parties, including Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members.
3. The Court preliminarily approves of the Settlement, including the Notice Program, finding that the proposed Settlement is sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to warrant providing Notice to the Settlement Class, but such finding is not to be deemed as an admission of fault or liability by Defendant or a finding of the validity of any claims asserted in the Action or of any wrongdoing or of any violation of law by Defendant. Defendant shall maintain all rights to assert that, but for settlement purposes, the Action should not be certified as a class.
4. For purposes of determining whether the terms of the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate, the following Settlement Class is preliminarily certified

for settlement purposes only:

All living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

5. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant; (b) governmental entities; (c) the Judge assigned to the Action, that Judge's immediate family, and Court staff; and (d) any Settlement Class Member who timely and validly opts-out of the Settlement.

6. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement are fair, adequate, and reasonable. In so finding, the Court has considered several factors, including: (1) the complexity and duration of the litigation; (2) the reaction of the class to the settlement; (3) the stage of the proceedings; (4) the risk of establishing liability; (5) the risk of establishing damages; (6) the risk of maintaining a class action; (7) the ability of the defendant to withstand a greater judgment; (8) the reasonableness of the settlement in light of the best recovery; and (9) the range of reasonableness of the settlement in light of all the attendant risks of litigation.

7. The Court finds that, for purposes of settlement: the number of members of the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable; there are questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class; the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class; the Plaintiffs are adequate representatives for the Settlement Class, and have retained experienced and adequate Class Counsel; the questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting any individual members of the Settlement Class; and a class action is superior to the other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

8. For purposes of settlement only, the Court finds and determines that Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Settlement Class in enforcing their rights in the

Action, and appoints them as Class Representatives, and the following attorneys are preliminarily appointed as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class: Jeff Ostrow of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. and Mariya Weekes of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC.

9. The Parties have selected Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. to serve as the Settlement Administrator. The Court hereby approves of and appoints Epiq and directs it to commence the Notice Program and initiate the Claims Process and to otherwise comply with all obligations of the Settlement Administrator as outlined in the Agreement.

10. The Parties have prepared the Notices, which are attached to the Agreement. The Court preliminarily finds that the Notice provided to Settlement Class members is the most practicable notice; is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action and of their right to object or to exclude themselves from the Settlement; and is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members entitled to receive notice.

11. The Court has carefully reviewed and hereby approves the Notices as to form and content and directs that they be without material alteration unless otherwise modified by agreement of the Parties and approved by the Court. The Court directs that the Notice Program be implemented as outlined in the Agreement.

12. Settlement Class Members who wish to opt-out of the Settlement and exclude themselves from participation may do so by submitting timely and valid requests at any time before the Opt-Out Deadline (15 days before the initial scheduled date of the Final Approval Hearing). The process to opt-out is set forth in the Agreement and in the Notices. Settlement Class members who opt-out shall have no rights under the Settlement, shall not share in any Settlement Class Member Benefits, and shall not be bound by the Settlement or by the Final Approval Order. “Mass”

or “class” requests for exclusion filed by third parties on behalf of a “mass” or “class” of Settlement Class Members or multiple Settlement Class Members where the opt-out has not been signed by each and every individual Settlement Class Member will not be allowed.

13. All Settlement Class Members who do not submit a timely, written request for exclusion in the manner set forth in the Notice and Agreement shall be bound by any Final Approval Order and final judgment entered, even if such Settlement Class Members never received actual notice of this Action or the Settlement. If Final Approval of the Settlement is granted, they shall be barred, now and in the future, from asserting any of the Released Claims, as defined in the Agreement, against any Released Parties as defined in the Agreement.

14. Settlement Class Members who wish to object to the Settlement and/or to Class Counsel’s Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards shall file any objections pursuant to the requirements of this paragraph. To be considered, the objection must include: (a) the objector’s full name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address (if any); (b) all grounds for the objection, accompanied by any legal support for the objection known to the objector or objector’s counsel; (c) the number of times the objector has objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date that the objector files the objection, the caption of each case in which the objector has made such objection, and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon the objector’s prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case; (d) the identity of all counsel who represent the objector, including any former or current counsel who may be entitled to compensation for any reason related to the objection to the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards; (e) the number of times in which the objector’s counsel and/or counsel’s law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date of the filed objection, the caption of each case

in which counsel or the firm has made such objection and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon counsel's or the counsel's law firm's prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case in which the objector's counsel and/or counsel's law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the preceding five years; (f) the identity of all counsel (if any) representing the objector, and whether they will appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (g) a list of all persons who will be called to testify at the Final Approval Hearing in support of the objection (if any); (h) a statement confirming whether the objector intends to personally appear and/or testify at the Final Approval Hearing; and (i) the objector's signature (an attorney's signature is not sufficient). Class Counsel and/or Defendant's Counsel may conduct limited discovery on any objector or objector's counsel, including taking depositions and propounding written document requests.

15. Objections to the Settlement and/or the Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards must be filed with the Court, and sent by U.S. Mail to Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator. For an objection to be considered by the Court, the objection must be submitted no later than the Objection Deadline (15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing), as specified in the Notices. If submitted by mail, an objection shall be deemed to have been submitted on the date the mail is postmarked. If submitted by courier, an objection shall be deemed to have been submitted on the shipping date reflected on the shipping label. Any Settlement Class Member who does not make an objection in the manner provided herein shall be deemed to have waived the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement and/or to the Application for Attorneys' Fees and Costs and, if Final Judgment is entered, shall forever be barred and foreclosed from raising such objections in this or any other proceeding and from challenging or opposing, or seeking to reverse, vacate, or modify, the Final Judgment or any aspect

thereof.

16. In advance of the Final Approval Hearing, the Settlement Administrator shall prepare a declaration for the Parties confirming that the Notice Program was completed in accordance with the terms of the Agreement and this Preliminary Approval Order, describing how the Notice Program was completed, indicating the number of Claim Forms received, providing the names of each Settlement Class Member who timely and properly requested to opt out from the Settlement Class, indicating the number of objections received, and other information as may be necessary to allow the Parties to seek and obtain Final Approval.

17. The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing to consider the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement on _____, 2025, at _____ a.m./p.m. The Court will advise the Parties in advance of the Final Approval Hearing whether the hearing will be held in person at the Broward County Courthouse, 201 SE 6th St, Fort Luaderdale, Florida 33301, or virtually by video. The date and time of the Final Approval Hearing will be set forth in the Notice and published on the Settlement Website. During the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and whether the Court should enter the proposed Final Approval Order and final judgment approving the Settlement and dismissing this Action on the merits, with prejudice. The Court will also consider the amount of any attorneys' fees and costs to be awarded to Class Counsel and whether to approve the amount of any Service Award to the Class Representatives. The Final Approval Hearing may be postponed, adjourned, or rescheduled by order of the Court without further notice to Settlement Class Members other than on the Settlement Website and the Court's docket.

18. The Court confirms the following schedule (which the court, upon showing of good cause by the Parties, may extend any of the deadlines):

Deadline to commence Notice Program	Within 15 days of Preliminary Approval
-------------------------------------	--

	Order
Deadline to complete Notice Program	At least 30 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing
Deadline for filing Motion for Final Approval, including Class Counsel's Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards	30 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing
Opt-Out Deadline	15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing
Objection Deadline	15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing
Claim Form Deadline	15 days before the initial scheduled Final Approval Hearing
Final Approval Hearing	_____ at __:__ a.m./p.m.

19. If the Settlement is terminated, not approved, canceled, fails to become effective for any reason, or the Effective Date does not occur, this order shall become null and void and shall be without prejudice to the rights of Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class members, and Defendant, all of whom shall be restored to their respective positions in the Action as provided in the Agreement

20. The Court stays all proceedings in this Action until further Order of the Court, except that the Parties may conduct such limited proceedings as may be necessary to implement the Settlement or to effectuate the term of the Agreement. Upon the entry of this order, with the exception of Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel, Defendant, and the Class Representatives implementation of the Settlement and the approval process in this Action, all members of the Settlement Class shall be provisionally enjoined and barred from asserting any claims or continuing any litigation against the Defendant and the Released Parties arising out of, relating to, or in connection with the Released Claims prior to the Court's decision as to whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement. For the benefit of the Settlement Class and to protect this Court's jurisdiction, this Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the Settlement proceedings to ensure the effectuation thereof in accordance with the Settlement preliminarily approved herein and the

related orders of this Court.

DONE AND ORDERED in chambers at Broward County, Florida, on this ____ day of _____, 2025.

HON. MICHELE TOWBIN SINGER
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:
All Counsel of Record

EXHIBIT 6
(FINAL APPROVAL ORDER)

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

GINA LETIZIO, EDUARDO GUILLEN,
ISABEL REEVES, PAUL COONS, as executor
of the Estate of ELIZABETH BISSELL, JOHN
CRERAR, and CHRISTOPHER SHARP,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

CASE NO.: CACE-25-011999

Plaintiffs,

v.

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP. f/k/a
AKUMIN CORP.,

Defendant.

_____ /

**[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
APPLICATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs submitted to the Court their Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards;

WHEREAS, on _____, 2025, the Court entered its Preliminary Approval Order, which, *inter alia*: (1) preliminarily approved the Settlement; (2) determined that, for purposes of the Settlement only, the Action should proceed as a class action and certified the Settlement Class; (3) appointed Plaintiffs as Class Representatives; (4) appointed Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as Class Counsel; (5) approved the form and manner of Notice and the Notice Program; (6) approved the Claim Process and Claim Form; and (7) set the Final Approval Hearing date;

WHEREAS, thereafter, Notice was provided to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order by Email Notice and Publication Notice and the Long Form Notice was made available to Settlement Class Members on the Settlement Website or on request to the Settlement Administrator;

WHEREAS, there were no objections or the Settlement and _____ Settlement Class Members opted-out of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, on _____, 2025, the Court held a Final Approval Hearing to determine whether the Settlement was fair, reasonable, and adequate, and to consider settlement Class Counsel's Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards;

WHEREAS, based on the foregoing, having considered the papers filed and proceedings held in connection with the Settlement, having considered all of the other files, records, and proceedings in the Action, and being otherwise fully advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

1. This Final Approval Order incorporates the definitions in Section II of the Settlement Agreement.

2. The 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 and Notice Program fully satisfied the requirements of due process, Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and all other applicable law and rules. The Claims Process was fair, and the Claim Form was easy to read and understand.

3. The terms of the Settlement are fair, adequate, and reasonable. In so finding, the Court has considered several factors, including: (1) the complexity and duration of the litigation; (2) the reaction of the Class to the settlement; (3) the stage of the proceedings; (4) the risk of establishing liability; (5) the risk of establishing damages; (6) the risk of maintaining a class action; (7) the ability of the defendant to withstand a greater judgment; (8) the reasonableness of the

settlement in light of the best recovery; and (9) the range of reasonableness of the settlement in light of all the attendant risks of litigation.

4. Based on the information presented to the Court, the Claims Process has proceeded as ordered and consistent with the Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order. All Settlement Class Members who submitted Valid Claims shall receive their Settlement Class Member Benefits pursuant to the Settlement's terms. All Settlement Class Members who did not submit a Claim, or for whom the Claim is determined to be invalid, shall still be bound by the terms of the Settlement and Releases therein.

5. The distribution plan for Settlement Class Member Benefits proposed by the Parties in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

6. The Class Representatives and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and will continue to adequately represent and protect the interests of Settlement Class Members in connection with the Settlement.

7. Because the Court grants Final Approval of the Settlement set forth in the Agreement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, the Court authorizes and directs implementation of all terms and provisions of the Settlement.

8. All Parties to this Action, including all Settlement Class Members, are bound by the Settlement as set forth in the Agreement and this Order.

9. The appointment of Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives is affirmed.

10. The appointment of Class Counsel is affirmed.

11. The appointment of the Settlement Administrator is affirmed.

12. The Court affirms its findings that the Settlement Class meets the relevant requirements of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220(a) and (b)(2) and (3) for only the purposes

of the Settlement in that: (1) the number of members of the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable; (2) there are questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class; (3) the claims of the Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class; (4) the Plaintiffs are adequate representatives for the Settlement Class, and has retained experienced and adequate Class Counsel; (5) the questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting any individual members of the Settlement Class; and (6) a class action is superior to the other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. In finding the Settlement fair, reasonable, and adequate, the Court has also considered that there were no objections to the Settlement, and no opt-outs, indicating an overwhelming positive reaction from the Settlement Class, and the opinion of competent counsel concerning such matters.

13. Therefore, the Court finally certifies the following Settlement Class:

All living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant; (b) governmental entities; (c) the Judge assigned to the Action, that Judge's immediate family, and Court staff; and (d) any Settlement Class Member who timely and validly opts-out of the Settlement.

14. Judgment shall be, and hereby is, entered dismissing the Action with prejudice, on the merits.

15. As of the Effective Date, and in exchange for the relief described in the Agreement, the Releasing Parties shall release the Released Parties from the Released Claims.

16. Class Counsel is awarded \$ _____ for attorneys' fees and costs. These payments shall be paid by Defendants in accordance with the Agreement. The Court evaluated

Settlement Class Counsel's request, and concludes that amount is fair and within the range of reason.

17. The Class Representatives shall be awarded Service Awards in the amount of \$ _____. The Service Awards shall be paid by Defendants in accordance with the Agreement.

18. Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members and Releasing Parties, and persons purporting to act on their behalf, are permanently enjoined from commencing or prosecuting (either directly, representatively, or in any other capacity) any of the Released Claims against any of the Released Parties in any action or proceeding in any court, arbitration forum, or tribunal.

19. The Court hereby retains and reserves jurisdiction over: (1) implementation of this Settlement and any distributions to the Settlement Class Members; (2) the Action, until the Effective Date, and until each and every act agreed to be performed by the Parties shall have been performed pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, including the exhibits appended thereto; and (3) all Parties, for the purpose of enforcing and administering the Settlement.

20. In the event the Effective Date of the Settlement does not occur, the Settlement shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by and in accordance with the Agreement, and this Final Approval Order and any other order entered by this Court in accordance with the terms of the Agreement shall be vacated, *nunc pro tunc*. In such event, all orders entered and releases delivered in connection with the Settlement shall be null and void and have no further force and effect, shall not be used or referred to for any purpose whatsoever, and shall not be admissible or discoverable in any proceeding. The Action shall return to its status immediately prior to execution of the Agreement.

21. All Settlement Class Members shall be bound by this Final Approval Order.

22. There being no just reason for delay, the Clerk of Court is hereby directed to enter final judgment forthwith pursuant to Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.

DONE AND ORDERED in Broward County, Florida, this _____ day of _____, 2025.

HON. MICHELE TOWBIN SINGER
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

Copies Furnished to:

Counsel of Record

EXHIBIT B

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

GINA LETIZIO, EDUARDO GUILLEN,
ISABEL REEVES, PAUL COONS, as executor CASE NO.: CACE-25-011999
of the Estate of ELIZABETH BISSELL, JOHN
CRERAR, and CHRISTOPHER SHARP,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP. f/k/a
AKUMIN CORP.,

Defendant.

_____ /

**JOINT DECLARATION OF CLASS COUNSEL
JEFF OSTROW AND MARIYA WEEKES**

We, Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes, hereby declare as follows:

1. We are counsel of record for Plaintiffs¹ and Class Counsel for the Settlement Class in the above-captioned matter. We submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Class Counsels' Application for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards. Unless otherwise noted, we have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could and would testify competently to them if called upon to do so. Firm resumes of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. ("KO"), and Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman, PLLC ("Milberg"), (together, "Firm Resumes") are attached hereto as *Exhibits 1-2*.

¹ All terms capitalized herein have the same meanings as those in the Settlement Agreement ("Agreement").

Facts Supporting Settlement Approval

2. As can be seen from the Firm Resumes, Class Counsel have extensive experience in the litigation, certification, trial, and settlement of consumer class-action litigation, and specifically in data breach litigation. There are few, if any, firms in the nation with the expertise of Class Counsel in these types of cases. Class Counsel have collectively recovered hundreds of millions of dollars for the classes they represented in dozens of cases. In negotiating this Settlement, Class Counsel had the benefit of years of experience and a familiarity with the facts of this Action as well as with other data breach cases. We are informed and believe Defendant's counsel is also highly experienced in this type of litigation.

3. The Parties' counsel fully evaluated the strengths, weaknesses, and equities of the Parties' respective positions and they believe the proposed Settlement fairly resolves their differences.

4. Defendant is a radiology and oncology service provider based in Florida. In the ordinary course of operating its business, Defendant collects, maintains, and stores Private Information pertaining to current and former employees and patients, including confidential personally identifiable information and protected health information.

5. On October 11, 2023, a cyberattack occurred on Defendant's computer systems. In response, Defendant immediately launched an investigation revealing that on that date an unauthorized third party accessed and encrypted files for the purpose of extortion. This included temporary access to certain files from Defendant's system, which may have included the Private Information entrusted to Defendant.

6. Following the Data Incident, Defendant was named in several court class action lawsuits in the Southern District of Florida, all related to the Data Incident, and all alleging similar

claims on behalf of overlapping putative classes.

7. On December 30, 2024, Plaintiffs in the related actions filed a Motion to Consolidate Actions and Appoint Interim Class Counsel.

8. On February 27, 2025, the Court entered an order consolidating the Related Actions into the first-filed action and set a deadline for applications for interim class counsel for Plaintiffs to file a consolidated complaint following the appointment of interim class counsel.

9. On March 3, 2025, Plaintiffs renewed their motion to appoint Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as interim class counsel, expressly noting the consent of all Plaintiffs, and the motion was granted on March 5, 2025.

10. On April 14, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a consolidated complaint alleging negligence and negligence *per se*, breach of implied contract, breach of fiduciary duty, breach of confidence, unjust enrichment, and declaratory judgment.

11. On April 30, 2025, the Parties filed a joint discovery report pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), and on May 7, 2025, the Court entered a trial and pre-trial schedule.

12. On May 14, 2025, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint.

13. Thereafter, the Parties decided to explore early resolution and scheduled a mediation for August 7, 2025, with experienced data breach class action mediator Rodney A. Max, Esq., of Upchurch Watson White & Max.

14. On May 19, 2025, to conserve resources in anticipation of mediation, the Parties jointly moved to stay the case pending mediation, which the Court granted. In advance of the mediation, the Parties exchanged detailed informal discovery related to the cause and scope of the Data Incident, the number of individuals involved, the type of personal information impacted, and

Plaintiffs' claimed damages. The Parties attended mediation on August 7, 2025. After a full day of negotiating, the Parties reached an agreement. During mediation, the Parties determined that jurisdiction was proper in state court.

15. Consequently, on August 11, 2025, Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the federal action and filed the Action in this Court.

16. The Parties then interviewed settlement administrators, negotiated the full terms of the Settlement Agreement, drafted the Notices and Claim Form, and ultimately signed the Settlement Agreement on September 10, 2025.

17. Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Preliminary Approval on September 11, 2025, and the Court granted the motion on September 16, 2025.

18. As there are nearly 1.2 million Settlement Class Members, the value of this benefit to the Settlement Class overall is in the hundreds of millions of dollars. It would be impossible and/or impractical to (i) separately join each of the members of the Settlement Class in the Action or (ii) have each of the Settlement Class Member file suit and move to consolidate their suits into this Action concerning the same legal issues.

19. Resolution of over a million claims in one action is far superior to individual lawsuits because it promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication. Given the small value of their individual claims, and their support for the Settlement, it can be inferred that Settlement Class Members are not interested in prosecuting their own claims. Class Counsel is unaware of any other litigation against Defendant arising from the Data Incident. It is desirable to litigate the claims in this Court given Defendant's substantial business activity in Florida, and because the causes of action accrued in Florida, and manageability is no concern in the context of class settlement approval.

20. Class Counsel believe the Settlement Class Member Benefits, which include a Cash Payment for Documented Losses related to fraud, identity theft, or misuse of their Personal Information for a maximum of \$2,500.00 per Settlement Class Member, are fair, adequate, and reasonable. To receive payment for Documented Losses, a Settlement Class Member must complete and submit a Claim Form and include detailed documentation in support of the Claim. Examples of detailed documentation include (but are not limited to): telephone records, correspondence including emails, or receipts. Except as expressly provided under the Agreement, personal certifications, declarations, or affidavits from the Settlement Class Member do not constitute proper documentation but may be included to provide clarification, context, or support for other submitted reasonable documentation. As there are approximately 1,200,000 Settlement Class Members, the potential recovery value of this benefit to the Settlement Class overall is in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

21. In addition to a Cash Payment for Documented Losses, all Settlement Class Members will be entitled to one year of CyEx's Medical Shield Complete. This includes credit monitoring with one bureau, with additional monitoring of: (a) healthcare insurance plan IDs, healthcare beneficiary identifier ID; (b) medical records; (c) national provider identifier; (d) international classification of disease; (e) health savings account; (f) high-risk transactions; and (g) the dark web. The product also provides for \$1,000,000.00 of identity theft insurance and contains real-time alerts and victim assistance. The market value of this benefit is \$186,480,000.00 (1,200,000 Settlement Class Members x \$155.40).

22. In consideration for the Settlement Class Member Benefits, Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members agree to release Defendant from claims related to the Data Incident. The Releases are narrowly tailored to the claims made in the Action.

23. On September 22, 2025, Epiq received the Class List from Defendant containing records for 1,165,790 Settlement Class Members. From October 1, 2025, through October 30, 2025, Epiq initiated Publication Notice which consisted of a robust digital campaign and a comprehensive sponsored search listing program. All told, the campaigns were extremely successful in increasing the notice reach.

24. Also, following Preliminary Approval, Epiq established the Settlement Website, a toll-free telephone number, and postal address for Settlement Class Member inquiries. The toll-free Settlement telephone line went live on September 30, 2025. The telephone line has been active 24 hours a day / seven days a week and provides Settlement Class Members with answers to frequently asked questions and allows them to request Long Form Notices or Claim Forms. These additional forms of notice further buttressed the highly successful direct Notice Program.

25. The efforts undertaken in the Notice Program are consistent with best-practicable, Court-approved notice programs in similar matters. Overall, the Notice Program was highly effective. It was the best notice under the circumstances, satisfied the requirements of due process, and conformed with all aspects of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220. The result of the Notice Program, consisting of direct Email Notice and Publication Notice, combined with the Settlement Website and toll-free telephone, was that greater than 70% of the Settlement Class received actual notice of the Settlement. The rate exceeds the Federal Judicial Center's guidelines concerning appropriate reach, which state that a notice plan that reaches a minimum of 70% of targeted class members is reasonable.

26. The Notice Program was timely commenced and properly completed in full compliance with the Court's instructions in the Preliminary Approval Order and the requirements in the Settlement Agreement.

27. The Settlement Class fully endorses and supports the Settlement. Following the successful Notice Program, the Settlement Class had ample opportunity to opt-out or object to the Settlement.

28. The deadline to opt-out of or object to the Settlement is November 30, 2025 (15 days before the Final Approval Hearing). There are no objections and only four opt-outs. Should any objections be timely and properly submitted, Class Counsel will notify the Court before Final Approval Hearing. The same is true if anyone else opts-out.

29. As of November 6, 2025, there have been 839 Claim Forms submitted online by mail. The number of Claim Form submissions will increase as there is still another three weeks before the Claim Form Deadline. The Settlement Administrator will review all Claim Forms to determine their validity, eligibility, and the type and amount of Settlement Class Member Benefit to which the Settlement Class Member may be entitled.

30. The timing of the Claim Process was structured to ensure that all Settlement Class members had adequate time to review the terms of the Settlement, compile documents supporting their Claim, and decide whether to submit a Claim, opt-out of, or object to the Settlement.

31. While Plaintiffs and Class Counsel firmly believe Plaintiffs' claims would have resulted in class certification and favorable adjudication on the merits, Plaintiffs faced significant risks had they continued to litigate the Action,² which include Defendant successfully: (i) moving

² "Data breach cases . . . are particularly risky, expensive and complex" due at least in part to the cutting-edge, innovative nature of data breach litigation and the rapidly evolving law. *Gordon v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.*, No. 17-cv-01415- CMA-SKC, 2019 WL 6972701, at *1 (D. Colo. Dec. 16, 2019); *see also In re Wawa, Inc. Data Sec. Litig.*, No. 19-6019, 2024 WL 1557366, at *20 (E.D. Pa. April 9, 2024) ("Data breach litigation is inherently complex."); *In re Equifax Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 17-MD-2800, 2020 WL 256132, *15 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 17, 2020) (in data breach "[t]he law . . . remains uncertain and the applicable legal principles have continued to evolve"). For these reasons, data breach cases like this one have been dismissed at

for dismissal of Plaintiffs' claims; (ii) opposing class certification; (iii) appealing a class certification order; (iv) prevailing on a post-certification summary judgment motion; (v) prevailing at trial; or (vi) appealing a post-certification summary judgment or post-trial judgment.

32. Moreover, even if a litigation class were certified and Plaintiffs prevailed on the merits, it would still take years to litigate the Action through trial and the various appeals.

33. The Settlement eliminates all of those risks and the years of delays by getting the Settlement Class Members their money and the non-monetary security enhancements now.

34. The risk of establishing damages in this Action was not insignificant.

35. Class Counsel vigorously advocated for the Settlement Class Members in this Action and believe the Settlement is in the best interest of the Settlement Class.

36. The potential recovery value of these benefits is highly substantial.

37. The Settlement offers substantial Settlement Class Member Benefits that favorably compare with similar data breach class actions.

38. The Settlement will provide certain, substantial, and immediate relief to the Settlement Class. It ensures Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims will receive guaranteed compensation now and provides Settlement Class Members with access to Settlement Class Member Benefits that may not have been available at trial. Accordingly, the Court should find the

the pleading stage and generally face substantial class certification hurdles. *See, e.g., In re Blackbaud, Inc., Customer Data Breach Litigation*, No. 3:20-mn-02972-JFA, 2024 WL 21555221 (D.S.C. May 14, 2024) (denying class certification in a data breach action after concluding proposed class and sub-classes were not ascertainable); *In re TD Ameritrade Account Holder Litig.*, No. C 07-2852 SBA, 2011 WL 4079226, at *14 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 13, 2011) (“many [data breach class actions] have been dismissed at the pleading stage.”); *In re TJX Cos. Retail Sec. Breach Litig.*, 246 F.R.D. 389 (D. Mass. 2007) (denying class certification in cybersecurity incident class action litigation). Maintaining class certification is often an equally challenging hurdle. *See e.g., Marriott Int’l Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 78 F.4th 677 (4th Cir. Aug. 18, 2023) (decertifying classes).

Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable and within the range of possible recovery.

Facts Supporting Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards

39. After the Parties agreed on all material terms of the Settlement, they discussed attorneys' fees, costs, and Service Awards. Defendant agreed to separately pay attorneys' fees, including all litigation costs and expenses, in the amount of \$2.85 million.

40. The attorneys' fees and costs are based upon the total value of the Settlement Class Member Benefits made available as a direct result of Class Counsel's efforts.

41. Payment of attorneys' fees and costs will not impact the amount paid to Settlement Class Members who claim a Cash Payment for Documented Losses, nor will it impact the Medical Data Monitoring.

42. The Parties agreed Class Counsel would request Service Awards for the Class Representative in an amount of up to \$2,500 each.

43. There have been no objections by any of the Settlement Class Members to the amounts requested.

44. The Service Awards are meant to compensate the Class Representatives for their efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, which includes maintaining contact with Class Counsel, participating in client interviews, providing relevant documents, assisting in the investigation of the Action, remaining available for consultation throughout settlement negotiations, reviewing relevant pleadings and the Agreement, and answering Class Counsel's many questions.

45. The requested Service Awards are justified in light of the Class Representatives' willingness to devote their time and energy to prosecuting this Action and is reasonable in consideration of the overall benefit conferred on the Settlement Class and should be approved.

46. Class Counsel have demonstrated their skills, experience, and reputation. Class

Counsel have extensive experience in the litigation, certification, trial, and settlement of consumer class-action litigation, and specifically in data breach litigation. There are few, if any, firms in the nation with the expertise of Class Counsel in these types of cases. Class Counsel have collectively recovered billions of dollars for the classes they represented in hundreds of cases. In negotiating this Settlement, Class Counsel had the benefit of years of experience and a familiarity with the facts of this Action as well as with other data breach cases.

47. Class Counsel's work on this matter includes: investigating the cause and effects of alleged unlawful sharing of Plaintiff's and Settlement Class Members' Private Information, interviewing potential clients, evaluating the potential class representatives, contributing to the evaluation of the merits of the Action before filing the Complaint; conducting legal research; drafting the Complaint, the settlement term sheet, the Agreement, the Notices and Claim Form, the Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Motion for Final Approval, including Class Counsel's Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards; communicating with Defendant's Counsel, preparing document and information requests for Defendant as part of informal discovery; engaging in extensive settlement negotiations with Defendant; and providing updates to and handling questions from our Class Representatives. Class Counsel were mindful to avoid duplicative efforts among themselves.

48. The Settlement Class may never have secured relief, financial or otherwise, absent this Settlement. Without reaching a swift settlement, Plaintiffs would have otherwise endured lengthy, expensive, and arduous litigation, during which they would still be exposed to the risk of identity theft. Accordingly, the requested attorneys' fee award considers the novel, complex, and difficult nature of data breach class action cases, and appropriately compensates Class Counsel's ability to resolve this matter efficiently while recovering the maximum amount available to the

Settlement Class in a timely manner.

49. Based on 514 hours of work, Class Counsel's current lodestar (hours x hourly rates) is approximately \$540,000. This amount does not include an estimated 40 hours that Class Counsel will spend preparing for and attending the Final Approval Hearing and assisting the Settlement Administrator following Final Approval. This additional time will increase the lodestar to approximately \$580,000, which will result in an approximate multiplier of 4.9. The lodestar is broken down by firm (Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. – \$296,750; and Milberg Coleman Byson Phillips Grossman PLLC– \$243,250).

50. The requested award is justified in light of the fact that Class Counsel rendered services without compensation, achieved an outstanding result for the Settlement Class with a highly substantial value, and billed at rates commensurate with their unique experience. The requested attorneys' fee is also fair in view of the complicated nature of the Action, and the time, effort, and skill required. The financial risks borne by Class Counsel fully support the fee requested.

51. The additional time Class Counsel will spend working on the case include preparing for and attending the Final Approval Hearing and assisting the Settlement Administrator following Final Approval.

52. Class Counsel and Plaintiffs have had a relationship that started before filing the complaints in the actions and will continue to work with one another for a few more months, including time after Final Approval. Prosecuting and settling the Action demanded considerable time, labor, and skill. Class Counsel's work on this matter includes: investigating the cause and effects of alleged unlawful sharing of Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class Members' information, interviewing potential clients, evaluating the potential class representatives, contributing to the

evaluation of the merits of the Action before filing of the federal complaint, conducting legal research, drafting the federal complaint and litigating there, drafting the Complaint in this Action, working with experts, preparing discovery requests in advance of mediation, drafting the mediation statement, attending mediation, negotiating the terms of the Settlement, drafting a settlement term sheet, negotiating and drafting the Settlement Agreement, interviewing and selecting the Settlement Administrator, creating the relevant notices of settlement, drafting the Motion for Preliminary Approval and Motion for Final Approval including Class Counsel's Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards and multiple declarations, communicating with defense counsel, providing updates to and handling questions from the Class Representatives, and preparing for the Final Approval Hearing.

53. The time spent on this Action could otherwise have been spent on other fee-generating work. Because Class Counsel undertook representation of this matter on a contingency-fee basis, we shouldered the risk of expending substantial costs and time in litigating the Action without any monetary gain in the event of an adverse judgment.

54. If not devoted to litigating this Action, from which any remuneration is wholly contingent on a successful outcome, the time our firms spent working on this Action could and would have been spent pursuing other fee-generating and/or lower risk cases from the time the Action was being investigated throughout the litigation.

55. Litigation is inherently unpredictable and therefore risky. Here, that risk was very real, due to the rapidly evolving nature of case law pertaining to data privacy matters, and the state of data privacy law. Therefore, despite Class Counsel's devotion to the Action and our confidence in the claims alleged against Defendant, there have been many factors beyond our control that posed significant risks.

56. Class Counsel have significant and unique legal experience in consumer class action litigation, and data breach litigation specifically.

57. Class Counsel incorporate by reference the previous discussion regarding their inability to work on other cases because of the time burdens of this Action and its importance.

58. With respect to demands imposed by the client, the representation of the Settlement Class does not end with Final Approval of the Settlement.

59. Ultimately, Class Counsel are responsible for seeing that the terms of the Settlement are followed, which will involve a substantial time commitment.

60. From the time Class Counsel filed the Action, there existed a real possibility they would achieve no recovery and, hence, no compensation.

61. The hourly rates charged by Class Counsel range from \$900.00 to \$1,175.00 per hour for attorneys. These hourly rates are within the range of hourly rates approved by Florida courts and elsewhere in the United States for legal services in class actions of a similar nature, considering the type of matter, level of experience, training, and education.

62. Given the experience, reputation, and skills of Class Counsel, these hourly rates are reasonable and are well within those customarily charged in this locale for services of a similar nature. Courts around the country have approved Class Counsel's rates.

63. The hourly rates for the attorneys who worked on this Action are as follows, and the background and class action experience of the attorneys who performed the work in this Action are: Jeff Ostrow (Managing Partner) - \$1,150.00; Jonathan Streisfeld (Senior Partner) - \$1,150.00; and Mariya Weekes (Partner) - \$950.00

64. Additionally, we have incurred litigation costs which were reasonably and necessarily incurred for the prosecution of this Action. Those costs, totaling \$22,325.00, were

incurred for fees related to filing service, experts, and mediation.

65. Class Counsel continue to work with Defendant and the Settlement Administrator regarding Claims administration and processing, as well as answering questions from Settlement Class members about the Settlement and the process.

* * * * *

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Florida and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in Fort Lauderdale, Florida on November 14, 2025.

/s/ Jeff Ostrow
Jeff Ostrow

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of Florida and the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in Coral Gables, Florida on November 14, 2025.

/s/ Mariya Weekes
Mariya Weekes

EXHIBIT 1



FIRM RESUME

One West Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 500
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Telephone: 954.525.4100

Facsimile: 954.525.4300

Website: www.kolawyers.com

Miami – Fort Lauderdale – Boca Raton

OUR FIRM

For over two decades, Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert (KO) has provided comprehensive, results-oriented legal representation to individual, business, and government clients throughout Florida and the rest of the country. KO has the experience and capacity to represent its clients effectively and has the legal resources to address almost any legal need. The firm's 25 attorneys have practiced at several of the nation's largest and most prestigious firms and are skilled in almost all phases of law, including consumer class actions, multidistrict litigation involving mass tort actions, complex commercial litigation, and corporate transactions. In the class action arena, the firm has experience not only representing individual aggrieved consumers, but also defending large institutional clients, including multiple Fortune 100 companies.

WHO WE ARE

The firm has a roster of accomplished attorneys. Clients have an opportunity to work with some of the finest lawyers in Florida and the United States, each one committed to upholding KO's principles of professionalism, integrity, and personal service. Among our roster, you'll find attorneys whose accomplishments include Board Certified in their specialty; serving as in-house counsel for major corporations, as city and county attorneys handling government affairs, and as public defenders and prosecutors; achieving multi-millions of dollars through verdicts and settlements in trials, arbitrations, and alternative dispute resolution procedures; successfully winning appeals at every level in Florida state and federal courts; and serving government in various elected and appointed positions.

KO has the experience and resources necessary to represent large putative classes. The firm's attorneys are not simply litigators, but rather, experienced trial attorneys with the support staff and resources needed to coordinate complex cases.

CLASS ACTION PLAINTIFF

Since its founding, KO has initiated and served as lead class counsel in dozens of high-profile class actions. Although the actions are diverse by subject area, KO has established itself as one of the leading firms that sue national and regional banks and credit unions related to the unlawful assessment of fees. Their efforts spanning a decade plus have resulted in recoveries in excess of \$500 million and monumental practices changes that have changed the industry and saving clients billions of dollars.

Additionally, other past and current cases have been prosecuted for breaches of insurance policies; data breaches; data privacy; wiretapping; biometric privacy; gambling; false advertising; defective consumer products and vehicles; antitrust violations; and suits on behalf of students against colleges and universities arising out of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The firm has in the past litigated certified and proposed class actions against Blue Cross Blue Shield and United Healthcare related to their improper reimbursements of health insurance benefits. Other insurance cases include auto insurers failing to pay benefits owed to insureds with total loss vehicle claims. Other class action cases include cases against Microsoft Corporation related to its Xbox 360 gaming platform, ten of the largest oil companies in the world in connection with the destructive propensities of ethanol and its impact on boats, Nationwide Insurance for improper mortgage fee assessments, and several of the nation's largest retailers for deceptive advertising and marketing at their retail outlets and factory stores.

CLASS ACTION DEFENSE

The firm also brings experience in successfully defended many class actions on behalf of banking institutions, mortgage providers and servicers, advertising conglomerates, aircraft manufacturer and U.S. Dept. of Defense contractor, a manufacturer of breast implants, and a national fitness chain.

MASS TORT LITIGATION

The firm also has extensive experience in mass tort litigation, including serving as Lead Counsel in the Zantac Litigation, one of the largest mass torts in history. The firm also has handled cases against 3M related to defective earplugs, several vaginal mesh manufacturers, Bayer in connection with its pesticide Roundup, Bausch & Lomb for its Renu with MoistureLoc product, Wyeth Pharmaceuticals related to Prempro, Bayer Corporation related to its birth control pill YAZ, and Howmedica Osteonics Corporation related to the Stryker Rejuvenate and AGB II hip implants. In connection with the foregoing, some of which has been litigated within the multidistrict arena, the firm has obtained tens of millions in recoveries for its clients.

OTHER AREAS OF PRACTICE

In addition to class action and mass tort litigation, the firm has extensive experience in the following practice areas: commercial and general civil litigation, corporate transactions, health law, insurance law, labor and employment law, marital and family law, real estate litigation and transaction, government affairs, receivership, construction law, appellate practice, estate planning, wealth preservation, healthcare provider reimbursement and contractual disputes, white collar and criminal defense, employment contracts, environmental, and alternative dispute resolution.

FIND US ONLINE

To learn more about KO, or any of the firm's other attorneys, please visit www.kolawyers.com.

CLASS ACTION AND MASS TORTS

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Aseltine v. Bank of America, N.A., 3:23-cv-00235 (W.D.N.C. 2024) – \$21 million
McNeil v. Capital One, N.A., 1:19-cv-00473 (E.D.N.Y.) – \$16 million
Devore, et al. v. Dollar Bank, GD-21-008946 (Ct. Common Pleas Allegheny 2024) - \$7 million
Nimsey v. Tinker Federal Credit Union, C1-2019-6084 (Dist. Ct. Oklahoma 2024) - \$5.475 million
Precision Roofing of N. Fla. Inc., et al. v. CenterState Bank, 3:20-cv-352 (S.D. Fla. 2023) - \$2.65 million
Checchia v. Bank of America, N.A., 2:21-cv-03585 (E.D. Pa. 2023) - \$8 million
Quirk v. Liberty Bank, X03-HHD-CV20-6132741-S (Jud. Dist. Ct. Hartford 2023) - \$1.4 million
Meier v. Prosperity Bank, 109569-CV (Dist. Ct. Brazoria 2023) - \$1.6 million
Abercrombie v. TD Bank, N.A., 0:21-cv-61376 (S.D. Fla. 2022) - \$4.35 million
Perks, et al. v. TD Bank, N.A., 1:18-cv-11176 (E.D.N.Y. 2022) - \$41.5 million
Fallis v. Gate City Bank, 09-2019-CV-04007 (Dist. Ct., Cty. of Cass, N.D. 2022) - \$1.8 million
Glass, et al. v. Delta Comm. Cred. Union, 2019CV317322 (Sup. Ct. Fulton Ga. 2022) - \$2.8 million
Roy v. ESL Fed. Credit Union, 19-cv-06122 (W.D.N.Y. 2022) - \$1.9 million
Wallace v. Wells Fargo, 17CV317775 (Sup. Ct. Santa Clara 2021) - \$10 million
Doxey v. Community Bank, N.A., 8:19-CV-919 (N.D.N.Y. 2021) - \$3 million
Coleman v. Alaska USA Federal Credit Union, 3:19-cv-0229-HRH (Dist. of Alaska 2021) - \$1 million
Smith v. Fifth Third Bank, 1:18-cv-00464-DRC-SKB (W.D. Ohio 2021) - \$5.2 million
Lambert v. Navy Federal Credit Union, 1:19-cv-00103-LO-MSN (S.D. Va. 2021) - \$16 million
Roberts v. Capital One, N.A., 16 Civ. 4841 (LGS) (S.D.N.Y. 2021) - \$17 million
Lloyd v. Navy Federal Credit Union, 17-cv-01280-BAS-RBB (S.D. Ca. 2019) - \$24.5million
Farrell v. Bank of America, N.A., 3:16-cv-00492-L-WVG (S.D. Ca. 2018) - \$66.6 million
Bodnar v. Bank of America, N.A., 5:14-cv-03224-EGS (E.D. Pa. 2015) - \$27.5 million
Morton v. Green Bank, 11-135-IV (20th Judicial District Tenn. 2018) - \$1.5 million
Hawkins v. First Tenn. Bank, CT-004085-11 (13th Jud. Dist. Tenn. 2017) - \$16.75 million
Payne v. Old National Bank, 82C01-1012 (Cir. Ct. Vanderburgh 2016) - \$4.75 million
Swift v. Bancorpsouth, 1:10-CV-00090 (N.D. Fla. 2016) - \$24.0 million
Mello v. Susquehanna Bank, 1:09-MD-02046 (S.D. Fla. 2014) – \$3.68 million
Johnson v. Community Bank, 3:11-CV-01405 (M.D. Pa. 2013) - \$1.5 million
McKinley v. Great Western Bank, 1:09-MD-02036 (S.D. Fla. 2013) - \$2.2 million
Blahut v. Harris Bank, 1:09-MD-02036 (S.D. Fla. 2013) - \$9.4 million
Wolfgeher v. Commerce Bank, 1:09-MD-02036 (S.D. Fla. 2013) - \$18.3 million
Case v. Bank of Oklahoma, 09-MD-02036 (S.D. Fla. 2012) - \$19.0 million
Hawthorne v. Umpqua Bank, 3:11-CV-06700 (N.D. Cal. 2012) - \$2.9 million
Simpson v. Citizens Bank, 2:12-CV-10267 (E.D. Mich. 2012) - \$2.0 million
Harris v. Associated Bank, 1:09-MD-02036 (S.D. Fla. 2012) - \$13.0 million
LaCour v. Whitney Bank, 8:11-CV-1896 (M.D. Fla. 2012) - \$6.8 million
Orallo v. Bank of the West, 1:09-MD-202036 (S.D. Fla. 2012) - \$18.0 million
Taulava v. Bank of Hawaii, 11-1-0337-02 (1st Cir. Hawaii 2011) - \$9.0 million

In re: Fortra File Transfer Software Data Breach Litigation, MDL No. 3090 (S.D. Fla.) – \$27 million
In re: Evolve Bank & Trust Customer Data Breach Litig., MDL No. 3127 (W.D. Tenn.) - \$17.0 million
In re: Snowflake, Inc., Data Breach Litigation, MDL No. 3126 (D. Mont.) - Co-Lead Counsel
In re: Consumer Vehicle Driving Data Tracking Collection, MDL No. 3115 (N.D. Ga.) - Exec. Comm.
In re Change Healthcare, Inc. Data Breach Litigation, MDL No. 3108 (D. Minn.) - Exec. Comm.
In re: PowerSchool Holdings, Inc. Customer Data Breach Litig., MDL No. 3149 (S.D. Cal.) - Exec. Comm.

MDLs

DATA BREACH AND PRIVACY

In Re: AT&T Inc Customer Data Security Breach Litigation, 3:24-cv-00757 (N.D. Tex.) - \$177 million
McNally et al. v. Infosys McAmish Systems, LLC, 1:24-cv-00995 (N.D. Ga.) - \$17.5 million
Crowe, et al. v. Managed Care of North America, Inc., 0:23-cv-61065-AHS (S.D. Fla.) – Co-Lead Counsel
Malinowski, et al. v. IBM Corp. and Johnson & Johnson, 7:23-cv-08421 (S.D.N.Y.) – Co-Lead Counsel
Gordon, et al. v. Zeroed-In Technologies, LLC, et al., 1:23-CV-03284 (D. Md.) – Co-Lead Counsel
Harrell, et al. v. Webtpa Employer Services LLC, 3:24-CV-01158 (N.D. Tex.) - \$13.75 million
Gambino, et al. v. Berry Dunn Mcneil & Parker LLC, 2:24-CV-00146 (D. Me.) - \$7.25 million
Isaac v. Greylock McKinnon Associates, Inc., 1:24-CV-10797 (D. Mass.) - \$600,000
Rodriguez, et al. v. Caesars Entertainment, Inc., 2:23-CV-01447 (D. Nev.) - Steering Committee Chair
Owens v. MGM Resorts International, 2:23-cv-01480-RFB-MDC (D. Nev.) - \$45 million
Doyle v. Luxottica of America, Inc., 1:20-cv-00908-MRB (S.D. Ohio) - Executive Committee
Doe, et al. v. Highmark, Inc., 2:23-cv-00250-NR (W.D. Penn.) - Executive Committee
Silvers, et al. v. HCA Healthcare, Inc., 1:23-cv-01003-LPH (S.D. In.) - Executive Committee
In re: 21st Century Oncology, MDL No. 2737 (M.D. Fla. 2021) - \$21.8 million
In re: CaptureRx Data Breach, 5:21-cv-00523 (W.D. Tex. 2022) - \$4.75 million
Lopez, et al. v. Volusion, LLC, 1:20-cv-00761 (W.D. Tex. 2022) - \$4.3 million
Mathis v. Planet Home Lending, LLC, 3:24-CV-00127 (D. Conn.) - \$2.425 million
In re loanDepot Data Breach Litigation, 8:24-cv-00136 (C.D. Cal.) - \$25 million
Stadnik v. Sovos Compliance, LLC, 1:23-CV-12100 (D. Mass.) - \$3.5 million
Turner v. Johns Hopkins, et al., 24-C-23-002983 (Md. Cir. Ct.) - \$2.9 million
Peterson v. Vivendi Ticketing US LLC, 2:23-CV-07498 (C.D. Cal.) - \$3.25 million
Katz et al. v. Einstein Healthcare Network, 02045 (Pa. Ct. C.P., Phila.) - \$1.6 million
Opris et al v. Sincera Reproductive Medicine et al, 2:21-cv-03072 (E.D. Pa.) - \$1.2 million
Garza et al v. Healthalliance, Inc. et al, 7245012023 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) - \$1.29 million
McLean et al. v. Signature Performance, Inc. et al., 8:24-cv-00230 (D. Neb.) - \$8.5 million
Wahab et al. v. Boston Children's Health Phys., LLP, 73692/2024 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) - \$5.15 million

Ostendorf v. Grange Indemnity Ins. Co., 2:19-cv-01147-ALM-KAJ (E.D. Ohio 2020) - \$12.6 million
Paris, et al. v. Progressive Select Ins. Co., et al., 19-21760-CIV (S.D. Fla. 2023) - \$38 million
Spielman v. USAA, et al., 2:19-cv-01359-TJH-MAA (C.D. Ca. 2023) - \$3 million
Walters v. Target Corp., 3:16-cv-1678-L-MDD (S.D. Cal. 2020) - \$8.2 million
Papa v. Grieco Ford Fort Lauderdale, LLC, 18-cv-21897-JEM (S.D. Fla. 2019) - \$4.9 million
In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig., MDL 2626 (M.D. Fla.) - \$88 million
Vandiver v. MD Billing Ltd., 2023LA000728 (18th Jud. Dist. Ill. 2023) - \$24 million
Skrandel v. Costco Wholesale Corp., 9:21-cv-80826-BER (S.D. Fla. 2024) - \$1.3 million
Evans v. Church & Dwight Co., Inc., 1:22-CV-06301 (N.D. Ill. 2023) - \$2.5 million
In Re: Farm-Raised Salmon & Salmon Prod. Antitrust Litig., No. 1:19-cv-21551 (S.D. Fla. 2023) - \$75 million
Perry v. Progressive Michigan, et al., 22-000971-CK (Cir. Ct. Washtenaw) - Class Counsel
In re Apple Simulated Casino-Style Games Litig., MDL No. 2958 (N.D. Cal.) - Executive Committee
In re Google Simulated Casino-Style Games Litig., MDL No. 3001 (N.D. Cal.) - Executive Committee
In re Facebook Simulated Casino-Style Games Litig., No. 5:21-cv-02777 (N.D. Cal.) - Exec. Committee

In re Zantac Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL No. 2924 (S.D. Fla.) - Co-Lead Counsel
In re: National Prescription Opiate Litigation, No. MDL No. 2804 (N.D. Ohio) - \$100 million
In re: Juul Labs, No. MDL No. 2913 (N.D. Cal.) - \$26 million
In re: Davenport Hotel Building Collapse, LACE137119 (Dist. Ct. Scott Cty., Iowa) - Class Counsel
In re: 3M Combat Arms Earplug Prod. Liab. Litig., MDL No. 2885 (N.D. Fla.) - Numerous Plaintiffs
In re: Stryker Prod. Liab. Lit., 13-MD-2411 (Fla. Cir Ct.) - Numerous Plaintiffs

CONSUMER PROTECTION

MASS TORT



JEFF OSTROW

Managing Partner

ostrow@kolawyers.com

954.332.4200

Bar Admissions

Florida Bar

District of Columbia Bar

Court Admissions

Supreme Court of the United States

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois

U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan

U.S. District Court, Western District of Tennessee

U.S. District Court, Western District of Wisconsin

U.S. District Court, Western District of Kentucky

U.S. District Court, Northern District of New York

U.S. District Court, District of Colorado

U.S. District Court, Southern District of Indiana

U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Texas

U.S. District Court, District of Nebraska

Education

Nova Southeastern University, J.D. - 1997

University of Florida, B.A. - 1994

Jeff Ostrow is the Managing Partner of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. He established his own firm in 1997, immediately upon graduation from law school and has since grown KO to 30 attorneys with offices in South Florida, Philadelphia, and New York. In addition to overseeing the firm's day-to-day operations and strategic direction, Mr. Ostrow practices full time in the area of consumer class actions. He is a Martindale-Hubbell AV® Preeminent™ rated attorney in both legal ability and ethics, which is the highest possible rating by the most widely recognized attorney rating organization in the world.

Mr. Ostrow is an accomplished trial attorney who has experience representing both Plaintiffs and Defendants. He has successfully tried many cases to verdict involving multi-million-dollar damage claims in state and federal courts. He is currently court-appointed lead counsel or sits on plaintiffs' executive committees in multiple high profile nationwide multi-district litigation actions involving cybersecurity breaches and related privacy issues.

Additionally, he has spent the past 15 years serving as lead counsel in dozens of nationwide and statewide class action lawsuits against many of the world's largest financial institutions in connection with the unlawful assessment of fees. To date, his efforts have successfully resulted in the recovery of over \$1 billion for tens of millions of bank and credit union customers, as well as monumental changes in the way they assess fees. Those changes have forever revolutionized an industry, resulting in billions of dollars of savings. In addition, Mr. Ostrow has served as lead class counsel in many consumer class actions against some of the world's largest airlines, pharmaceutical companies, clothing retailers, health and auto insurance carriers, technology companies, and oil conglomerates, along with serving as class action defense counsel for some of the largest advertising and marketing agencies in the world, banking institutions, real estate developers, and mortgage companies. A selection of

settled class actions in which Mr. Ostrow has participated are listed herein above.

Mr. Ostrow often serves as outside General Counsel to companies, advising them in connection with their legal and regulatory needs. He has represented many Fortune 500® Companies in connection with their Florida litigation. He has handled cases covered by media outlets throughout the country and has been quoted many times on various legal topics in almost every major news publication, including the Wall Street Journal, New York Times, Washington Post, Miami Herald, and Sun-Sentinel. He has also appeared on CNN, ABC, NBC, CBS, Fox, ESPN, and almost every other major national and international television network in connection with his cases, which often involve industry changing litigation or athletes in Olympic swimming, professional boxing, the NFL, NBA and MLB.

Mr. Ostrow received a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from the University of Florida in 1994 and Juris Doctorate from Nova Southeastern University in 1997. He is a licensed member of The Florida Bar and the District of Columbia Bar, is fully admitted to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and Eleventh Circuit, the U.S. District Courts for the Southern, Middle, and Northern Districts of Florida, District of Colorado, Southern District of Indiana, Western District of Kentucky, Eastern District of Michigan, Northern District of Illinois, District of Nebraska, Northern District of New York, Western District of Tennessee, Eastern District of Texas, Western District of Wisconsin, Southern District of Indiana, Eastern District of Texas, and District of Nebraska. Mr. Ostrow is also member of several bar associations.

In addition to the law practice, he is the founder and president of ProPlayer Sports LLC, a full-service sports agency and marketing firm. He represents both Olympic Gold Medalist Swimmers, World Champion Boxers, and select NFL athletes, and is licensed by both the NFL Players Association as a certified Contract Advisor. At the agency, Mr. Ostrow handles all player-team negotiations of contracts, represents his clients in legal proceedings, negotiates all marketing and NIL engagements, and oversees public relations and crisis management. He has extensive experience in negotiating, mediating, and arbitrating a wide range of issues on behalf of clients with the NFL Players Association, the International Olympic Committee, the United States Olympic Committee, USA Swimming and the World Anti-Doping Agency. He has been an invited sports law guest speaker at New York University and Nova Southeastern University and has also served as a panelist at many industry-related conferences.

He is a lifetime member of the Million Dollar Advocates Forum. The Million Dollar Advocates Forum is the most prestigious group of trial lawyers in the United States. Membership is limited to attorneys who have had multi-million dollar jury verdicts. Additionally, he is consistently named as one of the top lawyers in Florida by Super Lawyers®, a publication that recognizes the best lawyers in each state. Mr. Ostrow is an inaugural recipient of the University of Florida's Warrington College of Business Administration Gator 100 award for the fastest growing University of Florida alumni- owned law firm in the world.

When not practicing law, Mr. Ostrow serves on the Board of Governors of Nova Southeastern University's Wayne Huizenga School of Business and is the Managing Member of One West LOA LLC, a commercial real estate development company with holdings in downtown Fort Lauderdale. He has previously sat on the boards of a national banking institution and a national healthcare marketing company. Mr. Ostrow is a founding board member for the Jorge Nation Foundation, a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization that partners with the Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital to send children diagnosed with cancer on all-inclusive Dream Trips to destinations of their choice. Mr. Ostrow resides in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and has 3 sons.



DAVID FERGUSON

Partner

Bar Admissions

The Florida Bar

Court Admissions

U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Florida

Education

Nova Southeastern University, J.D. - 1993

Nova Southeastern University, B.S. – 1990

Email: ferguson@kolawyers.com

David L. Ferguson is an accomplished trial attorney and chairs the firm's litigation department. He routinely leads high stakes litigation across a wide array of practice areas, including, but not limited to, employment law, complex business litigation, class actions, product liability, catastrophic personal injury, civil rights, and regulatory enforcement actions.

Mr. Ferguson is a Martindale-Hubbell AV® Preeminent™ rated attorney in both legal ability and ethics, a testament to the fact that his peers (lawyers and judges in the community) have ranked him at the highest level of professional excellence. Mr. Ferguson is well regarded as a formidable advocate in court and for providing creative and insightful strategic advice, particularly in emergency and extremely complex situations.

While in law school, Mr. Ferguson served as a Staff Member of the Nova Law Review. He was also a member of the Moot Court Society and the winner of the Moot Court Intramural Competition.

Representation of the Broward Sheriff's Office

Since 2013, Mr. Ferguson has had the privilege of representing the Broward Sheriff's Office ("BSO") in over 150 matters involving many different types of disputes and issues, including: defense of civil rights lawsuits in state and federal court; negotiating collective bargaining agreements with unions; and arbitrations brought by unions or employees subjected to termination or other significant discipline. Mr. Ferguson has had many arbitration final hearings and state and federal jury trials for BSO representing the agency as well as the Sheriff and numerous Deputies individually.

Class/Mass Actions

Mr. Ferguson has experience in class actions against large banks and some of the world's largest companies, including technology companies and oil conglomerates.

Additionally, during his career Mr. Ferguson has defended many large companies in MDL's, and mass and class actions, including medical equipment manufacturers, pharmaceutical companies, an aircraft parts and engine manufacturer and defense contractor, nationwide retailers, and a massive sugar manufacturer.

Large Fraud and Ponzi Cases

Mr. Ferguson has a great deal of experience litigating cases involving massive fraud claims, most often for victims, but also for select defendants. Mr. Ferguson's clients have included individual victims who have lost multiple millions of dollars in fraud schemes to large businesses with tremendous damages, including one international lending institution with damages in excess of \$150 million. Additionally, Mr. Ferguson successfully represented several individuals and entities subjected to significant claims by a receiver and the United States Marshals Service in a massive billion-dollar Ponzi scheme involving a notorious Ft. Lauderdale lawyer and his law firm.

Regulatory Agency Enforcement Actions

Mr. Ferguson has extensive experience defending individuals and entities in significant enforcement actions brought by regulatory agencies, including the CFTC, FTC, and SEC.

Employment, Human Resources, and Related Matters

Mr. Ferguson has represented numerous business and individuals in employment and human resource related matters. Mr. Ferguson has represented several Fortune 50 companies, including Pratt & Whitney/UTC, Home Depot, and Office Depot in all phases of employment related matters. Mr. Ferguson has litigated virtually every type of discrimination and employment related claim, including claims based upon race, pregnancy, disability, national origin, religion, age, sexual preference, sexual harassment, worker's compensation, unemployment, FMLA leave, FLSA overtime, unpaid wages, whistleblower, and retaliation.

Mr. Ferguson primarily represents companies, but also represents select individuals who have claims against their present or former employers. In addition to the wide variety of employment claims discussed above, as plaintiff's counsel Mr. Ferguson has also handled federal False Claims Act (Qui Tam) and the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act claims brought by individuals.

Business Disputes

Throughout his legal career, as counsel for plaintiffs and defendants, Mr. Ferguson has handled a myriad of commercial cases involving all types of business disputes, including claims for breach of partnership agreements, breach of shareholder or limited liability company operating agreements; dissolution of corporations and limited liability companies; appointment of receivers; breaches of fiduciary duty; conversion; constructive trust; theft; negligent or intentional misrepresentation or omissions; fraudulent inducement; tortious interference; professional negligence or malpractice; derivative actions, breach of contract, real estate disputes, and construction disputes.

Noncompetition and Trade Secret Litigation

Mr. Ferguson routinely represents companies and individuals in commercial disputes involving unfair and deceptive trade practices, unfair competition and/or tortious interference with contracts or valuable business relationships. Often these cases involve the enforcement of noncompetition agreements and protection of valuable trade secrets. Mr. Ferguson has extensive experience representing businesses seeking to enforce their noncompetition agreements and/or protect trade secrets through suits for injunctive relief and damages and representing subsequent employers and individuals defending against such claims. He has obtained numerous injunctions for his clients and has also successfully defended against them numerous times, including getting injunctions dissolved that were entered against his clients without notice or prior to his representation. Mr. Ferguson has also obtained contempt sanctions and entitlement to punitive damages against individuals and entities who have stolen trade secrets from his clients.



ROBERT C. GILBERT

Partner

Bar Admissions

The Florida Bar
District of Columbia Bar

Court Admissions

Supreme Court of the United States
U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit
U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida
U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida

Education

University of Miami School of Law, J.D. - 1985
Florida International University, B.S. - 1982

Email: gilbert@kolawyers.com

Robert C. “Bobby” Gilbert has over three decades of experience handling class actions, multidistrict litigation and complex business litigation throughout the United States. He has been appointed lead counsel, co-lead counsel, coordinating counsel or liaison counsel in many federal and state court class actions. Bobby has served as trial counsel in class actions and complex business litigation tried before judges, juries and arbitrators. He has also briefed and argued numerous appeals, including two precedent-setting cases before the Florida Supreme Court.

Bobby was appointed as Plaintiffs’ Coordinating Counsel in *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.*, MDL 2036, class action litigation brought against many of the nation’s largest banks that challenged the banks’ internal practice of reordering debit card transactions in a manner designed to maximize the frequency of customer overdrafts. In that role, Bobby managed the large team of lawyers who prosecuted the class actions and served as the plaintiffs’ liaison with the Court regarding management and administration of the multidistrict litigation. He also led or participated in settlement negotiations with the banks that resulted in settlements exceeding \$1.1 billion, including Bank of America (\$410 million), Citizens Financial (\$137.5 million), JPMorgan Chase Bank (\$110 million), PNC Bank (\$90 million), TD Bank (\$62 million), U.S. Bank (\$55 million), Union Bank (\$35 million) and Capital One (\$31.7 million).

Bobby has been appointed to leadership positions in numerous other class actions and multidistrict litigation proceedings. He is currently serving as co-lead counsel in *In re Zantac (Ranitidine) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 9:20-md-02924-RLR (S.D. Fla.), as well as liaison counsel in *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig.*, MDL 2626 (M.D. Fla.); liaison counsel in *In re 21st Century Oncology Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, MDL 2737 (M.D. Fla.); and *In re Farm-Raised Salmon and Salmon Products Antitrust Litig.*, No. 19-21551 (S.D. Fla.). He previously served as liaison counsel for indirect purchasers in *In re Terazosin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litig.*, MDL 1317 (S.D. Fla.), an antitrust class action that settled for over \$74 million.

For the past 18 years, Bobby has represented thousands of Florida homeowners in class actions to recover full compensation under the Florida Constitution based on the Florida Department of Agriculture's taking and destruction of the homeowners' private property. As lead counsel, Bobby argued before the Florida Supreme Court to establish the homeowners' right to pursue their claims; served as trial counsel in non-jury liability trials followed by jury trials that established the amount of full compensation owed to the homeowners for their private property; and handled all appellate proceedings. Bobby's tireless efforts on behalf of the homeowners resulted in judgments exceeding \$93 million.

Bobby previously served as an Adjunct Professor at Vanderbilt University Law School, where he co-taught a course on complex litigation in federal courts that focused on multidistrict litigation and class actions. He continues to frequently lecture and make presentations on a variety of topics.

Bobby has served for many years as a trustee of the Greater Miami Jewish Federation and previously served as chairman of the board of the Alexander Muss High School in Israel, and as a trustee of The Miami Foundation.



JONATHAN M. STREISFELD

Partner

Bar Admissions

The Florida Bar

Court Admissions

Supreme Court of the United States

U.S. Court of Appeals for the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth Ninth, and Eleventh Circuits

U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois

U.S. District Court, Western District of Michigan

U.S. District Court, Western District of New York

U.S. District Court, Western District of Tennessee

Education

Nova Southeastern University, J.D. - 1997

Syracuse University, B.S. - 1994

Email: streisfeld@kolawyers.com

Jonathan M. Streisfeld joined KO as a partner in 2008. Mr. Streisfeld concentrates his practice in the areas of consumer class actions, business litigation, and appeals nationwide. He is a Martindale Hubbell AV® Preeminent™ rated attorney in both legal ability and ethics.

Mr. Streisfeld has vast and successful experience in class action litigation, serving as class counsel in nationwide and statewide consumer class action lawsuits against the nation's largest financial institutions in connection with the unlawful assessment of fees. To date, his efforts have successfully resulted in the recovery of over \$500,000,000 for tens of millions of bank and credit union customers, as well as profound changes in the way banks assess fees. Additionally, he has and continues to serve as lead and class counsel for consumers in many class actions involving false advertising and pricing, defective products, data breach and privacy, automobile defects, airlines, mortgages, and payday lending. Mr. Streisfeld has also litigated class actions against some of the largest health and automobile insurance carriers and oil conglomerates, and defended class and collective actions in other contexts.

Mr. Streisfeld has represented a variety of businesses and individuals in a broad range of business litigation matters, including contract, fraud, breach of fiduciary duty, intellectual property, real estate, shareholder disputes, wage and hour, and deceptive trade practices claims. He also assists business owners and individuals with documenting contractual relationships and resolving disputes. Mr. Streisfeld has also provided legal representation in bid protest proceedings.

Mr. Streisfeld oversees the firm's appellate and litigation support practice, representing clients in the appeal of final and non-final orders, as well as writs of certiorari, mandamus, and prohibition. His appellate practice includes civil and marital and family law matters.

Previously, Mr. Streisfeld served as outside assistant city attorney for the City of Plantation and Village of Wellington in a broad range of litigation matters. As a member of The Florida Bar, Mr. Streisfeld served for many years on the Executive Council of the Appellate Practice Section and is a past Chair of the Section's Communications Committee.



KEN GRUNFELD

Partner

Bar Admissions

The Pennsylvania Bar

The New Jersey Bar

Court Admissions

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Circuits

U.S. District Ct, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

U.S. District Ct, Middle District of Pennsylvania

U.S. District Ct, Western District of Pennsylvania

U.S. District Ct, District of New Jersey

U.S. District Ct, Eastern District of Michigan

U.S. District Ct, Western District of Wisconsin

Education

Villanova University School of Law, J.D., 1999

University of Michigan, 1996

Email: grunfeld@kolawyers.com

Ken Grunfeld is one of the newest KO partners, having just started working at the firm in 2023. Having worked at one of Philadelphia's largest and most prestigious defense firms for nearly a decade defending pharmaceutical manufacturers, national railroads, asbestos companies and corporate clients in consumer protection, products liability, insurance coverage and other complex commercial disputes while working, Mr. Grunfeld "switched sides" about 15 years ago.

Since then, he has become one of the city's most prolific and well-known Philadelphia class action lawyers. His cases have resulted in the recovery of hundreds of millions of dollars for injured individuals.

Mr. Grunfeld brings with him a wealth of pre-trial, trial, and appellate work experience in both state and federal courts. He has successfully taken many cases to verdict. Currently, he serves as lead counsel in a number of nationwide class actions. Whether by settlement or judgment, Mr. Grunfeld makes sure the offending companies' wrongful practices have been addressed. He believes the most important part of bringing a wrongdoer to justice is to ensure that it never happens again; class actions can be a true instrument for change if done well.

Mr. Grunfeld has been named a Super Lawyer numerous times throughout his career. He has been a member of the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and American Bar Associations, as well as a member of the American Association for Justice (AAJ). He was a Finalist for AAJ's prestigious Trial Lawyer of the Year Award in 2012 and currently serves as AAJ's Vice Chair of the Class Action Law Group. To his strong view that attorneys should act ethically, he volunteers his time as a Hearing Committee Member for the Disciplinary Board of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Grunfeld received his undergraduate degree from the University of Michigan. He is an active member of the Michigan Alumni Association, Philadelphia chapter and serves as a Michigan Alumni Student recruiter for local high schools. He received his Juris Doctor from the Villanova University School of Law. He was a member of the Villanova Law Review and graduated Order of the Coif.

Ken is a life-long Philadelphian. He makes his home in Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania, where he resides with his wife, Jennifer, and his year-old twins.

KRISTEN LAKE CARDOSO

Partner



Bar Admissions

The Florida Bar
The State Bar of California

Court Admissions

U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida
U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida
U.S. District Court, Central District of California
U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California
U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois
U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Michigan

Education

Nova Southeastern University, J.D., 2007
University of Florida, B.A., 2004

Email: cardoso@kolawyers.com

Kristen Lake Cardoso is a litigation attorney focusing on consumer class actions and complex commercial litigation. She has gained valuable experience representing individuals and businesses in state and federal courts at both the trial and appellate levels in a variety of litigation matters, including contractual claims, violations of consumer protection statutes, fraud, breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, professional liability, real estate claims, enforcement of non-compete agreements, trade secret infringement, shareholder disputes, deceptive trade practices, and other business torts.

Currently, Ms. Cardoso serves as counsel in nationwide and statewide class action lawsuits concerning violations of state consumer protection statutes, false advertising, defective products, data breaches, and breaches of contract. Ms. Cardoso is actively litigating cases against major U.S. airlines for their failure to refund fares following flight cancellations and schedule changes, as well as cases against manufacturers for their sale and misleading marketing of products, including defective cosmetics and nutritional supplements. Ms. Cardoso has also represented students seeking reimbursements of tuition, room and board, and other fees paid to their colleges and universities for in-person education, housing, meals, and other services not provided when campuses closed during the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, Ms. Cardoso has represented consumers seeking recovery of gambling losses from tech companies that profit from illegal gambling games offered, sold, and distributed on their platforms.

Ms. Cardoso is admitted to practice law throughout the states of Florida and California, as well as in the United States District Courts for the Southern District of Florida, Middle District of Florida, Central District of California, Eastern District of California Northern District of Illinois, and Eastern District of Michigan.

Ms. Cardoso attended the University of Florida, where she received her Bachelor's degree in Political Science, cum laude, and was inducted as a member of Phi Beta Kappa honor society. She received her law degree from Nova Southeastern University, magna cum laude. While in law school, Ms. Cardoso served as an Articles Editor for the Nova Law Review, was on the Dean's List, and was the recipient of a scholarship granted by the Broward County Hispanic Bar Association for her academic achievements. When not practicing law, Ms. Cardoso serves as a volunteer at Saint David Catholic School, including as a member of the school Advisory Board and an executive member of the Faculty Student Association. She has also served on various committees with the Junior League of Greater Fort Lauderdale geared towards improving the local community through leadership and volunteering.



STEVEN SUKERT

Partner

Bar Admissions

The Florida Bar
The New York Bar

Court Admissions

United States District Court, Southern District of Florida
United States District Court, Middle District of Florida
United States District Court, Southern District of New York
United States District Court, Eastern District of New York
United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois
United States District Court, Central District of Illinois

Education

Georgetown University Law Center, J.D., 2018
Northwestern University, B.S., 2010

Email: sukert@kolawyers.com

Steven Sukert has experience in all aspects of complex litigation in federal and state court, including drafting successful dispositive motions and appeals, handling discovery, and arguing court hearings. Steven focuses his practice at KO on complex class actions and multi-district litigations in courts around the country, including in data privacy, bank overdraft fee, and other consumer protection cases.

Before joining KO, Steven gained experience at Gunster, Yoakley & Stewart, P.A. in Miami in high-stakes commercial cases often involving trade secret and intellectual property claims, consumer contract claims, and legal malpractice claims, as well as in international arbitrations. Steven co-authored an amicus brief in the Florida Supreme Court case *Airbnb, Inc. v. Doe* (Case No. SC20-1167), and helped organize the American Bar Association's inaugural International Arbitration Masterclass, in 2021.

Steven was born and raised in Miami. He returned to his home city after law school to clerk for the Honorable James Lawrence King in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

In 2018, Steven earned his J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center. While living in the nation's capital, he worked at the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Solicitor, where he won the Gary S. Tell ERISA Litigation Award; the Civil Fraud Section of the U.S. Department of Justice, where he worked on large Medicare fraud cases and pioneered the use of the False Claims Act in the context of pharmaceutical manufacturers who engaged in price fixing; and the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, where his proposal for writing an amicus brief in the *Janus v. AFSCME* U.S. Supreme Court case was adopted by the organization's board of directors.

Steven has a degree in Molecular Biology from Northwestern University. Prior to his legal career, he worked as a biomedical laboratory researcher at the Diabetes Research Institute in Miami.

CAROLINE HERTER

Associate



Bar Admissions

The Florida Bar

Court Admissions

U.S. District Court, Middle District of Florida

U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida

U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Southern District of Florida

Education

University of Miami School of Law, J.D. - 2020

University of Miami, B.S. – 2016

Email: Herter@kolawyers.com

Caroline Herter is a litigation attorney at the firm's Fort Lauderdale office. Caroline focuses her practice on consumer class actions, mass torts, and white-collar commercial litigation in state and federal courts nationwide. She has gained valuable experience representing individuals and businesses to hold wrongdoers accountable through claims involving personal injury, wrongful death, consumer fraud, products liability, breach of fiduciary duty, civil theft/conversion, corporate veil-piercing, fraudulent transfer, tortious interference, False Claims Act violations, and the like.

Before joining KO, Caroline worked at a boutique law firm in Miami where she represented plaintiffs in matters involving creditor's rights, insolvency, and asset recovery. She now applies this experience throughout her practice at KO, often combining equitable remedies with legal claims to ensure the best chance of recovery for her clients.

Notable cases that Caroline has been involved in include *In Re: Champlain Towers South Collapse Litigation*, where she was a member of the team serving as lead counsel for the families of the 98 individuals who lost their lives in the tragic condominium collapse. The case resulted in over \$1 billion recovered for class members, the second-largest settlement in Florida history. She also co-authored a successful petition for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court in *Olhausen v. Arriva Medical, LLC et al.*, a False Claims Act case involving the standard for determining a defendant's scienter, which led the high Court to reverse the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeal's earlier ruling against her client.

Caroline earned her law degree from the University of Miami School of Law, summa cum laude, where she received awards for the highest grade in multiple courses. During law school Caroline was an editor of the University of Miami Law Review and a member of the Moot Court Board.

Outside of her law practice, Caroline serves on the Board of Directors of the non-profit organization Americans for Immigrant Justice.

COURTNEY MACCARONE

Partner

Bar Admissions

New York

New Jersey

Court Admissions

U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York

U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York

U.S. District Court, District of New Jersey

U.S. District Court, District of Colorado

Education

Brooklyn Law School, J.D., *magna cum laude* – 2011

New York University, B.A., *magna cum laude* – 2008

Email: maccarone@kolawyers.com

Courtney Maccarone is a New York-based Partner of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. Ms. Maccarone became a class action attorney to advocate for individuals who might otherwise have no voice or recourse against powerful corporations, and she has devoted her entire legal career to representing consumers. Since graduating from law school in 2011, she has focused exclusively on prosecuting consumer class actions, advocating for consumer rights in state and federal courts across the country, with a particular focus on cases relating to data privacy, deceptive and unfair trade practices, and defective products.

Ms. Maccarone attended New York University where she received her Bachelor's degree, *magna cum laude*, in 2008. She received her law degree from Brooklyn Law School, *magna cum laude*, in 2011. While attending Brooklyn Law School, Ms. Maccarone served as the Executive Symposium Editor of the Brooklyn Journal of International Law and was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society.

Ms. Maccarone has been recognized as a Super Lawyer "Rising Star" for the New York Metro area each year since 2014.

Ms. Maccarone lives on Long Island with her husband, two children, and rambunctious golden retriever.

EXHIBIT 2



FIRM RESUME

Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman (“Milberg”) is an AV-rated international law firm with more than 100 attorneys and offices across the United States, the European Union, and South America. Combining decades of experience, Milberg was established through the merger of Milberg Phillips Grossman LLP, Sanders Phillips Grossman LLC, Greg Coleman Law PC, and Whitfield Bryson LLP.

Milberg prides itself on providing thoughtful and knowledgeable legal services to clients worldwide across multiple practice areas. The firm represents plaintiffs in the areas of antitrust, securities, financial fraud, consumer protection, automobile emissions claims, defective drugs and devices, environmental litigation, financial and insurance litigation, and cyber law and security.

For over 50 years, Milberg and its affiliates have been protecting victims’ rights. We have recovered over \$50 billion for our clients. Our attorneys possess a renowned depth of legal expertise, employ the highest ethical and legal standards, and pride ourselves on providing stellar service to our clients. We have repeatedly been recognized as leaders in the plaintiffs’ bar and appointed to numerous leadership roles in prominent national mass torts and class actions.

Milberg challenges corporate wrongdoing through class action, mass tort, consumer and shareholder right services, both domestically and globally.

In the United States, Milberg currently holds more than 100 court-appointed full- and co-leadership positions in state and federal courts across the country. Our firm has offices in California, Chicago, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, Washington D.C., and Puerto Rico. Milberg’s commitment to its clients reaches beyond the United States, litigating antitrust, securities, and consumer fraud actions in Europe and South America, with offices located in the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands. Milberg prides itself on providing excellent service worldwide.

The firm’s lawyers have been regularly recognized as leaders in the plaintiffs’ bar by the National Law Journal, Legal 500, Chambers USA, Time Magazine, Lawdragon, and Super Lawyers, among others.

“A powerhouse that compelled miscreant and recalcitrant businesses to pay billions of dollars to aggrieved shareholders and customers.”
- THE NEW YORK TIMES

PRACTICE AREAS

Milberg maintains a robust practice, representing plaintiffs across numerous areas of law. Milberg attorneys have amassed a wealth of experience in the areas of antitrust and competition law, securities litigation, defective consumer product and automobile litigation, consumer services litigation, dangerous drugs and devices litigation, data breach and biometric data litigation, environmental and toxic tort litigation, finance and insurance litigation, state and local government litigation, and whistleblower and qui tam lawsuits. Milberg attorneys focus their practice among these groups to provide their clients with the best representation possible. Over decades, Milberg attorneys have developed expertise in handling class action lawsuits, leading and overseeing multidistrict litigation, and representing municipalities and other public and governmental clients. Based on their reputation and experience, Milberg attorneys have been assigned to leadership roles in class actions, mass torts litigation, and multidistrict litigation nationwide, across all of these practice areas.

SECURITIES FRAUD

Milberg pioneered the use of class action lawsuits to litigate claims involving investment products, securities, and the banking industry. Fifty years ago, the firm set the standard for case theories, organization, discovery, methods of settlement, and amounts recovered for clients. Milberg remains among the most influential securities litigators in the United States and internationally.

Milberg and its attorneys were appointed Lead Counsel and Co-Lead Counsel in hundreds of federal, state, and multidistrict litigation cases throughout its history.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[In re: Nortel Networks Corp. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg attorneys served as Lead Counsel for the class and the court-appointed lead plaintiff, the Trustees of the Ontario Public Service Employees' Union Pension Plan Trust Fund, in this federal securities class action. The court approved a settlement valued at more than \$1.14 billion.

[In re: Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg represented investors in 310 securities class actions alleging a market manipulation scheme involving hundreds of initial public offerings and approximately 55 defendant investment banks. Plaintiffs alleged this scheme significantly contributed to the high-tech “bubble” of the late 1990s and early 2000s. In approving a \$586 million settlement, the court described the law firms on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee as the “cream of the crop.”

[In re: Zynga Inc. Sec. Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

A class action in which Zynga misled investors by portraying the online gaming company as financially strong and withholding non-public information, which in turn allowed a select few within the company to reap the benefits from the company's IPO, before the stock's value eventually collapsed.

[In re: Merck & Co., Inc. Sec. Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this federal securities fraud class action, and after more than 12 years of hard-fought litigation, ultimately obtained a combined settlement totaling \$1.062 billion, the largest securities class action settlement ever against a pharmaceutical company. The court described the settlement as "a settlement which is fair and just and which, in fact, is the best settlement which possibly could have been achieved in this case."

[In re: Deutsche Telekom AG Sec. Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel in this class action on behalf of purchasers of American Depositary Receipts. The plaintiffs alleged that Deutsche Telekom improperly failed to disclose plans to make a major corporate acquisition and overstated the value of real estate assets. Milberg attorneys played a pivotal role in achieving a \$120 million settlement.

[In re: Tyco Int'l Ltd., Sec. Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel in this litigation, which involved federal securities claims against Tyco and its former CEO, CFO, general counsel, and certain former directors for insider trading and the overstatement of billions of dollars in income. Milberg attorneys played a crucial role in achieving a \$3.2 billion settlement.

[In re: Vivendi Universal, S.A. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg was one of two Lead Trial Counsel in this securities fraud case tried to a jury over four months. The jury found Vivendi liable for dozens of false or misleading statements and awarded damages valued at well over a billion dollars. Six months later, in an unrelated case, the Supreme Court ruled that purchasers on foreign securities exchanges could not recover under U.S. law. Milberg's case against Vivendi continued with post-verdict proceedings under the new standard, and damages have been distributed to U.S. class members totaling over \$100 million.

[In re: Washington Public Power Supply System Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona

In this massive securities fraud litigation, Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel for a class that obtained, after several months of trial, settlements totaling \$775 million, the largest securities fraud settlement at that time.

[In re: Lucent Technologies, Inc. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this securities action, which alleged that Lucent and its senior officers misrepresented the demand for Lucent products and improperly recognized hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues. The case settled for \$600 million.

[In re: Biovail Corp. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg, representing Local 282 Welfare Trust Fund and serving as Co-Lead Counsel, litigated this securities action alleging that defendants made misleading statements concerning Biovail's financial results and its drug, Cardizem LA. Following substantial discovery, including depositions across the U.S. and Canada, Milberg obtained a \$138 million settlement for the class, and Biovail agreed to institute significant corporate governance changes.

[In re: CVS Corp. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this securities action on behalf of a class of purchasers of American Depository Receipts. The plaintiffs alleged that Deutsche Telekom improperly failed to disclose plans to make a major corporate acquisition and overstated the value of real estate assets. In 2005, following extensive discovery, including depositions in Germany, the court approved a \$120 million cash settlement.

[In re: CVS Corp. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this securities class action alleging that defendants issued false and misleading statements, which artificially inflated the price of CVS stock. The court approved a \$110 million settlement.

[In re: American Express Financial Advisors Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

This case involved allegations that American Express Financial Advisors violated securities laws by representing to class members that the company would provide tailored financial advice when the company actually provided "canned" financial plans and advice designed to steer clients into American Express and certain non-proprietary mutual funds. The case settled for \$100 million and required the company to adopt various remedial measures.

[Irvine v. ImClone Systems, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this case, in which the court approved a \$75 million cash settlement. The plaintiffs alleged that ImClone misrepresented the likelihood that its drug, Erbitux, would be approved, thereby artificially inflating the price of ImClone stock.

ANTITRUST

For over fifty years, Milberg's Antitrust Practice Group has prosecuted complex antitrust class actions against defendants in the healthcare, technology, agriculture, and manufacturing industries engaged in price-fixing, monopolization and other violations of antitrust law and trade restraints.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[In re: Dealer Management Systems Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Milberg is appointed Lead Counsel in this nationwide class action representing car dealerships. Plaintiffs allege that leading software providers entered into an unlawful agreement, monopolizing access to auto sales and service data in dealer management software used by dealers, thereby reducing competition and increasing prices. Milberg attorneys achieved a \$29.5 million settlement against one defendant and the case is proceeding against the remaining defendant.

[In re: ACTOS Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg attorneys played a significant role in this litigation, including appointment to the MDL Discovery Committee, which accused Takeda Pharmaceuticals of failing to warn patients of the risks of bladder cancer, heart failure and other side effects associated with the Type 2 diabetes drug. In 2015, roughly 9,000 claims were settled for \$2.4 billion and significant injunctive relief.

[In re: Cathode Ray Tube \(CRT\) Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg represented indirect purchaser plaintiffs in this class action alleging an international conspiracy among defendants to keep prices for cathode ray tube (CRT) displays artificially high. Milberg had a significant discovery role in the prosecution of this class action with settlements exceeding \$580 million.

[Blessing v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this case alleging that the merger of two U.S. satellite radio providers led to the monopolization of the satellite radio market and the elimination of competition.

[In re: Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida

Milberg represented indirect purchasers in a class action alleging that defendants conspired to maintain artificially high prices for disposable contact lenses through policies that prevented resale of the subject contact lenses below a minimum price. Settlements exceeded \$118 million.

[In re: Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg was appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in this class action alleging that manufacturers of a chemical essential to municipal water treatment engaged in price-fixing, bid-rigging and market allocation in violation of federal antitrust laws. Settlements were valued at \$92.5 million.

[Sandhaus v. Bayer AG](#)

Kansas State Court

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel in this case alleging that Bayer and several generic drug manufacturers entered into pay-for-delay agreements concerning an antibiotic marketed by Bayer, which caused the plaintiffs to continue paying supracompetitive prices for the drug throughout the class period. The case settled for \$9 million.

[In re: Fresh Process Potatoes Antitrust Litigation](#)

United States District Court, District of Idaho

Milberg served as Co-Lead Counsel for indirect purchaser plaintiffs in this class action alleging that potato growers, their cooperatives, processors, and packers violated federal antitrust laws by conspiring to manipulate the price and supply of potatoes. Milberg achieved a settlement for \$5.5 million and meaningful injunctive relief.

[In re: Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg is appointed part of a three-member Steering Committee in this consolidated class action alleging Google engaged in anticompetitive behavior through the Google Play Store, seeking injunctive relief and monetary damages on behalf of consumers forced to pay inflated prices for Play Store purchases.

[Series 17-03-615, a series of MSP Recovery Claims, Series LLC. v. Express Scripts, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Milberg represents third-party payers in this class action alleging that defendants participated in a vertical price-fixing scheme and their monopolistic, anticompetitive behavior caused plaintiffs and the class to pay inflated prices for the drug, H.P. Acthar Gel.

[In re: Hard Disk Drive Assemblies Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg represents a class of indirect purchaser end user plaintiffs in a class action alleging that the two largest manufacturers of hard disk drive (HDD) suspension assemblies illegally conspired to fix prices of these component parts, thereby raising prices of products purchased by plaintiffs and the class.

[In re: Deere & Co. Repair Services Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Milberg is appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in this class action alleging that John Deere illegally monopolized the repair and diagnostic services market for Deere brand agricultural equipment with onboard central computers known as engine control units, thereby inflating the prices of these services.

[Harley-Davidson Aftermarket Parts Marketing, Sales Practices and Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin

Milberg represents a class of Harley-Davidson motorcycle owners in a case alleging that Harley-Davidson uses its monopoly power to force motorcycle owners to use its compatible branded parts for repairs or risk losing warranty coverage.

[In re: California Gasoline Spot Market Antitrust Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg represents California consumers who were forced to pay supracompetitive prices for gasoline due to the manipulation of the California gasoline spot market.

FINANCIAL LITIGATION

For over five decades, Milberg has spearheaded litigation challenging unethical practices by some of the biggest financial and insurance institutions in the world and has been at the cutting edge of cases that directly impacted large banks, lenders, and insurers.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[In re: Prudential Insurance Co. Sales Practice Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg attorneys were appointed Lead Counsel and recovered more than \$4 billion for certain policyholders in this landmark case challenging Prudential's insurance sales practices.

[In re: Raytheon Co. Securities Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts

Milberg served as Lead Counsel in this case, which alleged that a major defense contractor failed to properly write down assets on construction contracts. Raytheon and its auditor, PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, settled for a total of \$460 million.

[In re: Chase Bank USA, N.A. "Check Loan" Contract Litigation](#)

U.S. District for the Northern District of California

Milberg served on the Executive Committee representing the class in this action against JP Morgan Chase & Co. The complaint alleged that Chase improperly increased the minimum monthly payment by 150% required for customers who entered into balance transfer loans with "fixed" interest rates that were guaranteed to remain so for the "life of the loan." Milberg and its Co-Counsel achieved a \$100 million settlement for the class.

[In re: General Electric Co. ERISA Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York

Milberg, serving as Co-Lead Counsel, achieved a \$40 million settlement on behalf of current and former G.E. employees who claimed that G.E.'s 401(k) Plan fiduciaries imprudently invested more than two-thirds of the Plan's assets in company stock. The settlement included important structural changes to G.E.'s 401(k) plan valued at more than \$100 million.

[In re: Royal Dutch/Shell Transport ERISA Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg attorneys led this ERISA breach of fiduciary duty class action against the Royal Dutch/Shell Oil Group of Companies on behalf of certain of the companies' U.S. employee investment plan participants. The \$90 million settlement included important provisions regarding the monitoring and training of individuals appointed to be ERISA fiduciaries.

[Mason v. Medline](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Milberg successfully represented a healthcare worker in a False Claims Act case against his former employer, Medline Industries, Inc., one of the nation's largest suppliers of medical and surgical products, along with its charitable arm, The Medline Foundation. The suit alleged that Medline engaged in a widespread illegal kickback scheme targeting hospitals and other healthcare providers that purchase medical products paid for by federal healthcare programs. Milberg pursued the case on a non-intervened basis and recovered \$85 million on behalf of the federal government — one of the largest settlements of a False Claims Act case in which the government declined to intervene.

[In re: Converse Technology, Inc. Derivative Litigation](#)

U.S. Supreme Court for the State of New York, New York County

As Co-Lead Counsel, Milberg negotiated a \$62 settlement which was approved by the court. The settlement also resulted in significant corporate governance reforms, including the replacement of various directors and officers; the amendment of the company's bylaws to permit certain shareholders to propose in the company's proxy materials nominees for election as directors; and the requirement that all equity grants be approved by both the compensation committee and a majority of the non-employee directors.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Milberg's Consumer Protection Practice Group focuses on improving product safety and protecting those who have fallen victim to deceptive marketing and advertising of goods and services and/or purchased defective products. Milberg attorneys have served as Lead Counsel and Co-Lead Counsel in hundreds of federal, state, and multidistrict litigation cases alleging the sale of defective products, improper marketing of products, and violations of consumer protection statutes.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[Cleveland v. Whirlpool Corp.](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota

Milberg attorneys led this class action involving leaking and defective washing machines. Milberg attorneys were pivotal in achieving a settlement valued at approximately \$21 million, which included meaningful service plan benefits and reimbursement for out-of-pocket repair expenses.

[Berman et al. v. General Motors LLC](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida

Milberg attorneys held leadership roles in this class action involving excessive oil consumption in Chevrolet and GMC vehicles. Milberg attorneys played a pivotal role in achieving a nationwide settlement valued at over \$40 million, securing vehicle repairs and reimbursement for out-of-pocket repair costs.

[Chess v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Central District of California

Milberg attorneys were named Co-Lead Counsel in this class action involving Volkswagen vehicles with defective transmissions. Milberg attorneys secured a settlement that included up to full reimbursement for out-of-pocket repair expenses and significant injunctive relief.

[Hamm v. Sharp Electronics Corporation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Class Counsel in this class action involving defectively designed microwave drawers. Milberg attorneys were instrumental in achieving a settlement valued at more than \$100 million, which included meaningful extended service plan benefits and reimbursement for out-of-pocket repair expenses.

[In re: Allura Fiber Cement Siding Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel and Steering Committee members by the court in this class action alleging defective fiber cement board siding. Milberg attorneys helped to secure a nationwide settlement for repair and replacement of homeowners' siding.

[In re: MI Windows and Doors, Inc., Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel in this multidistrict class action litigation and helped to secure a nationwide class settlement for homeowners who purchased defectively designed windows.

[In re: Zurn Pex Plumbing Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota

Milberg attorneys served on the Executive Committee in this multidistrict class action involving leaking and defective plumbing systems. Milberg attorneys secured monetary benefits valued at \$100,000 per class settlement member, and plumbing repairs in value up to \$7,000 per class settlement member.

[Hobbie, et al. v. RCR Holdings II, LLC, et al.](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Louisiana

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel in a multidistrict class action alleging improper usage of toxic and defective Chinese drywall. Milberg attorneys played an important role in securing a \$30 million settlement for remediation of 364-unit residential high-rise buildings constructed with the toxic drywall.

[In re: Chinese Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana

Milberg attorneys served on the Executive Committee in a multidistrict class action involving defective and toxic drywall.

[In re: Synthetic Stucco Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Steering Committee and played a pivotal role in securing settlements with four exterior insulation finishing system manufacturers for homeowners valued at over \$50 million.

[Bridget Smith v. Floor and Decor Outlets of America, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this class action alleging undisclosed formaldehyde exposure from wood and laminate flooring. Milberg attorneys achieved a national class action settlement for homeowners who purchased unsafe laminate wood flooring.

[In re: Lumber Liquidators Chinese-Manufactured Flooring Products Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this class action alleging formaldehyde exposure and secured a \$36 million national class action settlement for members who purchased a certain type of laminate flooring.

[In re: Windsor Wood Clad Window Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin

Milberg attorneys were appointed Lead Counsel in this class action alleging window defects. Milberg attorneys helped to secure a nationwide settlement for customers providing repairs, replacements, and compensation for out-of-pocket expenses.

[Norman et al. v. Nissan North America](#)

U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this class action alleging CVT transmission defects in Nissan vehicles. Milberg attorneys played a pivotal role in securing a nationwide settlement valued at approximately \$17 million for repairs, replacements, extended warranty, and cash benefits.

[In re: Horizon Organic Milk Plus DHA Omega-3 Marketing and Sales Practice Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this class action alleging falsely advertised brain health benefits. Milberg attorneys were essential in securing a settlement valued at \$1.3 million for consumers.

[In re: All-Clad Metalcrafters, LLC, Cookware Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania

Milberg attorneys were appointed to leadership positions in this multidistrict class action involving All-Clad's false advertising that its stainless-steel cookware was dishwasher safe. Milberg attorneys secured a nationwide settlement valued at \$4 million, including replacement products, monetary benefits, partial reimbursements for purchases of the defective products, and discounts on future product purchases.

[Julian, et al., v. TTE Technology, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this litigation involving the false advertising of TCL televisions' refresh rates. Milberg attorneys played an important role in securing a class settlement valued at \$2.5 million in cash benefits to class members.

[Roberts et al. v. Electrolux Home Products Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Central District of California

Milberg attorneys were named Co-Lead Counsel in this class action involving defective dryers manufactured by Electrolux. Milberg attorneys helped to obtain a settlement on behalf of more than one million class members, valued at over \$35 million.

[Tabak v. Apple Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg attorneys brought this class action against Apple for a defect in the iPhone 7 and iPhone 7 Plus, which negatively impacted the audio quality of the phones. Milberg attorneys played a pivotal role in bringing the case, briefing, and discovery. The parties have agreed to a class settlement in principle, valued at \$35 million.

[Koenig v. VIZIO, Inc.](#)

Superior Court of Los Angeles County, California

Milberg attorneys litigated this class action involving the false advertising of Vizio televisions' refresh rates. Milberg attorneys played a pivotal role, including briefing, discovery, and handling all trial responsibilities. The parties have agreed to a class settlement in principle, valued at over \$40 million.

[In re: Outer Banks Power Outage Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel and secured a \$10.35 million settlement in a class action in which residents, businesses, and vacationers on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands in North Carolina were impacted by a 9-day power outage.

[Elliott et al v. KB Home North Carolina Inc.](#)

North Carolina Superior Court

In this class action involving homeowners who purchased homes that were improperly built without weather-resistant barriers, Milberg attorneys played an essential role in securing a settlement valued at approximately \$6,500 to \$17,000 for each class member.

[In re: Allergan Biocell Textured Breast Implant Product Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in this multidistrict class action against Allergan for breast implants that caused cancer. Milberg attorneys continue to play a pivotal role in this ongoing case.

[In re: Evenflo Co., Inc. Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this multidistrict litigation against Evenflo for deceptively marketing its child booster seats.

[Carder v. Graco Children's Safety products, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia

Milberg attorneys were appointed to multiple leadership positions in this class action involving the deceptive marketing of child car seats.

[Coleman, et al, v. Britax Child Safety, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this class action involving the deceptive marketing of child car seats.

[In re: Seresto Flea and Tick Collar Marketing, Sales Practices And Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in this multidistrict class action against the manufacturers of Seresto flea and tick collars, which were linked to numerous pet deaths. The litigation is ongoing.

DANGEROUS DRUGS & DEVICES

Milberg is a nationally renowned firm in mass torts, fighting some of the largest, wealthiest, and most influential pharmaceutical and device companies and corporate entities in the world. Our experienced team of attorneys has led or co-led numerous multidistrict litigations of defective drugs and medical devices.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[In re: Avandia Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee and served on the Discovery and Media Sub-Committees on behalf of thousands of patients who took the Type 2 diabetes drug Avandia, alleging the manufacturer failed to disclose the known and increased risk of heart attack and cardiac death. GlaxoSmithKline set aside \$3.4 billion in 2011 to settle lawsuits.

[In re: Benicar \(Olmesartan\) Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee and Common Benefit Fee Committee in this multidistrict litigation which alleged that Benicar manufacturer Daiichi Sankyo and co-promoter Forest Laboratories were responsible for serious gastrointestinal injuries. In 2017, the defendants agreed to a \$300 million settlement.

[In re: Chantix \(Varenicline\) Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, Southern Division

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel in the Chantix Coordination in New York State Court and court-appointed member of the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in the MDL in Alabama.

[In re: Fluoroquinolone Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in the MDL in Minnesota litigating the broad-spectrum antibiotic that resulted in severe tendon damage, particularly debilitating Achilles tendon ruptures.

[Fosamax Litigation \(I & II\)](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Fosamax I: Milberg was appointed Lead Counsel in this New York MDL for ONJ cases and served on the Discovery Team in the Superior Court of New Jersey. Fosamax II: Milberg was appointed to Fosamax Femur MDL Plaintiffs Steering Committee for MDL in the District of New Jersey.

[In re: Fresenius Granuflo/Naturalyte Dialysate Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts

Milberg attorneys served on the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in the MDL. Granuflo and Naturalyte were manufactured and marketed by Fresenius Medical for use in dialysis treatment to address kidney failure both chronic and acute, but also caused increased heart complications.

[In re: Incretin Mimetics Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California (San Diego)

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the MDL Plaintiffs Steering Committee in California.

Incretins are a class of Type 2 Diabetes drugs which result in a significant increase in gastric side effects.

[In re: Infusion Pump Cases \(JCCP 4615\)](#)

U.S. Ninth Circuit Court, Eastern District of California

Milberg attorneys were appointed Plaintiffs Liaison Counsel. Studies showed that pain pumps were associated with high failure rates when used appropriately and often mis-used leading to increased failure rates and resultant complications.

[Risperdal and Invega Product Liability Litigation \(JCCP 4775\)](#)

California Second District Court of Appeal, Division Three

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in Risperdal/Invega Product Liability Litigation against Johnson & Johnson/Janssen regarding these anti-psychotic dopamine receptor blockers that cause hormonal changes in male users that can result in breast tissue growth.

[In re: Mirena IUD Levonorgestrel-Related Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee. Mirena, a hormone releasing IUD for contraception was intended for longer term placement, are prone to failure and breakage and resultant injuries.

[Propecia Finasteride Product Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee. Another Milberg attorney was appointed Lead Counsel in the New Jersey Multi County Litigation in Middlesex County, New Jersey. These litigations centered on sexual dysfunction resulting from use of Merck's male pattern hair loss product, Propecia.

[In re: Reglan Litigation](#)

U.S. Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division Atlantic County

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel in the Multi County Litigation in New Jersey State Court, Atlantic County. Reglan is often used for longer terms to address symptoms of GERD resulting in neurological injuries including Tardive Dyskinesia.

[Johnson & Johnson Talcum Powder Products Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation \(MDL 2738\)](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in the Johnson & Johnson Talcum Powder Litigation and served on the Science Committee and Bellwether Committee in the MDL in District Court New Jersey, as well as on the Science and Experts Committee of the PSC.

[In re: American Medical Systems, Inc., Pelvic Repair System Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the Plaintiffs Steering Committee in the AMS, Bard, Boston Scientific and Ethicon MDLs.

[In re: Vioxx Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana

Milberg attorneys served as Liaison to the media for Vioxx Plaintiffs Steering Committee and Public Relations Committee in Louisiana and on the New Jersey Multi County Litigation Vioxx discovery team.

[In re: Zicam Cold Remedy Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the MDL Plaintiffs Steering Committee in Arizona in this case involving a homeopathic, over the counter common cold and allergy symptom product that left many with impaired ability to smell.

[In re: Zimmer Nexgen Knee, Implant Products Liability Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division

Milberg attorneys were appointed to the MDL Plaintiff's Steering Committee in Illinois as well as the Electronic Storage Information Committee. Zimmer manufactures multiple devices including knee devices which resulted in premature failure necessitating additional, painful, and costly surgeries.

[In re: Crestor Products Liability Cases \(JCCP 4713\)](#)

California Superior Court

Milberg attorneys served as Co-Lead Counsel in the JCCP in State Court California on this highly potent AstraZeneca "me too" cholesterol managing statin litigation where serious side effects included newly onset diabetes and liver damage as well as reactions with Coumadin.

EMPLOYMENT & CIVIL RIGHTS

Milberg's Employment & Civil Rights attorneys focus on class actions and individual cases nationwide arising from discriminatory banking and housing practices, unpaid wages and sales commissions, improperly managed retirement benefits, workplace discrimination, and wrongful termination.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[In re: Black Farmers Discrimination Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Milberg attorneys were appointed Lead Counsel and secured a \$1.25 billion settlement fund for black farmers who alleged the U.S. Department of Agriculture discriminated against them by denying farm loans.

[Kingston v. IBM](#)

U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington

Milberg attorneys spearheaded a series of landmark cases against IBM alleging wrongful termination of software sales managers through a pattern of fraudulent conduct.

[Parry et al. v. Farmers Insurance Exchange, et al.](#)

Superior Court of Los Angeles County, California

Milberg attorneys were named Class Counsel and secured a \$75 million class-action settlement with Farmers Insurance on behalf of its agents alleging that Farmers Insurance misclassified its agents as independent contractors.

[Meek v. SkyWest, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg attorneys were Lead Counsel and secured a \$4.2 million class action settlement against SkyWest Airlines for allegedly failing to provide proper rest and meal breaks to its employees.

[Craig v. Rite Aid Corporation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania

This FLSA collective action and class action settled for \$20.9 million.

[Stillman v. Staples, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

This FLSA collective action had a Plaintiffs' trial verdict for \$2.5 million and a national settlement approved for \$42 million.

[Lew v. Pizza Hut of Maryland, Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey

This FLSA collective action had a statewide settlement for managers-in-training and assistant managers, providing recompense of 100% of lost wages.

ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION & TOXIC TORTS

Milberg's Environmental Litigation & Toxic Torts Practice Group focuses on representing clients in mass torts, class actions, multi-district litigation, regulatory enforcement, citizen suits, and other complex environmental and toxic tort matters. Milberg and its attorneys have held leadership roles in all facets of litigation in coordinated proceedings, with a particular focus on developing the building blocks to establish general causation, which is often the most difficult obstacle in an environmental or toxic tort case.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[Nnadili, et al. v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Milberg attorneys were Lead Counsel in a \$6.2 million settlement for owners and residents of 200 properties located above underground plume of petroleum from former Chevron gas station.

[In re: Swanson Creek Oil Spill Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland

Milberg attorneys served as Lead Counsel and achieved a \$2.25 million settlement arising from the largest oil spill in history of State of Maryland.

[In re: Exxon Valdez](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska

Milberg was a member of the Plaintiffs' Coordinating Committee and co-chair of the Plaintiffs' Law Committee in this massive litigation resulting from the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. The plaintiffs obtained a jury verdict of \$5 billion, which, after years of appeals by Exxon, was reduced to approximately \$500 million by the United States Supreme Court. The United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has since held that plaintiffs are entitled to post-judgment interest on the award in the amount of approximately \$470 million.

[Municipality of Bayamon, et al., v. Exxon Mobil Corp., et al.](#)

United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico

More than a dozen municipalities of Puerto Rico have filed a class action lawsuit against fossil fuel companies for their alleged role in the deadly 2017 hurricane season that devastated the Commonwealth, causing billions in damages and leaving thousands of people dead. The first-of-its-kind lawsuit seeks financial compensation from oil and coal companies for marketing and selling carbon-based products that they intentionally misrepresented to the public and worked together to publicly conceal the climate risk changes of their products while internally acting on climate science to safeguard their own assets.

[Sharon Weatherly v. Eastman Chemical Co.](#)

Circuit Court of Sullivan County, Tennessee Second Judicial District

Milberg attorneys led the effort to bring justice for hundreds of injured workers and their families resulting from a steam explosion at the Eastman Chemical Company which released asbestos and other toxic materials. Milberg filed a class-action lawsuit, pursuing claims for public and private nuisance, trespass, negligence, and strict liability for ultra-hazardous activity.

STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Milberg attorneys are dedicated to defending the Constitutional and statutory rights of individuals and businesses that are subjected to unlawful government exactions and fees by state and local governments or bodies.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[Daedalus, LLC, et al. v. City of Charlotte](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Mecklenburg County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$106 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer capacity fees and system development fees charged by the City of Charlotte, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Upright Builders, Inc., et al. v. Town of Apex](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Wake County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$15.3 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer capacity replacement fees and transportation impact fees charged by the Town of Apex, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Plantation Builders of Wilmington, Inc., et al. v. County of Brunswick](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Brunswick County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$15.25 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer capacity fees charged by Brunswick County, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Gerald Currin Builders, Inc. v. Town of Holly Springs](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Wake County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$7.9 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer capacity replacement fees charged by the Town of Holly Springs, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Meritage Homes of the Carolinas, Inc. v. Town of Holly Springs](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Wake County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$7.5 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful parks and recreation fees in-lieu of land dedication charged by the Town of Holly Springs, North Carolina as a condition of granting development approval to residential subdivision developers.

[Plantation Building of Wilmington, Inc. v. Town of Leland](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Brunswick County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$6.2 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer impact fees charged by the Town of Leland, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Shenandoah Homes, LLC v. Town of Clayton](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Johnston County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$2.7 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer impact fees charged by the Town of Clayton, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Granite Land and Timber, LLC v. Town of Clayton](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Johnston County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$2.45 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful parks and recreation fees in-lieu of land dedication charged by the Town of Clayton, North Carolina as a condition of granting development approval to residential subdivision developers.

[Mayfair Partners, LLC et al. v. City of Asheville](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Buncombe County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$1.85 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer impact fees charged by the City of Asheville, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Eastwood Construction, LLC, et. al v. City of Monroe](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Union County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$1.75 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer impact fees charged by the City of Monroe, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Larry Shaheen v. City of Belmont](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Gaston County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$1.65 million class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer impact fees charged by the City of Belmont, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

[Brookline Homes, LLC v. City of Mount Holly](#)

North Carolina Superior Court, Gaston County

Milberg attorneys recovered a \$483,468 class action settlement for property owners for unlawful water and sewer impact fees charged by the City of Mount Holly, North Carolina as a condition of providing water and sewer service to property owners.

Milberg is a leader in the fields of cyber security, data breach litigation, and biometric data collection, litigating on behalf of clients – both large and small – to change data security practices so that large corporations respect and safeguard consumers' personal data.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[In re: Google Buzz Privacy Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California

Milberg attorneys were appointed Lead Class Counsel and secured a \$8.5 million cy pres settlement.

[In re: Dept. of Veterans Affairs \(VA\) Data Theft Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Milberg attorneys were appointed Co-Lead Counsel representing veterans whose privacy rights were compromised by the theft of an external hard drive containing personal information of approximately 26.6 million veterans and their spouses; creation of a \$20 million fund for affected veterans and a cy pres award for two non-profit organizations.

[In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation](#)

U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota

Milberg represented as many as 110 million Target customers whose personal information was compromised in this landmark data breach case. Milberg, together with Co-Counsel, achieved compensation of \$10 million, entitling individual consumers to recover losses of up to \$10,000. An appeal of the settlement has been remanded to the District Court of Minnesota and remains pending.

APPELLATE

Consisting of former appellate judges, experienced appellate advocates, and former law clerks who understand how best to present compelling arguments to judges on appeal and secure justice for our clients beyond the trial courts, Milberg's Appellate Practice Group boasts an impressive record of success on appeal in both state and federal courts.

EXEMPLAR CASES

[Home Depot, U.S.A., Inc. v. Jackson](#)

United States Supreme Court

Milberg attorneys represented a consumer who was originally sued in a state court debt collection action. In response, Milberg attorneys filed third-party class action claims against Home Depot for deceptive trade practices regarding its store credit cards marketed to customers. Home Depot sought to remove the class action counterclaims, which were filed in the existing state court action, to federal court. Lengthy appeals followed, in which Milberg attorneys worked cooperatively with attorneys at Public Justice to represent the original consumer and class of consumers. Ultimately, the Supreme Court agreed with the consumers' position and held that a third-party counterclaim defendant may not remove state court claims either under the removal statute or under the Class Action Fairness Act. This decision represents a significant victory for consumer plaintiffs.

[Webb v. Injured Workers Pharmacy, LLC](#)

First Circuit Court of Appeals

Milberg attorneys scored a significant victory for plaintiffs in data breach and other federal tort cases. The decision animated the Supreme Court's decision in *TransUnion v. Ramirez*, by applying its standing analysis in a common sense and logically consistent manner to the real-world fact patterns posed by data breach cases. The decision demonstrates that federal court is still a viable forum for data breach cases based upon the material risk of future misuse, as well as actual misuse of data.

[Kingston v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.](#)

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

Milberg attorneys represented an IBM software sales manager who was fired for reporting racial discrimination and the unlawful capping of sales commissions. A jury awarded the plaintiff almost \$15 million. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the jury's finding of liability and most of the damages award, over a dissent.

[Fessler v. Int'l Bus. Machines Corp.](#)

Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals

Milberg attorneys represented an IBM software salesman whose sales commissions IBM had wrongly capped. The district court dismissed the salesman's claims. The Fourth Circuit reversed the dismissal, distinguishing a long line of older cases in which IBM had prevailed on the grounds that the new case was factually distinct and presented novel legal theories. The case was later resolved.

[Lytle v. Nutramax Labs., Inc.](#)

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

Milberg attorneys represented a class of consumers who purchased pet joint health supplements, which they claimed were deceptively marketed and labeled. The trial court granted class certification, and the defendant sought to appeal to the Ninth Circuit, which agreed to hear the appeal. Milberg attorneys argued that class certification was proper, and that the plaintiffs' proposed damages model—a conjoint analysis that surveyed consumers to determine the value of the product's deceptive statements—was valid for calculating classwide damages. The Ninth Circuit heard the parties' arguments in 2023, but has not yet ruled.

[Adkisson v. Jacobs Engineering Grp., Inc.](#)

Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals

Milberg attorneys represented a group of hundreds of workers and their families who were injured when cleaning up a large coal ash spill in Kingston, Tennessee. The workers alleged, among other things, that the defendant had denied them essential personal protection equipment. Following years of litigation and a trial on certain issues, the defendant raised a new defense based on a recent Supreme Court case, *Thacker v. Tennessee Valley Authority*. The defendant argued that it should be immune because it was acting as an agent of the federal government. The Sixth Circuit rejected this defense, finding that based upon the facts, the Tennessee Valley Authority—and, by extension, the defendant—were not immune, paving the way for future litigants to bring claims against the TVA and its agents. Following this ruling, the parties reached a settlement.

[Chisum v. Campagna](#)

North Carolina Supreme Court

Milberg attorneys represented a contractor who was wrongfully kicked out of several valuable real estate companies by his partners. The jury awarded the plaintiff millions of dollars, but the trial court granted judgment to the defendants on some of the claims. The North Carolina Supreme Court affirmed the jury's verdict while reversing the trial court's grant of judgment to the defendants. Following the reversal, the parties reached settlement, which was more lucrative for plaintiff than the original jury verdict.

[Plantation Bldg. of Wilmington, Inc. v. Town of Leland](#)

North Carolina Supreme Court

Milberg attorneys represented a class of contractors who sued a local government for charging illegal fees. The trial court certified the class, but the government appealed, raising a dangerous new legal theory that would have prevented class certification. The North Carolina Supreme Court rejected that new theory, after which the case settled for even more than the class had demanded before the appeal.

[Adkisson v. Jacobs Engineering Grp., Inc.](#)

Tennessee Supreme Court

Milberg attorneys represented a group of hundreds of workers and their families who were injured when cleaning up a large coal ash spill in Kingston, Tennessee. The workers alleged, among other things, that the defendant had denied them essential personal protection equipment. Following years of litigation and a trial on certain issues, the defendant argued that the plaintiffs' claims must be dismissed under the Tennessee Silica Claims Protection Act, and the trial court certified the question to the Tennessee Supreme Court. Milberg attorneys briefed the issues and argued on the workers' behalf that the TSCPA did not cover or require dismissal of their claims. Before the Tennessee Supreme Court could rule, the parties settled their claims.

LOCATIONS

PUERTO RICO

1311 Avenida Juan Ponce de León
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00907

CALIFORNIA

280 South Beverly Drive, Penthouse
Beverly Hills, California 90212

402 West Broadway, Suite 1760
San Diego, California 92101

FLORIDA

201 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200,
Coral Gables, Florida 33134

3833 Central Avenue
St. Petersburg, Florida 33713

ILLINOIS

227 W. Monroe Street, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

LOUISIANA

5301 Canal Boulevard
New Orleans, Louisiana 70124

MICHIGAN

6905 Telegraph Road, Suite 115
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48301

NEW JERSEY

1 Bridge Plaza North, Suite 675
Fort Lee, New Jersey 07024

NEW YORK

100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500
Garden City, New York 11530

405 E 50th Street
New York, New York 10022

NORTH CAROLINA

900 West Morgan Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

5 West Hargett Street, Suite 812
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

SOUTH CAROLINA

825 Lowcountry Blvd, Suite 101
Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464

TENNESSEE

800 S. Gay Street, Suite 1100
Knoxville, Tennessee 37929

WASHINGTON

1420 Fifth Ave, Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101

17410 133rd Avenue, Suite 301
Woodinville, Washington 98072

WASHINGTON, D.C.

5335 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Suite 440
Washington, D.C. 20015

NETHERLANDS

UNITED KINGDOM



EXHIBIT C

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

CASE NO. CACE25011999 DIVISION: 21 JUDGE: Singer, Michele Towbin (21)

Gina Letizio, et al

Plaintiff(s) / Petitioner(s)

v.

Akumin Operating Corp.

Defendant(s) / Respondent(s)

_____ /

**DECLARATION OF CAMERON R. AZARI, ESQ. REGARDING
IMPLEMENTATION AND ADEQUACY OF NOTICE PROGRAM**

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 & 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 notification plans. I previously filed declarations in this matter related to Epiq’s administration of the Settlement with defendant Brightline Inc.
4. Epiq is an industry leader in class action administration, having implemented more than a thousand successful class action notice and settlement administration matters. Epiq Legal Noticing has handled 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

DECLARATION OF CAMERON R. AZARI, ESQ. REGARDING
IMPLEMENTATION AND ADEQUACY OF NOTICE PROGRAM

notices that 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 review.

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. I have served as a notice expert and have been recognized and appointed by courts to design and provide notice in numerous data breach and privacy settlements, including:

Data Breach & Privacy Cases	Case No. & Court
<i>In re: Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Privacy Litigation</i>	3:20-cv-02155 (N.D. Cal.)
<i>In re: Capital One Consumer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	MDL No. 2915 (E.D. Va.)
<i>In re: Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation</i>	1:20-cv-05914 (S.D.N.Y.)
<i>In re: U.S. Office of Personnel Management Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	MDL No. 2664, (D.D.C.)
<i>In re: Department of Veteran Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litigation</i>	MDL No. 1796 (D.D.C.)
<i>In re: Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	MDL No. 2633 (D. Or.)
<i>McCullough v. True Health New Mexico, Inc.</i>	D-202-CV-2021-06816 (2nd Dist. Ct., N.M.)
<i>Chapman v. Insight Global Inc.</i>	1:21-cv-00824 (M.D. Penn.)
<i>Thomsen et al. v. Morley Cos., Inc.</i>	1:22-cv-10271 (E.D. Mich.)
<i>In re Scripps Health Data Incident Litigation</i>	37-2021-00024103 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego)
<i>Service et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America et al.</i>	C22-01841 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Contra Costa)
<i>Wenston Desue et al. v. 20/20 Eye Care Network, Inc. et al.</i>	21-cv-61275 (S.D. Fla.)
<i>Kostka et al. v. Dickey's Barbecue Restaurants, Inc. et al.</i>	3:20-cv-03424 (N.D. Tex.)
<i>Cochran et al. v. The Kroger Co. et al.</i>	5:21-cv-01887 (N.D. Cal.)
<i>Ford et al. v. [24]7.ai, Inc. (Best Buy Data Incident)</i>	MDL No. 2863 (N.D. Cal.)
<i>Snyder et al. v. The Urology Center of Colorado, P.C.</i>	2021CV33707 (2nd Dist. Ct. Cnty. of Denver Col.)
<i>Dearing v. Magellan Health Inc. et al.</i>	CV2020-013648 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Maricopa, Ariz.)
<i>Torretto et al. v. Donnelley Financial Solutions, Inc. and Mediant Communications Inc.</i>	1:20-cv-02667 (S.D.N.Y.)
<i>Stoll et al. v. Musculoskeletal Institute, Chartered d/b/a Florida Orthopaedic Institute</i>	8:20-cv-01798 (M.D. Fla.)
<i>Hameed-Bolden et al. v. Forever 21 Retail, Inc. et al.</i>	2:18-cv-03019 (C.D. Cal.)
<i>In re Community Health Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	MDL No. 2595 (N.D. Ala.)
<i>Lozano v. CodeMetro Inc.</i>	37-2020-00022701 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego)
<i>Fox et al. v. Iowa Health System d.b.a. UnityPoint Health</i>	3:18-cv-00327 (W.D. Wis.)

Data Breach & Privacy Cases	Case No. & Court
<i>Armon et al. v. Washington State University</i>	17-2-23244-1 consolidated with 17-2-25052-0 (Sup. Ct. Wash.)
<i>Kuss v. American HomePatient, Inc. et al.</i>	8:18-cv-02348 (M.D. Fla.)
<i>Nelson v. Roadrunner Transportation Systems, Inc.</i>	1:18-cv-07400 (N.D. Ill.)
<i>Adlouni v. UCLA Health System Auxiliary et al.</i>	BC589243 (Cal. Sup. Ct., L.A. Cnty.)
<i>Parsons v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLC</i>	3:16-cv-05387 (N.D. Cal.)
<i>In re: Valley Anesthesiology Consultants, Inc. Data Breach Litigation</i>	CV2016-013446 (Ariz. Super. Ct., Maricopa Cnty.)
<i>McGann et al., v. Schnuck Markets, Inc.</i>	1322-CC00800 (Mo. Cir. Ct.)
<i>Greater Chautauqua Federal Credit Union et al. v. Kmart Corp. et al.</i>	1:15-cv-02228 (N.D. Ill.)
<i>In re: Heartland Payment Systems, Inc. Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	MDL No. 2046 (S.D. Tex.)
<i>In re: Countrywide Financial Corp. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	MDL No. 1998, (W.D. Ky.)
<i>Bandy v. TOC Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Tennessee Orthopaedic Clinics, a division of Tennessee Orthopaedic Alliance, P.A.</i>	3:23-cv-00598, (M.D. Tenn)
<i>Medina et al. v. PracticeMax, Inc.</i>	CV-22-01261, (D. Ariz.)
<i>In re Waste Management Data Breach Litigation</i>	1:21-cv-06199, (S.D.N.Y)
<i>Sherwood, et al. v. Horizon Actuarial Services, LLC</i>	1:22-cv-01495, (N.D. Ga.)
<i>Briscoe et al. v. First Financial Credit Union</i>	D-202-CV-2022-02974, (2nd. Jud. Dist. Cnty. of Bernalillo, N.M.)
<i>Patterson et al. v. DPP II LLC, et al.</i>	DC-23-01733, (Dist. Ct of Dallas Cnty., Tex.)
<i>In Re: Canon U.S.A. Data Breach Litigation</i>	1:20-cv-06239, (E.D.N.Y.)

7. Courts have recognized our testimony as to which method of notification is appropriate for a given case, and I have provided testimony 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**.

8. 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.

9. The facts in this declaration 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

10. This declaration describes the successful implementation of the Settlement Notice Program (“Notice Program”) and Notices (the “Notice” or “Notices”) for *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp. f/k/a Akumin Corp.*, CACE-25-011999, in the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County, Florida. Epiq designed this Notice Program based on our extensive prior experience and research into the notice issues particular to this Settlement. The Notice Program as designed and implemented provided notice that was the most practicable under the circumstances to provide notice to the Settlement Class.

DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY

11. Epiq has procedures in place to protect the security of data for the Settlement Class. As with all cases, Epiq maintains extensive data security and privacy safeguards in its official capacity as the Settlement Administrator for this Action. A Service Agreement, which formally retains Epiq as the Settlement Administrator, governs Epiq’s settlement administration responsibilities for the Action. Epiq maintains adequate insurance in case of errors.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

15. 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.

16. 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.

17. 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 PROGRAM SUMMARY

18. Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 directs that, “notice shall be given to each member of the class who can be identified and located through reasonable effort and shall be given to the other members of the class in the manner determined by the court to be most

practicable under the circumstances.”¹ The Notice Program satisfied these requirements.

19. The Notice Program, including the email notice effort supplemented by a digital notice campaign, provided notice that was the most practicable under the circumstances, and satisfied the requirements of due process, including its “desire to actually inform” requirement.²

NOTICE PROGRAM DETAIL

20. On September 16, 2025, the Court approved the Notice Program and appointed Epiq as the Settlement Administrator in the *Order Granting Plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement* (“Preliminary Approval Order”). In the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court approved, for settlement purposes only, the following “Settlement Class”:

All living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (a) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant; (b) governmental entities; (c) the Judge assigned to the Action, that Judge’s immediate family, and Court staff; and (d) any Settlement Class Member who timely and validly opts-out of the Settlement.

21. After the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order was entered, Epiq implemented the Notice Program. This declaration details the notice activities undertaken to date. This declaration also discusses the administration activity to date.

NOTICE PROGRAM

Individual Notice

22. On September 22, 2025, Epiq received five data files with 1,165,790 records, which included names and other information for identified Settlement Class members (“Class List”). Settlement Class member records without a valid email address were sent to a third party

¹ Fla. R. Civ. P. Rule 1.220 (d)(2).

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 . . .”).

to perform “reverse lookups” by using their extensive databases to identify the most likely valid email address(es), if available. Epiq deduplicated and rolled-up the records and loaded the unique, identified Settlement Class member records into its database for this Settlement.

Individual Notice – Email

23. On October 2, 2025, Epiq commenced sending 74,002 Email Notices to 72,722 identified Settlement Class members for whom a valid email address was available. Some Settlement Class members had two or more valid email addresses and an Email Notice was sent to each valid email address. Subsequently, on October 20, 2025, Epiq commenced sending 691,437 Email Notices to 691,437 identified Settlement Class members for whom a valid email address was determined through the reverse look-up process. In total, 764,159 unique Settlement Class members were sent at least one Email Notice.

24. The following industry standard best practices were followed for the Email Notice efforts. The Email Notice was drafted in such a way that the subject line, the sender, and the body of the message overcame SPAM filters and ensured readership to the fullest extent reasonably practicable. For instance, the Email Notices used an embedded html text format. This format provided easy-to-read text without graphics, tables, images and other elements that in our experience would have increased the likelihood that the message would have been blocked by Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and/or SPAM filters for this type of communication. The Email Notices were sent from an IP address known to major email providers as one not used to send bulk “SPAM” or “junk” email blasts. Each Email Notice was transmitted with a digital signature to the header and content of the Email Notice, which allowed ISPs to programmatically authenticate that the Email Notices were from our authorized mail servers. Each Email Notice was also transmitted with a unique message identifier. The Email Notices included an embedded link to the Settlement Website. By clicking the link, recipients were able to access the Long Form Notice and additional information about the Settlement. The Email Notice is included as **Attachment 2**.

25. 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 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.

26. Additionally, a Long Form Notice and Claim Form (“Claim Package”) were mailed to all persons who requested one via the toll-free telephone number or other means. As of November 6, 2025, Epiq mailed 24 Claim Packages pursuant to such requests. The Long Form Notice is included as **Attachment 3**. The Claim Form is included as **Attachment 4**.

Digital Notice Campaign

27. Digital Notice through the use of internet and social media advertising has become a widely accepted component in legal notice programs. The internet and social media platforms have proven to be efficient and cost-effective methods to target classes with large numbers of members as part of providing notice of a settlement. According to MRI-Simmons³ data, 97% of all adults are online and 84% of all adults use social media.⁴

28. Digital Notice included advertising on the selected advertising network *Google Display Network*, which represents thousands of digital properties across all major content categories. Digital Notices were targeted to selected target audiences and were designed to encourage participation by Settlement Class members—which linked directly to the Settlement Website, allowing visitors easy access to relevant information and documents.

³ MRI-Simmons is a leading source of publication readership and product usage data for the communications industry. MRI-Simmons is a joint venture of GfK Mediamark Research & Intelligence, LLC (“MRI”) and Simmons Market Research. MRI-Simmons offers comprehensive demographic, lifestyle, product usage and exposure to all forms of advertising media collected from a single sample. As the leading U.S. supplier of multimedia audience research, the company provides information to magazines, televisions, radio, internet, and other media, leading national advertisers, and over 450 advertising agencies—including 90 of the top 100 in the United States. MRI-Simmons’s national syndicated data is widely used by companies as the basis for the majority of the media and marketing plans that are written for advertised brands in the United States.

⁴ MRI-Simmons 2025 Survey of the American Consumer®.

29. The Digital Notices were also placed on the leading social media platforms in the United States, including *Facebook*, *Instagram*, *Reddit*, and *X (Twitter)*. The social media campaign used an interest-based approach which focused on the interests that users exhibit while on the social media platforms, capitalizing on the target audience's propensity to engage in social media.

30. *Facebook* is the leading social networking site in the United States with 196.9 million users,⁵ and *Instagram* has 171.7 million active users in the United States.⁶

31. *Reddit* is a widely used social forum website that contains more than one million communities known as subreddits. These communities cover specific topics making this an ideal platform to reach individuals with focused interests. *Reddit* has more than 288 million users Worldwide.⁷

32. *X (Twitter)* is a popular microblogging social media website that allows posts/tweets containing images or videos. Users can like, comment, and share/retweet posts. *X* has more than 103.9 million users in the United States.⁸

33. The Digital Notices were distributed to a variety of target audiences, including those relevant to demonstrated interests and/or likes. All Digital Notices appeared on desktop, mobile and tablet devices. Digital Notices on *Facebook*, *Instagram*, *Reddit*, and *X (Twitter)* were targeted nationwide to reach Settlement Class members. Digital Notices were also targeted (remarketed) to people who clicked on a Digital Notice.

34. More details regarding the target audiences, specific ad sizes of the Digital Notices, and the number of impressions delivered for the media campaign are included in the following table:

⁵ Statista Digital 2025: Global Overview Report. Statista, founded in 2007, is a leading provider of worldwide market and consumer data and is trusted by thousands of companies around the world for data. Statista.com consolidates statistical data on over 80,000 topics from more than 22,500 sources and makes it available in German, English, French and Spanish.

⁶ Statista Digital 2025: Global Overview Report.

⁷ Statista Digital 2025: Global Overview Report.

⁸ Statista Digital 2025: Global Overview Report.

<i>Digital Plan</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Ad Sizes</i>	<i>Delivered Impressions</i>
<i>Google Display Network</i>	A18+ Intent Audience: ⁹ Radiology and Oncology Services	728x90, 300x250, 300x600 & 970x250	10,212,689
<i>Google Display Network</i>	Adults 18+ within 60 mile radius of an Akumin location ¹⁰	728x90, 300x250, 300x600 & 970x250	15,341,763
<i>Facebook</i>	Adults 18+	Newsfeed & Right Hand Column	7,935,241
<i>Facebook</i>	Adults 18+ within 60 mile radius of an Akumin location	Newsfeed & Right Hand Column	10,115,808
<i>Instagram</i>	Adults 18+	Newsfeed	5,387,950
<i>Instagram</i>	Adults 18+ within 60 mile radius of an Akumin location	Newsfeed	7,551,410
<i>Reddit</i>	Adults 18+ Keyword Targeting: Radiology and Oncology Services	Reddit Feed Ads	2,763,577
<i>X (Twitter)</i>	Adults 18+ Post Engagement: Radiology and Oncology Services	Feed Ads	2,556,153
TOTAL			61,864,591

35. Combined, over 61.8 million impressions were generated by the Digital Notices.¹¹ The internet and social media advertising campaign ran from October 1, 2025, through October 30, 2025. Clicking on the Digital Notices linked the reader to the Settlement Website, where they could easily obtain detailed information about the Settlement. Examples of the Digital Notices are included as **Attachment 5**.

Sponsored Search Listings

36. To facilitate locating the Settlement Website, sponsored search listings were acquired on the three most frequently visited internet search engines: *Google*, *Yahoo!*, and *Bing*.

⁹ “Intent Audience” targeted individuals that were researching or purchasing certain items on the internet.

¹⁰ All Akumin locations (including permanently closed) are listed at: <https://akumin.com/locations/>.

¹¹ The third-party ad management platform, ClickCease, was used to audit Digital Notice ad placements. This type of platform tracks all Digital Notice ad clicks to provide real-time ad monitoring, fraud traffic analysis, blocks clicks from fraudulent sources, and quarantines dangerous IP addresses. This helps reduce wasted, fraudulent or otherwise invalid traffic (e.g., ads being seen by ‘bots’ or non-humans, ads not being viewable, etc.).

When search engine visitors searched on selected common keyword combinations related to the Settlement, the sponsored search listings created for the Settlement were generally displayed at the top of the visitor's website page prior to the search results or in the upper right-hand column of the web-browser screen. All sponsored search listings linked directly to the Settlement Website.

37. The sponsored search listings, displayed nationwide, ran from October 1, 2025, through October 30, 2025. The sponsored search listings were displayed 16,886 times, which resulted in 2,158 clicks, which displayed the Settlement Website. A complete list of the sponsored search keyword combinations is included as **Attachment 6**. Examples of the sponsored search listing as displayed on each search engine are included as **Attachment 7**.

Settlement Website

38. On September 30, 2025, Epiq established a dedicated Settlement Website with an easy to remember domain name (www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com). Relevant documents, including the Settlement Agreement, Preliminary Approval Order, Long Form Notice, Claim Form, and other case-related documents are posted on the Settlement Website. Following the filing of the Motion for Final Approval, it too will be posted to the Settlement Website, along with the request for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards, and the Final Approval Order. In addition, the Settlement Website includes relevant dates, answers to frequently asked questions ("FAQs"), instructions for how Settlement Class members may opt-out (request exclusion) from or object to the Settlement prior to the deadlines, instructions for submitting a Claim Form, contact information for the Settlement Administrator, and how to obtain other case-related information. The Settlement Website also provides the ability for Settlement Class members to submit an online Claim Form. The Settlement Website address was prominently displayed in all notice documents. As of November 6, 2025, there have been 20,632 unique visitor sessions to the Settlement Website, and 33,898 web pages have been presented.

Toll-Free Telephone Number and Other Contact Information

39. On September 30, 2025, a toll-free telephone number (1-877-657-8732) was

established for the Settlement. Callers are able to hear an introductory message, have the option to learn more about the Settlement in the form of recorded answers to FAQs, and request that a Claim Package be mailed to them. This automated telephone 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 November 6, 2025, there have been 152 calls to the toll-free telephone number representing 397 minutes of use.

40. A postal mailing address and email address were established and continue to be available to allow Settlement Class members the opportunity to request additional information or ask questions.

Opt-Out Requests and Objections

41. The deadline to request exclusion from the Settlement or to object to the Settlement is November 30, 2025. As of November 6, 2025, Epiq has received four requests for exclusion. As of November 6, 2025, Epiq is aware of no objections to the Settlement.

Claim Submission & Distribution

42. The Notices provided a detailed summary of relevant information about the Settlement, including the Settlement Website address, and how Settlement Class members can file a Claim Form online or by mail. With any method of filing a Claim Form, Settlement Class members are given the option of receiving a digital payment or a traditional paper check. Epiq worked with counsel for the parties to select an appropriate menu of payment options. With selecting a digital payment option, the type of digital payment selected does not impact Epiq's compensation for its work as the Settlement Administrator, and no digital option was discouraged relative to other options.

43. The deadline for Settlement Class members to file a Claim Form is November 30, 2025. As of November 6, 2025, Epiq has received 839 Claim Forms (799 online and 40 paper). Since the Claim Form Deadline has not yet passed, these numbers are preliminary and are subject to change. Epiq anticipates the number of Claims submitted will continue to increase through the Claim Form Deadline. As standard practice, Epiq is in the process of conducting a

complete quality control review of Claim Forms received. There is a possibility that after detailed review, the total number of Claim Forms received will change due to duplicate and denied Claim Forms. To date, the claims process is progressing as anticipated and as compared to other similar data breach settlements Epiq has administered.

Settlement Administration Costs

44. As of November 6, 2025, administration costs total \$129,010, which is inclusive of the costs to implement the Notice Program and handle settlement administration to date. Based on the current scope of the settlement administration, Epiq has agreed to cap its fees and costs at \$200,000.

45. Additional work remains following the Final Approval Hearing to complete all aspects of the settlement administration. The remaining work to be completed includes: (1) distributing settlement funds to members of the Settlement Class with a valid Claim Form (digital payments or physical checks and postage); (2) handling undeliverable payments; (3) re-issuing payments; (4) communications with members of the Settlement Class, including maintaining the Settlement Website and toll-free telephone number throughout the remaining duration of the settlement administration; and (5) associated project management and related billable hours to handle the distribution and related settlement administration responsibilities. All costs are subject to the Service Contract under which Epiq is retained as the Settlement Administrator, and the terms and conditions of that agreement.

PLAIN LANGUAGE NOTICE DESIGN

46. The Notices were designed to be “noticed,” reviewed, and—by presenting the information in plain language—understood by Settlement Class members. The design of the Notices followed the principles embodied in the Federal Judicial Center’s (“FJC”) illustrative “model” notices posted at www.fjc.gov. Many courts, and the FJC itself, have approved notices that Epiq’s noticing experts have written and designed in a similar fashion. The Notices contained substantial, albeit easy-to-read summaries of all key information about Settlement Class members’ rights and options. Consistent with our normal practice, all notice documents underwent a final

edit prior to actual mailing and publication for grammatical errors and accuracy.

47. The Notices sent to identified Settlement Class members provided substantial information to the Settlement Class. The Notices included (i) details regarding Settlement Class members' ability to opt-out or object, (ii) the deadline to opt-out or object, and (iii) the date, time, and location of the Final Approval Hearing, among other information.

CONCLUSION

48. 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, in a settlement class action notice situation such as this, 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.

49. The Notice Program provided notice that was the most practicable under the circumstances, and satisfied the requirements of due process, including its “desire to actually inform” requirement.¹² The Notice Program individual notice effort combined with the media plan (digital and social media notice), Settlement Website, and toll-free telephone number reached at least 70% of the Settlement Class.


50. The Notice Program conformed to all aspects of the Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 regarding notice, comported with the guidance for effective notice set out in the Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth, and applicable FJC materials, and satisfied the requirements of due process, including its “desire to actually inform” requirement.

51. The Notice Program schedule afforded sufficient time to provide full and proper

¹² *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 . . .”).

notice to Settlement Class members before the Opt-Out Deadline and Objection Deadline.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed November 11, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Azari', positioned above a horizontal line.

Cameron R. Azari, Esq.

Attachment 1

epiq

legal noticingSM



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

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.

1.8M
mail or email
notice to vehicle
owners

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. Fioreck. 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, Lashmbae 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 Hoefer 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 2,254,411 notice packets and 1,019,408 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)(1)) 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 Julee (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.</i> , as part of <i>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</i> (Tax Assessment Financing)	Sup. Ct., Cal., Cnty. of Riverside, No. RICJCCP4940
<i>Nelson v. Roadrunner Transportation Systems, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	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.</i> (Overdraft)	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.</i> (Gold Market Instrument)	Ontario Sup. Ct., No. CV-15-543005-00CP & No. CV-16-551067-00CP
<i>Zaklit et al. v. Nationstar Mortgage LLC et al.</i> (TCPA)	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.</i> , as part of <i>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.</i> (TCPA)	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</i> (Data Breach)	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>Bakopanos 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

Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement

From Akumin Data Incident Settlement Administrator <noreply@AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com>

To [REDACTED]

Re: Court Ordered Notice of Class Action Settlement

Seventeenth Judicial Circuit Court, Broward County, Florida
Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp., Case No. CACE-25-011999

If you received notice indicating your Private Information may have been impacted in a Data Incident involving Akumin Operating Corp., you may be entitled to Settlement Class Member Benefits from a Settlement.

A Court authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

You can file your Claim Form [here](#).

A Settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit against Akumin Operating Corp. ("Defendant") involving a Data Incident that occurred on October 11, 2023, regarding allegedly unauthorized access to Defendant's computer network resulting in the acquisition of Private Information of members of the Settlement Class. The Private Information may have involved some combination of names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, driver's license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID numbers, other patient identifiers, other unique individual identifiers, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information, and/or electronic signatures.

The purpose of this Notice is to inform you of the class action and the Settlement so you may decide whether to file a Claim Form, opt-out, object, or do nothing.

Who's Included? Records show you are a Settlement Class Member, defined as all living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

What Does the Settlement Provide? As a Settlement Class Member, the following Settlement Class Member Benefits are provided as a result of the Settlement. You can submit a Claim Form for a cash payment for documented losses by submitting a Claim Form online or by mail **postmarked by November 30, 2025**.

1. **Cash Payment for Documented Losses:** You may submit a Claim Form supported by detailed documentation, for actual losses related to the Data Incident for up to \$2,500 per Settlement Class Member. Please refer to the Long-Form Notice on the Settlement Website for a description of the type of documentation you must provide to support a claim for a Cash Payment for Documented Losses.

AND

2. **Medical Data Monitoring:** In addition to a Cash Payment for Documented Losses, you may also submit a Claim Form to receive one year of free Medical Data Monitoring through CyEx Medical Shield Complete which also includes one year of one bureau credit monitoring.

You must submit your Claim Form [here](#) or by mail **postmarked by November 30, 2025**.

Other Options. If you do not want to be legally bound by the Settlement, you must submit a request to opt-out of the Settlement, **postmarked by November 30, 2025**. If you do not opt-out, you will give up the right to sue and will release the Defendant and the Released Parties from the legal claims in this lawsuit. If you do not opt-out, you may object to the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards by **November 30, 2025**. The [Long-Form Notice](#) on the Settlement Website explains how to opt-out or object. If you do nothing, you will get no Settlement Class Member Benefits, and you will be bound by the Settlement and any judgments and orders.

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on **December 15, 2025**, to consider whether to approve the Settlement, Class Counsel's attorneys' fees of \$2,850,000, including reimbursement of costs, Service Awards of up to \$2,500 each to the Class Representatives (all of which are paid by the Defendant separate and apart from the Settlement Class Member Benefits), and to consider any objections. You or your lawyer may attend and ask to appear at the hearing if you object, but you are not required to do so.

This Notice is a summary. Learn more about the Settlement [here](#) or by calling toll free 1-877-657-8732.

UniqueID	PIN
[REDACTED]	

If [REDACTED] should not be subscribed or if you need to change your subscription information for Akumin Data Incident, [please use this preferences page](#).

Attachment 3

If your Private Information was impacted in the Data Incident involving Akumin Operating Corp. that occurred on October 11, 2023, and you were sent notice, you may be entitled to Settlement Class Member Benefits from a Settlement.

A Court authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A Settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit against Akumin Operating Corp, (“Defendant”) involving a Data Incident that occurred on October 11, 2023, involving Defendant and allegedly resulting in unauthorized access to or acquisition of Settlement Class Members’ Private Information. The Private Information involved was some combination of names, home addresses, emails, other contact information, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, driver’s license numbers, passport numbers, Medical Record Numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID, other patient identifier, other unique individual identifier, financial account information, payment card information, diagnosis information, treatment information, patient imaging, occupational health information, biometric information, medical history, billing or claims information, health insurance subscriber numbers, health insurance group policy numbers, insurance benefits information, and/or electronic signatures.
- The Settlement Class includes: all living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.
- If you are a member of the Settlement Class, you can submit a Claim Form for the following Settlement Class Member Benefits:

Cash Payment – Documented Losses: You may submit a Claim Form and provide detailed documentation for losses related to the Data Incident for up to \$2500 per Settlement Class Member; **AND**
Medical Data Monitoring: In addition to Cash Payment, you may also submit a Claim Form to receive one year of free Medical Data Monitoring.

This Notice may affect your rights. Please read it carefully.

Your Legal Rights & Options		Deadline
Submit a Claim Form	The only way to get Settlement Class Member Benefits is to submit a timely and valid Claim Form.	Submitted or Postmarked by: November 30, 2025
Exclude Yourself	Get no Settlement Class Member Benefits. Keep your right to file your own lawsuit against the Released Parties about the Released Claims that are released by the Settlement in this lawsuit.	Postmarked by: November 30, 2025
Object to the Settlement	Stay in the Settlement but tell the Court why you do not agree with the Settlement. You will still be bound by the Settlement if the Court approves it.	Filed by: November 30, 2025
Do Nothing	Get no Settlement Class Member Benefits. Give up your legal rights.	

- These rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this Notice.
- The Court must decide whether to approve the Settlement, Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs and Service Awards. No Settlement Class Member Benefits will be provided unless the Court approves the Settlement.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why is this Notice being provided?

A court authorized this Notice because you have the right to know about the Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your rights and options before the Court decides whether to grant final approval to the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, your legal rights, what Settlement Class Member Benefits are available, who is eligible for the Settlement Class Member Benefits, and how to get them.

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

The Honorable Michele Towbin Singer of the Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County, Florida is overseeing this class action. The lawsuit is known as *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp.*, Case No. CACE-25-011999 (“lawsuit”). The individuals who filed this lawsuit are called the “Plaintiffs” and/or “Class Representatives” and the company sued, Akumin Operating Corp., is called the “Defendant.”

2. What is this lawsuit about?

The Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit against the Defendant on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated involving a Data Incident discovered on October 11, 2023, involving Defendant and allegedly resulting in unauthorized access to or acquisition of Settlement Class Members’ Private Information, as the result of the infiltration of Defendant’s computer systems. Private Information is defined in the first paragraph.

Defendant denies the legal claims and denies any wrongdoing or liability. The Court has not made any determination of any wrongdoing by Defendant, or that any law has been violated. Instead, the Plaintiffs and Defendant have agreed to a settlement to avoid the risk, cost, and time of continuing the lawsuit.

3. Why is there a Settlement?

The Plaintiffs and Defendant do not agree about the legal claims made in this lawsuit. The lawsuit has not gone to trial, and the Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiffs or Defendant. Instead, the Plaintiffs and Defendant have agreed to settle the lawsuit. The Class Representatives, Defendant, and their lawyers believe the Settlement is best for the Settlement Class because of the Settlement Class Member Benefits available and the risks and uncertainty associated with continuing the lawsuit.

4. Why is this lawsuit a class action?

In a class action, one or more people (called Class Representatives) sue on behalf of all people who have similar legal claims. Together, all these people are called a class or class members, and now that there is a settlement, “Settlement Class Members.” One court resolves the issues for all class members, except for those class members who timely exclude themselves (opt out) from the Settlement class.

WHO IS INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

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

You are included in the Settlement Class if you are a living individual residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

6. Are there exceptions to being included in the Settlement?

Yes. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (1) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant, or their respective subsidiaries and affiliated companies; (2) governmental entities; and (3) the Judge assigned to the lawsuit, that Judge’s immediate family, and Court staff.

7. What if I am still not sure whether I am part of the Settlement?

If you are still not sure whether you are a Settlement Class Member, you may go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call toll-free 1-877-657-8732.

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

8. What does this Settlement provide?

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you can submit a Claim Form for the following Settlement Class Member Benefits:

Cash Payment – Documented Losses

You may submit a Claim Form with detailed documentation for losses related to the Data Incident for up to \$2,500 per Settlement Class Member.

Examples of expenses incurred as a result of the Data Incident include (but are not limited to): unreimbursed losses relating to fraud or identity theft; costs associated with freezing or unfreezing credit with any credit reporting agency; and miscellaneous expenses such as notary, fax, postage, copying, mileage, and long-distance telephone charges.

Examples of detailed documentation include (but are not limited to): telephone records, correspondence including emails, or receipts. Personal certifications, declarations, or affidavits from the Settlement Class Member do not constitute detailed documentation but may be included to provide clarification, context, or support for other submitted detailed documentation.

You will not be reimbursed for expenses if you have been reimbursed for the same expenses by another source, including compensation provided in connection with the identity protection and credit monitoring services offered as part of the notification letter provided by Defendant or otherwise.

If you do not submit detailed documentation supporting a loss, or if your Claim Form is invalid as determined by the Settlement Administrator, and you do not cure your Claim Form, your Claim will be rejected.

Medical Data Monitoring - In addition to Cash Payment, you may also submit a Claim Form to receive one year of free Medical Data Monitoring. The monitoring product is CyEx's Medical Shield Complete and includes monitoring by one bureau.

9. What am I giving up to receive Settlement Class Member Benefits or to stay in the Settlement?

Unless you exclude yourself (opt out), you will remain in the Settlement Class. If the Settlement is approved and becomes final, all Court orders and any judgments will apply to you and legally bind you. You will not be able to sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Released Parties about the Released Claims in this lawsuit. The specific rights you are giving up are called "Released Claims."

10. What are the Released Claims?

Section XI of the Settlement Agreement describes the Releases, Released Claims, and Released Parties, in necessary legal terminology, so please read this section carefully. The Settlement Agreement is available at www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com. For questions regarding the Releases, Released Claims, or Released Parties and what the language in the Settlement Agreement means, you can also contact Class Counsel listed below for free, or you can talk to your own lawyer at your own expense.

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

HOW TO GET BENEFITS FROM THE SETTLEMENT

11. How do I submit a Claim Form?

You must submit a timely and valid Claim Form to receive any Settlement Class Member Benefits as described above. Your Claim Form must be submitted online at www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com by **November 30, 2025 by 11:59 p.m. Eastern time**, or mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address on the Claim Form, **postmarked by November 30, 2025**. Paper Claim Forms are available for download at www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or by calling 1-877-657-8732, by emailing Info@AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com, or by writing to:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box 2079
Portland, OR 97208-2079

12. What happens if my contact information changes after I submit a Claim Form?

If you change your mailing address or email address after you submit a Claim Form, it is your responsibility to inform the Settlement Administrator of your updated information. You may notify the Settlement Administrator of any changes by writing to:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box 2079
Portland, OR 97208-2079

13. When will I receive my Settlement Class Member Benefits?

If you file a timely and valid Claim Form, the Settlement Class Member Benefits will be provided after the Settlement is approved by the Court and becomes final.

It may take time for the Settlement to be approved and become final. Please be patient and check www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com for updates.

EXCLUDE YOURSELF OR OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT

If you are a member of the Settlement Class and want to keep any right you may have to sue or continue to sue the Released Parties on your own about the legal claims in this lawsuit or the Released Claims, then you must take steps to get out of the Settlement. This is called excluding yourself from—or “opting out” of—the Settlement.

14. How do I opt out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must mail a written request for exclusion, which includes the following:

1. Your name, address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
2. Your personal physical signature; and
3. A statement that you want to be excluded from the Settlement Class, such as “I hereby request to be excluded from the Settlement Class in the *Akumin Data Breach*.”

The exclusion request must be **mailed** to the Settlement Administrator at the following address, and be **postmarked** by November 30, 2025:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box 2079
Portland, OR 97208-2079

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

You cannot opt out (exclude yourself) by telephone or by email.

“Mass” or “class” requests for exclusion filed by third parties on behalf of a “mass” or “class” of Settlement Class Members or multiple Settlement Class Members where the opt out has not been signed by each and every individual Settlement Class Member will not be allowed.

15. If I opt out can I still get anything from the Settlement?

No. If you opt out, you will not be able to receive Settlement Class Member Benefits, and you will not be bound by the Settlement or any judgments in this lawsuit. You can only get Settlement Class Member Benefits if you stay in the Settlement and submit a timely and valid Claim Form.

16. If I do not opt out, can I sue the Defendant for the same thing later?

No. Unless you opt out, you give up any right to sue any of the Defendant and Released Parties for the legal claims this Settlement resolves and Releases, and you will be bound by all the terms of the Settlement, proceedings, orders, and judgments in the lawsuit. You must opt out of this lawsuit to start or continue your own lawsuit or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant and Released Parties about the Released Claims in this Settlement. If you have a pending lawsuit, speak to your lawyer in that lawsuit immediately.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

17. How do I tell the Court I do not like the Settlement?

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you can tell the Court you do not agree with all or any part of the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, and Service Awards.

To object, you must file your timely written objection with the Court as provided below by **November 30, 2025** and send copies by U.S. Mail to Class Counsel, Defendant’s Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator stating that you object to the Settlement in: *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp.*, Case No. CACE-2025-011999.

To file an objection, you cannot exclude yourself from the Settlement Class. Your objection must include all of the following information:

1. Your full name, mailing address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
2. The case name and number: *Gina Letizio, et al. v. Akumin Operating Corp.*, Case No. CACE-2025-011999.
3. Documentation sufficient to establish membership in the Settlement Class, such as a copy of the Email Notice you received;
4. All grounds for the objection, accompanied by any legal support for the objection known to you as the objector or your own lawyer;
5. The number of times you have objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date that you file the objection, the caption of each case in which you have made such objection, and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon your prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case;
6. The identity of all lawyers representing you, including any former or current lawyers who may be entitled to compensation for any reason related to the objection to the Settlement and/or Application for Attorneys’ Fees, and Costs and Service Awards, and whether they will appear at the Final Approval Hearing;
7. The number of times your lawyer or your lawyer’s law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date of the filed objection, the caption of each case in which your lawyer or the firm has made such objection and a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon your lawyer’s or the lawyer’s law firm’s prior objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case;
8. A list of all persons who will be called to testify at the Final Approval Hearing in support of your objection (if any);
9. A statement confirming whether you intend to personally appear and/or testify at the Final Approval Hearing; and
10. Your signature as the objector (a lawyer’s signature is not sufficient).

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

Class Counsel and/or Defendant's Counsel may conduct limited discovery on any objector or objector's lawyer, including the taking of depositions and requiring the production of documents.

To object, you must file your timely written objection with the Court by **November 30, 2025**, and send it by U.S. Mail or shipped by private courier (such as Federal Express) to Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator postmarked by **November 30, 2025**, at the following addresses:

COURT	CLASS COUNSEL	DEFENDANT'S COUNSEL	SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR
Clerk Circuit Court of Broward County 201 SE 6th St. Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301	Jeff Ostrow Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. 1 West Las Olas Blvd. Suite 500 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301 Mariya Weekes Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC 333 SE 2nd Avenue Suite 2000 Miami, FL 33131	Ian Ross iross@sidley.com 1001 Brickell Bay Dr. Miami, FL 33131	<i>Akumin Data Incident</i> Settlement Administrator PO Box 2079 Portland, OR 97208-2079

18. What is the difference between objecting and asking to be excluded?

Objecting is simply telling the Court that you do not like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Settlement Class. Opting out is telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the Settlement Class. If you opt out, you cannot object because you are no longer part of the Settlement.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

19. Do I have a lawyer in the lawsuit?

Yes. The Court has appointed Jeff Ostrow of Kopelowitz Ostrow P.A. and Mariya Weekes of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grosman PLLC as Class Counsel to represent you and the Settlement Class for the purposes of this Settlement. You may hire your own lawyer at your own cost if you want someone other than Class Counsel to represent you in this lawsuit.

20. How will Class Counsel be paid?

Class Counsel will file a motion asking the Court to award attorneys' fees of up to \$2,850,000, plus reimbursement of costs. Class Counsel will also ask the Court to approve the Service Awards for the Class Representatives of up to \$2,500 each for their efforts. Defendant shall pay or cause to be paid any Court-approved attorneys' fees and costs or Service Awards. The Court may award less than these amounts.

THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

The Court will hold a "Final Approval Hearing" to decide whether to approve the Settlement and Application for Attorneys' Fees, and Costs and Service Awards. You may attend and you may ask to speak if you file an objection by the deadline, but you do not have to.

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

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

The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on **December 15, 2025**, at **8:30 a.m.** via Zoom Video Conference before the Honorable Michele Towbin Singer. At this hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court will also consider approval of the Settlement and Class Counsel's request for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards. If you file a timely objection, and you (or your lawyer) ask to speak at the hearing, the Court, at its discretion, may hear objections at the hearing.

Note: The date and time of the Final Approval Hearing are subject to change without further notice to the Settlement Class. Please check the Settlement Website from time to time to confirm that the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing has not changed.

INVITATION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO JOIN

JUDGE TOWBIN SINGER'S HEARING DOCKET VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE:

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://zoom.us/j/91926028850> Meeting ID: 919 2602 8850

All Zoom meetings now include toll-free numbers for Participants calling in by phone: (888) 475-4499, (833) 548-0276, (833) 548-0282, and (877) 853-5257 US Toll-free

Meeting ID: 919 2602 8850

Your local number: +1 786 635 1003

**If calling in by phone, you are automatically muted once you sign in. To unmute yourself please dial *6.

Please Note: If you do not wish to appear by Zoom Video or do not have the technology, you may appear by phone by dialing in with one of the numbers provided above or by finding your Local Number and using the Meeting ID Code.

22. Do I have to attend the Final Approval Hearing?

No. Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. However, you are welcome to attend at your own expense. If you file an objection, you do not have to attend the Final Approval Hearing to speak about it. As long as you file your written objection by the deadline, the Court will consider it.

23. May I speak at the Final Approval Hearing?

If there are objections that were filed by the deadline, the Court will consider them. If you file a timely objection, and you (or your lawyer) ask to speak at the hearing, the Court, at its discretion, may hear objections at the hearing.

GET MORE INFORMATION

24. How do I get more information about the Settlement?

This Notice summarizes the Settlement. Complete details about the Settlement are provided in the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement and other related documents are available at www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com. You may get additional information at www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com, by calling toll-free 1-877-657-8732, by emailing Info@AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com, or by writing to:

Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
PO Box 2079
Portland, OR 97208-2079

**PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE COURT'S
CLERK OFFICE REGARDING THIS NOTICE.**

Questions? Go to www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call 1-877-657-8732.

Attachment 4

MAIL
ID

0000PLACEHOLDER000

**Must be postmarked
or submitted online
NO LATER THAN
November 30, 2025**

**Akumin Data Incident
Settlement Administrator
P.O. BOX 2079
Portland, OR 97208-2079
www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com**

Akumin Data Incident Claim Form

SETTLEMENT BENEFITS – WHAT YOU MAY GET

If your Private Information was impacted in the Data Incident involving Akumin Operating Corp. that occurred on October 11, 2023, you may submit a Claim.

The easiest way to submit a Claim is online at www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com, or you can print out, complete, and mail this entire Claim Form (with any required documentation) to the mailing address above.

**All Settlement Class Members are eligible to file a Claim for both
Medical Data Monitoring and a Cash Payment for Documented Losses.**

You may submit a Claim for one or both of the following

- 1. Medical Data Monitoring:** Use the Claim Form to request one year of free Medical Data Monitoring.
- 2. Cash Payment for Documented Losses:** If you incurred financial losses from fraud or identity theft that you believe is fairly traceable to the Data Incident, you can be reimbursed up to \$2,500.00. You must submit detailed documentation supporting your Claim.

More information about the Settlement Class Member Benefits above may be found in the Settlement Agreement which is located on the Settlement Website (www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com).

Claims must be submitted online or postmarked by November 30, 2025. Use the website address above for online Claims or the physical address above for mailed claims.

The Settlement Administrator may contact you to request additional documentation to process your Claim.

Please note that Settlement Class Member Benefits will be distributed only after the Settlement is approved by the Court and becomes final.

If the Settlement is approved and your Claim for a Cash Payment is accepted, you will receive an email at the email address you provide below prompting you to select how you would like to be paid. You can receive your Cash Payment via a variety of digital options, or you can elect to receive a paper check.

If the Settlement is approved and you file a Valid Claim for Medical Data Monitoring, you will receive an email with a code and activation instructions at the email address you provide below.

If you want to submit a Claim online go to: www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com. Otherwise, if you are going to submit your Claim by mail, please complete the section below.

MAIL ID

0000PLACEHOLDER000

Your Information

We will use this information to contact you and process your Claim. It will not be used for any other purpose. If any of the following information changes, you must promptly notify the Settlement Administrator.

First Name:

MI:

Last Name:

Unique ID (As shown on the notice you received):

Mailing Address (Required):

City:

State:

ZIP Code:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

MAIL
ID

0000PLACEHOLDER0000

Medical Data Monitoring

You may be eligible to receive free Medical Data Monitoring services.

You can elect to submit a Claim for Medical Data Monitoring. This benefit includes one year of CyEx Medical Shield Complete with one bureau of monitoring and at least \$1,000,000.00 of identity theft insurance and real time alerts.

The one-year period will commence when you use your code to activate the Medical Data Monitoring.

Medical Data Monitoring: I want to receive free Medical Data Monitoring.

If you select Medical Data Monitoring, you will be sent instructions and an activation code after the Settlement is final to your email address or home address.

Cash Payment for Documented Losses: Money You Lost or Spent

If you incurred financial losses from fraud or identity theft that you believe are fairly traceable to the Data Incident and have not been reimbursed for that money, you may be entitled to receive reimbursement for up to \$2,500.00 if you provided the documentation or information requested herein and that documentation is verified.

It is important for you to send documents that show what happened and how much you lost or spent so that you can be reimbursed. Documentation must be mailed along with this Claim Form.

Cash Payment for Documented Losses: I have experienced a documented out-of-pocket loss related to fraud or identity theft as a result of the Akumin Data Incident. I am providing the necessary information and documentation. I understand that if appropriate documentation is not provided, my claim may be denied.

To look up more details about Cash Payments for Documented Losses, visit www.AkuminDataIncidentSettlement.com or call toll-free 1-877-657-8732. You will find more information about the types of losses that can be paid back to you, what documents you need to attach, and how the Settlement Administrator decides whether to approve your payment.

By filling out the boxes on the next page of this form, you are certifying that the money you spent does not relate to other data breaches.

You may make as many copies of the Claim Form pages as necessary to list all of your expenses. If you need more space to list your losses, please submit additional pages of this Claim Form to provide that information.

MAIL ID

0000PLACEHOLDER000

Loss Type	Approximate Date Loss	Amount of Loss
Costs for freezing or unfreezing your credit report on or after 10/11/2023 if related to fraud or identity theft and fairly traceable to the Data Incident.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div>
Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching and why it's related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Receipts, notices, or account statements reflecting payment for a credit freeze.</i> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		
Credit monitoring and identity theft protection purchased between 10/11/2023 and the date of your Claim Submission are related to fraud or identity theft and fairly traceable to the Data Incident.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div>
Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching and why it's related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Receipts or statements for credit monitoring services.</i> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		
Costs, expenses, and losses due to identity theft, fraud, or misuse of your Private Information on or after 10/11/2023 and that you believe are fairly traceable to the Data Incident.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div>
Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching and why it's related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Account statement with unauthorized charges highlighted, police reports, IRS documents, FTC Identity Theft Reports, letters refusing to refund fraudulent charges, credit monitoring services you purchased.</i> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		
Professional fees paid to address identity theft, fraud or misuse of your Private Information on or after 10/11/2023 and that you believe are fairly traceable to the Data Incident	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> - <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; margin-top: 5px;"> MM DD YYYY </div>	\$ <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div> . <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 30px; height: 30px; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> </div>
Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching and why it's related to the Data Incident) <i>Examples: Receipts, bills, and invoices from accountants, lawyers, or others.</i> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>		

MAIL ID

0000PLACEHOLDER000

Signature

I affirm under the laws of the United States that the information I have supplied in this form and any copies of documents that I am sending to support my claim are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

I understand that I may be asked to provide more information by the Settlement Administrator before my claim is complete.

Print Name

Signature

Date: - -
MM DD YYYY

Attachment 5

Health



Mark Lennihan/AP/Photo

Pfizer agrees to deal on lowering drug prices amid Trump pressure

In doctors' offices, the consequences of Trump's comments on Tylenol and vaccines are immediately clear

Federal agencies are studying safety of abortion drug mifepristone, driving new concerns about limits on access

FDA authorizes first eyeglass lenses to slow nearsightedness in children in the US

Acetaminophen use during pregnancy not linked to autism, our study of 2.5 million children shows

What science says about leucovorin, the drug Trump touted for autism

What pregnant people should know about acetaminophen



Listeria found in Walmart, Trader Joe's meals may be linked to deadly outbreak

After cuts to research funding, Trump pledges millions for pediatric cancer initiative involving AI

After years of increases, abortion trends are shifting in states without bans

For Subscribers: Can the party drug ketamine be a mental health breakthrough? It was for me

The 17 best arch-support shoes, according to podiatrists and editors


Gunman who killed 4 in Manhattan office tower that houses NFL had CTE, medical examiner confirms

The most comfortable walking shoes, according to podiatrists and shoe experts

She was the world's oldest person, living to 117. What do her genes reveal about the secret of longevity?

Thyroid eye disease: Types of surgery

If you were a patient of Akumin, your Private Information may have been impacted in a Data Incident,



Advertisement Ad Feedback

LIFE, BUT BETTER



Nevada, Arizona and Alabama rank lowest in nation for mental health. Where your state lands



I have been in 8 weddings, then had my own, and here is what I learned

Health



Mark Lennihan/Getty Images

Pfizer agrees to deal on lowering drug prices amid Trump pressure

In doctors' offices, the consequences of Trump's comments on Tylenol and vaccines are immediately clear

Federal agencies are studying safety of abortion drug mifepristone, driving new concerns about limits on access

FDA authorizes first eyeglass lenses to slow nearsightedness in children in the US

Acetaminophen use during pregnancy not linked to autism, our study of 2.5 million children shows

What science says about leucovorin, the drug Trump touted for autism

What pregnant people should know about acetaminophen



Listeria found in Walmart, Trader Joe's meals may be linked to deadly outbreak

After cuts to research funding, Trump pledges millions for pediatric cancer initiative involving AI

After years of increases, abortion trends are shifting in states without bans

For Subscribers: Can the party drug ketamine be a mental health breakthrough? It was for me

The 17 best arch-support shoes, according to podiatrists and editors

Gunman who killed 4 in Manhattan office tower that houses NFL had CTE, medical examiner confirms

The most comfortable walking shoes, according to podiatrists and shoe experts

She was the world's oldest person, living to 117. What do her genes reveal about the secret of longevity?

Thyroid eye disease: Types of surgery

and you may be entitled to benefits from a Settlement.

[Learn More](#)

Advertisement [Ad Feedback](#)

LIFE, BUT BETTER



Nevada, Arizona and Alabama rank lowest in nation for mental health. Where your state lands



I have been in 8 weddings, then had my own, and here is what I learned

If you were a patient of Akumin, your Private Information may have been impacted in a Data Incident, and you may be entitled to benefits from a Settlement.

[Learn More](#)



TRENDING Government shutdown Fleet Week Walnut Creek double-slaying Clean Air Vehicle program Kaiser workers authorize strike Cupertino Whole Foods

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION - 2 MINS AGO

Live updates: Government shutdown begins, Trump threatens to fire federal workers

US GOVERNMENT - 2 HOURS AGO

How a federal government shutdown will impact the Bay Area

VALLEJO - 43 MINS AGO

Missing woman found dead in Vallejo; suspect arrested

NASA - 4 HOURS AGO

An asteroid might be heading for the moon. Should we nuke it?

NBC BAY AREA NEWS

Watch live: NBC Bay Area News 24/7



BAY AREA WEATHER - 1 HOUR AGO

La Niña expected to bring 'extreme' weather patterns statewide, head climatologist say...



MILITARY - 14 HOURS AGO

Hayward veteran reacts to Pete Hegseth's comments on women in the military

WALNUT CREEK - 19 HOURS AGO

Accused killer's mistress faces charges in Walnut Creek double-slaying

TRANSPORTATION - 14 HOURS AGO

Clean Air Vehicle decal program ends this week

VALLEJO - 15 HOURS AGO

Vallejo police: Woman hit and killed by vehicle was shoved

National Radar

San Jose, CA

66° TONIGHT 64°

LOCAL [See all](#)



- Meta AI
- Friends
- Memories
- Saved
- Groups
- Video
- Marketplace
- See more

Legal Notice
Sponsored

If your private information impacted in Akumin's Data Incident, you may be entitled to benefits form a Settlement.



AKUMINDASAPRODENTSETTLEMENT.COM
Akumin Data Incident [Learn more](#)

Like Comment Share

Sponsored



Get started with Claude Code
www.anthropic.com

- Meta AI
- Friends
- Memories
- Saved
- Groups
- Video
- Marketplace



Sponsored



Akumin Data Incident
@akuminlab | akuminlab.com



legal.notice
Sponsored



Learn more



legal.notice Was your private information impacted in Akumin's Data Incident? You may get benefits.



Legal Notice Promoted



If you were a patient of Akumin, your Private Information may have been impacted in a Data Incident, and you may be entitled to benefits from a Settlement.



akumindataincidentsettlement.com

[Learn More](#)

Vote

0

Share



Legal Notice 

Ad

If you were a patient of Akumin, your Private Information may have been impacted in a Data Incident, and you may be entitled to benefits from a Settlement.



www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com



Attachment 6

Akumin Data Incident

Sponsored Search Keyword List

Akumin Data Breach
Akumin Breach
Akumin Data Incident
Akumin Incident
Akumin Settlement
Akumin Breach Settlement
Akumin Data Settlement
Akumin Data Breach Settlement
Akumin Data Incident Settlement
Akumin Lawsuit
Akumin Breach Lawsuit
Akumin Data Lawsuit
Akumin Data Breach Lawsuit
Akumin Data Incident Lawsuit
Akumin Litigation
Akumin Breach Litigation
Akumin Data Litigation
Akumin Data Breach Litigation
Akumin Data Incident Litigation
Akumin Class Action
Akumin Breach Class Action
Akumin Data Class Action
Akumin Data Breach Class Action
Akumin Data Incident Class Action
Akumin Class Action Lawsuit
Akumin Breach Class Action Lawsuit
Akumin Data Class Action Lawsuit
Akumin Data Breach Class Action Lawsuit
Akumin Data Incident Class Action Lawsuit
Akumin Class Action Settlement
Akumin Breach Settlement
Akumin Data Class Action Settlement
Akumin Data Breach Class Action Settlement
Akumin Data Incident Class Action Settlement
Akumin Cyber Attack
Akumin Cyberattack
Akumin Claim Form
Akumin Payment
Akumin Cash Payment

Attachment 7




Akumin Data Breach



AI Mode **All** News Images Videos Short videos Forums More - Tools -

Sponsored

 **akumindataincidentsettlement.com**
<https://www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com>

Akumin Data Incident - Class Action Settlement

Was your private information impacted in Akumin's Data Incident? You may get benefits. To find out more information and to see if you are included, visit the website.

 **AuntMinnie**
<https://www.auntminnie.com/risk-management/article>

Patients seek \$5M from Akumin over data breach



Jan 3, 2025 — "The data breach was a direct result of defendant's failure to implement adequate and reasonable cybersecurity procedures and protocols ...

 **Radiology Business**
<https://radiologybusiness.com/topics/legal-news/ra...>

Radiology provider Akumin failed to protect patient info ...

Jan 2, 2025 — "The data breach was a direct result of [Akumin's] failure to implement adequate and reasonable cybersecurity procedures and protocols ...

People also ask :

- How much compensation will I get for a data breach? 
- How can I tell if I was part of a data breach? 
- Should I worry about the recent data breach? 
- Am I entitled to compensation for data breach? 

[Feedback](#)

 **ClassAction.org**
<https://www.classaction.org/akumin-december-2023>

Akumin Data Breach Update 2024 | Class Action Lawsuit

The direct notification process for the Akumin data breach is expected to be completed by the end of December 2024, the site states.

 **Mass.gov**
<https://www.mass.gov/doc/download/PDF>

Akumin. - Notice of Data Event

Dec 29, 2023 — What Happened? On October 11, 2023, Akumin experienced a ransomware incident, which involved an unauthorized.

Sponsored

akumindataincidentsettlement.com
<https://www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com>

Akumin Data Incident - Class Action Lawsuit

Benefits are available to those impacted in Akumin's Data Incident. To find out more information and to see if you are included, visit the website.

Radiology Business
<https://radiologybusiness.com/topics/legal-news/ra...>

Radiology provider Akumin failed to protect patient info ...

Jan 2, 2025 – The cyberattack came at a particularly inopportune time for Akumin, which was grappling with large debt payments, damages from a hurricane and ...

AuntMinnie
<https://www.auntminnie.com/risk-management/article>

Patients seek \$5M from Akumin over data breach

Jan 3, 2025 – The data breach was a direct result of defendant's failure to implement adequate and reasonable cybersecurity procedures and protocols ...

JD Supra
<https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/akumin-confirms...>

Akumin Confirms Data Breach Impacting Consumers ...

Jan 2, 2024 – The Akumin investigation determined that, on October 11, 2023, an unauthorized party was able to access and acquire certain files on the ...

ClassAction.org
<https://www.classaction.org/akumin-december-2023>

Akumin Data Breach Update 2024 | Class Action Lawsuit

On October 11, 2023, Akumin discovered an unauthorized actor had accessed its systems and copied files without permission as part of a ransomware attack.

People also ask

- Which hospitals have been affected by the cyber attack?
- Who is the CEO of Akumin?
- Who is behind the Halliburton cyber attack?
- What is the biggest cyber attack in healthcare?

[Feedback](#)

Central Florida Public Media
<https://www.cfpublic.org/health/ransomware-attack-...>

Ransomware attack shuts down Central Florida radiology

Ad related to: Akumin Breach Settlement



akumindataincidentsettlement.com
www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com

Akumin Data Incident - Class Action Settlement

Was your private information impacted in Akumin's Data Incident? You may get benefits. To find out more information and to see if you are included, visit the website.



ClassAction.org
www.classaction.org › data-breach-lawsuits › akumin

Akumin Data Breach Update 2024 | Class Action Lawsuit

Jan 2, 2025 · Attorneys working with ClassAction.org are looking into whether a class action lawsuit can be filed in light of the Akumin data breach. As part of their investigation, they need t...



Top Class Actions
topclassactions.com › lawsuit-settlements › lawsuit

Akumin Corp. faces class action after data breach allegedly ...

Jan 1, 2024 · Akumin Corp. bears responsibility for an October cyberattack that compromised its network and led to a data breach, a new class action lawsuit alleges.

Searches related to Akumin Breach Settlement

akumin breach settlement update

yahoo data breach settlement

akumin breach settlement claim

breach settlement yahoo

akumin breach settlement scam

akumin breach settlement amount

akumin breach settlement status

akumin breach settlement payout



Radiology Business
radiologybusiness.com › topics › healthcare

Radiology provider Akumin failed to protect patient info ...

Jan 2, 2025 · A proposed class-action lawsuit in Florida claims that radiology and oncology services provider Akumin failed to protect sensitive patient information prior to a crippling...



AuntMinnie.com
www.auntminnie.com › practice-management

Patients seek \$5M from Akumin over data breach | AuntMinnie

Jan 3, 2025 · Radiology and oncology service provider Akumin negligently failed to properly secure, safeguard, and adequately destroy the health and personal data of its outpatient...



JD Supra
www.jdsupra.com › legalnews › akumin-confirms-data

Ad related to: Akumin Data Incident

akumindataincidentsettlement.com
www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com

Akumin Data Incident - Class Action Lawsuit

Benefits are available to those impacted in Akumin's Data Incident. To find out more information and to see if you are included, visit the website.

oag.ca.gov
oag.ca.gov › system › files

Akumin, Inc. - Notice of Data Event - CA

As we disclosed on our website at the time of the incident, Akumin experienced a ransomware incident in October 2023. Since the incident, we conducted a detailed review of the impacted...

Radiology Business
radiologybusiness.com › topics › healthcare

Radiology provider Akumin failed to protect patient info ...

Jan 2, 2025 · Letizio and others claim Akumin failed to properly safeguard sensitive information including Social Security numbers and other unique identifiers. This has left thousands of...

Searches related to Akumin Data Incident

- akumin data incident management
- akumin data incident center
- akumin data incident report
- akumin data incident form
- akumin data incident response
- akumin data incident detection
- akumin data incident prevention
- akumin data incident management system

Top Class Actions
topclassactions.com › lawsuit-settlements › privacy

Akumin class action alleges data breach compromised protected ...

Jan 2, 2025 · Akumin, a nationwide radiology and oncology services provider, has been hit with a class action lawsuit alleging its negligence led to a data breach.

JD Supra
www.jdsupra.com › legalnews › akumin-confirms-data

Akumin Confirms Data Breach Impacting Consumers' SSNs ...

Jan 2, 2024 · On December 29, 2023, Akumin Inc. filed a notice of data breach with the Attorney General of Massachusetts after discovering that it was the target of a recent ransomware...

🔍 Akumin Data Incident 🔊 🔄

ALL 🔍 SEARCH 📺 VIDEOS 🖼️ IMAGES 📍 MAPS 📰 NEWS 🛩️ COPILOT ⋮ MORE 🛠️ TOOLS

About 88,000 results

akumindataincidentsettlement.com
<https://www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com>

Akumin Data Incident - Class Action Settlement

Sponsored Was your private information impacted in Akumin's Data Incident? You may get benefits. To find out more information and to see if you are included, visit the website.



The Akumin data incident involved a ransomware attack that occurred on October 11, 2023, affecting the company's ability to provide diagnostic services. The attack led to the unauthorized access to certain files on the IT network, prompting Akumin to take its systems offline and secure them. The company's investigation revealed that files were copied without permission, and Akumin undertook an intensive review to identify the affected files and notify individuals about the incident. The breach exposed

[Read more](#) ▾

California State Portal
Akumin, Inc. - Notice of Data Event - CA

Radiology Business
Radiology provider Akumin failed to protect patient inf...

[View all](#)

ca.gov
<https://oag.ca.gov/system/files>

PDF Akumin, Inc. - Notice of Data Event - CA

As we disclosed on our website at the time of the incident, Akumin experienced a ransomware incident in October 2023. Since the incident, we conducted a detailed review of the impacted ...

Radiology Business
<https://radiologybusiness.com/topics/healthcare...>

Radiology provider Akumin failed to protect patient ...

Jan 2, 2025 - Letizio and others claim Akumin failed to properly safeguard sensitive information including Social Security numbers and other unique ...



Top Class Actions
<https://topclassactions.com/lawsuit-settlements...>

Akumin class action alleges data breach ...

Jan 2, 2025 - Akumin, a nationwide radiology and oncology services provider, ...

Reviews: 3



Related searches for Akumin Data Incident

akumin ransomware

is akumin a scam

🔍 Akumin Data Lawsuit

ALL 🔍 SEARCH NEWS IMAGES VIDEOS MAPS COPILOT ⋮ MORE TOOLS

About 62,300 results

🌐 akumindataincidentsettlement.com
https://www.akumindataincidentsettlement.com

Akumin Data Incident | Class Action Lawsuit

Sponsored Benefits are available to those impacted in Akumin's Data Incident. To find out more information and to see if you are included, visit the website.



The Akumin data breach lawsuit has garnered significant attention due to the extensive exposure of sensitive patient information and the potential financial and emotional harm caused to affected individuals. The lawsuit, filed by Gina Letizio, seeks damages exceeding \$5 million and aims to hold Akumin accountable for its negligence in protecting patient data. The breach, which occurred in October 2023, involved a cyberattack that compromised personal information, including names,

Read more ▾

🌐 AuntMinnie.com
Patients seek \$5M from Akumin over data breach |...

🏆 Top Class Actions
Akumin class action alleges data breach compromised...

📄 📄 📄
View all

News about Akumin Data Lawsuit

bing.com > news



🇺🇸 NPR · 19h
A lawsuit tries to block the Trump administration's efforts to merge personal data
A class action lawsuit argues that the administration's efforts to combine ...

See more news >

Feedback 🗨️

🌐 AuntMinnie.com
https://www.auntminnie.com > ...

Patients seek \$5M from Akumin over data breach
Jan 3, 2025 - Radiology and oncology service provider Akumin negligently failed to



Related searches for Akumin Data Lawsuit

🔍 **Is akumin a scam**

🔍 **akumin ransomware scam**

🔍 **akumin ransomware hack**

EXHIBIT D

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 17TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR
BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA**

GINA LETIZIO, EDUARDO GUILLEN,
ISABEL REEVES, PAUL COONS, as executor
of the Estate of ELIZABETH BISSELL, JOHN
CRERAR, and CHRISTOPHER SHARP,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

CASE NO.: CACE-25-011999

Plaintiffs,

v.

AKUMIN OPERATING CORP. f/k/a
AKUMIN CORP.,

Defendant.

**FINAL APPROVAL ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
APPLICATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs submitted to the Court their Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards;

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2025, the Court entered its Preliminary Approval Order, which, *inter alia*: (1) preliminarily approved the Settlement; (2) determined that, for purposes of the Settlement only, the Action should proceed as a class action and certified the Settlement Class; (3) appointed Plaintiffs as Class Representatives; (4) appointed Jeff Ostrow and Mariya Weekes as Class Counsel; (5) approved the form and manner of Notice and the Notice Program; (6) approved the Claim Process and Claim Form; and (7) set the Final Approval Hearing date;

WHEREAS, thereafter, Notice was provided to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order by Email Notice and Publication Notice and the Long Form Notice was made available to Settlement Class Members on the Settlement Website or on request to the Settlement Administrator;

WHEREAS, there were no objections or the Settlement and only ____ Settlement Class Members opted-out of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, on December 15, 2025, the Court held a Final Approval Hearing to determine whether the Settlement was fair, reasonable, and adequate, and to consider settlement Class Counsel's Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards;

WHEREAS, based on the foregoing, having considered the papers filed and proceedings held in connection with the Settlement, having considered all of the other files, records, and proceedings in the Action, and being otherwise fully advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED as follows:

1. This Final Approval Order incorporates the definitions in Section II of the Settlement Agreement.

2. The 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 and Notice Program fully satisfied the requirements of due process, Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and all other applicable law and rules. The Claims Process was fair, and the Claim Form was easy to read and understand.

3. The terms of the Settlement are fair, adequate, and reasonable. In so finding, the Court has considered several factors, including: (1) the complexity and duration of the litigation; (2) the reaction of the Class to the settlement; (3) the stage of the proceedings; (4) the risk of establishing liability; (5) the risk of establishing damages; (6) the risk of maintaining a class action; (7) the ability of the defendant to withstand a greater judgment; (8) the reasonableness of the

settlement in light of the best recovery; and (9) the range of reasonableness of the settlement in light of all the attendant risks of litigation.

4. Based on the information presented to the Court, the Claims Process has proceeded as ordered and consistent with the Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order. All Settlement Class Members who submitted Valid Claims shall receive their Settlement Class Member Benefits pursuant to the Settlement's terms. All Settlement Class Members who did not submit a Claim, or for whom the Claim is determined to be invalid, shall still be bound by the terms of the Settlement and Releases therein.

5. The distribution plan for Settlement Class Member Benefits proposed by the Parties in the Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

6. The Class Representatives and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and will continue to adequately represent and protect the interests of Settlement Class Members in connection with the Settlement.

7. Because the Court grants Final Approval of the Settlement set forth in the Agreement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, the Court authorizes and directs implementation of all terms and provisions of the Settlement.

8. All Parties to this Action, including all Settlement Class Members, are bound by the Settlement as set forth in the Agreement and this Order.

9. The appointment of Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives is affirmed.

10. The appointment of Class Counsel is affirmed.

11. The appointment of the Settlement Administrator is affirmed.

12. The Court affirms its findings that the Settlement Class meets the relevant requirements of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220(a) and (b)(2) and (3) for only the purposes

of the Settlement in that: (1) the number of members of the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder is impracticable; (2) there are questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class; (3) the claims of the Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class; (4) the Plaintiffs are adequate representatives for the Settlement Class, and has retained experienced and adequate Class Counsel; (5) the questions of law and fact common to the members of the Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting any individual members of the Settlement Class; and (6) a class action is superior to the other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy. In finding the Settlement fair, reasonable, and adequate, the Court has also considered that there were no objections to the Settlement, and only _____ opt-outs, indicating an overwhelming positive reaction from the Settlement Class, and the opinion of competent counsel concerning such matters.

13. Therefore, the Court finally certifies the following Settlement Class:

All living individuals residing in the United States whose Private Information may have been impacted in the Data Incident.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) all persons who are directors, officers, and agents of Defendant; (b) governmental entities; (c) the Judge assigned to the Action, that Judge's immediate family, and Court staff; and (d) any Settlement Class Member who timely and validly opts-out of the Settlement.

14. The following individuals have timely opted-out of the Settlement and will not be bound by the Releases contained in the Settlement, nor will they be by the this Court's judgment:

_____, _____, _____, and _____.

15. Judgment shall be, and hereby is, entered dismissing the Action with prejudice, on the merits.

16. As of the Effective Date, and in exchange for the relief described in the Agreement, the Releasing Parties shall release the Released Parties from the Released Claims.

17. Class Counsel is awarded \$2.85 million for attorneys' fees and costs. These payments shall be paid by Defendants in accordance with the Agreement. The Court evaluated Settlement Class Counsel's request, and concludes that amount is fair and within the range of reason.

18. The Class Representatives shall be awarded Service Awards in the amount of \$2,500 each. The Service Awards shall be paid by Defendants in accordance with the Agreement.

19. Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members and Releasing Parties, and persons purporting to act on their behalf, are permanently enjoined from commencing or prosecuting (either directly, representatively, or in any other capacity) any of the Released Claims against any of the Released Parties in any action or proceeding in any court, arbitration forum, or tribunal.

20. The Court hereby retains and reserves jurisdiction over: (1) implementation of this Settlement and any distributions to the Settlement Class Members; (2) the Action, until the Effective Date, and until each and every act agreed to be performed by the Parties shall have been performed pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, including the exhibits appended thereto; and (3) all Parties, for the purpose of enforcing and administering the Settlement.

21. In the event the Effective Date of the Settlement does not occur, the Settlement shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by and in accordance with the Agreement, and this Final Approval Order and any other order entered by this Court in accordance with the terms of the Agreement shall be vacated, *nunc pro tunc*. In such event, all orders entered and releases delivered in connection with the Settlement shall be null and void and have no further force and effect, shall not be used or referred to for any purpose whatsoever, and shall not be

admissible or discoverable in any proceeding. The Action shall return to its status immediately prior to execution of the Agreement.

22. All Settlement Class Members shall be bound by this Final Approval Order.

23. There being no just reason for delay, the Clerk of Court is hereby directed to enter final judgment forthwith pursuant to Florida Rules of Civil Procedure.

DONE AND ORDERED in Broward County, Florida, this _____ day of _____, 2025.

HON. MICHELE TOWBIN SINGER
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE