

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

MARIA BALLESTEROS, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMBULNZ NY, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 2025-005051-CA-01

**PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
SETTLEMENT**

Plaintiff Maria Ballesteros (“Plaintiff” or the “Settlement Class Representative”)¹ individually and on behalf the Settlement Class, respectfully moves this Court to enter the Final Approval Order, which grants final approval to the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release (“Agreement”). This Motion is made pursuant to the Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220(e) and is based on the accompanying Memorandum of Law and authorities cited therein, all files, records, and proceedings in this matter, and states:

INTRODUCTION

On March 24, 2025, Plaintiff moved this Court for preliminary approval of a settlement with Defendant Ambulnz NY, LLC (“Ambulnz” or “Defendant”), the terms and conditions of which are

¹ All capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as those defined in the Settlement Agreement (“Agreement”), attached as *Exhibit A*.

set forth in the Agreement, attached to the Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Proposed Class Action Settlement (the "MPA").

The Class Notice plan has now been completed, with postcard notice having been sent to Settlement Class Members as instructed by the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. Declaration of Class Action Settlement Administrator ("Admin Decl.") ¶ 10, attached as *Exhibit B*. As of the filing of this motion, no objection(s) have been filed and only one Settlement Class Member has opted-out. *Id.* ¶ 36.

The preliminarily approved Settlement provides an outstanding recovery for Class Members. Accordingly, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter an order, *inter alia*, as follows: (1) granting Final Approval to the Settlement; (2) certifying the proposed Settlement Class for settlement purposes; (3) granting Plaintiff's pending Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Service Awards filed on August 1, 2025 (the "Fee Motion"); and (4) entering Final Judgment. A proposed order is attached hereto.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I. The Litigation

The history of this litigation is fully set forth in Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement and Certification of Settlement Class and Memorandum in Support filed on March 24, 2025. For purposes of efficiency, Plaintiff incorporates the Factual Background section contained in that Brief. The Court granted Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Settlement on May 2, 2025. *See* Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Settlement ("PAO"). The Court, *inter alia*, (1) preliminarily approved the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, (2) conditionally certified the Settlement Class, (3) appointed

Settlement Class Counsel, (4) approved the Settlement Class Notice, (5) appointed the Settlement Administrator, and (5) scheduled a Final Approval Hearing. *Id.*

II. The Settlement

A. Overview

The Settlement secures reimbursement to Class Members for out-of-pocket losses resulting from the Security Incident, as well as other benefits. The Settlement provides:² (1) up to a total of \$400.00 per claimant for ordinary documented out-of-pocket losses; (2) reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74.00) for lost time, which amount is included in the ordinary loss cap of \$400.00 per claimant; (3) reimbursement for documented extraordinary losses up to \$4,500.00 per Settlement Class Member; and (4) one year of Credit Monitoring Services, to include one-bureau credit monitoring and \$1,000,000 in identity theft insurance, among other features. Agreement ¶ 7, 41-2. Alternatively, and in lieu of the aforementioned benefits, Settlement Class Members may elect an alternative cash payment determined as follows: (i) Defendant will provide \$30.00 in compensation to each Settlement Class Member whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number was implicated in the Security Incident; or (ii) \$10.00 in compensation to each Settlement Class Member whose Social Security and/or Driver's License Number was not implicated in the Security Incident. *Id.* at ¶ 43. As of August 5, 2025, the Class Action Settlement Administrator has received 359 claims. Admin Decl. ¶ 38.

Furthermore, as set forth in Plaintiff's Fee Motion, Defendant has agreed to pay, subject to Court approval, up to \$230,000.00 in attorneys' fees and litigation costs and expenses and a

² See Agreement ¶¶ 42(a), 42(b), 42 (c), and 41 respectively.

service award of up to \$2,000.00 to the Settlement Class Representative separate and apart from all other settlement benefits.

B. The Settlement Class

The proposed Settlement Class is defined as the following:

All individuals residing in the United States whose PII and/or PHI was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.

Agreement ¶ 36.

C. Release

In exchange for the Settlement Class Member Benefits, Plaintiff and Settlement Class Members agree to release Defendant from any claims they may have related to the Security Incident. *Id.* at § XIV. The Releases are narrowly tailored to claims arising out of or relating to the Security Incident. *Id.*

D. The Notice Program

Following the Court’s preliminary approval of the Settlement and appointment of Epiq Class Actions & Claims Solutions, Inc. (“Epiq”) as the Settlement Administrator (*see* PAO at p. 3), Epiq received two data files containing 73,245 records for identified Settlement Class members, including names and current or last known addresses, if available. Admin Decl. ¶ 22. Epiq then deduplicated and rolled-up the records and loaded the unique, identified Settlement Class Member records into its database, which resulted in 69,841 unique, identified Settlement Class Member records. *Id.* On June 16, 2025 Epiq mailed 63,797 postcard notices via USPS first-class mail to identified Settlement Class Members for whom an associated physical mailing address was available (the “Postcard Notices”). *Id.* ¶ 23. Prior to sending the Postcard Notices, Epiq checked all mailing addresses against the National Change of Address database maintained by the USPS to ensure all address information was up-to-

date and accurately formatted for mailing. *Id.* ¶ 24. Furthermore, Epiq certified all of the addresses via the Coding Accuracy Support System to ensure the quality of the zip code and verified through Delivery Point Validation to verify the accuracy of the addresses. *Id.*

Of the total Class, 6,044 records had incomplete or invalid physical addresses and were not sent a Postcard Notice. As a result, these records were specifically targeted with digital noticing using a “list activation” strategy via *Google Display Network, Facebook, and Instagram*. *Id.* ¶ 23. Additionally, a Long Form Notice and Claim Form (“Claim Package”) was mailed to all persons who requested one via the toll-free telephone number or other means. *Id.* ¶ 26. As of July 28, 2025, Epiq mailed 47 Claim Packages as a result of such requests. *Id.*

As of August 5, 2025 notice efforts, through the aforementioned notice program, reached approximately 90% of the identified Settlement Class, which is more than adequate to meet the requirements of due process. *Id.* ¶¶ 19, 40. The Notices included, among other information, a detailed summary of the relevant information about the Settlement, including the Settlement Website address and how Settlement Class Members can submit a Claim Form online or by mail, the legal rights of the Settlement Class Members, and other related documents and information. *See Id.* ¶ 23, 37. Moreover, as noted above, for those individuals for whom last known address information was missing or incomplete, digital notice was sent via targeted social media. *Id.* ¶ 23.

E. Opt-Outs and Objections

The Notices informed Settlement Class Members of their right to opt out or object. *Id.* Settlement Class Members have sixty (60) days after the Notice Deadline to exclude themselves from the Settlement. Agreement § X ; PAO at p. 8. The Opt-Out Period ends on August 15, 2025. PAO at p. 8. The deadline for the Opt-Out Period was specified in each of the Notices. Agreement § X and Exhibit A to the Agreement. The Notices also informed Settlement Class Members of their right to

object to the Settlement and/or to aspects of Settlement Class Counsel's application for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses. *Id.* The deadline for Objections is also August 15, 2025. PAO at p. 8. As of August 5, 2025, the Settlement Administrator received one (1) request for exclusion and zero (0) objections. Admin Decl. ¶ 36.

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

On August 1, 2025, Settlement Class Counsel filed a Motion requesting approval of attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and the Settlement Class Representative service award. *See* Fee Motion. Settlement Class Counsel will present the Fee Motion concurrently with this present Motion for final approval before this Court on August 22, 2025. PAO at p. 8.

LEGAL STANDARD

In 1980, the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure were amended to bring them in line with the federal class action rules. *Cheatwood v. Barry University, Inc.*, 2001 WL 1769914, n.14 (Fla. Cir. Ct. Dec. 26, 2001), citing *Lance v. Wade*, 457 So.2d 1008, 1009 n.2 (Fla. 1984). As such, "federal cases are persuasive authority for interpretation of [R]ule 1.220." *Toledo v. Hillsborough County Hosp. Auth.*, 747 So.2d 958, 960 n.1 (Fla. 2d DCA 1997). The approval of a Class Action settlement is a two-step process. First, the Court must determine whether the proposed settlement deserves approval pursuant to the requirements of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220. Second, after notice has been provided and Settlement Class Members have had the opportunity to object, the Court must determine whether final approval is warranted. *See* Manual for Complex Litigation, Sec. 21.635 (4th ed. 2013). Here, Plaintiff is before the Court on the second and final approval stage, and asks that this Court make the final determination that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

There is a strong judicial and public policy favoring the voluntary conciliation and settlement of complex class action litigation. *In re U.S. Oil & Gas Litig.*, 967 F.2d 489, 493 (11th Cir. 1992)

(“Public policy strongly favors the pretrial settlement of class action lawsuits”). This is because class action settlements ensure class members a benefit, as opposed to the “mere possibility of recovery at some indefinite time in the future.” *In re Domestic Air Transp.*, 148 F.R.D. 297, 306 (N.D. Ga. 1993). However, where parties “seek certification of the settlement class and approval of their settlement simultaneously, the trial court is required to apply heightened scrutiny and to take a more active role as a guardian of the interests of the absent class members.” *Griffith v. Quality Distribution, Inc.*, 307 So. 3d 791, 796 (Fla. 2d. DCA 2018), quoting *Ramos v. Philip Morris Cos.*, 743 So. 2d 24, 31 (Fla. 2d. DCA 1999).

MEMORANDUM OF LEGAL AUTHORITY

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”).³

Generally, where there is no objection to certification and no change in circumstances from the Order preliminarily certifying a class for settlement purposes, courts certify a class for purposes of final approval of the settlement as a matter of course. *See, e.g., Hanley v. Tampa Bay Sports & Ent. LLC*, No. 819CV00550CEHCPT, 2020 WL 2517766, at *4 (M.D. Fla. Apr. 23, 2020) (“[The] lack of opposition and Settlement Class Member support weigh strongly in favor of the Court’s approval of the Settlement Agreement”). Here, there were no objections to certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes. Moreover, there has been no change in factual circumstances since preliminary approval.

For purposes of certifying the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement, all the requirements of Rule 1.220(a) are met: there are thousands of Settlement Class members (numerosity);⁴ who all share the same claim – that their personal information was potentially accessed during Security Incident at issue here (commonality);⁵ Plaintiff’s claims are based on the same legal theories as the rest of the Settlement Class members’ claims and Plaintiff avers she is not subject to any unique affirmative defenses (typicality);⁶ and Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel have secured substantial

³ “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).

⁴ *See Vega v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, 564 F.3d 1256, 1267 (11th Cir. 2009) (class larger than forty members is sufficiently numerous); *see also Andreas-Moses v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*, 326 F.R.D. 309, 314 (M.D. Fla. 2018).

⁵ *See Williams b. Mohwalk Indus. Inc.*, 568 F.3d 1350, 1355 (11th Cir. 2009) (commonality requires “at least one issue whose resolution will affect all or a significant number of the putative class members”).

⁶ *Id.* at 1357.

relief, and have no interests antagonistic to the Settlement Class (adequacy).⁷ As to Rule 1.220(b)(3), pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, there are no individual issues precluding class treatment (predominance), and class treatment is the best method of adjudication, as seen in the fact that every Settlement Class member may receive relief without the need for numerous (and duplicative) individual cases (superiority). *See Sosa v. Safeway Premium Fin. Co.*, 73 So. 3d 91, 106-07 (Fla. 2011) (outlining requirements for class certification). Thus, certification of the Settlement Class is warranted.

A. The Terms of the Settlement are Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.

Before granting final approval, the Court considers whether the settlement “is the 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); *Nelson v. Wakulla Cnty.*, 985 So. 2d 564, 570 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008). The Court previously found the Settlement to be sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to warrant providing Notice to the Settlement Class. PAO at p. 2. At the final approval hearing, after notice to the 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); *Nelson v. Wakulla Cnty.*, 985 So. 2d 564, 570 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008). 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).

⁷ *See Andreas-Moses*, 326 F.R.D. at 315.

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.” See *Nelson*, 985 So. 2d at 570 (citation omitted); see also *Bennett*, 737 F.2d at 986. “In assessing these factors, “the Court ‘should be hesitant to substitute ... her own judgement for that of counsel.’” *LiPuma v. American Express Co.*, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1298, 1315 (S.D. Fla. 2005) (quoting *In re Smith*, 926 F.2d 1027, 1028 (11th Cir. 1991)).

These factors support the conclusion that the Court should approve the Settlement as fair, adequate, and reasonable. See *Ramos v. Philip Morris Companies, Inc.*, 743 So. 2d 24, 32 (Fla. 3d DCA 1999) (approving settlement because benefits obtained must be analyzed in light of significant risk of litigation); *Wilson v. EverBank*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15751, at *34 (S.D. Fla. Feb. 3, 2016) (finding significant that appellate court could rule unfavorably to settlement class members).

Continuing litigation through class certification briefing, and summary judgement briefing (and potentially trial), and through an extensive appellate process would have been extremely expensive and complex, and likely would have extended for several years. See, e.g. *Borcea v. Carnival Corp.*, 238 F.R.D. 664, 673 (S.D. Fla. 2006) (approving settlement and finding significant that class members risked recovering nothing on threshold issue of whether a litigated class would be certified); *Hamilton v. SunTrust Mortg. Inc.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 154762, at * 7 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 24, 2014) (avoiding expense and length of protracted litigation is a significant factor in analyzing terms of settlement). Moreover, not a single class member objected to the terms of the Agreement, which is virtually dispositive on the question of whether the terms of the settlement are fair and reasonable to

Class Members. *See also Barnhill v. Fla. Microsoft Anti-Trust Litig.*, 905 So. 2d 195, 200 (Fla. 3d DCA 2005) (“The fairness of the settlement and propriety of the release is confirmed by the fact that so few of the class members have objected to it[.]”).

As set forth in the Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Settlement made available to the class here is more than reasonable, given the complexity of the litigation and the significant risks and barriers that loomed in the absence of settlement including, but not limited to, potential dispositive motions, Defendant’s assertion of various legal challenges, and additional highly contested motions practice including, a motion to dismiss, a motion for class certification and motions for summary judgment, plus trial and potential appellate review following a final judgment.

For all these reasons, Plaintiff here chose to settle her claims considering this risk, and Settlement Class members will receive substantial relief.

1. The likelihood of success at trial.

While Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel firmly believe Plaintiff’s claims would have resulted in class certification and favorable adjudication on the merits, Plaintiff faced significant risks should she have continued to litigate the Action, which include Defendant: (i) successfully moving for dismissal of Plaintiffs’ claims; (ii) successfully opposing class certification; (iii) successfully appealing a class certification order; (iv) successfully prevailing on a post-certification summary judgment motion; (v) prevailing at trial; or (vi) successfully appealing a post-certification summary judgment or post-trial judgment. Moreover, even if the class were certified and prevailed on the merits, it would still take years to litigate the Action through trial and the various appeals (e.g., the class certification order and final judgment). The Settlement eliminates all of those risks and the years of delays by getting the Settlement Class Members their money now.

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. Indeed, there was no assurance that a jury or the Court would have found 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.

Settlement Class Counsel vigorously litigated this Action and believe the Settlement is in the best interest of the Settlement Class. The Settlement offers substantial Settlement Class Member Benefits that favorably compare with similar data breach class actions. These benefits include (1) up to a total of \$400.00 per claimant for ordinary documented out-of-pocket losses; (2) reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74.00) for lost time, which amount is included in the ordinary loss cap of \$400.00 per claimant; (3) reimbursement for documented extraordinary losses up to \$4,500.00 per Settlement Class Member; and (4) one year of Credit Monitoring Services, to include one-bureau credit monitoring and \$1,000,000 in identity theft insurance, among other features. Agreement ¶ 7, 41-2. These benefits are similar to many data breach class actions. *See, e.g., Baksh v. IvyRehab Network, Inc.*, No. 7:20-cv-01845 (S.D.N.Y.) (reimbursing out-of-pocket expenses up to \$75 and \$20 for lost time, capped at \$75,000 in the aggregate, credit monitoring, and data security enhancements); *Rutledge v. Saint Francis Healthcare Sys.*, No. 1:20-cv-00013-SPC (E.D. Mo.) (reimbursing out-of-pocket expenses and lost time up to \$180, credit monitoring, and data security enhancements); *Chacon v. Nebraska Medicine*, No. 8:21-cv-00070 (D. Neb.) (reimbursing ordinary expenses up to \$300, extraordinary expenses up to \$3,000, credit monitoring, and data security enhancements).

The Settlement will provide certain, substantial, and immediate relief to the Settlement Class. It ensures that 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 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* n.4, *supra*, litigating these claims further would have undoubtedly proven difficult and consumed even more significant time, money, and judicial resources. Even if Plaintiff 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.* ¶ 16; *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.

Following the successful Notice Program, discussed herein, the Settlement Class had ample opportunity to opt-out or object to the Settlement. As of the date of the filing of this motion, one (1)

Settlement Class member has opted-out of the Settlement, but there have been no objections. Admin Decl. ¶ 37. The deadline to request exclusion from the Settlement or to object to the Settlement is August 15, 2025. *See* PAO at p. 8. Should any objections be timely filed, Settlement Class Counsel will notify the Court before the Final Approval Hearing. The same is true if there are any additional opt-out requests.

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 information and negotiations as to the final details of the Settlement Agreement. Based upon Settlement Class Counsel’s experience, this was an appropriate time to negotiate a classwide settlement.

Based on the foregoing, it is Settlement 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.

B. The Notice Provided to Class Members Was the Best Practicable Notice and Comported with Due Process Requirements.

The notice requirements of Rule 1.220(c) are designed to provide sufficient due process to

class members by sufficiently informing them of the pendency of the Action and providing an opportunity to be heard or opt out and must be the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances.” *Nelson v. Wakulla Cnty.* 985 So. 2d 564, 576 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008). To satisfy such 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 Settlement Administrator sent direct, individual Notice by first-class mail, to members of the Settlement Class for whom an address is known. Agreement ¶ 51. Individual, direct notice clearly comports with due process requirements. *See e.g., Juris v. Inamed Corp.*, 685 F.3d 1294, 1320 (11th Cir. 2012). For a small portion of the Settlement Class for whom a last known address was unknown or incomplete, Notice was disseminated by targeted advertisements on social media websites on desktop, mobile and tablet devices, including Google Display Network, Facebook, and Instagram, and ran for a total of thirty (30) days. Agreement at 51.; Admin Decl. ¶ 23, 32 . Additionally, the Settlement Administrator established a Settlement Website with online filing capabilities. *Id.* ¶ 33. The Settlement Website also contained a summary of the settlement, downloadable copies of the settlement documents and filings, as well as important dates and deadlines. *Id.* Further, the Settlement Administrator made a toll-free telephone number available for Settlement Class Members to call and obtain information regarding the settlement. *Id.* ¶ 34. Through these efforts, approximately 902% of the Settlement Class members were reached— an extraordinary result. *Id.* ¶¶ 19, 40; *see e.g., Morgan v. Pub. Storage*, 301 F. Supp. 3d 1237, 1262 (S.D. Fla. 2016)

“email notice provided to more than 90% of the Class members in this lawsuit was the best practicable notice and was reasonably calculated to apprise them of their rights.”); *Desue v. 20/20 Eye Care Network, Inc.*, No. 21-CIV-61275-RAR, 2023 WL 4420348, at *8 (S.D. Fla. July 8, 2023) (notice to 86% of class “fairly apprised the Class of the proposed settlement terms and of the options open to them”).

Moreover, as outlined in the PAO dated May 2, 2025, the Notice provided included a clear explanation of the terms of the Settlement, the amount sought in attorneys’ fees and incentive awards, informed Class Members of their right to object or to seek exclusion and the method and deadline by which to do so and provided an opportunity to be heard. *See generally* Admin Decl. (and notice exhibits attached thereto); *see also Nolan v. Integrated Real Estate Processing, LP*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 136890, at *20-21 (M.D. Fla. Sep. 9, 2009) (setting forth what should be included in Notice of settlement).

Thus, and for the same reasons as set forth in the Motion for Preliminary Approval and this Court’s Preliminary Approval Order, the Notice provided to the Settlement Class members constitutes the best notice practicable and comports with due process requirements.

IV. The Court Should Grant Class Action Certification for Purposes of Settlement.

Plaintiff and Settlement 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). This Court provisionally certified the Settlement Class in its Preliminary Approval Order, finding that the Settlement Class meets the numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy requirements of Rule 1.220(a), and the predominance and superiority requirements of Rule 1.220(b)(3). PAO at p. 1-2. Since the Court’s provisional certification and commencing the notice program, there have been no developments that would alter the Court’s conclusion that class certification for settlement purposes is appropriate. For

the reasons discussed below, Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel urge the Court to find 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 court 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. Plaintiff meets each of the class certification requirements and seek certification under subdivision Rule 1.220(b)(2) and (3).

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 more than 60,000 members of the Settlement Class. 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.

Commonality: The movant must demonstrate that 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. Plaintiff's claims all relate to the Security Incident, 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 Plaintiff's and other Settlement Class members' claims since they each concern potential access to Personal Information in connection with the Security Incident, and are thus based

on the same legal theories and underlying events. Therefore, Plaintiff possesses similar legal interests and experienced the same legal injury as the Settlement Class members. Plaintiff's 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 Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel have zealously litigated Plaintiff's claims, secured substantial relief, and have no interests antagonistic to the Settlement Class. Further, Settlement Class Counsel is highly qualified and has a great deal of experience litigating consumer class actions, including in the data privacy context.

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 thousands of 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. Settlement Class Counsel is unaware of any other litigation against Defendant arising from the Security Incident. It is desirable to litigate the claims in the Miami-Dade County Circuit Court given Defendant's location, and manageability is no concern in the context of class settlement approval.

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

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant final approval of the proposed Settlement, and enter an order of final approval including:

1. Directing payment be issued to Settlement Class Members in accordance with the terms of the Agreement;
2. Certifying the Settlement Class for purposes of settlement only;
3. Finding that the Notice provided was the best notice practicable and comported with due process requirements;
4. Appointing the named Plaintiff as the class representative;
5. Finding that the terms of the Settlement were fair, adequate and reasonable;
6. Releasing Defendant and the other Released Parties from Released Claims, including Unknown Claims;
7. Barring and enjoining Released Parties from asserting Released Claims, including Unknown Claims;

8. Entering judgement with prejudice and without costs except as provided in the Agreement; and
9. Reserving jurisdiction to administer, supervise, and enforce the Agreement according to its terms.

Dated: August 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andrew J. Shamis

Andrew J. Shamis

Florida Bar No. 101754

SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.

14 NE 1st Avenue, Suite 705

Miami, Florida 33132

Tel: (305) 479-2299

EXHIBIT A

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND RELEASE

This Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement Agreement” or “Agreement”) is entered into by and between Maria Ballesteros (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of the Settlement Class, and Ambulnz NY, LLC (“Defendant”) (collectively the “Parties”), in the action *Ballesteros. v. Ambulnz NY, LLC*, to be filed in the 11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla. upon the execution of this Agreement) (the “Action”).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on August 22, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint against Defendant in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, relating to a data security incident affecting Defendant;

WHEREAS, on December 17, 2024, Plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal without prejudice;

WHEREAS, upon the execution of this Agreement, Plaintiff will file a complaint against Defendant in the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Fla. relating to the aforementioned data security incident;

WHEREAS, Defendant denies the allegations and causes of action pled in the Action, including but not limited to averments of standing, liability, injury, damages, wrongdoing, or certifiability of a class under the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, or otherwise; and

WHEREAS, following prolonged and extensive arm’s length negotiations, the Parties reached an agreement of the essential terms of a settlement;

WHEREAS this Agreement is for settlement purposes only, and nothing in this Agreement shall constitute, be construed as, or be admissible in evidence as any admission of the validity of any claim or fact alleged by Plaintiff in this Action or in any other pending or subsequently filed action, or of any wrongdoing, fault, violation of law, or liability of any kind on the part of Released Parties or admission of the validity or lack thereof of any claim, allegation, or defense asserted in this Action or any other action.

NOW, THEREFORE, in exchange for the mutual promises and valuable consideration provided for in this Agreement, the Parties agree to a full, complete, and final settlement and resolution of the Action and any and all Released Claims (including Unknown Claims), subject to Court approval, on the following terms and conditions:

I. DEFINITIONS

In addition to terms defined elsewhere in this Agreement, the following defined terms shall have the meanings set forth below:

1. “Approved Claim” means the timely submission of a Claim Form by a Participating Settlement Member that has been approved by the Settlement Administrator subject to the Claims

Review Process.

2. “Claim Form” means the form(s) Participating Settlement Class Members must submit to be eligible for Unreimbursed Losses, Lost Time, and/or Credit Monitoring, or an Alternative Cash Payment, under the terms of the Settlement, which form is attached hereto as **Exhibit 3**, or form(s) approved by the Court substantially similar to **Exhibit 3**.

3. “Claims Deadline” means the deadline by which Settlement Class Members must submit valid Claim Form(s), which deadline is ninety (90) days after the Notice Deadline.

4. “Claims Period” means the period of time during which Settlement Class Members may submit Claim Forms, which will end ninety (90) days after the Notice Deadline.

5. “Claims Review Process” means the process for reviewing and determining whether claims are valid as set forth in Paragraph 45.

6. “Court” means the Circuit Court for the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida.

7. “Credit Monitoring Services” means the credit monitoring services described in Paragraph 41, which include one (1) year of one-bureau credit monitoring and \$1 million in identity theft insurance, among other features.

8. “Defendant’s Counsel” means Eric Fish and Robyn Feldstein of Baker & Hostetler LLP.

9. “Effective Date” means one business day following the latest of: (i) the date upon which the time expires for filing or noticing any reconsideration or appeal of the Final Approval Order and Judgment, or entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment if no person or entity has standing to appeal or seek reconsideration; (ii) if there is an appeal or appeals or reconsideration sought, the date on which the Final Approval Order and Judgment is affirmed without any material modification and is no longer subject to judicial review; or (iii) the date of final dismissal of any appeal or reconsideration or the final dismissal of any proceeding on certiorari with respect to the Final Approval Order and Judgment, and the Final Approval Order and Judgment is no longer subject to judicial review. Notwithstanding the above, any order modifying or reversing any attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses or Service Award to a Class Representative shall not affect the “Effective Date” or any other aspect of the Final Approval Order and Judgment.

10. “Extraordinary Losses” means monetary losses that meet the following conditions: (i) The loss is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss caused by (A) misuse of the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information or (B) fraud associated with the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information; (ii) The loss noted in i.(A) or i.(B) was more likely than not caused by the Security Incident; (iii) The loss occurred between April 21, 2024 and the Notice

Deadline; and (iv) The loss is not already covered by the Ordinary Loss or Lost Time categories and the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all of the Settlement Class Member's credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance.

11. "Fee Award and Costs" means the amount of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of Litigation Costs and Expenses awarded by the Court to Settlement Class Counsel in satisfaction of any request or claim for payment of attorneys' fees, costs, and litigation expenses in connection with this Action.

12. "Final Approval Order and Judgment" means an order and judgment that the Court enters, which finally approves the Settlement Agreement, certifies the Settlement Class, dismisses the Action with prejudice, and otherwise satisfies the settlement-related provisions of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure and is consistent with all material provisions of this Agreement.

13. "Final Approval Hearing" means the hearing to be conducted by the Court to determine the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the Settlement pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and whether to issue the Final Approval Order and Judgment.

14. "Litigation Costs and Expenses" means costs and expenses incurred by Settlement Class Counsel and their law practices in connection with commencing, prosecuting, and settling the Action.

15. "Lost Time" means time Settlement Class Members spent monitoring accounts or otherwise dealing with issues related to the Security Incident, up to a maximum of four (4) hours at \$18.50/hour, supported by an attestation that the activities were related to the Security Incident, as set forth in Paragraph 42.

16. "Notice" means notice of the proposed class action Settlement to be provided to Settlement Class Members, substantially in the forms attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** ("Short Form Notices") and **Exhibit 2** ("Long Form Notice")

17. "Notice Deadline" means the last day by which Notice must issue to the Settlement Class Members, and will occur no later than forty-five (45) days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order.

18. "Notice and Administrative Expenses" means all of the expenses incurred in the administration of this Settlement, including, without limitation, all expenses or costs associated with providing Notice to the Settlement Class, locating Settlement Class Members, performing National Change of Address search(es) and/or skip tracing for undeliverable notices, processing claims, determining the eligibility of a person to be a Settlement Class Member, and administering, calculating and distributing payments to Settlement Class Members who submit valid Claim Forms. Notice and Administrative Expenses also includes all reasonable fees and expenses incurred by the Settlement Administrator in administering the terms of this Agreement.

19. "Objection Deadline" is the last day on which a Settlement Class Member may file an objection to the Settlement, which will be sixty (60) days after the Notice Deadline.

20. “Opt Out” means a Settlement Class Member (i) who timely submits a properly completed and executed Request for Exclusion, (ii) who does not rescind that Request for Exclusion prior to the Opt-Out Deadline, and (iii) as to which there is not a successful challenge to the Request for Exclusion.

21. “Opt-Out Deadline” is the last day on which a Settlement Class Member may submit a Request for Exclusion, which will be sixty (60) days after the Notice Deadline.

22. “Ordinary Loss” means documented ordinary losses incurred or spent between April 21, 2024 and the Notice Deadline and includes out of pocket expenses incurred as a result of the Security Incident, including unreimbursed bank fees, long distance phone and cell phone charges (only if charged by the minute), data charges (only if charged based on the amount of data used), postage or gasoline for local travel, and Fees for credit reports, credit monitoring or other identity theft insurance products purchased as a result of the Security Incident.

23. “Participating Settlement Class Member” means a Settlement Class Member who does not submit a valid Request for Exclusion prior to the Opt-Out Deadline, as set forth in Paragraph 54.

24. “PHI” means personal health information.

25. “PII” means personally identifiable information.

26. “Personal Information” means information that identifies an individual or in combination with other information can be used to identify, locate, or contact an individual. The term “Personal Information” is not intended here, nor should it be viewed as, having any bearing on the meaning of this term or similar term in any statute or other source of law beyond this Agreement, or how the Parties may use the term in other circumstances.

27. “Preliminary Approval Order” means an order directing issuance of Notice to Settlement Class Members, determining that the Court will likely be able to approve the Settlement under Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220, and determining that the Court will likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of resolving this Action. Such order will include the forms and procedure for providing notice to the Settlement Class, including notice of the procedure for Settlement Class Members to object to or opt-out of the Settlement, and set a date for the Final Approval Hearing, substantially in the form annexed hereto as **Exhibit 4**.

28. “Released Claims” means any and all claims, liabilities, rights, demands, suits, actions, causes of action, obligations, damages, penalties, costs, attorneys’ fees, losses, and remedies of every kind or description—whether known or unknown (including Unknown Claims), existing or potential, suspected or unsuspected, asserted or unasserted, liquidated or unliquidated, legal, statutory, or equitable—that relate to or arise from the Security Incident, the operative facts alleged in the Action, including the complaint and any amendment thereto, the Released Parties’ information security policies and practices, or the Released Parties’ maintenance or storage of Personal Information, regardless of whether such claims arise under federal, state and/or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, common law, or other source of law.

29. “Released Parties” means Defendant and each and every of its respective predecessors, successors, assigns, parents, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, owners, and related or affiliated entities of any nature whatsoever, whether direct or indirect, as well as any and all of Defendant’s and these entities’ respective predecessors, successors, officers, directors, employees, advisors, vendors, stockholders, partners, servants, agents, attorneys, representatives, insurers, reinsurers, subrogees and assigns. Each of the Released Parties may be referred to individually as a “Released Party.”

30. “Releasing Parties” and a “Releasing Party” means the Settlement Class Representative and Participating Settlement Class Members, and each of their respective heirs, executors, administrators, representatives, agents, partners, predecessors, successors, attorneys, assigns, and any other person purporting to assert a claim on their respective behaves.

31. “Request for Exclusion” means a writing by or on behalf of a Settlement Class Member in which he or she requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class in the form and manner provided for in the Notice and as described below in Paragraph 54.

32. “Security Incident” means the April 2024 cybersecurity incident that is the subject matter of the Action.

33. “Service Award Payment” means compensation awarded by the Court and paid to the Settlement Class Representative in recognition of their role in this Action as set forth in Paragraph 67.

34. “Settlement” means the settlement of the Action by and between the Parties, and the terms thereof as stated in this Settlement Agreement.

35. “Settlement Administrator” means Epiq Class Action and Claims Solutions, Inc., subject to Court approval.

36. “Settlement Class” means all individuals residing in the United States whose PII and/or PHI was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.

37. “Settlement Class Counsel” means Andrew Shamis of Shamis & Gentile, P.A. and Joseph Kanee of Edelsberg Law, P.A.

38. “Settlement Class List” means the list of the names and current or last known address information for Settlement Class Members to the extent reasonably available, which Defendant shall provide to the Settlement Administrator within fifteen (15) days of entry of the Preliminary Approval Order. Defense counsel will advise the Settlement Administrator of which Settlement Class Member’s Social Security Number and/or Drivers License Number was implicated in the Security Incident.

39. “Settlement Class Member” means an individual who falls within the definition of the Settlement Class.

40. “Settlement Class Representative” means Maria Ballesteros.

41. “Settlement Payment” or “Settlement Check” mean the payment to be made via mailed check or via electronic means (to the extent feasible) to a Participating Settlement Class Member pursuant to the claims process set forth in Paragraph 46.

42. “Settlement Website” means the website the Settlement Administrator will establish and use to provide Settlement Class Members with information about the Settlement and relevant case documents and deadlines, as set forth in Paragraph 52.

II. SETTLEMENT BENEFITS AND REIMBURSEMENT

41. **Credit Monitoring Services.** Settlement Class Members shall be offered an opportunity to enroll in Credit Monitoring Services (as defined above) provided through the Settlement Administrator.

42. **Out-of-Pocket Reimbursement and Lost Time.** Defendant will pay Approved Claims for Ordinary Losses and Lost Time as well as Extraordinary Losses as described below. Settlement Class Members who submit a valid and timely Claim Form may choose from all applicable claim categories below.

- a. **Claims for Compensation for Ordinary Losses** up to a total of \$400.00 per claimant, upon submission of a valid claim with supporting documentation for out-of-pocket losses incurred or spent between April 21, 2024 and the Notice Date:
 - i. *Out of pocket expenses incurred* as a result of the Security Incident, including unreimbursed bank fees, long distance phone and cell phone charges (only if charged by the minute), data charges (only if charged based on the amount of data used), postage or gasoline for local travel;
 - ii. *Fees for credit reports, credit monitoring or other identity theft insurance products* purchased as a result of the Security Incident;
- b. **Claims for Compensation for Lost Time.** Settlement Class Members who spent time monitoring accounts or otherwise dealing with issues related to the Security Incident can submit a claim for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74) provided they provide an attestation on the Claim Form of the activities performed and that those activities were related to the Security Incident.
- c. **Claims for Extraordinary Losses** up to a total of \$4,500.00 per Settlement Class Member in compensation on submission of a valid and timely Claim Form, with supporting documentation and an attestation, for monetary losses that meet the following conditions:
 - i. The loss is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss caused by (A) misuse of the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information or (B) fraud associated with the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information;
 - ii. The loss noted in i.(A) or i.(B) was more likely than not caused by the Security Incident;

- iii. The loss occurred between April 21, 2024 and the Notice Date;
- iv. The loss is attested to and not already covered by the Ordinary Loss or Lost Time categories and the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all of the Settlement Class Member's credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance.

43. **Alternative Cash Benefit.** Defendant will pay Approved Claims for Alternative Cash Benefits as follows: (i) Defendant will provide \$30 in compensation to each Settlement Class Member whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number was implicated in the Security Incident; or (ii) \$10 in compensation to each Settlement Class Member whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number was not implicated in the Security Incident, upon submission of a valid and timely Claim Form. This an alternative benefit. If a Settlement Class Member chooses this benefit, he or she is not eligible for any of the benefits outlined in Paragraphs 41 and 42.

VI. CLAIMS PROCESS AND PAYMENTS TO PARTICIPATING SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBERS

44. **Submission of Electronic and Hard Copy Claims.** Settlement Class Members may submit Claim Forms to the Settlement Administrator electronically via the Settlement Website or physically by mail to the Settlement Administrator. Claim Forms must be submitted electronically or postmarked on or before the Claims Deadline. The Settlement Administrator will maintain records of all Claim Forms submitted until the later of (a) one hundred and eighty (180) Days after the Effective Date or (b) the date all Claim Forms have been fully processed in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. Information submitted by Settlement Class Members in connection with Claim Forms shall be deemed confidential and protected as such by the Settlement Administrator, Settlement Class Counsel, and Defendant's Counsel.

45. **Claims Review Process.** The Settlement Administrator shall have the sole discretion and authority to determine whether and to what extent a claim for Credit Monitoring Services, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, Extraordinary Losses, or Alternative Cash Benefit is valid.

- a. The Settlement Administrator will verify that each person who submits a Claim Form is a member of the Settlement Class.
- b. The Settlement Administrator will determine that each Claim Form submitted by a Settlement Class Member was submitted during the Claims Period and is timely.
- c. In determining whether claimed Ordinary Losses and Extraordinary Losses are more likely than not caused by the Security Incident, the Settlement Administrator will consider (i) the timing of the alleged loss and whether it occurred on or after April 21, 2024; (ii) whether the alleged loss for the specific Participating Settlement Class Member, involved the types of information for that individual that may have been affected in the Security Incident; (iii) the explanation of the Settlement Class Member as to why the alleged loss was caused by the Security Incident; and (iv) other factors the Settlement Administrator reasonably finds to be relevant.

- d. In determining the appropriate amount for claimed Alternative Cash Benefits, the Settlement Administrator will rely on the Settlement Class List and/or information provided by Defendant.
- e. The Settlement Administrator is authorized to contact any Settlement Class Member (by e-mail, telephone, or U.S. mail) to seek clarification regarding a submitted claim prior to making a determination as to its validity.
- f. No decision of the Settlement Administrator shall be deemed to constitute a finding, admission, or waiver by Defendant as to any matter of fact, law, or evidence having any collateral effect on any proceedings in any forum or before any authority.
- g. To the extent the Settlement Administrator determines that a timely claim for Credit Monitoring Services, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, Extraordinary Losses, or Alternative Cash Benefits by a Settlement Class Member is deficient in whole or in part, the Settlement Administrator shall notify the Settlement Class Member of the deficiencies and provide the Settlement Class member twenty-one (21) days to cure the deficiencies. If the Settlement Administrator subsequently determines that the Settlement Class Member has not cured the deficiencies, the Settlement Administrator will notify the Settlement Class Member within ten (10) days of that determination. For individuals submitting a Claim Form who are not Settlement Class Members, the Settlement Administrator need not provide a cure opportunity. The Settlement Administrator may consult with the Parties in making these determinations.
- h. If a Settlement Class Member receives notice that the Settlement Administrator has determined that the deficiencies it identified have not been cured, the Settlement Class Member may request an appeal in writing, including any supporting documents. The appeal must be submitted within twenty-one (21) days of the Settlement Administrator sending the notice. In the event of an appeal, the Settlement Administrator shall provide the Parties with all relevant documentation regarding the appeal. The Parties will confer regarding the appeal. If they agree on a disposition of the appeal, that disposition will be final and non-appealable. If they cannot agree on disposition of the appeal, the dispute will be submitted to the Settlement Administrator for final, non-appealable disposition. In reaching disposition, the Settlement Administrator is authorized to communicate with counsel for the Parties separately or collectively.

46. **Payment.**

- a. After the Effective Date, and after final determinations have been made with respect to all claims submitted during the Claims Period pursuant to the Claims Review Process, the Settlement Administrator shall provide the Parties an accounting of all Approved Claims for Credit Monitoring Services, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, Extraordinary Losses, or Alternative Cash Benefits and also provide funding instructions to Defendant. Within forty-five (45) days of receiving this accounting, Defendant or its representative shall transmit the funds needed to pay Approved Claims for Credit Monitoring Services, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, Extraordinary Losses, or Alternative Cash Benefits in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

- b. Payments issued by the Settlement Administrator for Approved Claims for Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, Extraordinary Losses, or Alternative Cash Benefits shall be issued in the form of a check, or via electronic means (to the extent feasible) and sent as soon as practicable after the Settlement Administrator receives the funds described in Paragraph 46.a.
- c. All Settlement Class Members who fail to submit a valid Claim Form for any benefits under this Agreement within the time frames set forth herein, or such other period as may be ordered by the Court, shall be forever barred from receiving any payments or benefits pursuant to the Settlement, but will in all other respects be subject to and bound by the provisions of this Agreement, including but not limited to the releases contained herein, and the Final Approval Order and Judgment.

47. **Timing.** Settlement Checks shall bear the legend that they expire if not negotiated within ninety (90) days of their issue date.

48. **Returned Checks.** For any Settlement Check returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator shall, within thirty (30) days after the check is returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable, send an e-mail and/or telephone that Participating Settlement Class Member to obtain updated address information. Any replacement Settlement Checks issued to Participating Settlement Class Members shall remain valid and negotiable for sixty (60) days from the date of issuance and thereafter will automatically be canceled and deemed void if not cashed by the Participating Settlement Class Members within that time.

49. **Voided Checks.** In the event a Settlement Check becomes void, the Participating Settlement Class Member to whom that Settlement Check was made payable will forfeit the right to payment and will not be entitled to payment under the Settlement, and the Agreement will in all other respects be fully enforceable against the Participating Settlement Class Member. No later than one hundred and twenty (120) days after the issuance of the last Settlement Check, the Settlement Administrator shall take all steps necessary to stop payment on any Settlement Checks that remain uncashed.

IX. SETTLEMENT CLASS NOTICE

50. **Timing of Notice.** Within fifteen (15) days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant shall provide the Settlement Class List to the Settlement Administrator. Within forty-five (45) days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator shall disseminate the Short Form Notice to Settlement Class Members for whom it has a valid mailing address. The Settlement Administrator shall make the Long Form Notice and Claim Form available to Settlement Class Members on the Settlement Website.

51. **Form of Notice.** Notice shall be disseminated via postcard through First Class U.S. mail to Settlement Class Members on the Settlement Class List with last known address information. Notice shall also be provided on the Settlement Website. The Notice mailed to Settlement Class Members will consist of a Short Form Notice in a form substantially similar to that attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. The Settlement Administrator shall have discretion to format the Short Form Notice in a reasonable manner to minimize mailing and administrative costs. Before

Notices are mailed, Settlement Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel shall first be provided with a proof copy (reflecting what the items will look like in their final form) and shall have the right to inspect the same for compliance with the Settlement Agreement and any orders of the Court. For Notices sent via postcard that are returned as undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator shall use reasonable efforts (e.g., skip trace) to identify an updated mailing address and resend the postcard notice if an updated mailing address is identified. In addition, the Long Form Notice and Claim Form approved by the Court may be adjusted by the Settlement Administrator in consultation and agreement with the Parties, as may be reasonable and necessary and not inconsistent with such Court approval. For the small number of Settlement Class Members on the Settlement List without last known address information, Notice shall be disseminated within forty-five (45) days of the Preliminary Approval Order by targeted advertisements on social media websites on desktop, mobile and tablet devices, including Google Display Network, Facebook, and Instagram, and shall run for a total of thirty (30) days. Such advertisements shall be disseminated only to those on the social media websites with the same names as those on the Settlement List without a last known address (believed to be approximately 4,000 people or less). The substance of the advertisements shall include a headline summarizing the Notice and shall direct people to the Settlement Website.

52. **Settlement Website.** The Settlement Administrator will establish the Settlement Website as soon as practicable following entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, but prior to dissemination of the Notice. The Settlement Website shall contain relevant documents, including, but not limited to, the Long Form Notice, the Claim Form, this Agreement, Plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement, the Preliminary Approval Order, Plaintiff's motion for an award of attorneys' fees, costs and expenses, and service awards, and the operative complaint in the Action. The Settlement Website shall also include a toll-free telephone number, e-mail address, and mailing address through which Settlement Class Members may contact the Settlement Administrator directly. The Settlement Website shall not include any advertising and shall remain operational until at least sixty (60) days after all Settlement Payments have been distributed.

53. **Cost of Notice and Administration.** Defendant will pay for the Notice and Administrative Expenses, which will be paid separately from costs associated with providing the Settlements benefits in Paragraphs 41-43.

X. OPT-OUTS AND OBJECTIONS

54. **Opt-Outs.** The Notice shall explain the procedure for Settlement Class Members to exclude themselves or "opt-out" of the Settlement by submitting a Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator postmarked no later than sixty (60) days after the Notice Deadline. The Notice also must state that any Settlement Class Member who does not file a timely Request for Exclusion in accordance with this paragraph will lose the opportunity to exclude himself or herself from the Settlement and will be bound by the Settlement.

- a. The Request for Exclusion must include the name of the proceeding, the individual's full name, current address, personal signature, and the words "Request for Exclusion" or a comparable statement that the individual does not wish to participate in the Settlement.
- b. No person shall purport to exercise any exclusion rights of any other person, or purport (a) to opt-out Settlement Class Members as a group, in the aggregate, or as a class; or

- (b) to opt-out more than one Settlement Class Member on a single Request for Exclusion, or as an agent or representative. Any such purported Request(s) for Exclusion shall be void, and the Settlement Class Member(s) who is or are the subject of such purported Request(s) for Exclusion shall be treated as a Participating Settlement Class Member and be bound by this Settlement Agreement, including the Release contained herein, and judgment entered thereon, unless he or she submits a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.
- c. Within seven (7) days after the Opt-Out Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall provide the Parties with a complete and final list of all Opt Outs.
- d. All persons who Opt Out shall not receive any benefits or be bound by the terms of this Agreement.

55. **Objections.** The Notice shall explain the procedure for Settlement Class Members to object to the Settlement or request for attorneys' fees and Litigation Costs and Expenses by filing written objections with the Court no later than the Objection Deadline. The written objection must include (i) the name of the proceedings; (ii) the Settlement Class Member's full name and current mailing address; (iii) a statement that states with specificity the grounds for the objection, as well as any documents supporting the objection; (iv) the identity of any attorneys representing the objector; (v) a statement regarding whether the Settlement Class Member (or his/her attorney) intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (vi) the signature of the Settlement Class Member or the Settlement Class Member's attorney. The Settlement Class Member shall also send a copy of the written objection to the Settlement Administrator postmarked or emailed no later than the Objection Deadline. Any Settlement Class Member who does not file a timely and adequate objection in accordance with this paragraph waives the right to object or to be heard at the Final Approval Hearing and shall be forever barred from making any objection to the Settlement and shall be bound by the terms of the Agreement and by all proceedings, orders, and judgments in the Action. The exclusive means for any challenge to the Agreement shall be through the provisions of this paragraph. Within seven (7) days after the Objection Deadline, the Claims Administrator shall provide the Parties with all objections submitted.

XI. DUTIES OF THE SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

56. **Duties of Settlement Administrator.** The Settlement Administrator shall perform the functions and duties necessary to effectuate the Settlement and as specified in this Agreement, including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. Obtaining the Settlement Class List for the purpose of disseminating Notice to Settlement Class Members;
- b. Causing the Notice Program to be effectuated in accordance with the terms of this Settlement Agreement and orders of the Court;
- c. Performing National Change of Address searches on the Settlement Class List and/or skip tracing on undeliverable notices;
- d. Providing Notice to Settlement Class Members via U.S. mail or targeted social media

advertising in accordance with Paragraph 51 herein;

- e. Establishing and maintaining the Settlement Website;
- f. Establishing and maintaining a toll-free telephone line with interactive voice response for Settlement Class Members to call with Settlement-related inquiries, and answering the questions of Settlement Class Members who call with or otherwise communicate such inquiries in a timely fashion;
- g. Responding to any mailed or emailed Settlement Class Member inquiries in a timely fashion;
- h. Reviewing, determining the validity of, and processing all claims submitted consistent with the terms of this Agreement;
- i. Receiving and reviewing Requests for Exclusion and objections from Settlement Class Members. If the Settlement Administrator receives any Requests for Exclusion, objections, or other requests from Settlement Class Members after the deadlines set forth herein, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly provide copies thereof to Settlement Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel;
- j. Working with the provider of Credit Monitoring Services to receive and send activation codes to Settlement Class Members who submitted valid claims for Credit Monitoring Services after the Effective Date;
- k. After the Effective Date, processing and transmitting Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members;
- l. Providing weekly or other periodic reports to Settlement Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel that include information regarding claims, objections, Opt Outs and other data agreed to between Settlement Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel and the Settlement Administrator;
- m. In advance of the Final Approval Hearing, preparing an affidavit to submit to the Court that: (i) attests to implementation of Notice in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; and (ii) identifies each Settlement Class Member who timely and properly submitted a Request for Exclusion; and
- n. Performing any function related to settlement administration as provided for in this Agreement or agreed-upon among Settlement Class Counsel, Defendant's Counsel, and the Settlement Administrator.

XII. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL, FINAL APPROVAL, AND JURISDICTION

57. **Certification of the Settlement Class.** For purposes of this Settlement only, and in the context of this Agreement only, the Parties stipulate to the certification of the Settlement Class, which is contingent upon the Court entering the Final Approval Order and Judgment of this Settlement and the occurrence of the Effective Date. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i)

Defendant, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge. Should: (1) the Settlement not receive final approval from the Court, (2) the Effective Date not occur, or (3) the Agreement is otherwise terminated, the certification of the Settlement Class shall be void, and neither the Agreement nor any order or other action relating to the agreement shall be offered by any person as evidence or cited in support of a motion to certify a class for any purpose other than this Settlement. Defendant reserves the right to contest class certification for all other purposes. The Parties further stipulate to designate the Settlement Class Representative as the representative for the Settlement Class.

58. **Preliminary Approval.** Following execution of this Agreement, Settlement Class Counsel shall file a motion for preliminary approval of this Settlement with the Court. Settlement Class Counsel shall provide Defendant's counsel with a draft of the motion for preliminary approval within a reasonable time frame prior to filing same to ensure that any requested revisions from Defendant are addressed. The proposed Preliminary Approval Order shall be in the form attached as **Exhibit 4**.

59. **Final Approval.** Settlement Class Counsel shall move the Court for a Final Approval Order and Judgment of this Settlement, to be issued following the Final Approval Hearing. Counsel for the Parties shall request that the Court set a date for the Final Approval Hearing no earlier than 120 days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order. Settlement Class Counsel shall provide Defendant's counsel with a draft of the motion for final approval within a reasonable time frame prior to filing same to ensure that any requested revisions from Defendant are addressed.

60. **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 between the Parties arising out of or relating to this Agreement that cannot be resolved by negotiation and agreement by counsel for the Parties. The Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to the administration, consummation, and enforcement of the Agreement and shall retain jurisdiction for the purpose of enforcing all terms of the Agreement. The Court shall also retain jurisdiction over all questions and/or disputes related to the Notice and the Settlement Administrator. As part of its agreement to render services in connection with this Settlement, the Settlement Administrator consents to the jurisdiction of the Court for this purpose and any dispute between or among the Settlement Administrator, Plaintiff, and/or Defendant.

XIII. MODIFICATION AND TERMINATION

61. **Modification.** The terms and provisions of this Agreement may be amended, modified, or expanded by written agreement of the Parties and approval of the Court; provided, however, that, after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Parties may, by written agreement, effect such amendments, modifications, or expansions of this Agreement and its implementing documents (including all exhibits hereto) without further notice to the Settlement Class or approval by the Court if such changes are consistent with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order and do not materially alter, reduce, or limit the rights of Settlement Class Members

or Defendant under this Agreement.

62. **Termination.** If more than 100 members of the Settlement Class exclude themselves from the settlement (i.e., opt-out), Defendant, in its sole discretion, may terminate this settlement. Defendant will bear all costs for which it is responsible under this settlement through the date of termination, including all costs and fees then due and owing to the Settlement Administrator. For the avoidance of doubt, Defendant will not be obligated to pay attorneys' fees and costs or service award if Defendant terminates the settlement under this provision. Additionally, Settlement Class Counsel (on behalf of the Settlement Class Members) and Defendant shall have the right to terminate this Agreement by providing written notice of their or its election to do so ("Termination Notice"): (1) within fourteen (14) days of the Court's refusal to grant preliminary approval of the Settlement in any material respect; (2) the Court's refusal to enter the Final Approval Order and Judgment in any material respect, or (3) the date the Final Approval Order and Judgment is modified or reversed in any material respect by any appellate or other court.

63. **Effect of Termination.** In the event of a termination as provided in Paragraph 62, this Agreement shall be considered null and void, all of the Parties' obligations under the Agreement 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 claims and defenses will be preserved. Any Court orders preliminarily or finally approving certification of the Settlement Class and any other orders entered pursuant to the Agreement shall be deemed null and void and vacated.

XIV. RELEASES

64. **The Release.** Upon the Effective Date, and in consideration of the Settlement benefits described herein, each Releasing Party shall be deemed to have completely and unconditionally released, acquitted, and forever discharged Defendant and each of the Released Parties from any and all Released Claims, including Unknown Claims.

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

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.

Upon the Effective Date, each-Releasing Party shall be deemed to have, and shall have,

waived any and all provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by any law of any state, the District of Columbia or territory of the United States, by federal law, or principle of common law, or the law of any jurisdiction outside of the United States, which is similar, comparable or equivalent to Section 1542 of the California Civil Code. The Releasing Parties acknowledge that they may discover facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of the Released Claims or relation of the Released Parties thereto, but that it is their intention to finally and forever settle and release the Released Claims, including but not limited to any Unknown Claims they may have, as that term is defined in this paragraph. The Parties acknowledge, and the Released Parties shall be deemed by operation of the Agreement to have acknowledged, that the foregoing waiver is a material term of the Agreement.

66. **Bar to Future Suits.** Upon entry of the Final Approval Order and Judgment, the Settlement Class Representative and other Participating Settlement Class Members shall be enjoined from initiating, asserting, or prosecuting any and all Released Claims, including Unknown Claims, in any proceeding against any of the Released Parties or based on any actions taken by any of the Released Parties that are authorized or required by this Agreement or by the Final Approval Order and Judgment. It is further agreed that the Settlement may be pleaded as a complete defense to any proceeding subject to this Section.

XV. SERVICE AWARD PAYMENTS

67. **Service Award Payments.** At least fourteen (14) days before the Opt-Out and Objection Deadlines, Settlement Class Counsel will file a motion seeking a service award payment for the Settlement Class Representative in recognition for their contribution to this Action. Plaintiff agrees not to seek, and Defendant agrees not to oppose, Settlement Class Counsel's request for a service award not to exceed Two Thousand (\$2,000.00). Defendant shall pay the Court-approved service award to an account established by Settlement Class Counsel within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date. Settlement Class Counsel will ensure payment instructions are provided through secure processes. Settlement Class Counsel will then distribute the service award. Defendant's obligations with respect to the Court-approved service award shall be fully satisfied upon transmission of the funds into the account established by Settlement Class Counsel. Defendant shall have no responsibility for, interest in, or liability whatsoever with respect to any distribution or allocation of service awards. Nor shall Defendant be responsible for any tax obligations or payments associated with the amount paid into the account established by Settlement Class Counsel. To the extent the Effective Date does not occur, Defendant shall have no obligation to pay any service awards. This amount was negotiated after the primary terms of the settlement were negotiated.

68. **No Effect on Agreement.** The finality or effectiveness of the Settlement, including the Final Approval Order and Judgment, shall not depend on the amount or timing of service awards approved and awarded by the Court or any appeal thereof. The amount and timing of service awards is intended to be considered by the Court separately from the Court's consideration of the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement. No decision by the Court, or modification or reversal or appeal of any decision by the Court, concerning the amount of the service awards shall constitute grounds for termination of this Agreement.

XVI. ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, EXPENSES

69. **Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Expenses.** At least fourteen (14) days before the Opt-Out and Objection Deadlines, Settlement Class Counsel will file a motion for an award of attorneys' fees and Litigation Costs and Expenses to be paid by Defendant. Settlement Class Counsel agrees to seek, and Defendant agrees not to oppose, an award of attorneys' fees and expenses not to exceed Two Hundred Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$230,000). Defendant shall pay the Court- approved attorneys' fees and expenses to an account established by Settlement Class Counsel within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date. Settlement Class Counsel will ensure payment instructions are provided through secure processes. Defendant's obligations with respect to the Court-approved attorneys' fees and Litigation Costs and Expenses shall be fully satisfied upon transmission of the funds into the account established by Settlement Class Counsel. Defendant shall have no responsibility for, interest in, or liability whatsoever with respect to any distribution or allocation of attorneys' fees or Litigation Costs and Expenses. Nor shall Defendant be responsible for any tax obligations or payments associated with the amount paid into the account established by Settlement Class Counsel. To the extent the Effective Date does not occur, Defendant shall have no obligation to pay any attorneys' fees or Litigation Costs and Expenses. The amount of attorneys' fees and Litigation Costs and Expenses was negotiated after the primary terms of the Settlement were negotiated.

70. **No Effect on Agreement.** The finality or effectiveness of the Parties' Settlement shall not depend on the amount or timing of attorneys' fees and Litigation Costs and Expenses approved and awarded by the Court or any appeal thereof. The amount and timing of attorneys' fees and Litigation Costs and Expenses are intended to be considered by the Court separately from the Court's consideration of the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement. No decision by the Court, or modification or reversal or appeal of any decision by the Court, concerning the amount or timing of attorneys' fees or Litigation Costs and Expenses shall constitute grounds for termination of this Agreement.

XVII. NO ADMISSION OF LIABILITY

71. **No Admission of Liability.** The Parties understand and acknowledge that this Agreement constitutes a compromise and settlement of disputed claims. No action taken by the Parties either previously or in connection with the negotiations or proceedings connected with this Agreement shall be deemed or construed to be an admission of the truth or falsity of any claims or defenses heretofore made or that could have been made, or an acknowledgment or admission by any party of any fault, liability, or wrongdoing of any kind whatsoever.

72. **No Use of Agreement.** Neither the Settlement Agreement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Settlement: (i) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used as, an admission of, or evidence of, the validity of any claim made by Plaintiff or any Settlement Class Member, including any Settlement Class Member who opts out of the Settlement; or (ii) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used as, an admission of, or evidence of, any fault or omission by the Released Parties in the Action, or any Settlement Class Member who opts out of the Settlement, or in any proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal.

XVIII. MISCELLANEOUS

73. **Integration of Exhibits.** The exhibits to this Agreement and any exhibits thereto are a material part of the Settlement and are incorporated and made a part of the Agreement.

74. **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement, including all exhibits hereto, shall constitute the entire Agreement among the Parties with regard to the subject matter hereof and shall supersede any previous agreements, representations, communications and understandings among the Parties, including counsel for the Parties. This Agreement may not be changed, modified, or amended except in writing signed by all Parties or their successors in interest. The Parties contemplate that, subject to Court approval or without such approval where legally permissible and consistent with any orders of the Court in this proceeding, the exhibits to this Agreement—which are an integral and material part of the Settlement and are hereby incorporated as part of the Agreement—may be modified by subsequent Agreement of counsel for the Parties prior to dissemination of the Notice to the Settlement Class.

75. **Resolution.** The Parties intend this Agreement to be a final and complete resolution of all disputes between them with respect to the Action. The Parties each agree that the Settlement and this Agreement were negotiated in good faith and at arm's-length and reflects a Settlement reached voluntarily after consultation with legal counsel of their choice.

76. **Other Litigation.** Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel will not cooperate with or encourage any action or filing of claims against Defendant or any Released Parties related to any of the allegations or claims alleged in the Action.

77. **Deadlines.** If any of the dates or deadlines specified herein falls on a weekend or legal holiday, the applicable date or deadline shall fall on the next business day. All reference to “days” in this agreement shall refer to calendar days unless otherwise specified.

78. **Singular and Plurals.** As used in this Agreement, all references to the plural shall also mean the singular and to the singular shall also mean the plural whenever the context so indicates and reasonably dictates.

79. **Headings.** The headings contained in this Agreement are for reference purposes only and shall not affect in any way the meaning or interpretation of this Agreement.

80. **Construction.** For the purpose of construing or interpreting this Agreement, this Agreement is to be deemed to have been drafted equally by all Parties and shall not be construed strictly for or against any Party.

81. **Cooperation of Parties.** The Parties to this Agreement agree to cooperate in good faith to effectuate the Settlement described in this Agreement.

82. **Obligation to Meet and Confer.** Before filing any motion in the Court raising a dispute arising out of or related to this Agreement between the Parties, the Parties shall consult with each other and certify to the Court that they have consulted in good faith.

83. **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.

84. **Governing Law.** The Agreement shall be construed in accordance with, and be governed by, the laws of the State of Florida, without regard to choice of law principles.

85. **Taxability.** Defendant does not make and has not made any representations regarding the taxability of any Settlement Benefit, Fee Award, and/or any other payments made pursuant to this Agreement. Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel (on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class Members) represent that that they have not relied upon any representation of the Defendant or its attorneys or the Settlement Administrator on the subject of taxability of any consideration provided under this Agreement. Plaintiff and Settlement Class Counsel (on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class Members) understand and expressly agree that any income or other tax, including any interest, penalties or other payment obligations ultimately determined to be payable from or with respect to any Settlement Benefit, Fee Award, and/or any other payments made pursuant to this Agreement, as well as any state or federal reporting obligations imposed on them arising therefrom or attributable thereto, shall not be Defendant's responsibility.

86. **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 signatories do not sign the same counterparts. Original signatures are not required. Any signature submitted electronically, by facsimile, or through e-mail of an Adobe PDF shall be deemed an original.

87. **Notices.** All notices to Settlement Class Counsel and counsel for Defendant provided for herein, shall be sent by email to:

Andrew Shamis
SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.
ashamis@shamisgentile.com

Joseph Kanee
EDELSBERG LAW, P.A.
joseph@edelsberglaw.com

All notices to Defendant provided for herein, shall be sent by email to:

Eric R. Fish
Baker & Hostetler LLP
efish@bakerlaw.com


The notice recipients and addresses designated above may be changed by written notice to the other Party.

88. **Authority.** Any person executing this Agreement in a representative capacity represents and warrants that he or she is fully authorized to do so and authorized to bind the Party on whose behalf he, she or they sign this Agreement to all of the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

[Signatures on following pages.]

SIGNATURES

Maria Ballesteros

By: 
Maria Ballesteros (Mar 5, 2025 18:38 PST)

Date: Mar 5, 2025

Defendant Ambulnz NY, LLC

By: 
Ely D. Tendler. Esq.
General Counsel

Date: 3/6/2025

Approved as to form by:

SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.
EDELSBERG LAW, P.A.
Counsel for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class

By: *andrew shamis*
Andrew Shamis

Date: Mar 6, 2025

By: *Joseph Kanee*
Joseph Kanee

Date: Mar 6, 2025

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
Counsel for Defendant

By: *Eric R. Fish*
Eric R. Fish

Date: March 6, 2025

— EXHIBIT 1 —

To all persons whose personal information may have been accessed during an April 2024 cybersecurity incident that impacted Ambulnz, a proposed class action settlement may affect your rights.

For more information on the proposed settlement, including how to submit a claim, exclude yourself, or submit an objection, please visit [Website URL](#).

A state court has authorized this Notice.

This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

Ambulnz Security Incident [Settlement admin address]

«ScanString»

Postal Service: Please do not mark barcode.

Notice ID: «Notice ID»

Confirmation Code: «Confirmation Code»

«FirstName» «LastName»

«Address1»

«Address2»

«City», «StateCd» «Zip»

«CountryCd»

Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC, xxx-xxxxx-CA-01 (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.)

Why am I receiving this notice? You are receiving this Notice because the records of Defendant Ambulnz NY, LLC (“Ambulnz”) show your personal information may have been accessed during a cybersecurity incident Ambulnz experienced in April 2024 (“Security Incident”). You are therefore likely a Settlement Class Member eligible to receive benefits under this Settlement.

What are the Settlement Benefits? Under the Settlement, Ambulnz will pay all valid and timely claims for Credit Monitoring, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, and Extraordinary Losses, or an Alternative Cash Benefit, summarized below:

- Credit Monitoring – 1 year of credit monitoring and identity protection services.
- Ordinary Losses– Up to a total of \$400 per claimant.
- Lost Time Claim - \$18.50 per hour for up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74).
- Extraordinary Losses- Up to a total of \$4,500 per claimant.
- Alternative Cash Benefit - \$30 per claimant whose Social Security Number and/or Driver’s License Number was implicated in the Security Incident and \$10 per claimant whose Social Security Number and/or Driver’s License Number was not implicated in the Security Incident.

Please visit www.xxx.com for a full description of the Settlement benefits and documentation requirements.

How do I Submit a Claim Form for Benefits? You must submit a Claim Form, available at www.xxx.com to be eligible to receive a Settlement benefit. Your completed Claim Form must be **submitted online, or mailed to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked, by DATE**.

What are my other options? If you **Do Nothing**, you will be legally bound by the terms of the Settlement, and you will release your claims against Ambulnz and other Released Parties as defined in the Settlement Agreement. You may **Opt-Out** of or file an objection to the Settlement by **DATE**. Please visit www.xxx.com for more information on how to Opt-Out and exclude yourself from or Object to the Settlement.

Do I have a Lawyer in this Case? Yes, the Court appointed Andrew Shamis of Shamis & Gentile, P.A. to represent you and other members of the Settlement Class. You will not be

charged directly for these lawyers; instead, they will receive compensation from Ambulanz (subject to Court approval). If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

The Court's Final Approval Hearing. The Court is scheduled to hold a Final Approval Hearing on **DATE**, to consider whether to approve the Settlement, service awards for the Class Representative (of \$2,000), and a request for attorneys' fees and expenses (up to \$230,000) for Settlement Class Counsel. You may appear at the hearing, either yourself or through an attorney hired by you, but you don't have to.

This notice is only a summary. For more information, visit www.insert or call toll-free 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

— EXHIBIT 2 —

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Circuit Court of the 11th Judicial District for Miami-Dade County, Florida

Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC

Case No. xxx-xxxxxx-CA-01

IF YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION WAS POTENTIALLY IMPACTED BY A CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT THAT AMBULNZ EXPERIENCED IN APRIL 2024, A PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT MAY AFFECT YOUR RIGHTS

A state court authorized this Notice. You are not being sued.

This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A Settlement has been reached with Ambulnz NY, LLC (“Ambulnz” or “Defendant”) in a class action lawsuit about a cybersecurity incident that occurred in or around April 2024 (“Security Incident”).
- The lawsuit is captioned *Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC*, xxx-xxxxxx-CA-01 (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.). Ambulnz denies the allegations and all liability or wrongdoing with respect to any and all facts and claims alleged in the lawsuit but has agreed to a settlement to avoid the costs and risks associated with continuing this case.
- You are included in this Settlement if you are a Settlement Class Member. A Settlement Class Member is an individual who resides in the United States and whose personally identifiable information (“PII”) and/or personal health information (“PHI”) was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.
- If a Settlement Class Member, your rights are affected whether you act or don’t act. Please read this Notice carefully.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT		DEADLINE
SUBMIT A CLAIM	<p>The only way to receive cash and other benefits from this Settlement is by submitting a valid and timely Claim Form.</p> <p>You can submit your Claim Form online at _____or download the Claim Form from the Settlement Website and mail it to the Settlement Administrator. You may also call or email the Settlement Administrator to receive a paper copy of the Claim Form.</p>	_____, 2024
OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT	<p>You can choose to opt out of the Settlement and receive no payment. This option allows you to sue, continue to sue, or be part of another lawsuit against the Defendant related to the legal claims resolved by this Settlement. You can elect to retain your own legal counsel at your own expense. If you opt out you will not be able to participate in the cash and other benefits from the Settlement.</p>	_____, 2024
OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT AND/OR ATTEND A HEARING	<p>If you do not opt out of the Settlement, you may object to it by writing to the Court about why you don't like the Settlement. You may also ask the Court for permission to speak about your objection at the Final Approval Hearing. If you object, you may also file a claim for benefits.</p>	_____, 2024
DO NOTHING	<p>Unless you opt out of the settlement, you are part of the Settlement. If you do nothing, you will not get a payment from this Settlement and you will give up the right to sue, continue to sue, or be part of another lawsuit against the Defendant related to the legal claims resolved by this Settlement.</p>	No Deadline

- These rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this Notice.
- The Court in charge of this case still has to decide whether to approve the Settlement.

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

BASIC INFORMATION	3
WHO IS IN THE SETTLEMENT	4
THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS	4
HOW TO GET A PAYMENT—MAKING A CLAIM	6
THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU	6
OPTING OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT	7
COMMENTING ON OR OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT	8
THE COURT’S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING	9
IF I DO NOTHING	9
GETTING MORE INFORMATION	9

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why was this Notice issued?

A state court authorized this Notice because you have a right to know about the proposed Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your options before the Court decides whether to grant final approval of the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, your legal rights, what benefits are available, and who can receive them.

The lawsuit is captioned *Ballesteros v. Amublz NY, LLC*, [xxxx-xxxxxx-CA-01](#) (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.). The person that filed this lawsuit is called the “Plaintiff” and the company they sued, Ambulnz, is called the “Defendant.”

2. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit alleges that personal information was impacted by the cybersecurity incident that affected Ambulnz in or around April 2024 (“Security Incident”).

3. What is a class action?

In a class action, one or more individuals sue on behalf of other people with similar claims. These individuals who sue are known as “Class Representatives” or “Plaintiffs.” Together, the people included in the class action are called a “class” or “class members.” One court resolves the lawsuit for all settlement class members, except for those who exclude themselves (sometimes called, “opting out”) from a settlement. In this Settlement, the Class Representative is Maria Ballesteros.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Court did not decide in favor of the Plaintiff or the Defendant. The Defendant denies all claims and contends that it has not violated any laws. Plaintiff and the Defendant agreed to a Settlement to avoid the costs and risks of a trial, and through the Settlement, Settlement Class Members are eligible to claim payments and other benefits. The Plaintiff and their attorneys, who also represent the Settlement Class Members, think the Settlement is best for all Settlement Class Members.

WHO IS IN THE SETTLEMENT?

5. Who is included in the Settlement?

The Settlement Class consists of all individuals who reside in the United States whose PII and/or PHI was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.

6. Are there exceptions to being included?

Yes. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i) Ambulnz, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

If you are not sure whether you are included in the Settlement Class, you can ask for free help by calling, emailing or writing to the Settlement Administrator at:

Toll-Free: 1-**XXX-XXX-XXXX**

Questions? Call 1-**XXX-XXX-XXXX** Toll-Free or Visit **[Website URL]**

[email address]

Ambulnz Settlement, c/o Settlement Administrator, [address].

You may also view the Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement Agreement”) at [Website URL].

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

7. What does the Settlement provide?

Under the Settlement, Ambulnz will pay all valid and timely claims for Credit Monitoring, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, and Extraordinary Losses. Ambulnz will also pay all valid and timely claims for Alternative Cash Benefits in lieu of the other benefits of the Settlement.

8. How much will my payment be?

Payments and other benefits will vary - Settlement Class Members may submit a claim using the Claim Form for: (1) 1 year of credit monitoring; (2) Ordinary Loss Claims – up to a total of \$400 per claimant; (3) Lost Time - \$18.50 per hour for up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74,); and (4) Extraordinary Loss Claims - up to a total of \$4,000 per claimant. Alternatively, Settlement Class Members may submit a claim for an Alternative Cash Benefit of either \$30 or \$10 per claimant, depending on whether Ambulnz’s records reflect that their Social Security Number or Driver’s License Information was implicated in the Security Incident.

Credit Monitoring Services. All Settlement Class Members shall have the ability to make a claim for 1 year of one-credit bureau credit monitoring services and identity protection services by choosing this benefit on the Claim Form. Even if Settlement Class Members previously accepted the Defendant’s offer of complimentary credit monitoring services, they may still claim this benefit.

Ordinary Losses up to a total of \$400 per claimant, upon submission of a valid claim with supporting documentation for out-of-pocket losses incurred or spent between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of settlement is sent to the Settlement Class, including: (i) Out of pocket expenses incurred as a result of the Security Incident, including unreimbursed bank fees, long distance phone and cell phone charges (only if charged by the minute), data charges (only if charged based on the amount of data used), postage or gasoline for local travel; and (ii) Fees for credit reports, credit monitoring or other identity theft insurance products purchased as a result of the Security Incident.

Lost Time Claims for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74) with an attestation on the Claim Form of the activities performed and that those activities were related to the Security Incident.

Extraordinary Losses up to a total of \$4,500 per Settlement Class Member in compensation on submission of a valid and timely claim for monetary losses that meet the following conditions: i) The loss is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss caused by (A) misuse of the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information or (B) fraud associated with the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information; ii) The loss noted in i.(A) or i.(B) was more likely than not caused by the Security Incident; iii) The loss occurred between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of settlement is sent to the Class; iv) The loss is not already covered by the Ordinary Loss or Lost Time categories and v) the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all of the Settlement Class Member’s credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance, if any.

Alternative Cash Benefit. In lieu of the above benefits, Settlement Class Members may submit a claim using the Claim Form for an Alternative Cash Benefit of : (i) \$30 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Driver’s License Number were implicated in the Security Incident, as reflected in Ambulnz’s records; or (ii) \$10 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Driver’s License Number were not implicated in the Security Incident. A Settlement Class Member electing to receive an Alternative Cash Benefit is not eligible for any other benefits of the Settlement.

9. What claims am I releasing if I stay in the Settlement Class?

Unless you opt out of the Settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant about any of the legal claims this Settlement resolves. The “Releases” section in the Settlement Agreement describes the legal claims that you give up if you remain in the Settlement Class. The Settlement Agreement can be found at [\[Website URL\]](#).

[HOW TO GET A PAYMENT - MAKING A CLAIM](#)

10. How do I submit a claim and get a cash payment?

Claim Forms may be submitted online at [\[Website URL\]](#) or printed from the website and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at: *Ambulnz Settlement*, c/o Settlement Administrator, [\[address\]](#).

You may also contact the Settlement Administrator to request a Claim Form by telephone 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX, by email [Email Address], or by U.S. mail at the address above.

11. What is the deadline for submitting a claim?

If you submit a claim by U.S. mail, the completed and signed Claim Form must be postmarked by [Deadline Date]. If submitting a Claim Form online, you must do so by [Deadline Date].

12. When will I get my payment?

The short answer is – after the Settlement is “finally approved” and challenges, if any, to that approval are finally resolved. The Court is scheduled to hold a final approval hearing on _____, 2025 to decide whether to approve the Settlement, how much attorneys’ fees and costs to award to Settlement Class Counsel for representing the Settlement Class, and whether to award a Service Award to the Class Representative who brought this Action on behalf of the Settlement Class.

If the Court approves the Settlement, there may be appeals. It is always uncertain whether appeals will be filed and, if so, how long it will take to resolve them. Settlement payments will be distributed as soon as possible, if and when the Court grants final approval to the Settlement and after any appeals are resolved.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

13. Do I have a lawyer in the case?

Yes, the Court appointed Andrew Shamis of Shamis & Gentile, P.A. to represent you and other members of the Settlement Class (“Settlement Class Counsel”). You will not be charged directly for these lawyers; instead, they will receive compensation from Ambulnz (subject to Court approval).

If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

14. Should I get my own lawyer?

It is not necessary for you to hire your own lawyer because Settlement Class Counsel works for you. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

15. How will the lawyers be paid?

Settlement Class Counsel will file a motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses to be paid by Ambulnz. Ambulnz has agreed not to oppose Settlement Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses not to exceed Two Hundred Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$230,000). If Settlement Class Counsel seeks more than \$241,066 in attorneys' fees and expenses, Ambulnz has reserved all rights to object and oppose such requests.

Settlement Class Counsel will also seek a service award payment for the Class Representative in recognition for their contributions to this Action. Ambulnz has agreed not to oppose Settlement Class Counsel's request for a service award not to exceed Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) for the Class Representative. To the extent more than \$2,000 in service awards is sought for the Class Representative, Ambulnz has reserved all rights to object and oppose such a request.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

16. How do I opt out of the Settlement?

If you do not want to receive any benefits from the Settlement, and you want to keep your right to separately sue the Defendant about the legal issues in this case, you must take steps to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class. This is called "opting out" of the Settlement Class. The deadline for requesting exclusion from the Settlement is **[Deadline Date]**.

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must submit a written request for exclusion to the Court that includes the following information:

- the case name: *Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC*, **xxxx-xxxxxx-CA-01** (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.);
- your full name;
- current address;
- personal signature; and
- the words "Request for Exclusion" or a comparable statement that you do not wish to participate in the Settlement.

Your request for exclusion must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address below, postmarked no later than **[Deadline Date]**.

Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator
ATTN: Exclusion Request
[address]

If you exclude yourself, you are telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the

Settlement. You may only exclude yourself – not any other person.

COMMENTING ON OR OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

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

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you can choose (but are not required) to object to the Settlement if you do not like it or a portion of it, whether that be to the Settlement benefits, the request for attorneys' fees or service awards, the releases provided to the Defendant, or some other aspect of the Settlement. Through an objection, you give reasons why you think the Court should not approve the Settlement.

For an objection to be considered by the Court, the objection must include: (i) the name of the proceedings; (ii) the Settlement Class Member's full name and current mailing address; (iii) a statement that states with specificity the grounds for the objection, as well as any documents supporting the objection; (iv) the identity of any attorneys representing the objector; (v) a statement regarding whether the Settlement Class Member (or his/her attorney) intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (vi) the signature of the Settlement Class Member or the Settlement Class Member's attorney.

Any Settlement Class Member who does not file a timely and adequate objection in accordance with the above paragraph waives the right to object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing, and shall be bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement and by all orders and judgments in the Action.

Objections must be filed with the Court no later than **[Deadline Date]**.

Clerk of the Court
73 W. Flagler Street
Miami, Florida
33130

18. What is the difference between objecting and excluding?

Objecting is telling the Court that you do not like something about the Settlement. You can object to the Settlement only if you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement. Excluding yourself from the Settlement means telling the Court you do not want to be part of the Settlement. If you opt out of the Settlement, you cannot object to it because the Settlement no longer affects you.

THE COURT'S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

Questions? Call 1-**XXX-XXX-XXXX** Toll-Free or Visit **[Website URL]**

19. When is the Court's Final Approval Hearing?

The Court is scheduled to hold a final approval hearing on _____, **2025** at _____ **a.m./p.m. E.T.**, at [address/via zoom], Courtroom ____, to decide whether to approve the Settlement, how much attorneys' fees and costs to award to Settlement Class Counsel for representing the Settlement Class, and whether to award a service award payment to the Class Representative who brought this Action on behalf of the Settlement Class. If you are a Settlement Class Member, you or your attorney may ask permission to speak at the hearing at your own cost. If you do not like the Settlement, remember you may object to it but you have to follow certain requirements (see Question 17). The date and time of this hearing may change without further notice. Please check www._____ for updates.

20. Do I have to come to the Final Approval Hearing?

No. Settlement Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. You may attend at your own expense if you wish. If you file an objection, you may but you do not have to come to the Final Approval Hearing to talk about it. If you file your written objection on time and in accordance with the requirements above, the Court will consider it. You may also pay your own lawyer to attend, but such attendance is not necessary for the Court to consider an objection that was filed on time and meets the requirements above.

IF I DO NOTHING

21. What happens if I do nothing at all?

If you are a Settlement Class Member and you do nothing, you will give up your right to start a lawsuit, continue a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant and the Released Parties, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, about the legal issues resolved by this Settlement. In addition, you will be bound by the releases of the Released Parties in the Settlement and not be eligible to receive a payment from this Settlement.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

22. How do I get more information?

This Notice summarizes the proposed Settlement. Complete details are provided in the Settlement Questions? Call 1-[XXX-XXX-XXXX](tel:1-XXX-XXX-XXXX) Toll-Free or Visit [\[Website URL\]](#)

Agreement. The Settlement Agreement and other related documents are available at the Settlement Website, [Website URL].

If you have additional questions, you may contact the Settlement Administrator by email, phone, or mail:

Email: [Email Address]

Toll-Free: 1-[XXX-XXX-XXXX]

Mail: Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator, [address]

Publicly filed documents can also be obtained by visiting the office of the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida or by reviewing the Court's online docket. For those planning to visit the Court for more information, please contact the Court for its regular business hours and for any costs associated with obtaining documents maintained by the Court.

You may also contact your counsel in this matter, the Settlement Class Counsel, as follows:

Andrew Shamis
SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.
ashamis@shamisgentile.com

PLEASE DO NOT CONTACT THE COURT OR AMBULNZ

— EXHIBIT 3 —

Your claim must be submitted online or postmarked by: **[DEADLINE]**

Circuit Court of the 11th Judicial District for Miami-Dade
County, Florida
Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC
Case No. **xxxx-xxxxxx-CA-01**

CLAIM FORM

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Complete this Claim Form if you are a Settlement Class Member and you wish to receive Settlement benefits. You are a member of the Settlement Class and eligible to submit a Claim Form if:

You are an individual who resides in the United States whose personally identifiable information (“PII”) and/or personal health information (“PHI”) was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the cybersecurity incident that affected Ambulnz in or around April 2024 (“Security Incident”).

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i) Ambulnz, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

Settlement Class Members may submit a claim form for: (1) 1 year of credit monitoring; (2) Ordinary Loss Claims – up to a total of \$400 per claimant; (3) Lost Time - \$18.50 per hour for up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74); and (4) Extraordinary Loss Claims- up to a total of \$5,250 per claimant. Instead of these benefits, Class Members may submit a claim form for an Alternative Cash Benefit.

Credit Monitoring Services. All Settlement Class Members shall have the ability to make a claim for 1 year of credit monitoring services and identity protection services.

Ordinary Losses up to a total of \$400.00 per claimant, upon submission of a valid claim with supporting documentation for out-of-pocket losses incurred or spent between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of settlement is sent to the Settlement Class, including: i) Out of pocket expenses incurred as a result of the Security Incident, including unreimbursed bank fees, long distance phone and cell phone charges (only if charged by the minute), data charges (only if charged based on the amount of data used), postage or gasoline for local travel; and ii) fees for credit reports, credit monitoring or other identity theft insurance products purchased because of the Security Incident.

Lost Time Claims for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74) with an attestation on the Claim Form of the activities performed and that they were related to the Security Incident.

Extraordinary Losses up to a total of \$4,500.00 per Settlement Class Member in compensation on submission of a valid and timely claim form with supporting documentation and an attestation on the claim form for monetary losses that meet the following conditions: i) The loss is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss caused by (A) misuse of the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information or (B) fraud associated with the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information; ii) The loss noted in i.(A) or i.(B) was more likely than not caused by the Security Incident; iii) The loss occurred between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of settlement is sent to the Settlement Class; iv) The loss is not already covered by the Ordinary Loss or

QUESTIONS? VISIT **WWW. .COM** OR CALL TOLL-FREE 1-**XXX-XXX-XXXX**

Lost Time categories and the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all of the Settlement Class Member's credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance.

Alternative Cash Benefit. In lieu of the above benefits, Settlement Class Members may submit a claim for an Alternative Cash Benefit of: (1) \$30 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Drivers License Number were implicated in the Security Incident; or (2) \$10 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Drivers License Number were not implicated in the Security Incident. If you select this benefit, you will not be eligible for any other benefit of the settlement.

This Claim Form may be submitted electronically *via* the Settlement Website at [redacted] or completed and mailed, including any supporting documentation, to: *Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator*, [address].

I. SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBER NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION

Provide your name and contact information below. You must notify the Settlement Administrator if your contact information changes after you submit this Claim Form.

First Name

Last Name

Street Address

City

State

Zip Code

Email Address

Telephone Number

Notice ID Number, if known

II. ORDINARY LOSSES AND LOST TIME SELECTION

- Check this box if you are requesting compensation for **Ordinary Losses** up to a total of \$400.00. By checking this box, you are attesting the losses you incurred were a result of actual out-of-pocket losses related to the Security Incident.

***You must submit supporting documentation demonstrating actual, unreimbursed monetary loss.**

QUESTIONS? VISIT [WWW.\[redacted\].COM](http://WWW.[redacted].COM) OR CALL TOLL-FREE 1-[redacted]

Complete the chart below describing the supporting documentation you are submitting.

<i>Description of Documentation Provided</i>	<i>Amount</i>
<i>Example: Receipt for credit score repair services</i>	<i>\$100</i>
TOTAL AMOUNT CLAIMED	

III. LOST TIME SELECTION

Check this box if you spent time monitoring accounts or otherwise dealing with issues related to the Security Incident. You can submit a claim for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74).

<i>Description of Activity(ies) Performed</i>
<i>Example: Calling credit monitoring service</i>

By checking the box above, you are attesting the activities you performed were related to the Security Incident.

Indicate the number of hours spent: 1 Hour 2 Hours 3 Hours or 4 Hours

IV. EXTRAORDINARY LOSSES SELECTION

Check this box if you are requesting compensation for **Extraordinary Losses** up to a total of \$5,250.00. By checking this box, you are attesting the losses you incurred were a result of actual identity theft related
 QUESTIONS? VISIT WWW.FEDERALBUREAUOFINVESTIGATION.COM OR CALL TOLL-FREE 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

any other benefit of the settlement.

VIII. PAYMENT SELECTION

Please select **one** of the following payment options, which will be used should you be eligible to receive a Settlement payment:

PayPal - Enter your PayPal email address: _____

Venmo - Enter the mobile number associated with your Venmo account ----- _____

Zelle - Enter the mobile number or email address associated with your Zelle account:

Mobile Number: _____ - _____ - _____ or Email Address: _____

Virtual Prepaid Card - Enter your email address: _____

Physical Check - Payment will be mailed to the address provided in Section I above.

YOU WILL RECEIVE A VERIFICATION EMAIL REGARDING YOUR DIGITAL PAYMENT. YOU MUST VERIFY AND AUTHENTICATE YOUR PAYMENT INFORMATION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE A DIGITAL PAYMENT. IF YOU DO NOT VERIFY AND AUTHENTICATE YOUR INFORMATION, A PAPER CHECK WILL BE SENT TO YOU.

IX. ATTESTATION & SIGNATURE

I swear and affirm under the laws of the United States that the information I have supplied in this Claim Form is true and correct to the best of my recollection, and that this form was executed on the date set forth below. I understand my claim is subject to verification and that I may be asked to provide supplemental information by the Settlement Administrator before my claim is considered complete and valid.

Signature

Printed Name

Date

— EXHIBIT 4 —

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

MARIA BALLESTEROS, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMBULNZ NY, LLC,

Defendant.

NO. **XXXX-XXXXXX**-CA-01

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (**Doc. No. _**) (the “Motion”), the terms of which are set forth in a Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and Defendant Ambulnz NY, LLC (“Ambulnz,” and, together with Plaintiff, the “Parties”), with accompanying exhibits attached to Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law in Support of the Motion (the “Settlement Agreement”).¹

Having fully considered the issue, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the Motion and **ORDERS** as follows:

1. **Class Certification for Settlement Purposes Only.** The Settlement Agreement provides for a Settlement Class defined as follows:

All individuals residing in the United States whose PII and/or PHI was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i) Ambulnz, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii)

¹ All defined terms in this Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement (“Preliminary Approval Order”) have the same meaning as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, unless otherwise indicated.

any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge. Pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220(e), the Court finds giving notice to the Settlement Class is justified. The Court finds it will likely be able to approve the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court also finds it will likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of judgment on the Settlement because it meets all requirements of Rule 1.220.

Specifically, the Court provisionally finds for settlement purposes only that: (a) the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder of all Settlement Class Members would be impracticable; (b) there are issues of law and fact that are common to the Settlement Class; (c) the claims of the Settlement Class Representative are typical, and the Settlement Class Representative seeks similar relief as the claims of the Settlement Class Members; (d) the Settlement Class Representative will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Settlement Class; (e) questions of law or fact common to Settlement Class Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members; and (f) a class action and class settlement is superior to other methods available for a fair and efficient resolution of this Litigation.

2. **Settlement Class Representative and Settlement Class Counsel.** The Court finds that Plaintiff Maria Ballesteros will likely satisfy the requirements of Rule 1.220(a) and should be appointed as the Settlement Class Representative. Additionally, the Court finds Andrew Shamis of Shamis & Gentile, P.A. will likely satisfy the requirements of Rule 1.220(a) and should be appointed as Settlement Class Counsel.

3. **Preliminary Settlement Approval.** Upon preliminary review, the Court finds the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate to warrant providing notice of the Settlement to the

Settlement Class and accordingly the Settlement is preliminarily approved. In making this determination, the Court has considered the monetary and non-monetary benefits provided to the Settlement Class through the Settlement, the specific risks faced by the Settlement Class in prevailing on their claims, the good faith, arms' length negotiations between the Parties and absence of evidence of collusion in the Settlement, the effectiveness of the proposed method for notifying and distributing relief to the Settlement Class, the proposed manner of allocating benefits to Settlement Class Members, the equitable treatment of the Settlement Class Members under the Settlement, and all of the other factors required by Rule 1.220 and relevant case law.

4. **Jurisdiction.** The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Florida Stat. § 26.012 and § 86.011 and personal jurisdiction over the parties before it. Additionally, venue is proper in this District pursuant to Florida Stat. § 47.011 and § 47.051.

5. **Final Approval Hearing.** A Final Approval Hearing shall be held on _____, 202__, at [address/via zoom], where the Court will determine, among other things, whether: (a) the Settlement Class should be finally certified for settlement purposes; (b) the Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and finally approved; (c) this action should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement; (d) Settlement Class Members (who have not timely and validly excluded themselves from the Settlement) should be bound by the releases set forth in the Settlement Agreement; (e) the application of Settlement Class Counsel for an award of Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses should be approved; (f) the Action should be dismissed with prejudice; and (g) the application of the Settlement Class Representative for a Service Award should be approved.

6. **Settlement Administrator.** The Court appoints Epiq Class Actions & Claims Solutions, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator, with responsibility for class notice and

settlement administration. The Settlement Administrator is directed to perform all tasks the Settlement Agreement requires. The Settlement Administrator's fees will be paid pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

7. **Notice.** The proposed notice program set forth in the Settlement Agreement and the Notices and Claim Form attached to the Settlement Agreement as **Exhibits 1, 2, and 3** are hereby approved. Non-material modifications to these Exhibits consistent with this Order may be made by the Settlement Administrator in consultation and agreement with the Parties, and without further order of the Court.

8. **Findings Concerning Notice.** The Court finds that the proposed form, content, and method of giving Notice to the Settlement Class as described in the Settlement Agreement and its exhibits: (a) will constitute the best practicable notice to the Settlement Class; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the proposed Settlement, and their rights under the proposed Settlement, including, but not limited to, their rights to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement and to claim benefits provided under the terms of the Settlement Agreement; (c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members; (d) meet all applicable requirements of law, including Rule 1.220; and (e) meet the requirements of the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States and Florida Constitutions. The Court further finds that the Notice provided for in the Settlement Agreement is written in plain language, uses simple terminology, and is designed to be readily understandable by Settlement Class Members.

The Settlement Administrator is directed to carry out the Notice program in conformance with the Settlement Agreement.

9. **Exclusion from Class.** Any Settlement Class Member who wishes to be excluded

from the Settlement Class must individually sign and timely submit a written request to the designated address established by the Settlement Administrator in the manner provided in the Notice. The written request must clearly manifest a person's intent to be excluded from the Settlement Class, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and must be submitted individually, i.e., one request is required for every Settlement Class Member seeking exclusion. To be effective, such requests for exclusion must be postmarked no later than the Opt-Out Deadline, which is no later than sixty (60) days from the Notice Deadline, and as stated in the Notice.

Within seven (7) days after the Opt-Out Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall furnish to Class Counsel and to Defendant's Counsel a complete list of all timely and valid requests for exclusion.

If a Final Approval Order and Judgment is entered, all Persons falling within the definition of the Settlement Class who do not timely and validly request to be excluded from the Settlement Class shall be bound by the terms of this Settlement Agreement and the Final Approval Order and Judgment. All Persons who submit valid and timely requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class shall not receive any cash benefits of and/or be bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

10. **Objections and Appearances.** A Settlement Class Member (who does not submit a timely written request for exclusion) desiring to object to the Settlement Agreement may submit a timely written objection by the Objection Deadline and as stated in the Notice. The Notice shall instruct Settlement Class Members who wish to object to the Settlement Agreement to file their objections with the Court by the Objection Deadline. Any such objections to the Settlement Agreement must be written and must include all of the following: i) the name of the proceedings; (ii) the Settlement Class Member's full name and current mailing address; (iii) a statement that

states with specificity the grounds for the objection, as well as any documents supporting the objection; (iv) the identity of any attorneys representing the objector; (v) a statement regarding whether the Settlement Class Member (or his/her attorney) intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (vi) the signature of the Settlement Class Member or the Settlement Class Member's attorney.

To be timely, written notice of an objection must be filed with the Clerk of Court by the Objection Deadline, which is no later than sixty (60) days from the Notice Deadline.

Any Settlement Class Member who fails to comply with the requirements for objecting shall waive and forfeit any and all rights he or she may have to appear separately and/or to object to the Settlement Agreement, shall be bound by all the terms of the Settlement Agreement and by all proceedings, orders, and judgments in the Action, and shall be precluded from seeking any review of the Settlement Agreement and/or Final Approval Order and Judgment by appeal or other means. The provisions stated in the Settlement Agreement shall be the exclusive means for any challenge to the Settlement Agreement. Any challenge to the Settlement Agreement or the Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be pursuant to appeal under the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure and not through a collateral attack.

11. **Claims Process.** Settlement Class Counsel and Ambulnz have created a process for Settlement Class Members to claim benefits under the Settlement. The Court preliminarily approves this process and directs the Settlement Administrator to make the Claim Form or its substantial equivalent available to Settlement Class Members in the manner specified in the Notice.

The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for effectuating the claims process.

Settlement Class Members who qualify for and wish to submit a Claim Form shall do so in accordance with the requirement and procedures specified in the Notice and the Claim Form. If

the Final Approval Order and Judgment is entered, all Settlement Class Members who qualify for any benefit under the Settlement but fail to submit a claim in accordance with the requirements and procedures specified in the Notice and the Claim Form shall be forever barred from receiving any such benefit, but will in all other respects be subject to and bound by the provisions in the Final Approval Order and Judgment, including the releases contained therein

12. **Termination of Settlement.** This Preliminary Approval Order shall become null and void and shall be without prejudice to the rights of the Parties and of no force or effect if: (a) the Court does not enter this Preliminary Approval Order; (b) Settlement is not finally approved by the Court or is terminated in accordance with the Settlement Agreement; or (c) the Effective Date does not occur. In such event, (i) the Parties shall be restored to their respective positions in the Action prior to execution of the Settlement Agreement and shall jointly request all scheduled Action deadlines be reasonably extended by the Court to avoid prejudice to any Party or Party's counsel; (ii) the terms and provisions of the Settlement Agreement shall have no further force and effect with respect to the Parties and shall not be used in the Action or in any other proceeding for any purpose, and (iii) any judgment or order entered by the Court in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement shall be treated as vacated, *nunc pro tunc*.

13. **Use of Order.** This Preliminary Approval shall not be construed or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against Defendant of any fault, wrongdoing, breach, liability, or the propriety of certifying any class in the Action. Nor shall this Preliminary Approval Order be i) construed or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against the Class Representative or any other Settlement Class Member that his or her claims lack merit or that the relief requested is inappropriate, improper, unavailable, or ii) as a waiver by any Party of any defense or claims they may have in this Action or in any other lawsuit.

14. **Continuance of Hearing.** The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the Final Approval Hearing and related deadlines without further written notice to the Settlement Class. If the Court alters any of those dates or times, the revised dates and times shall be posted on the Settlement Website maintained by the Settlement Administrator. The Court may approve the Settlement, with such modifications as may be agreed upon by the Parties, if appropriate, without further notice to the Settlement Class.

15. **Stay of Litigation.** All proceedings in the Action, other than those related to approval of the Settlement Agreement, are hereby stayed. Further, any actions brought by Settlement Class Members concerning the Released Claims are hereby enjoined and stayed pending the Final Approval Hearing and the order issuing therefrom.

16. **Schedule and Deadlines.** The Court orders the following schedule of dates for the specified actions/further proceedings:

<u>Event</u>	<u>Deadline</u>
Defendant Provides Class Member Information To Claims Administrator	Within 15 Days Of Entry Of Preliminary Approval Order
Deadline For Claims Administrator To Begin Sending Short Form Notice (By First Class USPS Mail)	Within Thirty (30) Days Of Entry Of Preliminary Approval Order (“Notice Deadline”)
Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Service Award to Be Filed by Settlement Class Counsel	At Least 14 Days Prior To Opt-Out/Objection Dates
Opt-Out/Objection Date Deadlines	60 Days After Notice Deadline
Claims Administrator Provides Parties With List Of Timely, Valid Opt-Outs	7 Days After Opt-Out Dates
Claims Deadline	90 Days After Notice Deadline
Motion For Final Approval To Be Filed By Class Counsel	At Least 14 Days Prior To Final Approval Hearing

Final Approval Hearing	[COURT TO ENTER DATE AND TIME] No Earlier Than 120 Days After Entry Of Preliminary Approval Order
------------------------	---

IT IS SO ORDERED

EXHIBIT B

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL
CIRCUIT IN AND FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

CASE NO: 2025-005051-CA-01

SECTION: CA11

JUDGE: Spencer Eig

Maria Ballesteros

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Ambulnz NY, LLC

Defendant(s)

**DECLARATION OF CAMERON R. AZARI, ESQ. ON 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.

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 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 team 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 hundreds of 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 *Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC*, Case No. 2025-005051-CA-01 currently pending in the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida. Epiq designed this Notice Program based on our extensive prior experience and research into the notice issues particular to this Settlement. We designed and implemented a notice program that was directed by the Court under the circumstances to provide notice to the Settlement Class Members.

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 as implemented satisfied these requirements.

19. The Notice Program as designed and implemented reached the greatest practicable number of identified Settlement Class Members with individual notice. With the address updating protocols that were used, the Notice Program individual notice efforts reached approximately 90% of the identified Settlement Class. The reach was further enhanced by a digital internet notice program (digital and social media notice) and a Settlement Website. In my experience, the reach of the Notice Program was consistent with other court-approved notice plans, was the best method practicable under the circumstances, and satisfied the requirements of due process, including its “desire to actually inform” requirement.²

NOTICE PROGRAM DETAIL

20. On May 2, 2025, the Court approved the Notice Program and appointed Epiq as the Settlement Administrator in the *Agreed Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement* (“Preliminary Approval Order”). In the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court approved and certified, for settlement purposes, the following “Settlement Class”:

All individuals residing in the United States whose PII and/or PHI was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.³

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i) Ambulnz, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

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 . . .”).

³ The April 2024 cybersecurity incident that is the subject matter of the Action.

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

Individual Notice

22. On May 8, 2025, Epiq received two data files containing 73,245 records for identified Settlement Class Members, including names and current or last known addresses, if available (“Settlement Class List”). Epiq deduplicated and rolled-up the records and loaded the unique, identified Settlement Class Member records into its database. These efforts resulted in 69,841 unique, identified Settlement Class Member records. A double Postcard Notice with an address updater form (“Postcard Notice”) was sent via United States Postal Service (“USPS”) first-class mail to all identified Settlement Class Members with an associated physical address.

Individual Notice – Direct Mail

23. On June 16, 2025, Epiq commenced sending 63,797 Postcard Notices to identified Settlement Class Members for whom an associated physical mailing address was available. Of the total Class, 6,044 records had incomplete or invalid physical addresses and were not sent a Postcard Notice. As a result, these records were specifically targeted with digital noticing using a “list activation” strategy via *Google Display Network*, *Facebook*, and *Instagram* described more in detail below. The Postcard Notices were sent via USPS first-class mail. The Postcard Notices clearly and concisely described the Settlement and the legal rights of the Settlement Class Members. Additionally, the Postcard Notices directed Settlement Class Members to visit the Settlement Website for additional information. The Postcard Notice is included as **Attachment 2**.

24. Prior to sending the Postcard Notices, all mailing addresses were checked against the National Change of Address (“NCOA”) database maintained by the USPS to ensure all address information was up-to-date and accurately formatted for mailing.⁴ In addition, the addresses were

⁴ The NCOA database is maintained by the USPS and consists of approximately 160 million permanent change-of-address (COA) records consisting of names and addresses of individuals,

certified via the Coding Accuracy Support System (“CASS”) to ensure the quality of the zip code and verified through Delivery Point Validation (“DPV”) to verify the accuracy of the addresses. This address updating process is standard for the industry and for the majority of promotional mailings that occur today.

25. The return address on the Postcard Notices is a post office box that Epiq maintains for this Settlement. The USPS automatically forwarded Postcard Notices with an available forwarding address order that has not expired (“Postal Forwards”). Postcard Notices returned as undeliverable were re-mailed to any new address available through USPS information, (for example, to the address provided by the USPS on returned mail pieces for which the automatic forwarding order has expired but is still within the time period in which the USPS returned the piece with the address indicated), or to better addresses that are found using a third-party address lookup service. Upon successfully locating better addresses, Postcard Notices were promptly remailed. As of August 5, 2025, Epiq has remailed 4,315 Postcard Notices.

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 August 5, 2025, Epiq mailed 47 Claim Packages as a result of such requests. The Long Form Notice is included as **Attachment 3**. The Claim Form is included as **Attachment 4**.

Media Plan

Internet Digital Notice Campaign

27. Internet advertising has become a standard component in legal notice programs. The internet has proven to be an efficient and cost-effective method to target class members as

families, and businesses who have filed a change-of-address with the Postal Service™. The address information is maintained on the database for 48 months and reduces undeliverable mail by providing the most current address information, including standardized and delivery-point-coded addresses, for matches made to the NCOA file for individual, family, and business moves.

part of providing notice of class certification and/or a settlement for a class action case. According to MRI-Simmons⁵ data, 97% of all adults are online and 84% of all adults use social media.⁶

28. The Notice Program included targeted digital noticing using a “list activation” strategy via *Google Display Network*, *Facebook*, and *Instagram*. This was accomplished by matching the full names for identified Settlement Class Members without a complete or valid physical mailing address with current consumer profiles. This strategy allowed for targeting digital noticing directly to specific individuals.

29. For the list activation Digital Notice efforts, *Google*, *Facebook*, and *Instagram* matched 7,891 records with a unique consumer profile within their databases for the 6,044 Settlement Class Member records with an incomplete or invalid physical address (since there were only names being matched, the match total is larger than the 6,044 names on the list due to people with the same name being matched). Digital Notices were served to 7,122 of these matched records. It is typical that Digital Notices cannot be served to all list activation matches due to a combination of factors such as technical configurations, subscriber engagement levels i.e. targeted individuals not using social media platforms, search, etc. regularly or at all during the prior 30 days, or because they opted out of ad personalization.

30. The Digital Notices linked directly to the Settlement Website, thereby allowing visitors easy access to relevant information and documents. Consistent with common practice, the Digital Notices used language from the Long Form Notice headline, which allowed users to identify themselves as potential members of the Settlement Class. All Digital Notices appeared

⁵ 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.

⁶ MRI-Simmons 2024 Survey of the American Consumer®.

on desktop, mobile, and tablet devices. Digital Notices were targeted nationwide to reach Settlement Class Members. Digital Notices were also targeted (remarketed) to people who clicked on a Digital Notice.

31. More details regarding the target audiences, specific ad sizes of the Digital Notices, and the number of delivered impressions are included in the following table:

Network/Property	Target	Ad Size	Delivered Impressions
<i>Google Display Network</i>	Targeted List Activation Data Match	728x90, 300x250, 300x600 & 970x250	417,930
<i>Facebook</i>	Targeted List Activation Match	Newsfeed & Right Hand Column	268,670
<i>Instagram</i>	Targeted List Activation Match	Instagram Feed Ads	263,330
TOTAL			949,930

32. Combined, 949,930 impressions were generated by the Digital Notices, which were targeted nationwide. The Digital Notices ran from June 16, 2025, through July 15, 2025.⁷ Clicking on the Digital Notices linked the readers to the Settlement Website, where they could easily obtain detailed information about the Settlement. Examples of the Digital Notices are included as **Attachment 5**.

Settlement Website

33. On June 13, 2025, Epiq established a dedicated website for the Settlement with an easy to remember domain name (www.AmbulnzSettlement.com). Relevant documents are posted on the Settlement website, including the Long Form Notice, Claim Form, Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, Preliminary Approval Order, and Complaint. In addition, the Settlement Website includes relevant dates, answers to frequently asked questions (“FAQs”), instructions for how Settlement Class Members are able to opt-out

⁷ The third-party ad management platform, ClickCease was used to audit the 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.).

(request exclusion) from or object to the Settlement, contact information for the Settlement Administrator, and how to obtain other case-related information. Settlement Class Members are also able to submit a Claim Form on the Settlement Website. The Settlement Website address was prominently displayed in all notice documents. As of August 5, 2025, there have been 2,407 unique visitor sessions to the Settlement Website, and 5,672 web pages have been presented.

Toll-Free Telephone Number

34. On June 13, 2025, a toll-free telephone number (1-888-867-7175) 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 August 5, 2025, there have been 209 calls to the toll-free telephone number representing 477 minutes of use.

35. 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.

Requests to Opt-Out and Objections

36. The deadline to opt out or object to the Settlement is August 15, 2025. As of August 5, 2025, Epiq has received one request to opt out. As of August 5, 2025, Epiq is aware of no objections to the Settlement.

Claim Submissions and Distribution Options

37. The Notices provided a detailed summary of the relevant information about the Settlement, including the Settlement Website address and how Settlement Class Members can submit a Claim Form online or by mail.

38. The deadline for Settlement Class Members to submit a Claim Form is September 15, 2025. As of August 5, 2025, Epiq has received 359 Claim Forms (328 online and 31 paper). Since the Claims Deadline has not yet passed, these numbers are preliminary. As standard practice,

Epiq is in the process of conducting a complete quality control review of Claim Forms received. There is a likelihood that after detailed review, the total number of Claim Forms received will change due to duplicate and denied Claim Forms.

CONCLUSION

39. 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 program be designed to reach the greatest practicable number of potential settlement 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 settlement class members in any way. All of these requirements were met in this case.

40. The Notice Program included individual notice via USPS first-class mail to identified Settlement Class Members. With the address updating protocols that were used, the Notice Program individual notice efforts reached approximately 90% of the identified Settlement Class. The reach was further enhanced by a digital internet notice program (digital and social media notice), and a Settlement Website. In 2010, the Federal Judicial Center (“FJC”) issued a *Judges’ Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide*, which is relied upon for federal cases, and is illustrative for state court. This guide states that, “the lynchpin in an objective determination of the adequacy of a proposed notice effort is whether all the notice efforts together will reach a high percentage of the class. It is reasonable to reach between 70–95%.”⁸ Here, we have developed and implemented a Notice Program that readily achieved a reach within that standard.

41. The Notice Program followed the guidance for satisfying due process obligations that a notice expert gleans from the United States Supreme Court’s seminal decisions, which

⁸ FED. JUDICIAL CTR, JUDGES’ CLASS ACTION NOTICE AND CLAIMS PROCESS CHECKLIST AND PLAIN LANGUAGE GUIDE 3 (2010), available at <https://www.fjc.gov/content/judges-class-action-notice-and-claims-process-checklist-and-plain-language-guide-0>.


emphasize the need: (a) to endeavor to actually inform the Settlement Class, and (b) to ensure that notice is reasonably calculated to do so:

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

42. The Notice Program conformed to all aspects of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 regarding notice and comported with the guidance for effective notice set out in the Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth.

43. The Notice Program schedule afforded sufficient time to provide full and proper 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 on August 7, 2025, at Beaverton, Oregon.



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

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.

\$63M
settlement

758M
digital impressions

85%
of class reached

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 [T] notice methodology implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order: (a) constituted methods that were reasonably calculated to inform the members of the Settlement Class of the Settlement and their rights thereunder; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the litigation, their right to object to the Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (c) were reasonable and constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (d) met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any other applicable law.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr., *In re fairlife Milk Products Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (Sept. 28, 2022) MDL No. 2909, 1:19-cv-03924 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice Program implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Order preliminarily approving the Settlement ... (i) constituted the best practicable notice, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, of their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, and of their right to seek monetary and other relief, (iii) constituted reasonable, due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and (iv) met all applicable requirements of due process and any other applicable law.

Judge Ethan P. Schulman, *Rodan & Fields LLC; Gorzo et al. v. Rodan & Fields, LLC* (Sept. 28, 2022) CJC-18-004981, CIVDS 1723435 & CGC-18-565628 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of San Bernadino, Cal. & Sup. Ct. Cnty. of San Francisco, Cal.):

The Court finds the Full Notice, Email Notice, Postcard Notice, and Notice of Opt-Out (collectively, the "Notice Packet") and its distribution to Class Members have been implemented pursuant to the Agreement and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court also finds the Notice Packet: a) Constitutes notice reasonably calculated to apprise Class Members of: (i) the pendency of the class action lawsuit; (ii) the material terms and provisions of the Settlement and their rights; (iii) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement; (iv) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement; (v) their right to claim a Settlement Benefit; (vi) their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (vii) the binding effect of the orders and judgment in the class action lawsuit on all Participating Class Members; b) Constitutes notice that fully satisfied the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Rules of Court, rule 3.769, and due process; c) Constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of the class action lawsuit; and d) Constitutes reasonable, adequate, and sufficient notice to Class Members.

Judge Anthony J. Trenga, *In re Capital One Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Sept. 13, 2022) MDL No. 1:19-md-2915, 1:19-cv-02915 (E.D. Va.):

Pursuant to the Court's direction, the Claims Administrator appointed by the Court implemented a robust notice program ... The Notice Plan has been successfully implemented and reached approximately 96 percent of the Settlement Class by the individual notice efforts alone.... Targeted internet advertising and extensive news coverage enhanced public awareness of the Settlement.

The Court finds that the Notice Program has been implemented by the Settlement Administrator and the Parties in accordance with the requirements of the Settlement Agreement, and that such Notice Program, including the utilized forms of Notice, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies due process and the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court finds that the Settlement Administrator and Parties have complied with the directives of the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Directing Notice of Proposed Settlement and the Court reaffirms its findings concerning notice

Judge Evelio Grillo, *Asetine v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.* (Sept. 13, 2022) RG21088118 (Cir. Ct. Cal. Alameda Cnty.):

The proposed class notice form and procedure are adequate. The email notice is appropriate given the amount at issue for each member of the class.

Judge David S. Cunningham, *Muransky et al. v. The Cheesecake Factory et al.* (Sept. 9, 2022) 19 stcv 43875 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Los Angeles):

The record shows that Class Notice has been given to the Settlement Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that such Class Notice: (i) constitutes reasonable and the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the terms of the Agreement and the Class Settlement set forth in the Agreement ("Class Settlement"), and the right of Settlement Class Members to object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement Class and appear at the Fairness Hearing held on May 20, 2022; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all person or entities entitled to

Judicial Quotes

receive notice; and (iv) meets the requirements of due process, California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, and California Rules of Court, Rules 3.760-3.771.

Judge Steven E. McCullough, *Fallis et al. v. Gate City Bank* (Sept. 9, 2022) 09-2019-cv-04007 (East Cent. Dist. Ct. Cass Cnty. N.D.):

The Courts finds that the distribution of the Notices and the Notice Program were properly implemented in accordance with N.D. R. Civ. P. 23, the terms of the Agreement, and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court further finds that the Notice was simply written and readily understandable and that the Notice (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (b) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Classes of the Agreement and their right to exclude themselves or object to the Agreement and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (c) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (d) meets all applicable requirements of North Dakota law and any other applicable law and due process requirements.

Judge Susan N. Burke, *Mayo v. Affinity Plus Federal Credit Union* (Aug. 29, 2022) 27-cv-20-11786 (4th Jud. Dist. Ct. Minn.):

The Court finds that Notice to the Settlement Class was the best notice practicable and complied with the requirements of Due Process, and that the Notice Program was completed in compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order and the Agreement.

Judge Paul A. Engelmayer, *In re Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation* (Aug. 5, 2022) 1:20-cv-05914 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the emailed and mailed notice, publication notice, website, and Class Notice plan implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Judge Analisa Torres' Preliminary Approval Order: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to appraise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of this Action, of the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder), of their right to exclude themselves from or object to the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, of the Claims Process, and of Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees, for reimbursement of expenses associated with the Action, and any Service Award; (d) provided a full and fair opportunity to all Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the foregoing matters; (e) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (f) met all applicable requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, including the Due Process Clause, and any other applicable rules of law.

Judge Denise Page Hood, *Bleachtech L.L.C. v. United Parcel Service Co.* (July 20, 2022) 14-cv-12719 (E.D. Mich.):

The Settlement Class Notice Program, consisting of, among other things, the Publication Notice, Long Form Notice, website, and toll-free telephone number, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution, which include the requirement of due process.

Judge Robert E. Payne, *Skochin et al. v. Genworth Life Insurance Company et al.* (June 29, 2022) 3:21-cv-00019 (E.D. Va.):

The Court finds that the plan to disseminate the Class Notice and Publication Notice the Court previously approved has been implemented and satisfies the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process. The Class Notice, which the Court approved, clearly defined the Class and explained the rights and obligations of the Class Members. The Class Notice explained how to obtain benefits under the Settlement, and how to contact Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator. The Court appointed Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. ("Epiq") to fulfill the Settlement Administrator duties and disseminate the Class Notice and Publication Notice. The Class Notice and Publication Notice permitted Class Members to access information and documents about the case to inform their decision about whether to opt out of or object to the Settlement.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Fernando M. Olguin, *Johnson v. Moss Bros. Auto Group, Inc. et al.* (June 24, 2022) 5:19-cv-02456 (C.D. Cal.):

Here, after undertaking the required examination, the court approved the form of the proposed class notice. (See Dkt. 125, PAO at 18-21). As discussed above, the notice program was implemented by Epiq. (Dkt. 137-3, Azari Decl. at ¶¶ 15-23 & Exhs. 3-4 (Class Notice)). Accordingly, based on the record and its prior findings, the court finds that the class notice and the notice process fairly and adequately informed the class members of the nature of the action, the terms of the proposed settlement, the effect of the action and release of claims, the class members' right to exclude themselves from the action, and their right to object to the proposed settlement....

Judge Harvey E. Schlesinger, *Beiswinger v. West Shore Home, LLC* (May 25, 2022) 3:20-cv-01286 (M.D. Fla.):

The Notice and the Notice Plan implemented pursuant to the Agreement (1) constitute the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (2) constitute notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Litigation, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (3) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (4) meet all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court.

Judge Scott Kording, *Jackson v. UKG Inc., f/k/a The Ultimate Software Group, Inc.* (May 20, 2022) 2020L0000031 (Cir. Ct. of McLean Cnty., Ill.):

The Court has determined that the Notice given to the Settlement Class Members, in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order, fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of 735 ILCS 5/2-803, applicable law, and the Due Process Clauses of the U.S. Constitution and Illinois Constitution.

Judge Denise J. Casper, *Breda v. Celco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* (May 2, 2022) 1:16-cv-11512 (D. Mass.):

The Court hereby finds Notice of Settlement was disseminated to persons in the Settlement Class in accordance with the Court's preliminary approval order, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that the Notice satisfied Rule 23 and due process.

Judge William H. Orrick, *Maldonado et al. v. Apple Inc. et al.* (Apr. 29, 2022) 3:16-cv-04067 (N.D. Cal.):

[N]otice of the Class Settlement to the Certified Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice satisfied due process and provided adequate information to the Certified Class of all matters relating to the Class Settlement, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e)(1).

Judge Laurel Beeler, *In re Zoom Video Communications, Inc. Privacy Litigation* (Apr. 21, 2022) 20-cv-02155 (N.D. Cal.):

Between November 19, 2021, and January 3, 2022, notice was sent to 158,203,160 class members by email (including reminder emails to those who did not submit a claim form) and 189,003 by mail. Of the emailed notices, 14,303,749 were undeliverable, and of that group, Epiq mailed notice to 296,592 class members for whom a physical address was available. Of the mailed notices, efforts were made to ensure address accuracy and currency, and as of March 10, 2022, 11,543 were undeliverable. In total, as of March 10, 2022, notice was accomplished for 144,242,901 class members, or 91% of the total. Additional notice efforts were made by newspaper ... social media, sponsored search, an informational release, and a Settlement Website. Epiq and Class Counsel also complied with the court's prior request that best practices related to the security of class member data be implemented.

[T]he Settlement Administrator provided notice to the class in the form the court approved previously. The notice met all legal prerequisites: it was the best notice practicable, satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2), adequately advised class members of their rights under the settlement agreement, met the requirements of due process, and complied with the court's order regarding court notice. The forms of notice fairly, plainly, accurately, and reasonably provided class members with all required information

Judicial Quotes

Judge Federico A. Moreno, *In re Takata Airbag Products Liability Litigation (Volkswagen)* (Mar. 28, 2022) MDL No. 2599 (S.D. Fla.):

[T]he Court finds that the Class Notice has been given to the Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order ... The Court finds that such Class Notice: (i) is reasonable and constitutes the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action and the terms of the Settlement Agreement, their right to exclude themselves from the Class or to object to all or any part of the Settlement Agreement, their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense) and the binding effect of the orders and Final Order and Final Judgment in the Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons and entities who or which do not exclude themselves from the Class; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), FED. R. CIV. P. 23 and any other applicable law as well as complying with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judge James Donato, *Pennington et al. v. Tetra Tech, Inc. et al.* (Mar. 28, 2022) 3:18-cv-05330 (N.D. Cal.):

On the Rule 23(e)(1) notice requirement, the Court approved the parties' notice plan, which included postcard notice, email notice, and a settlement website. Dkt. No. 154. The individual notice efforts reached an impressive 100% of the identified settlement class. Dkt. No. 200-223. The Court finds that notice was provided in the best practicable manner to class members who will be bound by the proposal. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1).

Judge Edward J. Davila, *Cochran et al. v. The Kroger Co. et al.* (Mar. 24, 2022) 5:21-cv-01887 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notices: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that is appropriate, in a manner, content, and format reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members ...; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Constitution of the United (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable laws and rules.

Judge Sunshine Sykes, *In re Renovate America Finance Cases* (Mar. 4, 2022) RICJCCP4940 (Sup. Ct. of Cal., Riverside Cnty.):

The Court finds that notice previously given to Class Members in the Action was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies the requirements of due process ...The Court further finds that, because (a) adequate notice has been provided to all Class Members and (b) all Class Members have been given the opportunity to object to, and/or request exclusion from, the Settlement, the Court has jurisdiction over all Class Members.

Judge David O. Carter, *Fernandez v. Rushmore Loan Management Services LLC* (Feb. 14, 2022) 8:21-cv-00621 (C. D. Cal.):

Notice was sent to potential Class Members pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the method approved by the Court. The Class Notice adequately describes the litigation and the scope of the involved Class. Further, the Class Notice explained the amount of the Settlement Fund, the plan of allocation, that Plaintiff's counsel and Plaintiff will apply for attorneys' fees, costs, and a service award, and the Class Members' option to participate, opt out, or object to the Settlement. The Class Notice consisted of direct notice via USPS, as well as a Settlement Website where Class Members could view the Long Form Notice.

Judge Otis D. Wright, II, *In re Toll Roads Litigation* (Feb. 11, 2022) 8:16-cv-00262 (C. D. Cal.):

The Class Administrator provided notice to members of the Settlement Classes in compliance with the Agreements, due process, and Rule 23. The notice: (i) fully and accurately informed class members about the lawsuit and settlements; (ii) provided sufficient information so that class members were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the proposed settlements; (iii) provided procedures for class members to file written objections to the proposed settlements, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed settlements; and (iv) provided the time, date, and place of the final fairness hearing. The Court finds that the Notice provided to the Classes

Judicial Quotes

pursuant to the Settlement Agreements and the Preliminary Approval Order and consisting of individual direct postcard and email notice, publication notice, settlement website, and CAFA notice has been successful and (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to the Settlements or exclude themselves from the Classes, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) otherwise met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court.

Judge Virginia M. Kendall, *In re Turkey Antitrust Litigations (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' Action) Sandee's Bakery d/b/a Sandee's Catering Bakery & Deli et al. v. Agri Stats, Inc.* (Feb. 10, 2022) 1:19-cv-08318 (N.D. Ill.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class, including individual notice all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable efforts, was the most effective and practicable under the circumstances. This notice provided due and sufficient notice of proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and this notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge Beth Labson Freeman, *Ford et al. v. [24]7.ai, Inc.* (Jan. 28, 2022) 5:18-cv-02770 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the manner and form of notice (the "Notice Program") set forth in the Settlement Agreement was provided to Settlement Class Members. The Court finds that the Notice Program, as implemented, was the best practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Program was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, class certification, the terms of the Settlement, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class and object to the Settlement, Class Counsel's fee request, and the request for Service Award for Plaintiffs. The Notice and notice program constituted sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Notice and notice program satisfy all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the constitutional requirement of due process.

Judge Terrence W. Boyle, *Abramson et al. v. Safe Streets USA LLC et al.* (Jan. 12, 2022) 5:19-cv-00394 (E.D.N.C.):

Notice was provided to Settlement Class Members in compliance with Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement, due process, and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The notice: (a) fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members about the Actions and Settlement Agreement; (b) provided sufficient information so that Settlement Class Members could decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the settlement; (c) provided procedures for Settlement Class Members to submit written objections to the proposed settlement, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed settlement; and (d) provided the time, date, and place of the Final Approval Hearing.

Judge Joan B. Gottschall, *Mercado et al. v. Verde Energy USA, Inc.* (Dec. 17, 2021) 1:18-cv-02068 (N.D. Ill.):

Epiq mailed and emailed notice to the Class on October 1, 2021. Therefore, direct notice was sent and delivered successfully to the vast majority of Class Members. The Class Notice, together with all included and ancillary documents thereto, complied with all the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and fairly, accurately, and reasonably informed members of the Class of: (a) appropriate information about the nature of this Litigation, including the class claims, issues, and defenses, and the essential terms of the Settlement Agreement; (b) the definition of the Class; (c) appropriate information about, and means for obtaining additional information regarding, the lawsuit and the Settlement Agreement; (d) appropriate information about, and means for obtaining and submitting, a claim; (e) appropriate information about the right of Class Members to appear through an attorney, as well as the time, manner, and effect of excluding themselves from the Settlement, objecting to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, or objecting to Lead and Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and costs, and the procedures to do so; (f) appropriate information about the consequences of failing to submit a claim or failing to comply with the procedures and deadline for requesting exclusion from, or objecting to, the Settlement; and (g) the binding effect of a class judgment on Class Members under Rule 23(c)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Judicial Quotes

The Court finds that Class Members have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice fully satisfies all requirements of applicable laws and due process.

Judge Patricia M. Lucas, *Wallace v. Wells Fargo* (Nov. 24, 2021) 17CV317775 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of Santa Clara):

On August 29, 2021, a dedicated website was established for the settlement at which class members can obtain detailed information about the case and review key documents, including the long form notice, postcard notice, settlement agreement, complaint, motion for preliminary approval . . . As of October 18, 2021, there were 2,639 visitors to the website and 4,428 website pages presented.

On August 30, 2021, a toll-free telephone number was established to allow class members to call for additional information in English or Spanish, listen to answers to frequently asked questions, and request that a long form notice be mailed to them . . . As of October 18, 2021, the telephone number handled 345 calls, representing 1,207 minutes of use, and the settlement administrator mailed 30 long form notices as a result of requests made via the telephone number.

Also, on August 30, 2021, individual postcard notices were mailed to 177,817 class members . . . As of November 10, 2021, 169,404 of those class members successfully received notice.

Judge John R. Tunheim, *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff Action)* (JBS USA Food Company, JBS USA Food Company Holdings) (Nov. 18, 2021) 18-cv-01776 (D. Minn.):

The notice given to the Settlement Class, including individual notice to all members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable effort, was the most effective and practicable under the circumstances. This notice provided due and sufficient notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and this notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

Judge H. Russel Holland, *Coleman v. Alaska USA Federal Credit Union* (Nov. 17, 2021) 3:19-cv-00229 (D. Alaska):

The Court approved Notice Program has been fully implemented. The Court finds that the Notices given to the Settlement Class fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and constituted valid, due, and sufficient Notice to Settlement Class Members consistent with all applicable requirements. The Court further finds that the Notice Program satisfies due process.

Judge A. Graham Shirley, *Zanca et al. v. Epic Games, Inc.* (Nov. 16, 2021) 21-CVS-534 (Sup. Ct. Wake Cnty., N.C.):

Notice has been provided to all members of the Settlement Class pursuant to and in the manner directed by the Preliminary Approval Order. The Notice Plan was properly administered by a highly experienced third-party Settlement Administrator. Proof of the provision of that Notice has been filed with the Court and full opportunity to be heard has been offered to all Parties to the Action, the Settlement Class, and all persons in interest. The form and manner of the Notice is hereby determined to have been the best notice practicable under the circumstances and to have been given full compliance with each of the requirements of North Carolina Rule of Civil Procedure 23, due process, and applicable law.

Judge Judith E. Levy, *In re Flint Water Cases* (Nov. 10, 2021) 5:16-cv-10444 (E.D. Mich.):

(1) a “Long Form Notice packet [was] mailed to each Settlement Class member ... a list of over 57,000 addresses— [and] over 90% of [the mailings] resulted in successful delivery;” (2) notices were emailed “to addresses that could be determined for Settlement Class members;” and (3) the “Notice Administrator implemented a comprehensive media notice campaign.” ... The media campaign coupled with the mailing was intended to reach the relevant audience in several ways and at several times so that the class members would be fully informed about the settlement and the registration and objection process.

The media campaign included publication in the local newspaper . . . local digital banners . . . television . . . and radio spots . . . banner notices and radio ads placed on Pandora and SoundCloud; and video ads placed on YouTube . . . [T]his settlement has received widespread media attention from major news outlets nationwide.

Plaintiffs submitted an affidavit signed by Azari that details the implementation of the Notice plan The affidavit is bolstered by several documents attached to it, such as the declaration of Epiq Class Action and Claims Solutions, Inc.’s Legal Notice Manager, Stephanie J. Fiereck. Azari declared that Epiq “delivered individual notice

Judicial Quotes

to approximately 91.5% of the identified Settlement Class” and that the media notice brought the overall notice effort to “in excess of 95%.” The Court finds that the notice plan was implemented in an appropriate manner.

In conclusion, the Court finds that the Notice Plan as implemented, and its content, satisfies due process.

Judge Vince Chhabria, Yamagata et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC (Oct. 28, 2021) 3:17-cv-03529 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court directed that Class Notice be given to the Class Members pursuant to the notice program proposed by the Parties and approved by the Court. In accordance with the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order and the Court-approved notice program, the Settlement Administrator caused the forms of Class Notice to be disseminated as ordered. The Long-form Class Notice advised Class Members of the terms of the Settlement Agreement; the Final Approval Hearing, and their right to appear at such hearing; their rights to remain in, or opt out of, the Settlement Class and to object to the Settlement Agreement; procedures for exercising such rights; and the binding effect of this Order and accompanying Final Judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, to the Settlement Class.

The distribution of the Class Notice pursuant to the Class Notice Program constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the requirements of due process, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and any other applicable law.

Judge Otis D. Wright, II, Silveira v. M&T Bank (Oct. 12, 2021) 2:19-cv-06958 (C.D. Cal.):

Notice was sent to potential class members pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the method approved by the Court. The Class Notice consisted of direct notice via USPS first class mail, as well as a Settlement Website where Class Members could view and request to be sent the Long Form Notice. The Class Notice adequately described the litigation and the scope of the involved class. Further, the Class Notice explained the amount of the Settlement Fund, the plan of allocation, that Plaintiff’s counsel and Plaintiff will apply for attorneys’ fees, costs, and a service award, and the class members’ option to participate, opt out, or object to the settlement.

Judge Timothy J. Korrigan, Smith v. Costa Del Mar, Inc. (Sept. 21, 2021) 3:18-cv-01011 (M.D. Fla.):

Following preliminary approval, the settlement administrator carried out the notice program The settlement administrator sent a summary notice and long-form notice to all class members, sent CAFA notice to federal and state officials ... and established a website with comprehensive information about the settlement Email notice was sent to class members with email addresses, and postcards were sent to class members with only physical addresses Multiple attempts were made to contact class members in some cases, and all notices directed recipients to a website where they could access settlement information A paid online media plan was implemented for class members for whom the settlement administrator did not have data When the notice program was complete, the settlement administrator submitted a declaration stating that the notice and paid media plan reached at least seventy percent of potential class members [N]otices had been delivered via postcards or email to 939,400 of the 939,479 class members to whom the settlement administrator sent notice—a ninety-nine and a half percent deliverable rate....

Notice was disseminated in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) requires that notice be “the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances.” Upon review of the notice materials ... and of Azari’s Declaration ... regarding the notice program, the Court is satisfied with the way in which the notice program was carried out. Class notice fully complied with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and was sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice of the settlement of this lawsuit.

Judge Jose E. Martinez, Kukorinis v. Walmart, Inc. (Sept. 20, 2021) 1:19-cv-20592 (S.D. Fla.):

[T]he Court approved the appointment of Epiq Class Action and Claims Solutions, Inc. as the Claims Administrator with the responsibility of implementing the notice requirements approved in the Court’s Order of Approval The media plan included various forms of notice, utilizing national consumer print publications, internet banner advertising, social media, sponsored search, and a national informational release According to the Azari Declaration, the Court-approved Notice reached approximately seventy-five percent (75%) of the Settlement Class on an average of 3.5 times per Class Member

Pertinently, the Claims Administrator implemented digital banner notices across certain social media platforms, including Facebook and Instagram, which linked directly to the Settlement Website ... the digital banner notices generated approximately 522.6 million adult impressions online [T]he Court finds that notice was “reasonably

Judicial Quotes

calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.”

Judge Steven L. Tiscione, *Fiore et al. v. Ingenious Designs, LLC* (Sept. 10, 2021) 1:18-cv-07124 (E.D.N.Y.):

Following the Court’s Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, the Notice Plan was effectuated by the Parties and the appointed Claims Administrator, Epiq Systems. The Notice Plan included a direct mailing to Class members who could be specifically identified, as well as nationwide notice by publication, social media and retailer displays and posters. The Notice Plan also included the establishment of an informational website and toll-free telephone number. The Court finds the Parties completed all settlement notice obligations imposed in the Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement. In addition, Defendants through the Class Administrator, sent the requisite CAFA notices to 57 federal and state officials. The class notices constitute “the best notice practicable under the circumstances,” as required by Rule 23(c)(2).

Judge John S. Meyer, *Lozano v. CodeMetro, Inc.* (Sept. 8, 2021) 37-2020-00022701 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Diego):

The Court finds that Notice has been given to the Settlement Class in the manner directed by the Court in the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that such Notice: (i) was reasonable and constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, the terms of the Settlement, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or object to all or any part of the Settlement, their right to appear at the Final Fairness Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of final approval of the Settlement on all persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iii) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and (iv) fully satisfied the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and any other applicable law.

Judge Mae A. D’Agostino, *Thompson et al. v. Community Bank, N.A.* (Sept. 8, 2021) 8:19-cv-0919 (N.D.N.Y.):

Prior to distributing Notice to the Settlement Class members, the Settlement Administrator established a website, ... as well as a toll-free line that Settlement Class members could access or call for any questions or additional information about the proposed Settlement, including the Long Form Notice. Once Settlement Class members were identified via Defendant’s business records, the Notices attached to the Agreement and approved by the Court were sent to each Settlement Class member. For Current Account Holders who have elected to receive bank communications via email, Email Notice was delivered. To Past Defendant Account Holders, and Current Account Holders who have not elected to receive communications by email or for whom the Defendant does not have a valid email address, Postcard Notice was delivered by U.S. Mail. The Settlement Administrator mailed 36,012 Postcard Notices and sent 16,834 Email Notices to the Settlement Class, and as a result of the Notice Program, 95% of the Settlement Class received Notice of the Settlement.

Judge Anne-Christine Massullo, *UFCW & Employers Benefit Trust v. Sutter Health et al.* (Aug. 27, 2021) CGC 14-538451 consolidated with CGC-18-565398 (Sup. Ct. Cnty. of San Francisco, Cal.):

The notice of the Settlement provided to the Class constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice and the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and meets the requirements of due process, the laws of the State of California, and Rule 3.769(f) of the California Rules of Court.

Judge Graham C. Mullen, *In re Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. et al.* (July 27, 2021) 16-cv-31602 (W.D.N.C.):

[T]he Declaration of Cameron R. Azari, Esq. on Implementation of Notice Regarding the Joint Plan of Reorganization of Kaiser Gypsum Company, Inc. and Hanson Permanente Cement, Inc. ... (the “Notice Declaration”) was filed with the Bankruptcy Court on July 1, 2020, attesting to publication notice of the Plan.

[T]he Court has reviewed the Plan, the Disclosure Statement, the Disclosure Statement Order, the Voting Agent Declaration, the Affidavits of Service, the Publication Declaration, the Notice Declaration, the Memoranda of Law, the Declarations, the Truck Affidavits and all other pleadings before the Court in connection with the Confirmation of the Plan, including the objections filed to the Plan. The Plan is hereby confirmed in its entirety

Judicial Quotes

Judge Anne-Christine Massullo, *Morris v. Provident Credit Union* (June 23, 2021) CGC-19-581616 (Sup. Ct. Cal. Cnty. of San Fran.):

The Notice approved by this Court was distributed to the Classes in substantial compliance with this Court's Order Certifying Classes for Settlement Purposes and Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement

("Preliminary Approval Order") and the Agreement. The Notice met the requirements of due process and California Rules of Court, rules 3.766 and 3.769(f). The notice to the Classes was adequate.

Judge Esther Salas, *Sager et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. et al.* (June 22, 2021) 18-cv-13556 (D.N.J.):

The Court further finds and concludes that Class Notice was properly and timely disseminated to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Class Notice Plan set forth in the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. No. 69). The Class Notice Plan and its implementation in this case fully satisfy Rule 23, the requirements of due process and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judge Josephine L. Staton, *In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation and Flaherty v. Hyundai Motor Company, Inc. et al.* (June 10, 2021) 8:17-cv-00838 and 18-cv-02223 (C.D. Cal.):

The Class Notice was disseminated in accordance with the procedures required by the Court's Orders ... in accordance with applicable law and satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process and constituted the best notice practicable for the reasons discussed in the Preliminary Approval Order and Final Approval Order.

Judge Harvey Schlesinger, *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation (ABB Concise Optical Group, LLC)* (May 31, 2021) 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the Settlement Agreement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's possible motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (iv) the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement Agreement, the Plan of Distribution, and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (v) the right to opt out of the Settlement Class; (vi) the right to appear at the Fairness Hearing; and (vii) the fact that Plaintiffs may receive incentive awards; (d) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the Settlement Agreement; and (e) satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause).

Judge Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. *Richards et al. v. Chime Financial, Inc.* (May 24, 2021) 4:19-cv-06864 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice and notice plan previously approved by the Court was implemented and complies with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) ... The Court ordered that the third-party settlement administrator send class notice via email based on a class list Defendant provided ... Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc., the third-party settlement administrator, represents that class notice was provided as directed Epiq received a total of 527,505 records for potential Class Members, including their email addresses If the receiving email server could not deliver the message, a "bounce code" was returned to Epiq indicating that the message was undeliverable Epiq made two additional attempts to deliver the email notice As of March 1, 2021, a total of 495,006 email notices were delivered, and 32,499 remained undeliverable In light of these facts, the Court finds that the parties have sufficiently provided the best practicable notice to the Class Members.

Judge Henry Edward Autrey, *Pearlstone v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* (Apr. 22, 2021) 4:17-cv-02856 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that adequate notice was given to all Settlement Class Members pursuant to the terms of the Parties' Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order. The Court has further determined that the Notice Plan fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1), applicable law, and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Lucy H. Koh, *Grace v. Apple, Inc.* (Mar. 31, 2021) 17-cv-00551 (N.D. Cal.):

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) requires that the settling parties provide class members with “the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort. The notice must clearly and concisely state in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the class certified; (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses; (iv) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Rule 23(c)(3).” The Court finds that the Notice Plan, which was direct notice sent to 99.8% of the Settlement Class via email and U.S. Mail, has been implemented in compliance with this Court’s Order (ECF No. 426) and complies with Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge Gary A. Fenner, *In re Pre-Filled Propane Tank Antitrust Litigation* (Mar. 30, 2021) MDL No. 2567, 14-cv-02567 (W.D. Mo.):

Based upon the Declaration of Cameron Azari, on behalf of Epiq, the Administrator appointed by the Court, the Court finds that the Notice Program has been properly implemented. That Declaration shows that there have been no requests for exclusion from the Settlement, and no objections to the Settlement. Finally, the Declaration reflects that AmeriGas has given appropriate notice of this settlement to the Attorney General of the United States and the appropriate State officials under the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and no objections have been received from any of them.

Judge Richard Seeborg, *Bautista v. Valero Marketing and Supply Company* (Mar. 17, 2021) 3:15-cv-05557 (N.D. Cal.):

The Notice given to the Settlement Class in accordance with the Notice Order was the best notice practicable under the circumstances of these proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process.

Judge James D. Peterson, *Fox et al. v. Iowa Health System d.b.a. UnityPoint Health* (Mar. 4, 2021) 18-cv-00327 (W.D. Wis.):

The approved Notice plan provided for direct mail notice to all class members at their last known address according to UnityPoint’s records, as updated by the administrator through the U.S. Postal Service. For postcards returned undeliverable, the administrator tried to find updated addresses for those class members. The administrator maintained the Settlement website and made Spanish versions of the Long Form Notice and Claim Form available upon request. The administrator also maintained a toll-free telephone line which provides class members detailed information about the settlement and allows individuals to request a claim form be mailed to them.

The Court finds that this Notice (i) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class members of the Settlement, the effect of the Settlement (including the release therein), and their right to object to the terms of the settlement and appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) constituted due and sufficient notice of the Settlement to all reasonably identifiable persons entitled to receive such notice; (iv) satisfied the requirements of due process, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1) and the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all applicable laws and rules.

Judge Larry A. Burns, *Trujillo et al. v. Ametek, Inc. et al.* (Mar. 3, 2021) 3:15-cv-01394 (S.D. Cal.):

The Class has received the best practicable notice under the circumstances of this case. The Parties’ selection and retention of Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. (“Epiq”) as the Claims Administrator was reasonable and appropriate. Based on the Declaration of Cameron Azari of Epiq, the Court finds that the Settlement Notices were published to the Class Members in the form and manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. See Dkt. 181-6. The Settlement Notices provided fair, effective, and the best practicable notice to the Class of the Settlement’s terms. The Settlement Notices informed the Class of Plaintiffs’ intent to seek attorneys’ fees, costs, and incentive payments, set forth the date, time, and place of the Fairness Hearing, and explained Class Members’ rights to object to the Settlement or Fee Motion and to appear at the Fairness Hearing The Settlement Notices fully satisfied all notice requirements under the law, including the Federal

Judicial Quotes

Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of the California Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1781, and all due process rights under the U.S. Constitution and California Constitutions.

Judge Sherri A. Lydon, *Fitzhenry v. Independent Home Products, LLC* (Mar. 2, 2021) 2:19-cv-02993 (D.S.C.):

Notice was provided to Class Members in compliance with Section VI of the Settlement Agreement, due process, and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The notice: (i) fully and accurately informed

Settlement Class Members about the lawsuit and settlement; (ii) provided sufficient information so that Settlement Class Members could decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the settlement; (iii) provided procedures for Class Members to file written objections to the proposed settlement, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed settlement; and (iv) provided the time, date, and place of the final fairness hearing.

Judge James V. Selna, *Alvarez v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.* (Feb. 9, 2021) 2:18-cv-08605 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notices attached as Exhibits to the Settlement Agreement: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Notice Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) their right to submit a claim (where applicable) by submitting a Claim Form; (iii) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; (iv) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (v) Named Plaintiffs' application for the payment of Service Awards; (vi) Class Counsel's motion for an award of 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 Hoefler Toal, Cook et al. v. South Carolina Public Service Authority et al. (July 31, 2020) 2019-CP-23-6675 (Ct. of Com. Pleas. 13th Jud. Cir. S.C.):

Notice was sent to more than 1.65 million Class members, published in newspapers whose collective circulation covers the entirety of the State, and supplemented with internet banner ads totaling approximately 12.3 million impressions. The notices directed Class members to the settlement website and toll-free line for additional inquiries and further information. After this extensive notice campaign, only 78 individuals (0.0047%) have opted-out, and only nine (0.00054%) have objected. The Court finds this response to be overwhelmingly favorable.

Judge Peter J. Messitte, Jackson et al. v. Viking Group, Inc. et al. (July 28, 2020) 8:18-cv-02356 (D. Md.):

[T]he Court finds, that the Notice Plan has been implemented in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order as amended. The Court finds that the Notice Plan: (i) constitutes the best notice practicable to the Settlement Class under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of this Lawsuit and the terms of the Settlement, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement, or to object to any part of the Settlement, their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of the Final Approval Order and the Final Judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all Persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class, (iii) due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) notice that fully satisfies the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, and any other applicable law.

Judge Michael P. Shea, Grayson et al. v. General Electric Company (July 27, 2020) 3:13-cv-01799 (D. Conn.):

Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Notice was mailed, emailed and disseminated by the other means described in the Settlement Agreement to the Class Members. This Court finds that this notice procedure was (i) the best practicable notice; (ii) reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Class Members of the pendency of the Civil Action and of their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement; and (iii) reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all entities and persons entitled to receive notice.

Judge Gerald J. Pappert, Rose v. The Travelers Home and Marine Insurance Company et al. (July 20, 2020) 19-cv-00977 (E.D. Pa.):

The Class Notice ... has been given to the Settlement Class in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. Such Class Notice (i) constituted the best notice practicable to the Settlement Class under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency and nature of this Action, the definition of the Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the rights of the Settlement Class to exclude themselves from the settlement or to object to any part of the settlement, the rights of the Settlement Class to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense), and the binding effect of the Settlement Agreement on all persons who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Class, (iii) provided due, adequate, and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class; and (iv) fully satisfied all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the due process requirements of the United States Constitution.

Judge Christina A. Snyder, Waldrup v. Countrywide Financial Corporation et al. (July 16, 2020) 2:13-cv-08833 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that mailed and publication notice previously given to Class Members in the Action was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfies the requirements of due process and FED. R. Civ. P. 23. The Court further finds that, because (a) adequate notice has been provided to all Class Members and (b) all Class Members have been given the opportunity to object to, and/or request exclusion from, the Settlement, it has jurisdiction over all Class Members. The Court further finds that all requirements of statute (including but not limited to 28 U.S.C. § 1715), rule, and state and federal constitutions necessary to effectuate this Settlement have been met and satisfied.

Judicial Quotes

Judge James Donato, *Coffeng et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.* (June 10, 2020) 17-cv-01825 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that, as demonstrated by the Declaration and Supplemental Declaration of Cameron Azari, and counsel's submissions, Notice to the Settlement Class was timely and properly effectuated in accordance with FED. R. CIV. P. 23(e) and the approved Notice Plan set forth in the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that said Notice constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfies all requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process.

Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald, *Behfarin v. Pruco Life Insurance Company et al.* (June 3, 2020) 17-cv-05290 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure and other laws and rules applicable to final settlement approval of class actions have been satisfied . . . This Court finds that the Claims Administrator caused notice to be disseminated to the Class in accordance with the plan to disseminate Notice outlined in the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order, and that Notice was given in an adequate and sufficient manner and complies with Due Process and Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

Judge Nancy J. Rosenstengel, *First Impressions Salon, Inc. et al. v. National Milk Producers Federation et al.* (Apr. 27, 2020) 3:13-cv-00454 (S.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Notice given to the Class Members was completed as approved by this Court and complied in all respects with the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process. The settlement Notice Plan was modeled on and supplements the previous court-approved plan and, having been completed, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances. In making this determination, the Court finds that the Notice provided Class members due and adequate notice of the Settlement, the Settlement Agreement, the Plan of Distribution, these proceedings, and the rights of Class members to opt-out of the Class and/or object to Final Approval of the Settlement, as well as Plaintiffs' Motion requesting attorney fees, costs, and Class Representative service awards.

Judge Harvey Schlesinger, *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation (CooperVision, Inc.)* (Mar. 4, 2020) 3:15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice: (a) was implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Orders; (b) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constitutes notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Classes of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the Settlement Agreements (including the Releases to the provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's possible motion for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (iv) the right to object to any aspect of the Settlement Agreements, the Plan of Distribution, and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses; (v) the right to opt out of the Settlement Classes; (vi) the right to appear at the Fairness Hearing; and (vii) the fact that Plaintiffs may receive incentive awards; (d) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the Settlement Agreement and (e) satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause).

Judge Amos L. Mazzant, *Stone et al. v. Porcelana Corona De Mexico, S.A. DE C.V f/k/a Sanitarios Lamosa S.A. DE C.V. a/k/a Vortens* (Mar. 3, 2020) 4:17-cv-00001 (E.D. Tex.):

The Court has reviewed the Notice Plan and its implementation and efficacy, and finds that it constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action and their right to object to the proposed settlement in full compliance with the requirements of applicable law, including the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and Rules 23(c) and (e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

In addition, Class Notice clearly and concisely stated in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the certified Equitable Relief Settlement Class; (iii) the claims and issues of the Equitable Relief Settlement Class; (iv) that a Settlement Class Member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(3).

Judicial Quotes

Judge Michael H. Simon, *In re Premera Blue Cross Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Mar. 2, 2020) MDL No. 2633, 3:15-md-2633 (D. Ore.):

The Court confirms that the form and content of the Summary Notice, Long Form Notice, Publication Notice, and Claim Form, and the procedure set forth in the Settlement for providing notice of the Settlement to the Class, were in full compliance with the notice requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) and 23(e), fully, fairly, accurately, and adequately advised members of the Class of their rights under the Settlement, provided the best notice practicable under the circumstances, fully satisfied the requirements of due process and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and afforded Class Members with adequate time and opportunity to file objections to the Settlement and attorney's fee motion, submit Requests for Exclusion, and submit Claim Forms to the Settlement Administrator.

Judge Maxine M. Chesney, *McKinney-Drobnis et al. v. Massage Envy Franchising* (Mar. 2, 2020) 3:16-cv-06450 (N.D. Cal.):

The COURT hereby finds that the individual direct CLASS NOTICE given to the CLASS via email or First Class U.S. Mail (i) fairly and accurately described the ACTION and the proposed SETTLEMENT; (ii) provided sufficient information so that the CLASS MEMBERS were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered by the SETTLEMENT, exclude themselves from the SETTLEMENT, or object to the SETTLEMENT; (iii) adequately described the manner in which CLASS MEMBERS could submit a VOUCHER REQUEST under the SETTLEMENT, exclude themselves from the SETTLEMENT, or object to the SETTLEMENT and/or appear at the FINAL APPROVAL HEARING; and (iv) provided the date, time, and place of the FINAL APPROVAL HEARING. The COURT hereby finds that the CLASS NOTICE was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and complied fully with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23, due process, and all other applicable laws.

Judge Harry D. Leinenweber, *Albrecht v. Oasis Power, LLC d/b/a Oasis Energy* (Feb. 6, 2020) 1:18-cv-01061 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice, as provided for in the Settlement Agreement, (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances to Settlement Class Members, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of, among other things, the pendency of the Action, the nature and terms of the proposed Settlement, their right to object or to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice, and (iv) complied fully with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law.

The Court finds that the Class Notice and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, and this Final Approval Order (i) constitute the most effective and practicable notice of the Final Approval Order, the relief available to Settlement Class Members pursuant to the Final Approval Order, and applicable time periods; (ii) constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice for all other purposes to all Settlement Class Members; and (iii) comply fully with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, the United States Constitution, the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable laws.

Judge Robert Scola, Jr., *Wilson et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. et al.* (Jan. 28, 2020) 17-cv-23033 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice, in the form approved by the Court, was properly disseminated to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Notice Plan and constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances. The forms and methods of the Notice Plan approved by the Court met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Code, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and any other applicable law.

Judge Michael Davis, *Garcia v. Target Corporation* (Jan. 27, 2020) 16-cv-02574 (D. Minn.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of this case, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement

Judicial Quotes

Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing, and satisfies the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks, *In re TD Bank, N.A. Debit Card Overdraft Fee Litigation* (Jan. 9, 2020) MDL No. 2613, 6:15-MN-02613 (D.S.C.):

The Classes have been notified of the settlement pursuant to the plan approved by the Court. After having reviewed the Declaration of Cameron R. Azari (ECF No. 220-1) and the Supplemental Declaration of Cameron R. Azari . . . , the Court hereby finds that notice was accomplished in accordance with the Court's directives. The Court further finds that the notice program constituted the best practicable notice to the Settlement Classes under the circumstances and fully satisfies the requirements of due process and Federal Rule 23.

Judge Margo K. Brodie, *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation* (Dec. 13, 2019) MDL No. 1720, 05-md-01720 (E.D.N.Y.):

The notice and exclusion procedures provided to the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class, including but not limited to the methods of identifying and notifying members of the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class, were fair, adequate, and sufficient, constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances, and were reasonably calculated to apprise members of the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class of the Action, the terms of the Superseding Settlement Agreement, and their objection rights, and to apprise members of the Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement Class of their exclusion rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any other applicable laws or rules of the Court, and due process.

Judge Steven Logan, *Knapper v. Cox Communications, Inc.* (Dec. 13, 2019) 2:17-cv-00913 (D. Ariz.):

The Court finds that the form and method for notifying the class members of the settlement and its terms and conditions was in conformity with this Court's Preliminary Approval Order (Doc. 120). The Court further finds that the notice satisfied due process principles and the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c), and the Plaintiff chose the best practicable notice under the circumstances. The Court further finds that the notice was clearly designed to advise the class members of their rights.

Judge Manish Shah, *Prather v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.* (Dec. 10, 2019) 1:17-cv-00481 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in Section VIII of the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of this case, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing, and satisfies the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.

Judge Liam O'Grady, *Liggio v. Apple Federal Credit Union* (Dec. 6, 2019) 1:18-cv-01059 (E.D. Va.):

The Court finds that the manner and form of notice (the "Notice Plan") as provided for in this Court's July 2, 2019 Order granting preliminary approval of class settlement, and as set forth in the Parties' Settlement Agreement was provided to Settlement Class Members by the Settlement Administrator The Notice Plan was reasonably calculated to give actual notice to Settlement Class Members of the right to receive benefits from the Settlement, and to be excluded from or object to the Settlement. The Notice Plan met the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

Judge Brian McDonald, *Armon et al. v. Washington State University* (Nov. 8, 2019) 17-2-23244-1 (consolidated with 17-2-25052-0) (Sup. Ct. Wash.):

The Court finds that the Notice Program, as set forth in the Settlement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, satisfied CR 23(c)(2), was the best Notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated to provide-and did provide-due and sufficient Notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Litigation; certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only; the existence and terms of the Settlement; the identity of Class Counsel and appropriate information about Class Counsel's then-forthcoming application for attorneys' fees and incentive awards to the Class Representatives; appropriate information about how to participate in the Settlement; Settlement Class Members' right to exclude themselves; their right to object to the Settlement and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, through counsel if they

Judicial Quotes

desired; and appropriate instructions as to how to obtain additional information regarding this Litigation and the Settlement. In addition, pursuant to CR 23(c)(2)(B), the Notice properly informed Settlement Class Members that any Settlement Class Member who failed to opt-out would be prohibited from bringing a lawsuit against Defendant based on or related to any of the claims asserted by Plaintiffs, and it satisfied the other requirements of the Civil Rules.

Judge Andrew J. Guilford, *In re Wells Fargo Collateral Protection Insurance Litigation* (Nov. 4, 2019) 8:17-ml-02797 (C.D. Cal.):

Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc. (“Epiq”), the parties’ settlement administrator, was able to deliver the court-approved notice materials to all class members, including 2,254,411 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 Bettelstone, *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 “apprise[d] interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford[ed] them an opportunity to present their objections.” Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 314 (1950). Indeed, the Notice Administrator reports that the notice delivery rate of 97.04% “exceed[ed] the expected range and is indicative of the extensive address updating and re-mailing protocols used.”

Judge Rebecca Brett Nightingale, *Ratzlaff et al. v. BOKF, NA d/b/a Bank of Oklahoma et al.* (May 15, 2017) CJ-2015-00859 (Dist. Ct. Okla.):

The Court-approved Notice Plan satisfies Oklahoma law because it is “reasonable” (12 O.S. § 2023(E)(I)) and it satisfies due process requirements because it was “reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections.” Shutts, 472 U.S. at 812 (quoting Mullane, 339 U.S. at 314-15).

Judge Joseph F. Bataillon, *Klug v. Watts Regulator Company* (Apr. 13, 2017) 8:15-cv-00061 (D. Neb.):

The court finds that the notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Class Action and of this settlement, as provided by the Settlement Agreement and by the Preliminary Approval Order dated December 7, 2017, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all persons and entities within the definition of the Settlement Class, and fully complied with the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 23 and due process. Due and sufficient proof of the execution of the Notice Plan as outlined in the Preliminary Approval Order has been filed.

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *Bias v. Wells Fargo & Company et al.* (Apr. 13, 2017) 4:12-cv-00664 (N.D. Cal.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice of Settlement given to the Settlement Class was adequate and reasonable and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including both individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort and publication notice.

Notice of Settlement, as given, complied with the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, satisfied the requirements of due process, and constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth herein.

Notice of the Settlement was provided to the appropriate regulators pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1715(c)(1).

Judge Carlos Murguia, *Whitton v. Deffenbaugh Industries, Inc. et al.* (Dec. 14, 2016) 2:12-cv-02247 and ***Gary, LLC v. Deffenbaugh Industries, Inc. et al.*** 2:13-cv-02634 (D. Kan.):

The Court determines that the Notice Plan as implemented was reasonably calculated to provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances and contained all required information for members of the proposed Settlement Class to act to protect their interests. The Court also finds that Class Members were provided an adequate period of time to receive Notice and respond accordingly.

Judge Yvette Kane, *In re Shop-Vac Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (Dec. 9, 2016) MDL No. 2380 (M.D. Pa.):

The Court hereby finds and concludes that members of the Settlement Class have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice satisfies all requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all other applicable laws.

Judge Timothy D. Fox, *Miner v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.* (Nov. 21, 2016) 60CV03-4661 (Ark. Cir. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Settlement Notice provided to potential members of the Class constituted the best and most practicable notice under the circumstances, thereby complying fully with due process and Rule 23 of the Arkansas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Eileen Bransten, *In re HSBC Bank USA, N.A.*, as part of *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation* (Oct. 13, 2016) 650562/2011 (Sup. Ct. N.Y.):

This Court finds that the Notice Program and the Notice provided to Settlement Class members fully satisfied the requirements of constitutional due process, the N.Y. C.P.L.R., and any other applicable laws, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

Judge Jerome B. Simandle, *In re Caterpillar, Inc. C13 and C15 Engine Products Liability Litigation* (Sept. 20, 2016) MDL No. 2540 (D.N.J.):

The Court hereby finds that the Notice provided to the Settlement Class constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Said Notice provided due and adequate notice of these proceedings and the matters set forth herein, including the terms of the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, requirements of due process and any other applicable law.

Judge Marcia G. Cooke, *Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co. and Abercrombie & Fitch Co.* (Apr. 11, 2016) 14-cv-23120 (S.D. Fla.):

Pursuant to the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator, Epiq Systems, Inc., has complied with the approved notice process as confirmed in its Declaration filed with the Court on March 23, 2016. The Court finds that the notice process was designed to advise Class Members of their rights. The form and method for notifying Class Members of the settlement and its terms and conditions was in conformity with this Court's Preliminary Approval Order, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B), the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and due process under the United States Constitution and other applicable laws.

Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litigation* (Mar. 22, 2016) MDL No. 2420, 4:13-md-02420 (N.D. Cal.):

From what I could tell, I liked your approach and the way you did it. I get a lot of these notices that I think are all legalese and no one can really understand them. Yours was not that way.

Judge Christopher S. Sontchi, *In re Energy Future Holdings Corp et al.* (July 30, 2015) 14-cv-10979 (Bankr. D. Del.):

Notice of the Asbestos Bar Date as set forth in this Asbestos Bar Date Order and in the manner set forth herein constitutes adequate and sufficient notice of the Asbestos Bar Date and satisfies the requirements of the Bankruptcy Code, the Bankruptcy Rules, and the Local Rules.

Judge David C. Norton, *In re MI Windows and Doors Inc. Products Liability Litigation* (July 22, 2015) MDL No. 2333, 2:12-mn-00001 (D.S.C.):

The court finds that the Notice Plan, as described in the Settlement and related declarations, has been faithfully carried out and constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of this Action, and was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to be provided with Notice.

The court also finds that the Notice Plan was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of: (1) the pendency of this class action; (2) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class and the proposed Settlement; (3) their right to object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement (including final certification of the Settlement Class, the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the proposed Settlement, the adequacy of the Settlement Class's representation by Named Plaintiffs or Class Counsel, or the award of attorney's and representative fees); (4) their right to appear at the fairness hearing (either on their own or through counsel hired at their own expense); and (5) the binding and preclusive effect of the orders and Final Order and Judgment in this Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all Persons who do not request exclusion from the Settlement Class. As such, the court finds that the Notice fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process

Judicial Quotes

Clause), the rules of this court, and any other applicable law, and provided sufficient notice to bind all Class Members, regardless of whether a particular Class Member received actual notice.

Judge Robert W. Gettleman, *Adkins et al. v. Nestlé Purina PetCare Company et al.* (June 23, 2015) 1:12-cv-02871 (N.D. Ill.):

Notice to the Settlement Class and other potentially interested parties has been provided in accordance with the notice requirements specified by the Court in the Preliminary Approval Order. Such notice fully and accurately informed the Settlement Class members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and of their opportunity to object or comment thereon or to exclude themselves from the Settlement; provided Settlement Class Members adequate instructions and a variety of means to obtain additional information; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of Illinois, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, due process, and other applicable law.

Judge James Lawrence King, *Steen v. Capital One, N.A.* (May 22, 2015) 2:10-cv-01505 (E.D. La.) and 1:10-cv-22058 (S.D. Fla.) as part of ***In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation***, MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the Settlement Class Members were provided with the best practicable notice; the notice was reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections . . . This Settlement with Capital One was widely publicized, and any Settlement Class Member who wished to express comments or objections had ample opportunity and means to do so.

Judge Rya W. Zobel, *Gulbankian et al. v. MW Manufacturers, Inc.* (Dec. 29, 2014) 1:10-cv-10392 (D. Mass.):

This Court finds that the Class Notice was provided to the Settlement Class consistent with the Preliminary Approval Order and that it was the best notice practicable and fully satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, and applicable law. The Court finds that the Notice Plan that was implemented by the Claims Administrator satisfies the requirements of FED. R. CIV. P. 23, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and Due Process, and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Plan constituted due and sufficient notice of the Settlement, the Final Approval Hearing, and the other matters referred to in the notices. Proof of the giving of such notices has been filed with the Court via the Azari Declaration and its exhibits.

Judge Edward J. Davila, *Rose v. Bank of America Corporation et al.* (Aug. 29, 2014) 5:11-cv-02390 & 5:12-cv-00400 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the notice was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of this action, all material elements of the Settlement, the opportunity for Settlement Class Members to exclude themselves from, object to, or comment on the settlement and to appear at the final approval hearing. The notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, satisfying the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B); provided notice in a reasonable manner to all class members, satisfying Rule 23(e)(1)(B); was adequate and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and, complied fully with the laws of the United States and of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process and any other applicable rules of court.

Judge James A. Robertson, II, *Wong et al. v. Alacer Corp.* (June 27, 2014) CGC-12-519221 (Sup. Ct. Cal.):

Notice to the Settlement Class has been provided in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order. Based on the Declaration of Cameron Azari dated March 7, 2014, such Class Notice has been provided in an adequate and sufficient manner, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies the requirements of California Civil Code Section 1781, California Civil Code of Civil Procedure Section 382, Rules 3.766 of the California Rules of Court, and due process.

Judge John Gleeson, *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation* (Dec. 13, 2013) MDL No. 1720, 05-md-01720 (E.D.N.Y.):

The Class Administrator notified class members of the terms of the proposed settlement through a mailed notice and publication campaign that included more than 20 million mailings and publication in more than 400 publications. The notice here meets the requirements of due process and notice standards . . . The objectors' complaints provide no reason to conclude that the purposes and requirements of a notice to a class were not met here.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Lance M. Africk, *Evans et al. v. TIN, Inc. et al.* (July 7, 2013) 2:11-cv-02067 (E.D. La.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice... as described in Notice Agent Lauran Schultz's Declaration: (a) constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances...; (c) constituted notice that was reasonable, due, adequate, and sufficient; and (d) constituted notice that fully satisfied all applicable legal requirements, including Rules 23(c)(2)(B) and (e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including Due Process Clause), the Rules of this Court, and any other applicable law, as well as complied with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

Judge Edward M. Chen, *Marolda v. Symantec Corporation* (Apr. 5, 2013) 3:08-cv-05701 (N.D. Cal.):

Approximately 3.9 million notices were delivered by email to class members, but only a very small percentage objected or opted out ... The Court ... concludes that notice of settlement to the class was adequate and satisfied all requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e) and due process. Class members received direct notice by email, and additional notice was given by publication in numerous widely circulated publications as well as in numerous targeted publications. These were the best practicable means of informing class members of their rights and of the settlement's terms.

Judge Ann D. Montgomery, *In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Products Liability Litigation* (Feb. 27, 2013) MDL No. 1958, 08-md-01958 (D. Minn.):

*The form and content of the notices provided to the class were direct, understandable, and consistent with the "plain language" principles advanced by the Federal Judicial Center . . . The notice plan's multi-faceted approach to providing notice to settlement class members whose identity is not known to the settling parties constitutes "the best notice [*26] that is practicable under the circumstances" consistent with Rule 23(c)(2)(B).*

Magistrate Judge Stewart, *Gessele et al. v. Jack in the Box, Inc.* (Jan. 28, 2013) 3:10-cv-00960 (D. Ore.):

Moreover, plaintiffs have submitted [a] declaration from Cameron Azari, a nationally recognized notice expert, who attests that fashioning an effective joint notice is not unworkable or unduly confusing. Azari also provides a detailed analysis of how he would approach fashioning an effective notice in this case.

Judge Carl J. Barbier, *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (Medical Benefits Settlement)* (Jan. 11, 2013) MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.):

Through August 9, 2012, 366,242 individual notices had been sent to potential [Medical Benefits] Settlement Class Members by postal mail and 56,136 individual notices had been e-mailed. Only 10,700 mailings—or 3.3%—were known to be undeliverable. (Azari Decl. ¶¶ 8, 9.) Notice was also provided through an extensive schedule of local newspaper, radio, television and Internet placements, well-read consumer magazines, a national daily business newspaper, highly-trafficked websites, and Sunday local newspapers (via newspaper supplements). Notice was also provided in non-measured trade, business and specialty publications, African-American, Vietnamese, and Spanish language publications, and Cajun radio programming. The combined measurable paid print, television, radio, and Internet effort reached an estimated 95% of adults aged 18+ in the Gulf Coast region an average of 10.3 times each, and an estimated 83% of all adults in the United States aged 18+ an average of 4 times each. (Id. ¶¶ 8, 10.) All notice documents were designed to be clear, substantive, and informative. (Id. ¶ 5.)

The Court received no objections to the scope or content of the [Medical Benefits] Notice Program. (Azari Supp. Decl. ¶ 12.) The Court finds that the Notice and Notice Plan as implemented satisfied the best notice practicable standard of Rule 23(c) and, in accordance with Rule 23(e)(1), provided notice in a reasonable manner to Class Members who would be bound by the Settlement, including individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort. Likewise, the Notice and Notice Plan satisfied the requirements of Due Process. The Court also finds the Notice and Notice Plan satisfied the requirements of CAFA.

Judge Carl J. Barbier, *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010 (Economic and Property Damages Settlement)* (Dec. 21, 2012) MDL No. 2179 (E.D. La.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice and Class Notice Plan satisfied and continue to satisfy the applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(b) and 23(e), the Class Action Fairness Act (28 U.S.C. § 1711 et seq.), and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution (U.S. Const., amend. V), constituting the best notice

Judicial Quotes

that is practicable under the circumstances of this litigation. The notice program surpassed the requirements of Due Process, Rule 23, and CAFA. Based on the factual elements of the Notice Program as detailed below, the Notice Program surpassed all of the requirements of Due Process, Rule 23, and CAFA.

The Notice Program, as duly implemented, surpasses other notice programs ... executed with court approval. The Notice Program included notification to known or potential Class Members via postal mail and e-mail; an extensive schedule of local newspaper, radio, television and Internet placements, well-read consumer magazines, a national daily business newspaper, and Sunday local newspapers. Notice placements also appeared in non-measured trade, business, and specialty publications, African-American, Vietnamese, and Spanish language publications, and Cajun radio programming. The Notice Program met the objective of reaching the greatest possible number of class members and providing them with every reasonable opportunity to understand their legal rights. See Azari Decl. ¶¶ 8, 15, 68. The Notice Program was substantially completed on July 15, 2012, allowing class members adequate time to make decisions before the opt-out and objections deadlines.

The media notice effort alone reached an estimated 95% of adults in the Gulf region an average of 10.3 times each, and an estimated 83% of all adults in the United States an average of 4 times each. These figures do not include notice efforts that cannot be measured, such as advertisements in trade publications and sponsored search engine listings. The Notice Program fairly and adequately covered and notified the class without excluding any demographic group or geographic area, and it exceeded the reach percentage achieved in most other court-approved notice programs.

Judge Alonzo Harris, Opelousas General Hospital Authority, A Public Trust, D/B/A Opelousas General Health System and ArkLamiss Surgery Center, L.L.C. v. FairPay Solutions, Inc. (Aug. 17, 2012) 12-C-1599 (27th Jud. D. Ct. La.):

Notice given to Class Members and all other interested parties pursuant to this Court's order of April 18, 2012, was reasonably calculated to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action, the certification of the Class as Defined for settlement purposes only, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, Class Members rights to be represented by private counsel, at their own costs, and Class Members rights to appear in Court to have their objections heard, and to afford persons or entities within the Class Definition an opportunity to exclude themselves from the Class. Such notice complied with all requirements of the federal and state constitutions, including the Due Process Clause, and applicable articles of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Class as Defined.

Judge James Lawrence King, Sachar v. Iberiabank Corporation (Apr. 26, 2012) as part of **In re Checking Account Overdraft** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the Notice previously approved was fully and properly effectuated and was sufficient to satisfy the requirements of due process because it described "the substantive claims ... [and] contained information reasonably necessary to [allow Settlement Class Members to] make a decision to remain a class member and be bound by the final judgment."... The Notice, among other things, defined the Settlement Class, described the release as well as the amount and method and manner of proposed distribution of the Settlement proceeds, and informed Settlement Class Members of their rights to opt-out or object, the procedures for doing so, and the time and place of the Final Approval Hearing. The Notice also informed Settlement Class Members that a class judgment would bind them unless they opted out, and told them where they could obtain more information, such as access to a full copy of the Agreement. Further, the Notice described in summary form the fact that Class Counsel would be seeking attorneys' fees of up to 30 percent of the Settlement. Settlement Class Members were provided with the best practicable notice "reasonably calculated, under [the] circumstances, to apprise them of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." Mullane, 339 U.S. at 314. The content of the Notice fully complied with the requirements of Rule 23.

Judge Bobby Peters, Vereen v. Lowe's Home Centers (Apr. 13, 2012) SU10-cv-2267B (Ga. Super. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Notice and the Notice Plan was fulfilled, in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Amendment, and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order and that this Notice and Notice Plan constituted the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of this action, constituted due and sufficient Notice of the proposed Settlement to all persons entitled to

Judicial Quotes

participate in the proposed Settlement, and was in full compliance with Ga. Code Ann § 9-11-23 and the constitutional requirements of due process. Extensive notice was provided to the class, including point of sale notification, publication notice and notice by first-class mail for certain potential Class Members.

The affidavit of the notice expert conclusively supports this Court's finding that the notice program was adequate, appropriate, and comported with Georgia Code Ann. § 9-11-23(b)(2), the Due Process Clause of the Constitution, and the guidance for effective notice articulate in the FJC's Manual for Complex Litigation, 4th.

Judge Lee Rosenthal, *In re Heartland Payment Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Mar. 2, 2012) MDL No. 2046 (S.D. Tex.):

*The notice that has been given clearly complies with Rule 23(e)(1)'s reasonableness requirement... the notice plan after its implementation and conservatively estimated that notice reached 81.4 percent of the class members. (Docket Entry No. 106, ¶ 32). Both the summary notice and the detailed notice provided the information reasonably necessary for the presumptive class members to determine whether to object to the proposed settlement. See Katrina Canal Breaches, 628 F.3d at 197. Both the summary notice and the detailed notice "were written in easy-to-understand plain English." In re Black Farmers Discrimination Litig., — F. Supp. 2d —, 2011 WL 5117058, at *23 (D.D.C. 2011); accord AGGREGATE LITIGATION § 3.04(c).15 The notice provided "satisf[ies] the broad reasonableness standards imposed by due process" and Rule 23. Katrina Canal Breaches, 628 F.3d at 197.*

Judge John D. Bates, *Trombley v. National City Bank* (Dec. 1, 2011) 1:10-cv-00232 (D.D.C.) as part of ***In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation*** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice given to the Settlement Class were in full compliance with the Court's January 11, 2011 Order, the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), and due process. The notice was adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. In addition, adequate notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to participate in the final fairness hearing were provided to the Settlement Class.

Judge Robert M. Dow, Jr., *Schulte v. Fifth Third Bank* (July 29, 2011) 1:09-cv-06655 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court has reviewed the content of all of the various notices, as well as the manner in which Notice was disseminated, and concludes that the Notice given to the Class fully complied with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, as it was the best notice practicable, satisfied all constitutional due process concerns, and provided the Court with jurisdiction over the absent Class Members.

Judge Ellis J. Daigle, *Williams v. Hammerman & Gainer Inc.* (June 30, 2011) 11-C-3187-B (27th Jud. D. Ct. La.):

Notices given to Settlement Class members and all other interested parties throughout this proceeding with respect to the certification of the Settlement Class, the proposed settlement, and all related procedures and hearings—including, without limitation, the notice to putative Settlement Class members and others... were reasonably calculated under all the circumstances and have been sufficient, as to form, content, and manner of dissemination, to apprise interested parties and members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the action, the certification of the Settlement Class, the Settlement Agreement and its contents, Settlement Class members' right to be represented by private counsel, at their own cost, and Settlement Class members' right to appear in Court to have their objections heard, and to afford Settlement Class members an opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class. Such notices complied with all requirements of the federal and state constitutions, including the due process clause, and applicable articles of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedures, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to all potential members of the Settlement Class.

Judge Stefan R. Underhill, *Mathena v. Webster Bank, N.A.* (Mar. 24, 2011) 3:10-cv-01448 (D. Conn.) as part of ***In re Checking Account Overdraft Litigation*** MDL No. 2036 (S.D. Fla.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice given to the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process.

Judicial Quotes

Judge Ted Stewart, *Miller v. Basic Research, LLC* (Sept. 2, 2010) 2:07-cv-00871 (D. Utah):

Plaintiffs state that they have hired a firm specializing in designing and implementing large scale, unbiased, legal notification plans. Plaintiffs represent to the Court that such notice will include: 1) individual notice by electronic mail and/or first-class mail sent to all reasonably identifiable Class members; 2) nationwide paid media notice through a combination of print publications, including newspapers, consumer magazines, newspaper supplements and the Internet; 3) a neutral, Court-approved, informational press release; 4) a neutral, Court-approved Internet website; and 5) a toll-free telephone number. Similar mixed media plans have been approved by other district courts post class certification. The Court finds this plan is sufficient to meet the notice requirement.

Judge Sara Loi, *Pavlov v. Continental Casualty Co.* (Oct. 7, 2009) 5:07-cv-02580 (N.D. Ohio):

[T]he elaborate notice program contained in the Settlement Agreement provides for notice through a variety of means, including direct mail to each class member, notice to the United States Attorney General and each State, a toll free number, and a website designed to provide information about the settlement and instructions on submitting claims. With a 99.9% effective rate, the Court finds that the notice program constituted the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B), and clearly satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

Judge James Robertson, *In re Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litigation* (Sept. 23, 2009) MDL No. 1796 (D.D.C.):

The Notice Plan, as implemented, satisfied the requirements of due process and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Plan was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the action, the terms of the Settlement, and their right to appear, object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement. Further, the notice was reasonable and constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice.

Legal Noticing Cases

Epiq Legal Noticing has served as a notice expert for planning, implementation and/or analysis in the following cases (this is a partial list of cases):

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Beauford v. The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Inc. et al.</i> (Pixel)	Cir. Ct. Baltimore Cnty., No. C-03-CV-23-000501
<i>Doe v. Clinivate, LLC</i>	Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Contra Costa, Cal., No. C22-01620
<i>Barletti et al. v. Connexin Software, Inc. d/b/a Office Practicum</i> (Data Breach)	E.D. Penn., No. 2:22-cv-04676
<i>Guy et al. v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	W.D. Wash., No. 2:22-cv-01558
<i>Farley et al. v. Eye Care Leaders Holding, LLC</i> (Data Breach)	M.D.N.C., No. 1:22-cv-00468
<i>In re Wright & Filippis, LLC Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	E.D. Mich., No. 2:22-cv-12908
<i>Holden et al. v. Guardian Analytics, Inc. et al.</i> (Data Breach)	D.N.J., No. 2:23-cv-2U5
<i>Bobo et al. v. Clover Network, LLC</i> (TCPA)	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., Dupage Cnty. Ill., No. 2023CH000168
<i>Dam v. Perkins Coie, LLP et al.</i> (Crypto)	E.D. Wash., No. 2:20-CV-00464
<i>Hoover et al. v. Camping World Group, LLC et al.</i> (Data Breach)	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill., No. 2023LA00037
<i>In re Hope College Data Security Breach Litigation</i>	W.D. Mich., No. 1:22-cv-01224
<i>Shaffer et al. v. George Washington University et al.</i> (Tuition Fees)	D.D.C., No. 20-1145
<i>In re U.S. Vision Data Breach Litigation</i>	D.N.J., No. 1:22-cv-06558
<i>Qureshi et al. v. American University</i> (Tuition Fees)	D.D.C., No. 1:20-cv-01141
<i>In re Canon U.S.A. Data Breach Litigation</i>	E.D.N.Y., No. 1:20-cv-06239
<i>Patterson et al. v. DPP II LLC et al.</i> (Data Breach)	Dist. Ct of Dallas Cnty., Tex., No. DC-23-01733
<i>In re Hyundai and Kia Engine Litigation II</i>	C.D. Cal, No. 8:18-cv-02223
<i>Perez et al. v. Discover Bank</i> (Alienage & Immigration Status Discrimination - Civil Rights for Loans)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:20-cv-06896
<i>In re Google Location History Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 5:18-cv-05062
<i>Finn and Contristano v. Empress Ambulance Services, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. N.Y., Cnty. of Westchester, No. 61058/2023
<i>Ward-Howie v. Frontwave Credit Union</i> (Bank Fees)	Sup. Ct. Cal. San Diego Cnty., Cal., No. 37-2022-00016328
<i>Morrow et al. v. Navy Federal Credit Union</i> (Bank Fees)	E.D. Va., No. 1:21-cv-00722
<i>In re Goodman Campbell Brain and Spine Data Incident Litigation</i>	Ind. Comm. Ct., No. 49D01-2207-PL-024807
<i>Healy et al. v. Reiter Affiliated Companies, LLC</i> (Data Breach)	Sup. Ct. Cal., Cnty. of Monterey, No. 22-cv-003056
<i>Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. v. Agak</i> (Bank Fees)	Sup. Ct. Cnty. of Ventura, Cal., No. 56-2017-00500587-CL-CL-VTA

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Crema v. Apple Inc. and Apple Canada Inc.</i> (Apple iPhone 6, 6 Plus, 6s, 6s Plus, SE, 7 or 7 Plus Smartphone, iPhone Power Management Settlement; Product Defect)	Sup. Ct. of B.C., No. S188008
<i>Lara v. Lubbock Heart Hospital, LLC, dba Lubbock Heart & Surgical Hospital</i> (Data Breach)	N.D. Tex., No. 5:23-cv-00036
<i>Hu et al. v. BMW of North America LLC et al.</i> (Product Liability Auto Emissions)	D.N.J., No. 2:18-cv-04363
<i>Williams et al. v. Tallahassee Memorial Healthcare, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	2nd Jud. Cir. Ct., Leon Cnty. Fla., No. 2023 CA 001430
<i>Doe v. Lima Memorial Hospital et al.</i> (Pixel)	Ct. of Common Pleas Allen Cnty. Ohio, No. CV2022 0490
<i>Mikulecky et al. v. Lutheran Social Services of Illinois</i> (Data Breach)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill., No. 2023-CH-00895
<i>In re Lipitor Antitrust Litigation</i> (End Payors - TPPs & Consumers) (Antitrust)	D.N.J., No. 3:12-cv-2389; MDL 2332
<i>In re American Financial Resources, Inc. Data Breach Litigation</i>	D.N.J., No. 2:22-cv-01757
<i>Lemar Agnew v. Foris DAX, Inc. d/b/a Crypto.com</i> (Cryptocurrency BIPA)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill., No. 2024-CH-00435
<i>Domitrovich et al. v. M.C. Dean, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	E.D. Vir., No. 1:23-cv-00210
<i>Moradpour v. Velodyne Lidar, Inc. et al.</i> (Securities)	N.D. Cal., No. 3:21-cv-01486
<i>Guy et al. v. Convergent Outsourcing, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	W.D. Wash., No. 2:22-cv-01558
<i>Briscoe et al. v. First Financial Credit Union</i> (Data Breach)	2nd. Jud. Dist. Cnty. of Bernalillo, N.M., No. D-202-CV-2022-02974
<i>Niewinski et al. v. State Farm Life Insurance Company et al.</i> (Universal Life Insurance Policies)	W.D. Mo., No. 23-04159-CV
<i>Sherwood et al. v. Horizon Actuarial Services, LLC</i> (Data Breach)	N.D. Ga., No. 1:22-cv-01495
<i>Prescott et al. v. Reckitt Benckiser LLC</i> (False Advertising)	N.D. Cal, No. 5:20-cv-02101
<i>Kaether et al. v. Metropolitan Area EMS Authority D/B/A MedStar Mobile Healthcare</i> (Data Breach)	Dist. Ct. Tarrant Cnty., Tex. No. 342-339562-23
<i>In re Waste Management Data Breach Litigation</i>	S.D. N.Y., No. 1:21-cv-06199
<i>Medina et al. v. PracticeMax, Inc.</i> (Data Breach)	D. Ariz., No. CV-22-01261
<i>Cavanaugh et al. v. Grenville Christian College et al.</i>	Sup. Ct. of Justice – Ontario, No. 08-CV-347100-00
<i>Bandy v. TOC Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Tennessee Orthopaedic Clinics, a division of Tennessee Orthopaedic Alliance, P.A.</i> (Data Breach)	M.D. Tenn., No. 3:23-cv-00598
<i>Sayas et al. v. Biometric Impressions Corp.</i> (BIPA)	Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Ill., No. 2020 CH 00201
<i>Nimsey v. Tinker Federal Credit Union</i> (Overdraft Fees)	Dist. Ct. Oklahoma Cnty., Okla., No. CJ-2019-6084
<i>Fiorentino v. Flosports, Inc.</i> (VPPA)	D. Mass., No. 1:22-cv-11502
<i>Nielsen v. Walt Disney Parks and Resorts U.S., Inc.</i> , (Consumer False Advertising)	C.D. Cal, No. 8:21-cv-02055

Legal Noticing Cases

Case Name	Court & Case No.
<i>Mayheu et al. v. Chick-fil-A Inc. (Delivery Fees & Menu Prices)</i>	Sup. Ct. Fulton Cnty., Ga., No.2022CV365400
<i>Arevalo et al. v. USAA Casualty Insurance Company et al. (Consumer)</i>	Dist. Ct., Bexar County, Tex. 285th Jud. Dist, No. 202-CI-16240
<i>In re McKinsey & Co., Inc. National Prescription Opiate Consultant Litigation All School District</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:21-md-02996-CRB
<i>In re McKinsey & Co., Inc. National Prescription Opiate Consultant Litigation Subdivision</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:21-md-02996-CRB
<i>Beasley et al. v. TTEC Services Corporation; Anderson v. TTEC Services Corporation (Data Breach)</i>	D. Col, No. 22-cv-00097; No. 22-cv-00347
<i>In re PFA Insurance Marketing Litigation</i>	N.D. Cal, No. 4:18-cv-03771 YGR
<i>Stauber v. Sudler Property Management (Data Breach)</i>	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill, No. 2023LA000411
<i>In re Accellion, Inc. Data Breach Litigation Accellion; Harbour et al. v. California Health & Wellness et al. (Health Net)</i>	N.D. Cal., MDL 3002, No. 5:21-CV-01155; 5:21-cv-03322-EJD
<i>Roberts et al. v. Zuora Inc. et al. (Securities)</i>	N.D. Cal., No. 3:19-cv-03422
<i>Black v. USAA Casualty Insurance (Auto Insurance)</i>	N.D. Ga., No. 1:21-cv-01363
<i>Alexander et al. v. Salud Family Health, Inc.</i>	19th Dist. Ct. Greeley Cnty., Col., No. 2023CV030580
<i>Jackson et al. v. Fandango Media, LLC (VPPA)</i>	18 th Jud. Cir. Ct. Dupage Cnty., Ind., No. 2023LA000631
<i>In re Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation</i>	D.Minn., No. 22-3031
<i>Ross et al. v. Panda Restaurant Group, Inc.</i>	Sup. Ct. Cal., Cnty of Los Angeles, No. 21STCV03662
<i>Fernandez et al. v. 90 Degree Benefits Wisconsin et al.</i>	E.D. Wis., No. 2:22-cv-00799
<i>Gudgel et al. v. Reynolds Consumer Products, Inc. et al.</i>	Cir. Ct. 19th Jud. Cir., Lake Cnty, Ill., No. 23LA00000486
<i>Julien et al. v. Cash Express, LLC (Data Breach)</i>	Cir. Ct. Putnam Cnty., Tenn., No. 2022-CV-221
<i>Sharma et al. v. Accutech Systems Corporation (Data Breach)</i>	Cir. Ct. 2, Del. Cnty, Ind., No. 18C02-2210-CT-000135
<i>Young et al. v. Military Advantage, Inc. d/b/a Military.com</i>	18th Jud. Cir., Cir. Ct., DuPage Cnty, Ill., No. 2023LA00535
<i>Lukens v. Utah Imaging Associates, Inc.</i>	3 rd Dist. Ct., Salt Lake Cnty., Utah, No. 210906618
<i>Miranda v. Xavier University (Tuition)</i>	S.D. Ohio, No. 1:20-cv-00539
<i>Holly Wedding et al. vs. California Public Employees' Retirement System et al. (Calpers II Settlement)</i>	Sup. Ct. Cnty of Los Angeles, Cal., No. BC517444
<i>Hrebenar v. Davis Yulee LLC, d/b/a Davis Chrysler Dodge Jeep Ram of 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

Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC, 2025-005051-CA-01 (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.)

Why am I receiving this notice? You are receiving this Notice because the records of Defendant Ambulnz NY, LLC ("Ambulnz") show your personal information may have been accessed during a cybersecurity incident Ambulnz experienced in April 2024 ("Security Incident"). You are therefore likely a Settlement Class Member eligible to receive benefits under this Settlement.

What are the Settlement Benefits? Under the Settlement, Ambulnz will pay all valid and timely claims for Credit Monitoring, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, and Extraordinary Losses, or an Alternative Cash Benefit, summarized below:

- Credit Monitoring - 1 year of credit monitoring and identity protection services.
- Ordinary Losses - Up to a total of \$400 per claimant.
- Lost Time Claim - \$18.50 per hour for up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74).
- Extraordinary Losses - Up to a total of \$4,500 per claimant.
- Alternative Cash Benefit - \$30 per claimant whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number was implicated in the Security Incident and \$10 per claimant whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number was not implicated in the Security Incident.

Please visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com for a full description of the Settlement benefits and documentation requirements.

How do I Submit a Claim Form for Benefits? You must submit a Claim Form, available at www.AmbulnzSettlement.com

to be eligible to receive a Settlement benefit. Your completed Claim Form must be **submitted online, or mailed to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked, by September 15, 2025.**

What are my other options? If you **Do Nothing**, you will be legally bound by the terms of the Settlement, and you will release your claims against Ambulnz and other Released Parties as defined in the Settlement Agreement. You may **Opt-Out** of or file an **objection** to the Settlement by **August 15, 2025**. Please visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com for more information on how to Opt-Out and exclude yourself from or Object to the Settlement.

Do I have a Lawyer in this Case? Yes, the Court appointed Andrew Shamis of Shamis & Gentile, P.A. to represent you and other members of the Settlement Class. You will not be charged directly for these lawyers; instead, they will receive compensation from Ambulnz (subject to Court approval). If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

The Court's Final Approval Hearing. The Court is scheduled to hold a Final Approval Hearing on **August 22, 2025**, to consider whether to approve the Settlement, service awards for the Class Representative (of \$2,000), and a request for attorneys' fees and expenses (up to \$230,000) for Settlement Class Counsel. You may appear at the hearing, either yourself or through an attorney hired by you, but you don't have to.

This notice is only a summary.

For more information, visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call toll-free 1-888-867-7175.

AL3802.v.02



NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST-CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 581 PORTLAND, OR

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

**AMBULNZ SECURITY INCIDENT
SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR
C/O EPIQ
PO BOX 2856
PORTLAND OR 97208-9603**



Attachment 3

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Circuit Court of the 11th Judicial District for Miami-Dade County, Florida

Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC

Case No. 2025-005051-CA-01

IF YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION WAS POTENTIALLY IMPACTED BY A CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT THAT AMBULNZ EXPERIENCED IN APRIL 2024, A PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT MAY AFFECT YOUR RIGHTS.

A state court authorized this Notice. You are not being sued.

This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A Settlement has been reached with Ambulnz NY, LLC (“Ambulnz” or “Defendant”) in a class action lawsuit about a cybersecurity incident that occurred in or around April 2024 (“Security Incident”).
- The lawsuit is captioned *Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC*, Case No. 2025-005051-CA-01 (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.). Ambulnz denies the allegations and all liability or wrongdoing with respect to any and all facts and claims alleged in the lawsuit but has agreed to a Settlement to avoid the costs and risks associated with continuing this case.
- You are included in this Settlement if you are a Settlement Class Member. A Settlement Class Member is an individual who resides in the United States and whose personally identifiable information (“PII”) and/or personal health information (“PHI”) was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.
- If you are a Settlement Class Member, your rights are affected whether you act or don’t act. Please read this Notice carefully.

SUMMARY OF YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT		DEADLINE
SUBMIT A CLAIM	The only way to receive cash and other benefits from this Settlement is by submitting a valid and timely Claim Form. You can submit your Claim Form online at www.ambulnzsettlement.com , or you can download the Claim Form from the Settlement Website and mail it to the Settlement Administrator. You may also call or email the Settlement Administrator to receive a paper copy of the Claim Form.	September 15, 2025
OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT	You can choose to opt out of the Settlement and receive no payment. This option allows you to sue, continue to sue, or be part of another lawsuit against the Defendant related to the legal claims resolved by this Settlement. You can elect to retain your own legal counsel at your own expense. If you opt out, you will not be able to participate in the cash and other benefits from the Settlement.	August 15, 2025
OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT AND/OR ATTEND A HEARING	If you do not opt out of the Settlement, you may object to it by writing to the Court about why you don’t like the Settlement. You may also ask the Court for permission to speak about your objection at the Final Approval Hearing. If you object, you may also file a claim for benefits.	August 15, 2025
DO NOTHING	Unless you opt out of the Settlement, you are part of the Settlement. If you do nothing, you will not get a payment from this Settlement and you will give up the right to sue, continue to sue, or be part of another lawsuit against the Defendant related to the legal claims resolved by this Settlement.	

- These rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this Notice.
- The Court in charge of this case still has to decide whether to approve the Settlement.

Questions? Call 1-888-867-7175 Toll-Free or Visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

BASIC INFORMATION	2
WHO IS IN THE SETTLEMENT.....	3
THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS	3
HOW TO GET A PAYMENT—MAKING A CLAIM	4
THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU.....	4
EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT	5
COMMENTING ON OR OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT.....	5
THE COURT’S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING	6
IF I DO NOTHING.....	6
GETTING MORE INFORMATION.....	7

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why was this Notice issued?

A state court authorized this Notice because you have a right to know about the proposed Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your options before the Court decides whether to grant final approval of the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, your legal rights, what benefits are available, and who can receive them.

The lawsuit is captioned *Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC, 2025-005051-CA-01* (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.). The person that filed this lawsuit is called the “Plaintiff” and the company they sued, Ambulnz, is called the “Defendant.”

2. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit alleges that personal information was impacted by the cybersecurity incident that affected Ambulnz in or around April 2024 (“Security Incident”).

3. What is a class action?

In a class action, one or more individuals sue on behalf of other people with similar claims. These individuals who sue are known as “Class Representatives” or “Plaintiffs.” Together, the people included in the class action are called a “class” or “class members.” One court resolves the lawsuit for all Settlement class members, except for those who exclude themselves (sometimes called, “opting out”) from a Settlement. In this Settlement, the Class Representative is Maria Ballesteros.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Court did not decide in favor of the Plaintiff or the Defendant. The Defendant denies all claims and contends that it has not violated any laws. Plaintiff and the Defendant agreed to a Settlement to avoid the costs and risks of a trial, and through the Settlement, Settlement Class Members are eligible to claim payments and other benefits. The Plaintiff and their attorneys, who also represent the Settlement Class Members, think the Settlement is best for all Settlement Class Members.

Questions? Call 1-888-867-7175 Toll-Free or Visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com

WHO IS IN THE SETTLEMENT

5. Who is included in the Settlement?

The Settlement Class consists of all individuals who reside in the United States whose PII and/or PHI was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the Security Incident.

6. Are there exceptions to being included?

Yes. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i) Ambulnz, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

If you are not sure whether you are included in the Settlement Class, you can ask for free help by calling, emailing, or writing to the Settlement Administrator at:

Toll-Free: 1-888-867-7175

Email: INFO@Ambulnzsettlement.com

Ambulnz Settlement, c/o Settlement Administrator, PO Box 2856, Portland, OR 97208-2856

You may also view the Settlement Agreement and Release (“Settlement Agreement”) at www.ambulnzsettlement.com.

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

7. What does the Settlement provide?

Under the Settlement, Ambulnz will pay all valid and timely claims for Credit Monitoring, Ordinary Losses, Lost Time, and Extraordinary Losses. Ambulnz will also pay all valid and timely claims for Alternative Cash Benefits in lieu of the other benefits of the Settlement.

8. How much will my payment be?

Payments and other benefits will vary—Settlement Class Members may submit a claim using the Claim Form for: (1) 1 year of credit monitoring; (2) Ordinary Loss Claims up to a total of \$400 per claimant; (3) Lost Time paid at \$18.50 per hour for up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74); and (4) Extraordinary Loss Claims up to a total of \$4,500 per claimant. Alternatively, Settlement Class Members may submit a claim for an Alternative Cash Benefit of either \$30 or \$10 per claimant, depending on whether Ambulnz’s records reflect that their Social Security Number or Driver’s License Information was implicated in the Security Incident.

Credit Monitoring Services. All Settlement Class Members shall have the ability to make a claim for 1 year of one-credit bureau credit monitoring services and identity protection services by choosing this benefit on the Claim Form. Even if Settlement Class Members previously accepted the Defendant’s offer of complimentary credit monitoring services, they may still claim this benefit.

Ordinary Losses up to a total of \$400 per claimant, upon submission of a valid claim with supporting documentation for out-of-pocket losses incurred or spent between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of Settlement is sent to the Settlement Class, including: (i) out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of the Security Incident, including unreimbursed bank fees, long-distance phone and cell phone charges (only if charged by the minute), data charges (only if charged based on the amount of data used), postage or gasoline for local travel; and (ii) fees for credit reports, credit monitoring or other identity theft insurance products purchased as a result of the Security Incident.

Lost Time Claims for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74) with an attestation on the Claim Form of the activities performed and that those activities were related to the Security Incident.

Questions? Call 1-888-867-7175 Toll-Free or Visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com

Extraordinary Losses up to a total of \$4,500 per Settlement Class Member in compensation on submission of a valid and timely claim for monetary losses that meet the following conditions: i) the loss is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss caused by (A) misuse of the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information or (B) fraud associated with the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information; ii) the loss noted in i.(A) or i.(B) was more likely than not caused by the Security Incident; iii) the loss occurred between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of Settlement is sent to the Class; iv) the loss is not already covered by the Ordinary Loss or Lost Time categories; and v) the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all of the Settlement Class Member’s credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance, if any.

Alternative Cash Benefit. In lieu of the above benefits, Settlement Class Members may submit a claim using the Claim Form for an Alternative Cash Benefit of: (i) \$30 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Driver’s License Number were implicated in the Security Incident, as reflected in Ambulnz’s records; or (ii) \$10 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Driver’s License Number were not implicated in the Security Incident. A Settlement Class Member electing to receive an Alternative Cash Benefit is not eligible for any other benefits of the Settlement.

9. What claims am I releasing if I stay in the Settlement Class?

Unless you opt out of the Settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant about any of the legal claims this Settlement resolves. The “Releases” section in the Settlement Agreement describes the legal claims that you give up if you remain in the Settlement Class. The Settlement Agreement can be found at www.ambulnzsettlement.com.

HOW TO GET A PAYMENT - MAKING A CLAIM

10. How do I submit a claim and get a cash payment?

Claim Forms may be submitted online at www.ambulnzsettlement.com or printed from the website and mailed to the Settlement Administrator at: *Ambulnz Settlement*, c/o Settlement Administrator, PO Box 2856, Portland OR 97208-2856.

You may also contact the Settlement Administrator to request a Claim Form by telephone at 1-888-867-7175, by email to info@ambulnzsettlement.com, or by U.S. mail at the address above.

11. What is the deadline for submitting a claim?

If you submit a claim by U.S. mail, the completed and signed Claim Form must be postmarked by September 15, 2025. If submitting a Claim Form online, you must do so by September 15, 2025.

12. When will I get my payment?

The short answer is after the Settlement is “finally approved” and challenges, if any, to that approval are finally resolved. The Court is scheduled to hold a final approval hearing on August 22, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. EST to decide whether to approve the Settlement, how much attorneys’ fees and costs to award to Settlement Class Counsel for representing the Settlement Class, and whether to award a Service Award to the Class Representative who brought this Action on behalf of the Settlement Class.

If the Court approves the Settlement, there may be appeals. It is always uncertain whether appeals will be filed and, if so, how long it will take to resolve them. Settlement payments will be distributed as soon as possible, if and when the Court grants final approval to the Settlement and after any appeals are resolved.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

13. Do I have a lawyer in the case?

Yes, the Court appointed Andrew Shamis of Shamis & Gentile, P.A. to represent you and other members of the Settlement Class (“Settlement Class Counsel”). You will not be charged directly for these lawyers; instead, they will receive compensation from Ambulnz (subject to Court approval).

Questions? Call 1-888-867-7175 Toll-Free or Visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com

If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

14. Should I get my own lawyer?

It is not necessary for you to hire your own lawyer because Settlement Class Counsel works for you. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

15. How will the lawyers be paid?

Settlement Class Counsel will file a motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses to be paid by Ambulnz. Ambulnz has agreed not to oppose Settlement Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses not to exceed Two Hundred Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$230,000). If Settlement Class Counsel seeks more than \$241,066 in attorneys' fees and expenses, Ambulnz has reserved all rights to object and oppose such requests.

Settlement Class Counsel will also seek a service award payment for the Class Representative in recognition for their contributions to this Action. Ambulnz has agreed not to oppose Settlement Class Counsel's request for a service award not to exceed Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) for the Class Representative. To the extent more than \$2,000 in service awards is sought for the Class Representative, Ambulnz has reserved all rights to object and oppose such a request.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

16. How do I opt out of the Settlement?

If you do not want to receive any benefits from the Settlement, and you want to keep your right to separately sue the Defendant about the legal issues in this case, you must take steps to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class. This is called "opting out" of the Settlement Class. The deadline for requesting exclusion from the Settlement is August 15, 2025.

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must submit a written request for exclusion to the Court that includes the following information:

- the case name: *Ballesteros v. Ambulnz NY, LLC*, 2025-005051-CA-01 (11th Judicial Circuit, Miami-Dade County, Fla.);
- your full name;
- current address;
- personal signature; and
- the words "Request for Exclusion" or a comparable statement that you do not wish to participate in the Settlement.

Your request for exclusion must be mailed to the Settlement Administrator at the address below, postmarked no later than August 15, 2025.

Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator
ATTN: Opt-Out Request
PO Box 2856
Portland, OR 97208-2856

If you exclude yourself, you are telling the Court that you do not want to be part of the Settlement. You may only exclude yourself – not any other person.

COMMENTING ON OR OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

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

If you are a Settlement Class Member, you can choose (but are not required) to object to the Settlement if you do not like it or a portion of it, whether that be to the Settlement benefits, the request for attorneys' fees or service awards, the releases provided to the Defendant, or some other aspect of the Settlement. Through an objection, you give reasons why you think the Court should not approve the Settlement.

Questions? Call 1-888-867-7175 Toll-Free or Visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com

For an objection to be considered by the Court, the objection must include: (i) the name of the proceedings; (ii) the Settlement Class Member's full name and current mailing address; (iii) a statement that states with specificity the grounds for the objection, as well as any documents supporting the objection; (iv) the identity of any attorneys representing the objector; (v) a statement regarding whether the Settlement Class Member (or his/her attorney) intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; and (vi) the signature of the Settlement Class Member or the Settlement Class Member's attorney.

Any Settlement Class Member who does not file a timely and adequate objection in accordance with the above paragraph waives the right to object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing and shall be bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement and by all orders and judgments in the Action.

Objections must be filed with the Court no later than August 15, 2025.

Clerk of the Court
Circuit Court of the 11th Judicial District
73 W. Flagler Street, Miami, FL 33130

18. What is the difference between objecting and excluding?

Objecting is telling the Court that you do not like something about the Settlement. You can object to the Settlement only if you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement. Excluding yourself from the Settlement means telling the Court you do not want to be part of the Settlement. If you opt out of the Settlement, you cannot object to it because the Settlement no longer affects you.

THE COURT'S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

19. When is the Court's Final Approval Hearing?

The Court is scheduled to hold a final approval hearing on **August 22, 2025, at 1:00 p.m. E.T.**, at the Courtroom located at 175 NW 1st Ave, Miami, FL 33128, to decide whether to approve the Settlement, how much attorneys' fees and costs to award to Settlement Class Counsel for representing the Settlement Class, and whether to award a service award payment to the Class Representative who brought this Action on behalf of the Settlement Class. If you are a Settlement Class Member, you or your attorney may ask permission to speak at the hearing at your own cost. If you do not like the Settlement, remember you may object to it, but you have to follow certain requirements (see Question 17). The date and time of this hearing may change without further notice. Please check www.ambulnzsettlement.com for updates.

20. Do I have to come to the Final Approval Hearing?

No. Settlement Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. You may attend at your own expense if you wish. If you file an objection, you may but you do not have to come to the Final Approval Hearing to talk about it. If you file your written objection on time and in accordance with the requirements above, the Court will consider it. You may also pay your own lawyer to attend, but such attendance is not necessary for the Court to consider an objection that was filed on time and meets the requirements above.

IF I DO NOTHING

21. What happens if I do nothing at all?

If you are a Settlement Class Member and you do nothing, you will give up your right to start a lawsuit, continue a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant and the Released Parties, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, about the legal issues resolved by this Settlement. In addition, you will be bound by the releases of the Released Parties in the Settlement and not be eligible to receive a payment from this Settlement.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

22. How do I get more information?

This Notice summarizes the proposed Settlement. Complete details are provided in the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement and other related documents are available at the Settlement Website, www.ambulnzsettlement.com.

If you have additional questions, you may contact the Settlement Administrator by email, phone, or mail:

Email: Info@Ambulnzsettlement.com

Toll-Free: 1-888-867-7175

Mail: Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator, PO Box 2856, Portland, OR 97208-2856

Publicly filed documents can also be obtained by visiting the office of the Circuit Court of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit in and for Miami-Dade County, Florida or by reviewing the Court's online docket. For those planning to visit the Court for more information, please contact the Court for its regular business hours and for any costs associated with obtaining documents maintained by the Court.

You may also contact your counsel in this matter, the Settlement Class Counsel, as follows:

Andrew Shamis
SHAMIS & GENTILE, P.A.
ashamis@shamisgentile.com

PLEASE DO NOT CONTACT THE COURT OR AMBULNZ

Questions? Call 1-888-867-7175 Toll-Free or Visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com

Attachment 4

**Must be postmarked or
submitted online NO
LATER THAN
September 15, 2025**

Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator
P.O. BOX 2856
PORTLAND, OR 97208-2856
www.ambulnzsettlement.com

Ballesteros v Ambulnz NY, LLC Claim Form

Circuit Court of the 11th Judicial District for Miami-Dade County, Florida

Case No. 2025-005051-CA-01

SETTLEMENT BENEFITS – WHAT YOU MAY GET

Complete this Claim Form if you are a Settlement Class Member and you wish to receive Settlement benefits. You are a member of the Settlement Class and eligible to submit a Claim Form if:

You are an individual who resides in the United States whose personally identifiable information (“PII”) and/or personal health information (“PHI”) was potentially exposed to unauthorized third parties as a result of the cybersecurity incident that affected Ambulnz in or around April 2024 (“Security Incident”).

Excluded from the Settlement Class are (i) Ambulnz, its officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Security Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

Settlement Class Members may submit a claim form for: (1) 1 year of credit monitoring; (2) Ordinary Loss Claims up to a total of \$400 per claimant; (3) Lost Time paid at \$18.50 per hour for up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74); and (4) Extraordinary Loss Claims up to a total of \$4,500 per claimant. Instead of these benefits, Class Members may submit a claim form for an Alternative Cash Benefit.

You may submit a claim for one or more of these benefits:

1. **Credit Monitoring Services:** All Settlement Class Members shall have the ability to make a claim for 1 year of credit monitoring services and identity protection services.
2. **Ordinary Losses** up to a total of \$400.00 per claimant, upon submission of a valid claim with supporting documentation for out-of-pocket losses incurred or spent between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of settlement is sent to the Settlement Class, including: i) out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a result of the Security Incident, including unreimbursed bank fees, long distance phone and cell phone charges (only if charged by the minute), data charges (only if charged based on the amount of data used), postage or gasoline for local travel; and ii) fees for credit reports, credit monitoring or other identity theft insurance products purchased because of the Security Incident.
3. **Lost Time Claims** for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74) with an attestation on the Claim Form of the activities performed and that they were related to the Security Incident.
4. **Extraordinary Losses** up to a total of \$4,500.00 per Settlement Class Member in compensation on submission of a valid and timely claim form with supporting documentation and an attestation on the claim form for monetary losses that meet the following conditions: i) the loss is an actual, documented and unreimbursed monetary loss caused by (A) misuse of the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information or (B) fraud associated with the Settlement Class Member’s Personal Information; ii) the loss noted in i.(A) or i.(B) was more likely than not caused by the Security Incident; iii) the loss occurred between April 21, 2024 and the day that the Court approved notice of settlement is sent to the Settlement Class; iv) the loss is not already covered by the Ordinary Loss or Lost Time categories; and v) the Settlement Class Member made reasonable efforts to avoid, or seek reimbursement for, the loss, including but not limited to exhaustion of all of the Settlement Class Member’s credit monitoring insurance and identity theft insurance.

OR

Questions? Visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call 1-888-867-7175.

1. **Alternative Cash Benefit.** In lieu of the above benefits, Settlement Class Members may submit a claim for an Alternative Cash Benefit of: (1) \$30 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number were implicated in the Security Incident; or (2) \$10 for those Settlement Class Members whose Social Security Number and/or Driver's License Number were not implicated in the Security Incident. If you select this benefit, you will not be eligible for any other benefit of the settlement.

* * *

This Claim Form may be submitted electronically via the Settlement Website at www.ambulnzsettlement.com or completed and mailed, including any supporting documentation, to:
*Ambulnz Security Incident Settlement Administrator, PO Box 2856
 Portland, OR 97208-2856*

The Claim Form must be submitted electronically or postmarked and mailed by September 15, 2025.

Please note: the settlement administrator may contact you to request additional documents to process your claim.

For more information and complete instructions visit www.ambulnzsettlement.com.

Please note that Settlement benefits will be distributed after the Settlement is approved by the Court and becomes final.

SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBER NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION

1. NAME (REQUIRED):

First Name

MI

Last Name

2. MAILING ADDRESS (REQUIRED):

Street Address

City

State

ZIP Code

3. PHONE NUMBER:

 - -

4. EMAIL ADDRESS:

5. UNIQUE ID:

CREDIT MONITORING SERVICES

You may be eligible to receive free Credit Monitoring Services.

All class members are eligible to claim one year of credit monitoring services, which includes, among other things, \$1,000,000 in identity theft insurance.

Please select the checkbox if you want the Credit Monitoring Services for which you are eligible.

Credit Monitoring Services: I want to receive free Credit Monitoring Services at the email entered in the above section.

If you select this option, you will be sent instructions and an activation code after the settlement is final to your email address or home address. Enrollment in this service will not subject you to marketing for additional services or any required payments.



Questions? Visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call 1-888-867-7175.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR LOST TIME

- Check this box if you spent time monitoring accounts or otherwise dealing with issues related to the Security Incident. You can submit a claim for reimbursement of \$18.50 per hour up to 4 hours (for a total of \$74).

By checking the box above, you are attesting that the activities you performed were related to the Security Incident.

Complete the chart below describing the lost time and supporting documentation you are submitting.

Hours lost as a result of the Security Incident	Description of the activities performed during the time claimed and their connection to the Security Incident
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 hour	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 hour	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 hour	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 hour	_____



Questions? Visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call 1-888-867-7175.

EXTRAORDINARY LOSSES

- Check this box if you are requesting compensation for **Extraordinary Losses** up to a total of \$4,500.00. By checking this box, you are attesting the losses you incurred were a result of actual out-of-pocket losses related to the Security Incident.

***You must submit supporting documentation demonstrating actual, unreimbursed monetary loss.**

Complete the chart below describing the supporting documentation you are submitting.

Loss Type and Examples of Documents	Amount and Date	Description of Loss or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching, and why it's related to the Security Incident)
Costs related to credit monitoring purchases/ freezing/unfreezing between April 21, 2024 and June 16, 2025 . <i>Examples: Receipts, notices, or account statements reflecting payment for a credit freeze</i>	\$ <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> . <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Date: <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> - <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> - <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> MM DD YYYY	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
Costs, expenses, and losses due to identity theft, fraud, or misuse of your personal information on or after April 21, 2024 and fairly traceable to the Ballesteros v Ambulnz breach Security Incident. <i>Examples: Account statement with unauthorized charges circled; police report; IRS document; FTC Identity Theft Report; letter refusing to refund fraudulent charges; receipt for your credit monitoring services purchase</i>	\$ <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> . <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Date: <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> - <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> - <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> MM DD YYYY	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
Other expenses such as notary, fax, postage, copying, mileage, long-distance telephone charges, or professional fees related to the Security Incident. <i>Examples: Phone bills, receipts, detailed list of addresses you traveled (i.e. police station, IRS office), reason why you traveled there (i.e. police report or letter from IRS re: falsified tax return) and number of miles you traveled</i>	\$ <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> . <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> Date: <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> - <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> - <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> MM DD YYYY	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>



Questions? Visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call 1-888-867-7175.

ORDINARY LOSSES

- Check this box if you are requesting compensation for **Ordinary Losses** up to a total of \$400.00. By checking this box, you are attesting that the losses you incurred were a result of actual identity theft related to the Security Incident.

***You must submit supporting documentation demonstrating actual, unreimbursed monetary loss and meeting the other criteria set forth above.**

Complete the chart below describing the supporting documentation you are submitting.

Expense Types and Examples of Documents	Approximate Amount of Expense and Date	Description of Expense or Money Spent and Supporting Documents (Identify what you are attaching, and why it's related to the Security Incident)
Unreimbursed Bank Fees <i>Examples: Bank statements with fees, such as card reissuance, unreimbursed overdraft and late fees, circled.</i>	\$ <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> . <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> Date: <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> MM DD YYYY	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
Postage or Gasoline for Local Travel <i>Examples: Postage or gasoline receipts with charges circled.</i>	\$ <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> . <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> Date: <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> MM DD YYYY	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
Any other expenses related to the Security Incident. <i>Examples: Cell phone data Charges, cell phone minutes, long distance charges with proof of expense and payment.</i>	\$ <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> . <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> Date: <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> MM DD YYYY	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/>



Questions? Visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call 1-888-867-7175.

ATTESTATION AND SIGNATURE

I affirm under the laws of the United States that the information I have supplied in this claim 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.

Signature

Date: - -
MM DD YYYY

Print Name



Questions? Visit www.AmbulnzSettlement.com or call 1-888-867-7175.

Attachment 5

U.S.

Politics

Sports

Entertainment

Life

Money

Travel

Opinion

Crossword

0

0

64 F

O

Subscribe

Sign in



Trump orders ICE to expand deportations in Democrat-run big cities

Trump challenged ICE to deliver "the single largest Mass Deportation Program in History" by expanding operations in large cities led by Democrats.

POLITICS 9:29 a.m. ET June 16



Trump Organization launches \$499 phone, new Trump Mobile cell service

MONEY 10:01 a.m. ET June 16



Against the odds, one teen rescues her four sisters from foster care

INVESTIGATIONS 5:53 a.m. ET June 15



See the 2025 pet special edition

Story from SVP



Minnesota shooting suspect to appear in court

Officials say Vance Luther Boeltner surrendered to police in a wooded area near his home. He faces multiple charges in a targeted attack on lawmakers.

NATION 9:31 a.m. ET June 16

Singer performs national anthem in Spanish after Dodgers said 'no'

Nezza was told she couldn't sing the national anthem in Spanish. Watch her do it anyway.

MUSIC 9:23 a.m. ET Jun 16



FIFA Club World Cup games today: Schedule, times, how to watch for June 16

Here's the full FIFA Club World Cup schedule, for June 16, including game times, TV channels, scores and how to stream.

SOCCER 6:03 a.m. ET Jun 16



Trump warned Israel against killing Iran's supreme leader

President Trump rejected an Israeli plan in recent days to kill Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, a senior U.S. official told USATODAY.

POLITICS 10:22 p.m. ET Jun. 15



Top Headlines

2025 US Open purse: Payouts, prize money at Oakmont

'Tankini summer' and why covering up at the beach is so controversial

Fivesleepers for college football national championship in 2025 season

Winners and losers from Sunday's play at College World Series

Minnesota shootings: John Hoffman's wife speaks out as suspect arrested

From 'Jaws' to 'The Meg,' we rank the 10 best shark movies ever

Shark attack victim can move her fingers again, family says


Red Sox trade All-Star to NL contender in blockbuster deal

Get the Daily Briefing in your inbox

Advertisement

To all persons whose personal information may have been accessed during a ransomware cybersecurity incident that impacted Ambulnz,

Featured Videos



ANTHROPOLOGIE

the goodies you browsed are **Back In Stock**

[SHOP NOW](#)


SPORTS



FIFA Club World Cup 2025: Three games hosted in Nashville's GEODIS Park



5 DAYS AGO
Brett Yormark - College Sports is in a better place



11 DAYS AGO
Becky Sauerbrunn - USWNT roster changes "a normal part of the cycle"



11 DAYS AGO
Nashville SC's Zimmerman added to CONCACAF Gold Cup roster



4 DAYS AGO
Judge denies Zeigler's request for preliminary injunction trying to play 5th season



14 DAYS AGO
Wright State knocks No. 1 national seed Vanderbilt out of NCAA regionals, wins 5-4



16 DAYS AGO
Louisville boots No. 1 overall seed Vanderbilt into losers' bracket at Nashville Regional



17 DAYS AGO
Cracker Barrel 400 returns to Nashville Superspeedway this weekend



22 DAYS AGO
Vanderbilt beats Ole Miss 3-2, wins SEC Tournament, clinch NCAA Tournament berth

To all persons whose personal information may have been accessed during an April 2024 cybersecurity incident that impacted Ambulnz, a proposed class action settlement may affect your rights.

[Learn More](#)

NASHVILLE SOUNDS

SEE MORE >



1 MONTH AGO
Nashville Sounds kick off 2025 season with home opener against Jacksonville



4 HOURS AGO
Report: Nashville top city for MLB expansion



2 HOURS AGO
Boy battling rare tumor to be named honorary Nashville Sounds player

TRENDING



UPDATED
Mother and children shot in Madison; suspect in custody



UPDATED
4-year-old girl killed in Madison domestic shooting, two

64° Los Angeles, ...



85° Naples, FL



My Dashboard

Today

Hourly

10 Day

Weekend

Monthly

Radar

Storms

More Forecasts

To all persons whose personal information may have been accessed during an April 2024 cybersecurity incident that impacted Ambulnz,

Los Angeles, CA

As of 7:08 am PDT

64°



Fair

Day 88° • Night 61°

Watch: Wind Rips Wedding Structure Off Building

Weather Today in Los Angeles, CA

Feels Like

64°



High / Low	88°/61°	Wind	← 1 mph
Humidity	85%	Dew Point	59°
Pressure	↑ 29.90 in	UV Index	0 of 11
Visibility	6 mi	Moon Phase	Waning Gibbous

Advertisement

TICKETS & PACKAGES ON SALE NOW


Morning 74° Sunny 0%

Afternoon 84° Sunny 0%

Advertisement

TICKETS & PACKAGES ON SALE NOW

Your Summer Outlook



Who Could See A Relatively Cool Summer?

64° Los Angeles, ...

85° Naples, FL

My Dashboard

Today

Hourly

10 Day

Weekend

Monthly

Radar

Storms

More Forecasts

a proposed class action settlement may affect your rights.

Learn More

Los Angeles, CA

As of 7:08 am PDT

64°



Fair

Day 88° • Night 61°

Watch: Wind Rips Wedding Structure Off Building

Weather Today in Los Angeles, CA

Feels Like

64°



High / Low	88°/61°	Wind	← 1 mph
Humidity	85%	Dew Point	59°
Pressure	↑ 29.90 in	UV Index	0 of 11
Visibility	6 mi	Moon Phase	Waning Gibbous

Advertisement

Morning	74°	Sunny	0%
Afternoon	84°	Sunny	0%

Advertisement

Your Summer Outlook




Who Could See A Relatively Cool Summer?

ADVERTISEMENT

To all persons whose personal information may have been accessed during an April 2024 cybersecurity incident that impacted Ambulnz, a proposed class action settlement may affect your rights.

[Learn More](#)



Lifestyle



The New York Times. Illustrations by Till Laur

The Subtle Art of the Dad Text

When it comes to corny jokes, random photos and sincere pep talks, father knows best.

23h ago · By CATHERINE PEARSON



Photo Illustration by The New York Times, Orfeo Tagrun (stamps)

30 Delightful Hotels in Europe Under \$300 a Night

We scoured the hotel scene in the heart of popular cities in search of stylish lodgings that won't break the bank. Here's the best of what we found.

June 11, 2025 · By NOËLLE DE LEEUW, CEYLAN YEĞİNSU, LISA ABEND, VALERIYA SAFRONOVA, STEPHEN HILTNER, SETH SHERWOOD, ELAINE GLUSAC, ANDREW FERREN and INGRID K. WILLIAMS

The Rice Hack That Fuels My Family

A dry skillet and patience are all you need to transform leftover rice into a meal, Eric Kim writes.

3d ago · By ERIC KIM



AN APPRAISAL

Like His Music, Brian Wilson's Style Was Deceptively Complex

In Pendleton shirts and khakis, Mr.

Wilson and the Beach Boys showed the world what easy Southern California living looked like.

June 12, 2025 · By GUY TREBAY



- Meta AI
- Friends
- Memories
- Saved
- Groups
- Reels
- Marketplace
- See more

Legal Notice
Sponsored

Was your personal info. accessed in an April 2024 cybersecurity incident involving Ambulnz? Your rights may be affected.



AMBLUNZSETTLEMENT.COM [Learn more](#)

Like Comment Share

- Meta AI
- Friends
- Memories
- Saved
- Groups
- Reels
- Marketplace
- See more

Acemate
Sponsored

No training partner? No problem.
Acemate is the first robot that rallies back — not just feeds balls.
Now live on Kickstarter — secure your early bird reward today!

Why Acemate stands out:

- AI-powered vision for real-time ball tracking
- Ultra-smooth 360° motion with mecanum wheels
- Smart feedback with data-driven analysis
- Feels like hitting with a real opponent



Sponsored



Ambulz
Cybersecurity
Incident
ambulz.io/ambulzincident.com



legal.notice
Sponsored



[Learn more](#)



legal.notice Was your personal information accessed in a cybersecurity incident involving Ambulnz?