CHRISTINA TUSAN (SBN 192203)
ctusan@ctusanlaw.com
ADRIAN BARNES (SBN 253131)
abarnes@ctusanlaw.com
TUSAN LAW, P.C.
680 E. Colorado Blvd. #180
Pasadena, CA 91101
(626) 418-8203
(626) 619-8253 (Fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

Electronically FILED by Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles 8/04/2026 10:22 AM David W. Slayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court, By A. Zadorian, Deputy Clerk

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

MELODY CHENG, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ONNI BROADWAY BLOCK LONG BEACH LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, **ONNI MANAGEMENT CALIFORNIA INC.**, a Delaware Corporation, **ONNI PROPERTIES LLC,** an Arizona limited liability company, and **DOES 1 through 10**, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV30653

DECLARATION OF CHRISTINA TUSAN IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Complaint Filed: October 20, 2025

I, Christina Tusan, declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18 and have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could and would testify competently to them.

2. I am an attorney admitted to practice before the courts of the State of California and in California federal courts.

3. I am the founding partner of the law firm Tusan Law, P.C. ("Tusan Law" or "Class Counsel") and counsel for the named Plaintiff Melody Cheng ("Plaintiff"), and a putative class of all current and former tenants and applicants of Onni, in California, who had a lease with Onni covering any portion of the period from January 1, 2025, to March 4, 2026, or whose information was accessible to IDIQ through the Yardi database.

4. I have no knowledge of the existence of any conflict of interest between Class Counsel and the Plaintiff, on the one hand, and any Class Member, on the other hand.

5. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. A copy of the Settlement Agreement in this matter is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

I. ATTORNEY EXPERIENCE

6. I received my bachelor's degree from Stanford University in 1994, *cum laude*, and my J.D. from the University of Southern California in 1997, where I was a member of the USC Law Review and received the Warren Ferguson Social Justice Writing Award.

7. Over the past 29 years, I have built a career and reputation as a nationally recognized consumer protection litigator. During that period, I have obtained over $1 billion in judgments on behalf of consumers.

8. Prior to entering private practice, in 2023, I directly litigated and led teams of attorneys in the litigation of complex consumer protection cases at federal, state and local consumer protection agencies. While at the FTC for seven years, I successfully led multiple complex consumer protection cases resulting in judgments of substantially over $578 million. I received the FTC Director's Award for co-leading the FTC team that obtained a $478 million summary judgment, which was the largest litigated judgment in an FTC matter at that time (and constituted full restitution for every dollar that defendants had collected in that case). I also received the FTC Director's Award for successfully leading

a large team of attorneys and staff in a case that was litigated against DeVry University and resulted in a $100 million settlement, which was the largest litigated settlement against a for-profit university at the time. All of the $100 million order in that judgment was for restitution that was returned to consumers either through direct payments or through loan forgiveness. While at the California Attorney General's Office, I obtained judgments valued at over $60 million, which also included strong consumer redress and preliminary and permanent injunctions. I also successfully led a large team of lawyers at the LA City Attorney's Office where we obtained judgments worth hundreds of millions of dollars.

9. I have received multiple awards for my work, including three awards from the FTC, the California Attorney General's Award for Excellence, the National Anti-Fraud Network's Siris Investigation of the Year Award in 2023, and the California Lawyers' Association's Consumer and Unfair Competition Law Award in 2024. And I serve as a Senior Editor of the California Antitrust and Unfair Competition Law Treatise.

10. I have also been selected to serve on the board of numerous prestigious consumer protection and privacy organizations. I am currently on the Law360 editorial board regarding consumer law matters. I am the Chair of the Beverly Hils Bar Association's Privacy and Cybersecurity Section and serve on the board of the Los Angeles County Bar Association's Privacy and Cybersecurity Section.

11. I also serve as an advisor, and was previously on the Executive Committee, for the California Lawyers Association's Antitrust and Consumer Protection Section. Additionally, I helped to start the Association's first Consumer and Unfair Competition Law Institute, which has now been running successfully for five years.

12. I am also regularly asked to serve as a speaker for a substantial number of continuing legal education programs, which are too numerous to list here. I recently served on a panel entitled "The Latest Privacy Litigation Updates" at the California Lawyers Association's Privacy Section's 2026 two-day conference. I further have served as a panelist on Classwide Damages Models in Misleading and False Advertising Consumer Class Actions hosted by Stratford (a Barbri Company) in March 2025. Additionally, I regularly host fireside chats and serve as a facilitator for MCLE events with consumer and privacy-protection regulators. This has included an in-person fireside chat in May 2026 with the current director of the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Consumer Protection entitled "Protecting

Consumers & Promoting Innovation in a Data-Driven Economy"; a remote MCLE entitled "FTC Privacy and AI Enforcement Trends: A Fireside Chat with the FTC's Former Consumer Protection Director"; and 2025 in-person question and answer session entitled "Data Privacy Day CLE & Mixer – Privacy & Cybersecurity Year in Review" with a Senior Privacy Attorney from the California Privacy Protection Agency. I have also spoken on a panel entitled "A 360 Degree View of Compliance-based Resolutions" for the Beverly Hills Bar Association.

13. Since entering private practice, I have worked on a variety of class action cases, including a significant number of cases relating to consumer privacy. I was actively involved in *Smith-Washington et al. v. TaxAct, Inc.*, No. 3:23-CV-00830-VC (N.D. Cal.), while at a prior firm where I worked as a partner, which resulted in a settlement valued at over $20,000,000 (when including cash and estimated in-kind relief).

14. I was appointed as co-lead counsel in *In re BetterHelp, Inc. Data Disclosure Cases*, No. 23-cv-01033-RS (N.D. Cal.), a case involving the disclosure of consumers' sensitive personal and medical information, where I have been actively litigating the case for almost three years. I was also appointed interim co-lead counsel in *In re Igloo Products Cooler Recall Litigation*, No. 25-298-JLH-EGT (D. Del), a nationwide product liability case, which also remains in active litigation.

15. Adrian Barnes, also a Partner at Tusan Law, played an active role in this case. Mr. Barnes earned his B.A in Rhetoric from the University of California at Berkeley in 2001, his M.A. in English Literature from University College London in 2003, and his J.D. from Columbia Law School in 2007. While at law school, Mr. Barnes was a James Kent Scholar and a member of the Columbia Law Review editorial board. He also won Columbia's Emil Schlesinger prize for the student most proficient in labor law. Mr. Barnes's practice initially focused on traditional labor law and wage and hour class actions. Over the past eight years, while continuing to litigate wage and hour class actions, Mr. Barnes has developed considerable experience in consumer and privacy rights class actions. Mr. Barnes has served as the lead drafter of all stages of the pleadings and discovery in numerous class action cases and his work has significantly contributed to obtaining settlements valued at over $25,000,000. Mr. Barnes is admitted to practice law in California and Washington.

16. A list of cases on which Mr. Barnes and I have served as lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or class counsel is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**.

17. Class Counsel's broad experience in the prosecution and resolution of consumer protection enforcement and class action litigation on behalf of California consumers has enabled Counsel to efficiently assess the value of the claims of Class Members and to obtain a fair and efficient settlement.

II. SUMMARY OF THE CASE

Background

Onni's Implementation of Positive Rental Payment Information Reporting

18. On September 19, 2024, Governor Newsom approved Assembly Bill No. 2747, which added section 1954.07 to the California Civil Code, requiring landlords to offer their tenants the option to have their positive rental payment information reported to at least one nationwide consumer reporting agency. Pursuant to section 1954.07, Onni was required to provide its tenants who had a lease "outstanding as of January 1, 2025" with an "offer of positive rental payment information reporting" "no later than April 1, 2025." Pursuant to section 1954.07, Onni was also required to provide its tenants who entered into a lease "on and after April 1, 2025," with an "offer of positive rental payment information reporting at the time of the lease agreement."

19. Plaintiff alleges that, in April of 2025, Onni informed Plaintiff and other Class Members, by email, that it had partnered with IDIQ to provide positive monthly rental payment reporting for its tenants to major credit bureaus. Plaintiff further alleges that Onni's communications indicated that tenants would have to take action to opt out of the positive monthly rental payment reporting with IDIQ.

20. Plaintiff alleges that, in order to facilitate its program with IDIQ, Onni provided IDIQ with certain tenant information including their name, address, email address, and social security number ("Private Information") before notifying Plaintiff or Class Members of its arrangement with IDIQ and without obtaining their prior consent.

Onni's Privacy Policy

21. At all relevant times, Onni has maintained a Privacy Policy which covers all Defendants in the instant case. The Privacy Policy applies to "all personal information collected by [Onni] about

any individual that interacts with [Onni], including. . ., our tenants, guests and visitors of our properties." Thus, Plaintiff and all other members of the putative class, as tenants of Onni, are protected by Onni's Privacy Policy.

22. The Privacy Policy explicitly describes the types of personal information which Onni may collect from its tenants, including names, addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, social security numbers, and driver's license numbers. It also sets out how tenants' personal information may be used. These potential uses include: to establish, develop and preserve our business relationship with you; to provide you with the services we offer, and ensure all related transactions are supported and implemented; to authenticate your identity and preserve your privacy when you contact Onni by telephone, electronic means or otherwise; to ensure our records are accurate and to protect you and Onni from error and fraud; and, to meet legal and regulatory requirements and allow us to meet contractual requirements relating to the services we provide. Plaintiff alleges that none of the listed potential uses can be reasonably read to encompass directly providing Private Information to a third party for positive rental payment reporting purposes without tenants' consent.

23. With respect to tenants in particular, including Class Members, the Privacy Policy notes: "We collect personal information from tenants to evaluate their creditworthiness, evaluate and process applications for tenancy, prepare leases and to provide tenants with relevant information and services throughout the term of the lease (including specialized services and memberships, such as for parking and fitness facilities)." Again, Plaintiff contends, there is no suggestion that tenants' Private Information would be shared, without consent, with a third party for positive rental payment reporting services, though Defendants disagree with this interpretation. Further, the Privacy Policy promises Onni's tenants: "Unless required or authorized by law, Onni will not collect or use personal information for any other or new purpose without obtaining further consent."

24. Moreover, the Privacy Policy describes specific purposes for which Onni may <u>share</u> tenants' personal information. Among these purposes, Onni disclosures that it may share personal information: within the Onni Group of Companies; with service providers hired to perform services on Onni's behalf, including "internal audit, management, billing, website hosting or similar services"; in connection with "the proposed or actual sale, transfer, amalgamation, re-organization, financing,

securitization, insuring or assignment of all or parts of [Onni's] business or assets"; when compelled to share personal information pursuant to a legal or regulatory demand or requirements; and, for other purposes, but only with the consent of tenants and in accordance with applicable law.

25. Finally, the Privacy Policy contains a "CCPA Privacy Notice for California Consumers." This CCPA Privacy Notice does not indicate that California tenants' personal information will be disclosed for any purpose other than those already listed in the Privacy Policy. It explicitly states: "We collect, use and disclose personal information of California consumers as detailed in this Privacy Policy."

Plaintiff's and Other Class Members' Lease Agreements

26. Onni's lease agreements with Plaintiff and Class Members provide that Onni will inform Plaintiff and Class Members, "at or before the point of collection, . . . as to the categories of personal information to be collected and the purposes for which the categories of personal information will be used."

27. Plaintiff contends that at no time did Onni inform Plaintiff or Class Members that it would share their Private Information with IDIQ for the purposes of permitting the positive reporting of their rental payments to credit reporting agencies or for any other purpose.

Summary of the Investigation and Discovery Conducted

28. Prior to retaining Counsel, Plaintiff conducted her own investigation into her concerns that her Private Information had been shared with IDIQ without her permission. Plaintiff communicated with both Onni and IDIQ and shared those communications with Counsel. Counsel for Plaintiff also conducted their own investigation into the positive rental payment reporting service offered by IDIQ, and the rental properties owned and managed by Onni in California.

29. Following the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint, the parties agreed to attend mediation and engage in an informal document and data exchange in preparation for the mediation.

30. In response to Plaintiff's written questions, Defendants produced information regarding: the class size; the types of information shared between Onni and IDIQ; the dates of the period during which Onni shared such information regarding tenants with IDIQ; remedial efforts undertaken by Onni.

31. Defendants also produced a sample lease agreement and a copy of the addendum added to the lease agreement through which tenants can opt-in to positive rental payment reporting.

32. Prior to the mediation, Counsel for Plaintiff also continued their own investigation, gathering additional documents and data, including all versions of Onni's privacy policy, and copies of Onni and IDIQ's communications with Class Members.

33. Having carefully reviewed and considered all of this information, Plaintiff was adequately informed to make the decision to settle this case on the proposed terms.

Summary of Settlement Negotiations

34. The settlement is a result of extensive settlement negotiations between the parties conducted at arm's length and informed by substantial factual and legal investigation.

35. The Parties ultimately attended a mediation on March 4, 2026, presided over by Mediator Jill Sperber.

36. At the mediation, the Parties were successful in reaching a settlement of Plaintiff's putative class claims and, shortly, thereafter executed a binding memorandum of understanding.

37. The Parties continued their arm's-length negotiations, and, on June 15, 2026, the Parties entered into the Settlement Agreement. Defendants have denied and continue to deny all allegations of wrongdoing, and the settlement is a compromise to avoid the expense and uncertainty of continued litigation.

III. THE RISKS, EXPENSES, COMPLEXITY, AND LIKELY DURATION OF FURTHER LITIGATION

38. Defendants strongly disagreed as to Plaintiff's ability to certify a class or to win on the merits. Assuming at least one of the two causes of action proceeded to trial, the losing party would likely appeal. This process would take years to resolve. Instead, this settlement provides an early resolution of this dispute, and Class Members will obtain a recovery in the relatively near future if the settlement is finally approved.

IV. THE RISKS OF ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING CLASS ACTION STATUS

39. Plaintiff strongly believes that she would have been able to successfully certify a class to pursue both claims in her Complaint. Plaintiff understands, however, that Defendants disagree.

40. In this regard, Defendants have indicated that they would argue that individual issues regarding harm or damages suffered by Plaintiff and other Class Members would require individualized inquiries into each respective individual. With respect to Plaintiff's CCPA claim, the availability of statutory damages diminishes the threat of this particular argument. And, regardless, Plaintiff disagrees that individual damages would prevent class certification given that the underlying liability issues can be determined by common evidence: Defendants' privacy policy (including their CCPA Notice), their standard leases, and the nature of the information shared by Onni with IDIQ. Relatedly, Plaintiff disagrees with Defendants' contention that common issues would not predominate because individualized inquiries would be required to determine, for example, whether each Class Member opted-out of the positive rental payment reporting program or whether each individual materially performed with respect to their lease agreement. Nevertheless, regardless of her confidence in her ability to certify a class, Plaintiff acknowledges that there are risks associated with achieving and maintain class action status were the litigation to proceed.

V. PLAINTIFF'S DAMAGES ANALYSIS

41. In the instant case, the settlement amount compares favorably with Plaintiff's Counsel's estimates of the maximum and realistic value of the Class Members' claims. The major risks applicable to the claims are discussed below, which includes a claim-by-claim comparison of the estimated potential recovery and discounted settlement amount attributable to each claim.

CCPA Claim (Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.150)

42. Plaintiff alleges that Onni violated the CCPA when it disclosed Class Members' Private Information to IDIQ without consent. Pursuant to Civil Code section 1798.150, Plaintiff calculated Defendants' maximum exposure assuming an award of statutory damages to each Class Member. The range of recoverable statutory damages per violation is $100 to $750. Pursuant to section 1798.150(2):

> In assessing the amount of statutory damages, the court shall consider any one or more of the relevant circumstances presented by any of the parties to the case, including, but not limited to, the nature and seriousness of the misconduct, the number of violations, the persistence of the misconduct, the length of time over which the misconduct occurred, the willfulness of the defendant's misconduct, and the defendant's assets, liabilities, and net worth.

Considering these factors, while Plaintiff considers the alleged violations to be serious, she acknowledges that it cannot be assumed that the Court would have assessed an award at the highest end of the range. Accordingly, Plaintiff calculates Defendants' maximum exposure assuming a statutory damages award of $375 per Class Member; a total of **$937,500**.

43. **Class Certification Risks:** Plaintiff applied a 10% discount for Onni's contentions, discussed above, that class certification would not be possible. Given the availability of statutory damages, Plaintiff considers that Defendants' arguments regarding the potential need for individual inquiries into each Class Members' respective injuries are not strong. Accordingly, only a minimal discount is appropriate.

44. **Procedural/Merits Risk**: As a procedural matter, Defendants would argue that Plaintiff's CCPA claim fails for inadequate notice given that Defendants have not been able to locate the initial CCPA Notice mailed by Plaintiff. However, Counsel for Plaintiff sent a copy of this CCPA Notice to Counsel for Defendants more than thirty business days prior to the filing of Plaintiff's Complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff does not consider that there is any risk that the Court would find inadequate notice for a CCPA claim and applies no discount on the basis of that defense.

45. In terms of merits, the CCPA Privacy Notice to Plaintiff and other Class Members did, in fact, inform them that "from time to time, Onni may be compelled to share personal information in response to a law, regulation, court order, subpoena, valid demand, . . . or other legally valid request or inquiry. In these circumstances, Onni will protect your interested by making reasonable efforts to ensure that orders or demands comply with the laws under which they are issued, that it shares only the personal information that is legally required and nothing more . . . ." And, thus, Defendants may argue that the disclosure of information to IDIQ in an attempt to comply with section 1954.07 of the California Civil Code was a permissible and disclosed use of Private Information. Critically, however, section 1954.07 only contemplates positive rental payment reporting for tenants who opt-in and it mandates methods by which tenants may opt-in. *See, e.g.,* Cal. Civil Code § 1954.07 (d)(1), (4), (f)(1), (g)(1), (k). And, it clarifies that Onni will not share any more information than is "legally required."

46. Defendants may also argue that IDIQ is a "service provider" within the meaning of section 1798.140(ag)(1). But, assuming *arguendo* that this definition is applicable, it does not obviate

the requirement that Defendants notify Class Members of the purposes for which their Private Information could be collected or used.

47. Defendants would also argue that Onni did not violate section 1798.150(a)(1) because the information provided to IDIQ was not "unencrypted" or "unredacted" and because the disclosure of the information to IDIQ was not "unauthorized." *See* section 1798.150(a)(1) (providing private right to action to "[a]ny consumer whose nonencrypted and nonredacted personal information . . . is subject to an unauthorized access and exfiltration, theft, or disclosure as a result of the business' violation of the duty to implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices appropriate to the nature of the information to protect the personal information." (emphasis added)). Plaintiff does not consider this to be a strong defense. Rather, the disclosure of Private Information to IDIQ was "unauthorized," within the meaning of section 1798.150(a)(1), because it was not disclosed for a purpose about which Plaintiff and other Class Members were informed by Onni's CCPA Privacy Notice, and the information was "nonencrypted and nonredacted" when disclosed to IDIQ, which is the unauthorized disclosure at issue. Whether it was stored on the Yardi database such that it would have been encrypted and redacted had some other actor tried to access it is not relevant.

48. Finally, Plaintiff would be required to prove that the unauthorized disclosure to IDIQ was a result of Onni's "violation of the duty to implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices appropriate to the nature of the information to protect the personal information." Civ. Code § 1798.150(a)(1). Plaintiff does not consider this a major risk to recovery given that Onni affirmatively chose to disclose Private Information to IDIQ without permission, but understands that Defendants believe this is a viable defense.

49. In total, Plaintiff applied a further 50% discount for the risks posed by these various defenses and arguments set out above. Applying both the certification and merits discounts, for settlement purposes, Defendants' realistic exposure on the CCPA claim is reduced to **$375,000**.

Breach of Contract Claim

50. Onni's lease agreements with Plaintiff and Class Members provided that Onni would inform Plaintiff and Class Members, "at or before the point of collection, . . . as to the categories of personal information to be collected and the purposes for which the categories of personal information

will be used." Plaintiff alleges that Defendants breached their lease agreements with Plaintiff and Class Members by disclosing Plaintiff's and Class Members' Private Information to IDIQ without informing Plaintiff and other Class Members at or before collecting their Private Information, that they would disclose that information to a third party for the purposes of positive rental payment reporting.

51. Plaintiff and Class Members would be entitled to recover compensatory damages for harm suffered as a result of Onni's breaches of their respective contracts. It is not possible, however, to estimate the class-wide damages recoverable under this cause of action without additional discovery. Moreover, Plaintiff is not aware of any evidence that the Private Information disclosed to IDIQ was further disclosed to any other party or was used by IDIQ for any purpose other than positive rental payment reporting. In terms of calculating Defendants' exposure, Plaintiff thinks it reasonable to assume a figure of one-quarter of the maximum exposure calculated for the CCPA claim: **$234,375**.

52. **Class Certification Risks:** Plaintiff would apply a 30% discount for Onni's contentions, discussed above, that class certification would not be possible. Given the unavailability of statutory damages for this cause of action, Plaintiff considers that Defendants' arguments regarding the potential need for individual inquiries into each Class Members' respective injuries are stronger than for the CCPA claim. Accordingly, a larger discount is appropriate.

53. **Merits Risks**: As to the merits, Defendants would argue, as discussed above, that they did not breach the lease agreements because they were compelled to share the Private Information with IDIQ pursuant to section 1954.07. For the reasons given above, Plaintiff would apply only a 20% discount on the basis of that argument.

54. In total, applying both the certification and merits discounts, for settlement purposes, Defendants' realistic exposure on the breach of contract claim is reduced to **$117,188**.

The Maximum Settlement Amount Represents an Excellent Result

55. In the aggregate, Plaintiff calculates Defendants' maximum exposure on the Class claims as **$1,171,875**, and their realistic exposure as **$492,188**. With these figures in mind, the Maximum Settlement Amount of **$240,000** represents a fair and reasonable return of 20.5% of the maximum, and 48.8% of Defendants' realistic exposure.

56. Based on my experience, and my evaluation of the case, I consider this settlement to be fair, adequate, and reasonable for the Class.

VI. CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES IS APPROPRIATE

The Class is Ascertainable and Sufficiently Numerous

57. Class Members can be readily identified from Onni's own tenant records and the Yardi database, without individualized inquiry. The Settlement Class is estimated to include approximately 2,500 members. With approximately 2,500 Class Members, joinder would be wholly impracticable and the numerosity requirement is satisfied.

"Community of Interest" Exists Among Class Members

58. Plaintiff challenges a common course of conduct by Onni—the alleged uniform, unauthorized disclosure of all Class Members' Private Information to IDIQ without notice or consent. The central legal and factual questions are identical for each Class Member: (1) whether Onni disclosed Class Members' Private Information to IDIQ without authorization; (2) whether such disclosure violated the CCPA; and (3) whether such disclosure breached Onni's lease agreements. These questions are common to all Class Members and susceptible to common proof. Individualized issues do not predominate.

Plaintiff's Claims are Typical of the Class Claims

59. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class that she seeks to represent because she was subject to the same conduct, suffered the same type of injury, and seeks the same types of relief.

VII. ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS

60. The Settlement Agreement provides that Defendants will not oppose a request for attorneys' fees of up to one third of the Maximum Settlement Amount (or $80,000). SA ¶ 91. This is fair, reasonable, and adequate to compensate Class Counsel for the substantial work they have already done to prosecute this Action, the risk they assumed to agree to take the case in the first place, the great expense spared to the Class by Class Counsel having achieved a successful resolution, and the continued time and expense that Class Counsel will incur by administering the fair distribution of the settlement fund should this Court grant the settlement's approval.

61. Class Counsel agreed to represent Plaintiff on behalf of the putative Class on a contingency basis and further agreed to advance all litigation costs. Our significant financial outlays would have been entirely lost if the case were not won, and the amount of Class Counsel's time that would have remained uncompensated in that event would have been substantial. Class Counsel also took on this case despite the known risks associated with Plaintiff's class allegations as described above and the unpredictable risks that are common to most complex class actions that develop only over the course of the litigation. Despite all this, Class Counsel was able to obtain a very favorable settlement for the Class.

62. Class Counsel have spent a considerable amount of time prosecuting this case, including, but not limited to, drafting pleadings, researching California Civil Code section 1954.07, investigating the facts underlying the case, meeting and conferring with Defendants' counsel, analyzing information provided by Defendants, drafting a mediation brief, and negotiating and finalizing the settlement agreement and related documents.

63. The Settlement Agreement's award of litigation costs of up to $15,000, SA ¶ 91, is intended for commonly reimbursed out-of-pocket costs incurred by my firm, including filing and process-serving fees, Plaintiff's share of the mediator's fees, expenses related to court appearances, copying, and legal and other research charges.

64. If the Court grants Preliminary Approval and authorizes the dissemination of notice of the settlement to the class, Class Counsel anticipates filing a Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Plaintiff's Service Awards that will be scheduled to be heard concurrently with the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel will submit their lodestar and costs breakdown with their motion for attorneys' fees and costs, which will be noticed to be heard at the same time as the final approval motion.

VIII. PLAINTIFF'S SERVICE AWARD

65. The request for a Service Award of $5,000 for Plaintiff Melody Cheng is reasonable and fair. The Service Award is intended to compensate Plaintiff for the critical role she played in this case and the substantial time, effort, and risks she undertook in helping secure the result obtained on behalf of the Settlement Class. The requested Service Award falls well within the range of incentive payments typically awarded to Class Representatives in similar class actions. *See e.g.*, *Pereltsvaig v. Stanford*,

No. 17-CV-311521 (Santa Clara Cty. Super. Ct. Jan. 4, 2019) (awarding $7,500 incentive award); *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 1380, 1393 (2010) (affirming incentive awards of $10,000). In agreeing to serve as class representative, Plaintiff formally agreed to accept the responsibility of representing the interests of all Class Members. She collected and provided documents and diligently assisted Class Counsel in the investigation for the case and in seeking informal discovery. Indeed, Plaintiff's participation in this case was unusual in that she initiated the investigation into potential misconduct by Defendants and then brought her concerns to Counsel. Her participation and assistance were critical to the success of this litigation and the enforcement of consumer privacy protections. Without Plaintiff's initial investigation and her subsequent commitment to come forward and serve as Class Representative in commencing this lawsuit, this litigation would not have been brought. Significantly, also, Plaintiff is granting Defendants a general release of all claims, which is far broader than the release being given by the members of the Class, who are releasing all claims arising from or related to the conduct alleged in the Complaint. Finally, Plaintiff's claims are not antagonistic to the interests of the class. Defendants do not oppose this request. A declaration from Plaintiff addressing her participation in this action, including the time she has committed thus far, is filed concurrently herewith.

IX. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR

66. After obtaining several bids, the parties have selected Analytics Consulting LLC to administer this settlement. Analytics Consulting has extensive experience in the settlement administration of consumer class actions like this one, having administered thousands of class action settlements, and they provided the lowest bid. The Settlement Agreement provides that the costs of administration will be paid out of the Maximum Settlement Amount. Costs of administration are currently estimated to be not greater than $15,000.

X. CY PRES BENEFICIARY

67. Subject to Court approval, Privacy Rights Clearinghouse has been designated as the *cy pres* beneficiary and recipient of funds associated with Class Member Settlement Payment checks that are not cashed. Privacy Rights Clearinghouse is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization committed to advancing data privacy for all by expanding access to information, increasing participation in policy

discussions, and advocating for stronger rights. In this regard, Privacy Rights Clearinghouse is a nonprofit organization which promotes the law consistent with the objectives and purposes of the causes of action in the instant case.

68. I certify that I do not and my law partner does not have any connection to or relationship with Privacy Rights Clearinghouse that could reasonably create the appearance of impropriety as between the selection of the recipient of the money or thing of value and the interests of the class, nor does my law firm. We have no interest or involvement in the work, governance, or operations of Privacy Rights Clearinghouse.

69. Defendants have also represented to me, through Counsel, that Defendants have no interest or involvement in the work, governance, or operations of Privacy Rights Clearinghouse.

70. Plaintiff considers it desirable to have a *cy pres* beneficiary, especially one so closely connected to the alleged failures of Defendants, because Plaintiff believes only a small number of checks will remain uncashed and the funds represented by those checks will likely not cover or barely more than cover the additional costs associated with re-distributing those funds to those of the approximately 2,500 class members who do cash their first checks.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 31, 2026.

_____/s/ Christina Tusan_____
CHRISTINA TUSAN

EXHIBIT 1

CHRISTINA TUSAN (SBN 192203)
ctusan@ctusanlaw.com
ADRIAN BARNES (SBN 253131)
abarnes@ctusanlaw.com
TUSAN LAW, P.C.
680 E. Colorado Blvd. #180
Pasadena, CA 91101
(626) 418-8203
(626) 619-8253 (Fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

MELODY CHENG, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ONNI BROADWAY BLOCK LONG BEACH LLC, a Delaware Corporation, **ONNI MANAGEMENT CALIFORNIA INC.,** a Delaware Corporation, **ONNI PROPERTIES LLC,** an Arizona Corporation, and **DOES 1 through 10**, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25STCV30653

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Case Filed: October 20, 2025

This Settlement and Release Agreement ("Agreement" or "Settlement Agreement") is entered into by and between Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC, Onni Management California Inc., and Onni Properties LLC (collectively "Onni" or "Defendants"), and Melody Cheng ("Plaintiff"), both individually and on behalf of the Settlement Class, in the case of *Cheng v. Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC et al.*, No. 25STCV30653, currently pending in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles (the "Litigation"). Defendants and Plaintiff are each referred to as a "Party" and are collectively referred to herein as the "Parties."

I. RECITALS

1. Onni owns, operates, and manages several rental apartment complexes in California.

2. Plaintiff filed the complaint in this action on October 20, 2025 ("Complaint"), in the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles, alleging that Onni disclosed its rental apartment tenants' confidential personal information, including names, addresses, phone numbers, email addresses, and social security numbers, to an unauthorized third party.

3. Defendants deny the claims asserted against them in the Litigation, deny all allegations of wrongdoing and liability, and deny all material allegations of the Complaint.

4. Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that the legal claims asserted in the Litigation have merit. Class Counsel have investigated the facts relating to the claims and defenses alleged and the underlying events in the Litigation, have made a thorough study of the legal principles applicable to the claims and defenses asserted in the Litigation, and have conducted a thorough assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Parties' respective positions.

5. On March 4, 2026, the Parties participated in a mediation presided over by Jill Sperber. Following prolonged and extensive arm's length negotiations, the Parties reached an agreement of the essential terms of a settlement, which led to this agreement.

6. The Parties desire to settle the Litigation and all existing and potential claims arising out of or related to the allegations or subject matter of the Complaint and the Litigation on the terms and conditions set forth herein for the purpose of avoiding the burden, expense, risk, and uncertainty of continuing to litigate the Litigation.

7. Plaintiff and Class Counsel, on behalf of the Settlement Class, have concluded, based upon their investigation, and taking into account the contested issues involved, the expense and time necessary to prosecute the Litigation through trial, the risks and costs associated with further prosecution of the Litigation, the uncertainties of complex litigation, and the substantial benefits to be received pursuant to this Settlement Agreement, that a settlement with Defendants on the terms set forth herein is fair and reasonable and in the best interest of Plaintiff and the Settlement Class. Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that the Settlement confers substantial benefits upon the Settlement Class.

8. This agreement is for settlement purposes only, and nothing in this Agreement or the settlement itself 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, of the propriety of class certification in this or any other action except for the purpose of pursuing the settlement reflected in this Agreement, or of any wrongdoing, fault, violation of law, or liability of any kind on the part of Released Entities or admission of the validity or lack thereof of any claim, allegation, or defense asserted in this Action or any other action..

II. DEFINITIONS

9. In addition to the terms defined elsewhere in the Settlement Agreement, the following terms used in this Settlement Agreement shall have meanings specified below:

10. "Action" or the "Litigation" means the lawsuit *Cheng v. Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC et al.*, No. 25STCV30653 pending in the Superior Court for the State of California, County of Los Angeles, filed on October 20, 2025.

11. "Administration Costs" shall include all costs related to carrying out the notice plan and administering the claims and settlement fund distribution process. The necessary costs associated with providing notice to Class Members and administering the settlement will be paid out of the Maximum Settlement Amount.

12. "Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses Award" means the attorneys' fees, expenses, and Litigation Costs awarded by the Court to Class Counsel, which shall be paid out of the Maximum Settlement Amount.

13. "Class Counsel" shall mean Christina Tusan and Adrian Barnes of Tusan Law P.C., located at 680 E. Colorado Blvd., #180, Pasadena, CA 91101.

14. "Class Members" means all current and former tenants and applicants of Onni, in California, who had a lease with Onni that covered any portion of the period from January 1, 2025, to March 4, 2026, or their information was accessible to IDIQ through the Yardi database. Excluded from the Class are tenants who signed an opt-in form that permitted release of their information to IDIQ and tenants who moved in after April 1, 2025, and who signed a lease addendum that permitted release of their information to IDIQ.

15. "Class Period" is the period of time between January 1, 2025, and March 4, 2026.

16. "Court" means the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles.

17. "Day(s)" means calendar days, but does not include the day of the act, event, or default from which the designated period of time begins to run. Further and notwithstanding the above, when computing any period of time prescribed or allowed by this Settlement Agreement, "Days" includes the last day of the period unless it is a Saturday, a Sunday, or a California state legal holiday, in which event the period runs until the end of the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or California state legal holiday.

18. "Defendants' Counsel" means Raymond O. Aghaian of Baker & Hostetler LLP, located at 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2700, Los Angeles, CA 90067 and Michael Kushner of Baker & Hostetler LLP, located at 600 Anton Blvd. Suite 900, Costa Mesa, CA 92626

19. "Effective Date" means the date the Final Approval Order and Final Judgment have become Final, as defined in paragraph 21, below.

20. "Exclusion Deadline" shall mean the deadline for filing a timely Request for Exclusion set at a date certain sixty (60) Days from the Notice Date, as defined in Paragraph 66, or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

21. "Final" with respect to a judgment or order means that all of the following have occurred: (i) the time expires for noticing any appeal; (ii) if there is an appeal, completion, in a manner that finally affirms and leaves in place the Final Approval Order and Final Judgment without any material modification; or (iii) final dismissal of any appeal or the final dismissal of any proceeding on certiorari.

22. "Final Approval Hearing" means the hearing before the Court to determine whether the Settlement should be given final approval.

23. "Final Approval Order" means the order of the Court finally approving this Settlement.

24. "Final Judgment" means the judgment in the Litigation, entered in connection with the Settlement and Final Approval Order.

25. "Litigation Costs" means costs and expenses incurred by Class Counsel in connection with commencing, investigating, prosecuting, mediating, settling the Litigation, and obtaining an order of final judgment.

26. "Long-Form Notice" means the written notice that will be provided electronically to the Class substantially in the form of **Exhibit A** to this Settlement Agreement.

27. "Maximum Settlement Amount" means the non-reversionary sum of $240,000.00.

28. "Net Settlement Amount" means the amount of funds that remain in the Maximum Settlement Amount after the payment of attorneys' fees, litigation costs, Plaintiff's Service Award, and Administration Costs, as approved by the Court.

29. "Notice Program" means the notice program described in Section VI of this Agreement.

30. "Objection Deadline" shall mean the deadline for filing a timely objection set at a date certain sixty (60) Days from the Notice Date, as defined in Paragraph 66, or as otherwise ordered by the Court.

31. "Parties" means Plaintiff and Defendants, collectively, and a "Party" means Plaintiff or one of the Defendants.

32. "Postcard Notice" means the written notice, substantially in the form attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, that will be mailed to Class Members for whom the Long-Form Notice is not successfully delivered electronically.

33. "Preliminary Approval Date" means the date the Preliminary Approval Order has been executed and entered by the Court.

34. "Preliminary Approval Order" means the order certifying the proposed Class for settlement purposes, preliminarily approving this Settlement Agreement, approving the Notice Program, and setting a date for the Final Approval Hearing.

35. "Released Claims" means all liabilities, rights, claims, actions, causes of action, and demands whether legal, statutory, or equitable, that are alleged in the Complaint or could reasonably have been alleged based on the facts and claims asserted in the Complaint and arising in the Class Period, including, without limitation, all liabilities, rights, claims, actions, causes of action, and demands resulting from, arising out of, based upon, or relating to the Unauthorized Access Incident.

36. "Released Entities" means (i) each Defendant; (ii) each Defendant's current and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions, related or affiliated companies; (iii) the current and former officers, directors, employees, stockholders, partners, members, managers, servants, attorneys, representatives, insurers, reinsurers and/or subrogees of any Defendant and/or any of its current and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions, departments; (iv) all predecessors and/or assigns of any of the foregoing; and (v) any individual or entity related to any Defendant that could be liable for any of the Released Claims.

37. "Request for Exclusion" means a written request made by a Class Member to the Settlement Administrator seeking to be excluded from the Settlement Class.

38. "Service Award" means the compensation paid to Plaintiff in recognition of her efforts and work in prosecuting the Action on behalf of the Class Members and negotiating the Settlement.

39. "Settlement" means the settlement reflected by this Settlement Agreement.

40. "Settlement Administrator" means Analytics Consulting LLC or such professional, third-party administrator as may be approved by the Court, retained to carry out the notice plan and administer the claims and settlement fund distribution process. The Settlement Administrator shall agree to confidentiality terms as may be required by the Parties.

41. "Settlement Agreement" or "Agreement" means this settlement agreement, including releases and all exhibits hereto.

42. "Settlement Class" means Plaintiff and all Settlement Class Members.

43. "Settlement Class Member[s]" means all Class Members who do not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion.

44. "Settlement Payment" refers to the amount paid to each Settlement Class Member.

45. "Unauthorized Access Incident" means the unauthorized access to Class Member information in the Yardi database that was granted to IDIQ in or around April 2025.

III. CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS

46. For settlement purposes only, the Parties will request that the Court certify the Settlement Class.

47. If this Settlement Agreement is terminated or disapproved, or if the Effective Date should not occur for any reason, then the Parties' request for certification of the Settlement Class will be withdrawn and deemed to be of no force or effect for any purpose in this or any other proceeding.

IV. SETTLEMENT CONSIDERATION

48. **The Maximum Settlement Amount**: Defendants agree to make a payment of Two Hundred and Forty Thousand Dollars and No Cents ($240,000.00) to the Settlement Administrator within 15 days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order.

49. It is estimated that there are 2,500 Class Members. Should the class size increase by more than 10%, the Maximum Settlement Amount shall increase proportionally by the number of Class Members in excess of 10% (i.e., if the Class size increases by 12%, the Maximum Settlement Amount will increase by 2%).

50. The Maximum Settlement Amount will be used to pay attorneys' fees, litigation costs, Plaintiff's Service Award, and Administration Costs, as approved by the Court, and the settlement shares of Settlement Class Members.

51. This settlement is not a reversionary settlement, and no portion of the Maximum Settlement Payment shall be returned to Defendants, unless this Settlement Agreement is voided, canceled, or terminated, as described in Section XV of this Agreement.

52. The Parties and their respective counsel have made no representation or warranty with respect to the tax treatment to any Class Representative or any Settlement Class Member of any payment or transfer made pursuant to this Agreement or derived from or made pursuant to the Maximum Settlement Amount. Each Settlement Class Member shall be solely responsible for the federal, state, and local tax consequences to him, her, or it of the receipt of funds from the Maximum Settlement Amount pursuant to this Agreement.

53. The Parties and their respective counsel shall not have any responsibility for or liability whatsoever with respect to (i) any act, omission, or determination of the other Party, the Settlement

Administrator, or any of their respective designees or agents, in connection with the administration of the Settlement or otherwise; (ii) the management, investment or distribution of the Maximum Settlement Amount; (iii) the formulation, design, or terms of the disbursement of the Maximum Settlement Amount; (iv) the determination, administration, calculation, or payment of any claims asserted against the Maximum Settlement Amount; (v) any losses suffered by, or fluctuations in the value of the Maximum Settlement Amount; or (vi) the payment or withholding of any taxes, expenses, and/or costs incurred in connection with the taxation of the Maximum Settlement Amount or the filing of any returns.

V. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

54. The Parties have mutually agreed to the selection of Analytics Consulting LLC, to undertake the administration of the Settlement in this Action.

55. The Settlement Administrator was selected after the Parties had solicited proposals from three potential administrators. Analytics Consulting LLC's estimate of costs was the lowest of the three proposals. The Parties reviewed the qualifications and experience of Analytics Consulting LLC, and its procedures to protect the security of class data. A brochure describing Analytics Consulting LLC's services and experience, including its procedures and practices regarding technology and data security is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**. Counsel for Plaintiff has also confirmed by email that Analytics Consulting LLC has adequate insurance of at least $5,000,000 in the event of a data breach or defalcation of funds.

56. The Parties and Settlement Administrator estimate that the costs and expenses of administration of the settlement will not exceed $15,000.

57. The Parties have verified that, as a condition of appointment, Analytics Consulting LLC agrees to be bound by this Agreement and to perform, as a fiduciary, all duties specified in this Agreement in exchange for the Administration Costs payment.

58. The Parties and their Counsel represent that they have no interest or relationship, financial or otherwise, with the Administrator other than a professional relationship arising out of prior experiences administering settlements.

59. The Settlement Administrator will cause the Notice Program to be effectuated in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and any orders of the Court. The Settlement

Administrator may request the assistance of the Parties to facilitate providing notice and to accomplish such other purposes as may be approved by both Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel. The Parties shall reasonably cooperate with such requests.

60. The Settlement Administrator will promptly review on a rolling basis Requests for Exclusion to ascertain their validity. Not later than 5 days after the expiration of the deadline for submitting Requests for Exclusion, the Settlement Administrator shall email a list to Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel containing (a) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have timely submitted valid Requests for Exclusion ("Exclusion List"); (b) the names and other identifying information of Class Members who have submitted invalid Requests for Exclusion; and (c) copies of all Requests for Exclusion submitted (whether valid or invalid).

61. The Settlement Administrator must, on a weekly basis, provide written reports to Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel that, among other things, tally the number of: Class Notices mailed or re-mailed, Class Notices returned undelivered, Requests for Exclusion (whether valid or invalid) received, objections received, challenges to Workweeks received and/or resolved, and checks mailed for Settlement Payments ("Weekly Report"). The Weekly Reports must include the Settlement Administrator's assessment of the validity of Requests for Exclusion and attach copies of all Requests for Exclusion and objections received.

62. Not later than 14 days before the date by which Plaintiff is required to file the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator will provide to Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its due diligence and compliance with all of its obligations under this Agreement, including, but not limited to, its mailing of Class Notice, the Class Notices returned as undelivered, the re-mailing of Class Notices, attempts to locate Class Members, the total number of Requests for Exclusion it received (both valid or invalid), and the number of written objections. The declaration shall attach the Exclusion List. The Settlement Administrator will supplement its declaration as needed or requested by the Parties and/or the Court. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Settlement Administrator's declaration in Court.

63. Within 10 days after the Settlement Administrator disburses all funds in the Maximum Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator will provide Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel

with a final report detailing its disbursements of all payments made under this Agreement. At least 15 days before any deadline set by the Court, the Settlement Administrator will prepare, and submit to Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel, a signed declaration suitable for filing in Court attesting to its disbursement of all payments required under this Agreement. Class Counsel is responsible for filing the Settlement Administrator's declaration in Court.

VI. NOTICE TO CLASS MEMBERS

64. The Settlement Administrator's fees and costs, including the costs of notice, will be paid from the Maximum Settlement Amount.

65. Within fifteen (15) Days of the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendants shall provide the Settlement Administrator with the names, most recent e-mail address, and most recent mailing address of each Class Member (the "Class List"). The Settlement Administrator shall maintain the Class List in confidence, use the Class List only for purposes of this Settlement, and restrict access to the Class List to the Administrator employees who need access to the Class List to effect and perform under this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall perform an email cleanse and skip trace of the Class List prior to sending the Class Notice.

66. Within forty-five (45) Days following entry of the Preliminary Approval Order ("Notice Date"), the Settlement Administrator shall provide the Long-Form Notice, in substantially the form attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, via the e-mail address associated with each Class Member. For those emails that bounce back, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly perform an in-depth search for a valid email address and resend the Long-Form Notice to that updated email address. If the email bounces back again, or no other valid email address can be found, the Settlement Administrator shall mail a Postcard Notice, in substantially the form attached hereto as **Exhibit B**, to the Class Member's most recent mailing address. If the postcard notice is returned to the Settlement Administrator with a forwarding address, it will be automatically re-mailed to the updated address. If the Postcard Notice is returned without a forwarding address, it will be sent through an advanced address search process in an effort to find a more current address for the record. If an updated address is obtained through the advanced search process, the Settlement Administrator will re-mail the notice to the updated address.

67. Such Class Members whose Long-Form Notice is undeliverable, and to whom a Postcard Notice is mailed, will have an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Exclusion Deadline to opt-out of the Settlement or an additional 14 calendar days beyond the Objection Deadline to object to the proposed Settlement Agreement.

68. Within forty-five (45) Days following entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, and prior to sending out the Long-Form Notice to all Class Members, the Settlement Administrator will create a Settlement Website. The Settlement Website will be at a suitable URL to be selected by the Parties from a list of available options provided by the Settlement Administrator.

69. Notice of any change of the date or location of the Final Approval Hearing will be given on the Settlement Website.

70. The Settlement Administrator will also post other information of interest to Class Members including copies of this Settlement Agreement, the Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Motion for Final Approval, and the Judgment. The Settlement Administrator will also maintain and monitor an email address and a toll-free telephone number to receive Class Member calls, faxes, and emails.

VII. OBJECTIONS

71. Any Settlement Class Member who wishes to object to the proposed Settlement Agreement may submit a written objection(s) to the Settlement ("Objection(s)") to the Settlement Administrator, at the address set forth in the Class Notice.

72. Each written Objection must (i) set forth the Settlement Class Member's full name, current address, telephone number, and email address and, if represented by counsel, that of his/her counsel; (ii) state that the Settlement Class Member objects to the Settlement, in whole or in part; (iii) set forth a statement of the legal and factual basis for the Objection; and (iv) provide copies of any documents that the Settlement Class Member wishes to submit in support of his/her position.

73. Written objections must be submitted to the Settlement Administrator by fax, email, or mail, no later than the Objection Deadline.

74. An objecting Settlement Class Member also has the right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (or to hire an attorney to appear at the Final Approval Hearing) to present an oral objection.

75. Any Settlement Class Member who does not submit a timely written Objection in accordance with this Settlement Agreement and the Class Notice or who does not present an oral objection (whether personally or through counsel) at the Final Approval Hearing shall not be treated as having submitted a valid Objection to the Settlement, shall forever be barred from raising any objection to the Settlement, and shall be foreclosed from seeking any review of the Settlement or the terms of the Settlement Agreement by appeal or other means.

VIII. OPT-OUTS/REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION

76. Any individual wishing to opt out of the Settlement Class shall individually sign and timely submit a written Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator at the address included in the Class Notice. The written notice must clearly manifest the individual's intent to opt-out of the Settlement Class. To be effective, written notice must be postmarked no later than the Exclusion Deadline.

77. The Settlement Administrator may not reject a Request for Exclusion as invalid because it fails to contain all the information specified in the Class Notice. The Settlement Administrator shall accept any Request for Exclusion as valid if the Settlement Administrator can reasonably ascertain the identity of the person as a Class Member and the Class Member's desire to be excluded. The Settlement Administrator's determination shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge. If the Settlement Administrator has reason to question the authenticity of a Request for Exclusion, the Settlement Administrator may demand additional proof of the Class Member's identity. The Settlement Administrator's determination of authenticity shall be final and not appealable or otherwise susceptible to challenge.

78. All individuals who submit valid and timely notices of their intent to opt out of the Settlement Class shall not receive any benefits of and/or be bound by the terms of this Settlement Agreement. All individuals falling within the definition of the Settlement Class who do not opt-out of the Settlement Class shall be bound by the terms of this Settlement Agreement and Judgment entered thereon.

79. Every Class Member who does not submit a timely and valid Request for Exclusion is deemed to be a Settlement Class Member, entitled to all benefits and bound by all terms and conditions

of the Settlement, including the Settlement Class Members' Release under Paragraph 110 of this Agreement, regardless of whether the Settlement Class Member actually receives the Class Notice or objects to the Settlement.

80. The Parties and their counsel agree not to take any action to encourage any Class Member to opt out of and/or object to the Settlement Agreement.

81. If the number of Class Members who opt out of the Settlement Class exceeds 10% of the total number of Class Members, Defendants have the option to unilaterally withdraw from and terminate this settlement within ten (10) court days of the last day upon which a timely Request for Exclusion could be submitted via a written notice to Plaintiff's Counsel. Written notice by e-mail or fax will suffice.

IX. CALCULATION OF THE NET SETTLEMENT AMOUNT AND DISTRIBUTION OF SETTLEMENT PROCEEDS

82. "Net Settlement Amount" means the amount of funds that remain in the Maximum Settlement Amount after the payment of attorneys' fees, litigation costs, Plaintiff's Service Award, and Administration Costs, as approved by the Court.

83. All members of the Settlement Class will receive an equal share of the Net Settlement Amount.

84. Within 10 days of Effective Date, the Settlement Administrator will distribute, subject to approval by the Court: (a) Settlement Payments; (b) attorneys' fees and costs; (c) Settlement Administration Costs; and (d) a Service Award.

85. Prior to mailing out the individual Settlement Payment checks, the Settlement Administrator, using the Class List, shall access the National Change of Address ("NCOA") Database, and update the addresses contained therein.

86. The Settlement Administrator shall send the individual Settlement Payment checks by bulk first class mail, forwarding requested, to the Settlement Class Members at the addresses identified through the process described above. As to any individual Settlement Payment checks that are returned as undeliverable, or where the NCOA Database indicates that the last known address of any Settlement Class Member is invalid or otherwise undeliverable, the Settlement Administrator will perform a skip trace procedure and re-mail all returned, undelivered mail within five calendar days of the date on which

the Settlement Administrator is informed that an individual Settlement Payment check is undeliverable or otherwise invalid.

87. Class Member Settlement Payment checks that are not cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days from the date of issuance by the Settlement Administrator will be canceled.

88. The Parties understand that, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure, the Court will set a date when the Parties shall report to the Court the total amount that was actually paid to Settlement Class Members and that the amount represented by the canceled Class Member Settlement Payment checks shall be paid by the Settlement Administrator to an appropriate recipient. The Parties will propose to the Court that an appropriate recipient of these unpaid residual funds is Privacy Rights Clearinghouse, which is 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization committed to advancing data privacy for all by expanding access to information, increasing participation in policy discussions, and advocating for stronger rights. In this regard, Privacy Rights Clearinghouse is a nonprofit organization which promotes the law consistent with the objections and purposes of the causes of action in the instant Action.

X. SERVICE/ENHANCEMENT AWARD

89. The Parties agree that Class Counsel may apply on behalf of the Class Representative to the Court for a Service Award to her not to exceed $5,000 for her role in this matter, and Defendants shall not oppose that request. Any Service Award approved by the Court will be paid out of the Maximum Settlement Amount. If approved by the Court, the Service Award will be paid no later than ten (10) Days after the Effective Date.

90. The Parties agree that the Court's approval or denial of any request for the Service Awards is not a condition to this Settlement Agreement and is to be considered by the Court separately from final approval, reasonableness, and adequacy of the settlement. Any reduction to the Service Award shall not operate to terminate or cancel this Settlement Agreement.

XI. ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES

91. Class Counsel shall request attorneys' fees of up to one third of the Maximum Settlement Amount and up to $15,000 for reimbursement of litigation costs. Any unapproved amounts will be added to the Net Settlement Amount and be distributed to the Settlement Class Members.

XII. NOTICES

92. All notices to the Parties required by the Settlement Agreement shall be made in writing and communicated by mail or e-mail to the following addresses:

All notices to Class Counsel or Plaintiff shall be sent to:

Christina Tusan
Adrian Barnes
Tusan Law, P.C.
680 E. Colorado Blvd., #180
Pasadena, California 91101
Tel: 626.418.8203
ctusan@ctusanlaw.com

All notices to Defendants' Counsel or Defendants shall be sent to:

Raymond O. Aghaian
Baker & Hostetler LLP
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2700
Los Angeles, California 90067
Tel: 310.979.8442
raghaian@bakerlaw.com

XIII. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL PROCESS

93. After execution of this Settlement Agreement, Class Counsel shall submit this Agreement to the Court and shall move the Court to enter the Preliminary Approval Order ("Motion for Preliminary Approval").

94. Within 15 days of the full execution of this Agreement, Defendants will prepare and deliver to Class Counsel a signed declaration from Defendants and Defense Counsel disclosing all facts relevant to any actual or potential conflicts of interest with the Administrator and Cy Pres Recipient. In their declarations, Defense Counsel and Defendants shall aver whether they are aware of any other pending matter or action asserting claims that will be extinguished or adversely affected by the Settlement.

95. Plaintiff will prepare and deliver to Defense Counsel all other documents necessary for obtaining preliminary approval.

96. Class Counsel and Counsel for Defendants are jointly responsible for expeditiously finalizing and filing the Motion for Preliminary Approval no later than 30 days after the full execution of this Agreement; obtaining a prompt hearing date for the Motion for Preliminary Approval; and appearing in Court to advocate in favor of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. Class Counsel is responsible for delivering the Court's Preliminary Approval to the Administrator.

97. If the Parties disagree on any aspect of the proposed Motion for Preliminary Approval and/or the supporting declarations and documents, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve the disagreement. If the Court does not grant Preliminary Approval or conditions Preliminary Approval on any material change to this Agreement, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel will expeditiously work together by meeting in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to modify the Agreement and otherwise satisfy the Court's concerns.

98. The Parties' Motion for Preliminary Approval shall move the Court to enter the Preliminary Approval Order, which:

a. Preliminarily approves this Settlement Agreement;

b. Provisionally certifies the Settlement Class (only for purposes of effectuating this Settlement);

c. Finds the proposed settlement is sufficiently fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class;

d. Finds the Notice program constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to the Class Members, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, complying fully with the requirements of the laws of California, the Constitution of the United States, and any other applicable law and that no further notice to the Class is required beyond that provided through the Notice Program;

e. Appoints the Settlement Administrator; directs the Settlement Administrator to administer the Settlement in accordance with the provisions of this Settlement Agreement;

f. Approves the Objection and Exclusion procedures as outlined in this Settlement Agreement;

g. Schedules a Final Approval Hearing to consider the final approval, reasonableness, and adequacy of the proposed settlement and whether it should be finally approved by the Court; and,

h. Contains any additional provisions agreeable to the Parties that might be necessary or advisable to implement the terms of this Settlement Agreement.

XIV. FINAL APPROVAL PROCESS AND HEARING

99. After the Objection Deadline and Exclusion Deadline and not less than 16 court days before the Calendared Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff will file in Court, a motion for final approval that includes a proposed Final Approval Order and a proposed Judgment (collectively "Motion for Final Approval"). Plaintiff shall provide drafts of these documents to Defendants' Counsel not later than 7 days before filing the Motion for Final Approval. Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel will expeditiously meet and confer in person or by telephone, and in good faith, to resolve any disagreements concerning the Motion for Final Approval.

100. Each Party retains the right to respond to any objection raised by a Settlement Class Member, including the right to file responsive documents in Court no later than five court days before the Final Approval Hearing, or as otherwise ordered or accepted by the Court.

101. The Motion for Final Approval shall ask the Court to enter a Final Approval Order and Judgment which includes the following provisions:

a. A finding that the Notice program fully and accurately informed all Settlement Class Members entitled to notice of the material elements of the settlement, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice, and complies fully with the laws of California, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law;

b. A finding that after proper notice to the Class, and after sufficient opportunity to object, no timely objections to this Settlement Agreement have been made, or a finding that all timely objections have been considered and denied;

c. Approval of the settlement, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Class, in all respects, finding that the settlement is

in good faith, and ordering the Parties to perform the Settlement in accordance with the terms of this Settlement Agreement;

d. Approve the requested Service Award to the named Plaintiff and Class Representative;

e. A finding that all Settlement Class Members, excluding Opt-Outs, shall, as of the entry of the Final Judgment, conclusively be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever completely released, relinquished, and discharged the Released Entities from the Released Claims; and

f. A reservation of exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the Litigation and the Parties for the purposes of, among other things, (i) supervising the implementation, enforcement, construction, and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement, the Final Approval Order, and the Final Judgment; and (ii) supervising the administration and distribution of the relief to the Settlement Class and resolving any disputes that may arise with regard to the foregoing.

102. The Parties agree to bear their own costs and attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses not otherwise awarded in accordance with this Settlement Agreement and the Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses Award as described in Section XI above.

103. Notice of the entry of Final Judgment will be provided to the Class by being posted, promptly after entry, on the Settlement Website.

104. If the Court does not grant Final Approval or conditions Final Approval on any material change to the Settlement (including, but not limited to, the scope of release to be granted by Class Members), the Parties will expeditiously work together in good faith to address the Court's concerns by revising the Agreement as necessary to obtain Final Approval. The Court's decision to award less than the amounts requested for the Class Representative Service Award, the Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses Award, or the Administration Costs Payment shall not constitute a material modification to the Agreement within the meaning of this paragraph.

105. The Parties agree that, after entry of Judgment, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the Parties, Action and the Settlement solely for purposes of (i) enforcing this Agreement or Judgment, (ii) addressing settlement administration matters and (iii) addressing such post-Judgment matters as are permitted by law.

106. Provided the Judgment is consistent with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, specifically including the Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses Award, the Parties, their respective counsel and all Settlement Class Members who did not object to the Settlement, waive all rights to appeal from the Judgment, including all rights to post-judgment and appellate proceedings, the right to file motions to vacate judgment, motions for new trial, extraordinary writs and appeals. The waiver of appeal does not include any waiver of the right to oppose such motions, writs or appeals. If an objector appeals the Judgment, the Parties' obligations to perform under this Agreement will be suspended until such time as the appeal is finally resolved and the Judgment becomes final, except as to matters that do not affect the Net Settlement Amount.

XV. TERMINATION OF THIS SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

107. The Parties agree to work in good faith to effectuate this Settlement Agreement including to reach agreement on any modification to the Settlement necessary to obtain final approval.

108. Nothing shall prevent Plaintiff or Defendants from appealing or seeking other appropriate relief from an appellate court with respect to any denial by the Court of final approval of the Settlement.

109. Plaintiff or Defendants shall have the right to terminate this Agreement by providing written notice of the election to do so ("Termination Notice") to all other Parties hereto after any of the following events: (i) the Court's refusal to grant Preliminary Approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (ii) the Court's refusal to grant final approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (iii) the Court's refusal to enter the Final Judgment in this State Court Action in any material respect; or (iv) the date upon which the Final Judgment is modified or reversed in any material respect by the Appellate Court or the Supreme Court. Notwithstanding the foregoing, prior to exercising any right of termination under this Paragraph, the Parties shall meet and confer in good faith regarding whether modifications to this Agreement or the proposed Final Judgment, supplemental submissions, additional evidence, or other measures could reasonably address the Court's stated concerns and permit preliminary or final approval of the Agreement or entry of Final Judgment. Plaintiff shall also have the right, with Defendants' reasonable cooperation, to file a renewed motion for Preliminary Approval, renewed motion for Final Approval, revised proposed Final Judgment, motion for reconsideration, or other appropriate application seeking approval of the Final Judgment or Agreement. No Party may issue a Termination Notice unless

and until: (a) the Parties have completed the meet-and-confer process in good faith; and (b) the Court has denied any renewed or revised motion, application, or request for approval, or the Parties reasonably determine in good faith that further efforts to obtain approval would be futile.

110. The Parties agree that the Court's failure to award, in whole or in part, an attorneys' fees payment to Class Counsel and/or the Service Award below shall not prevent the Agreement from becoming effective, nor shall it be grounds for termination. The procedures for any application for approval of attorneys' fees, expenses, or Service Award are to be considered by the Court separately from the Court's consideration of the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement.

111. If any Party is in material breach of the terms hereof, and fails to cure such material breach within thirty (30) days of notice, any other Party, provided that it is in substantial compliance with the terms of this Agreement, may terminate this Agreement on notice to all Parties.

112. If this Settlement Agreement is terminated or disapproved, or if the Effective Date should not occur for any reason, then: (i) this Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, the Final Approval Order (if applicable), and all of their provisions shall be rendered null and void; (ii) all Parties shall be deemed to have reverted to their respective status in the Litigation as of the date and time immediately preceding the execution of this Settlement Agreement; (iii) except as otherwise expressly provided, the Parties shall stand in the same position and shall proceed in all respects as if this Settlement Agreement and any related orders had never been executed, entered into, or filed; and (iv) no term or draft of this Settlement Agreement nor any part of the Parties' settlement discussions, negotiations, or documentation (including any declaration or brief filed in support of the motion for preliminary approval or motion for final approval), nor any rulings regarding class certification for settlement purposes (including the Preliminary Approval Order and, if applicable, the Final Approval Order and Final Judgment), will have any effect or be admissible into evidence for any purpose in the Litigation or any other proceeding.

113. In the event the Settlement is terminated pursuant to paragraph 109 of the Agreement, Plaintiff and Defendants shall be equally responsible for paying all Administration Costs incurred up to the date the Settlement is terminated. In the event that Defendants terminate the Settlement pursuant to paragraph 81 of the Agreement, Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying all Administration

Costs incurred up to the date the Settlement is terminated. In the event the Settlement is terminated as a result of a material breach as set forth in paragraph 111, the Party responsible for the breach shall be responsible for paying all of the Administrative Costs.

XVI. RELEASE

114. On the Effective Date and in consideration of the promises and covenants set forth in this Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff and all Settlement Class Members (i.e. Class Members who do not opt out of the Class) shall release the Released Entities from all Released Claims. Thereafter, Plaintiff and each and every Class Member shall be permanently barred and enjoined from initiating, asserting and/or prosecuting any Released Claim(s) against any of the Released Entities in any court, arbitration, tribunal, forum or proceeding.

115. Plaintiff's General Release: Upon the Effective Date, Plaintiff, on her own individual behalf, agrees to generally release the Released Entities from any and all causes of action, claims, rights, damages, punitive or statutory damages, penalties, liabilities, expenses, and losses and issues of any kind or nature whatsoever, that she may have had against the Released Entities arising on or before the date Plaintiff executes this Agreement. Plaintiff acknowledges that she may have claims that are presently unknown and that the release contained in this Settlement Agreement is intended to and will fully, finally, and forever discharge all claims against the Released Entities, whether now asserted or un-asserted, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, which now exist, or heretofore existed or may hereafter exist, which if known, might have affected her decision to enter into this release. The foregoing waiver includes, without limitation, an express waiver, to the fullest extent permitted by law, by Plaintiff of any and all rights under California Civil Code section 1542, which provides:

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

116. Nothing in the Release shall preclude any action to enforce the terms of this Settlement Agreement, including participation in any of the processes detailed herein.

XVII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

117. The recitals and exhibits to this Settlement Agreement are integral parts of the Settlement and are expressly incorporated and made a part of this Settlement Agreement.

118. This Settlement Agreement is for settlement purposes only. Neither the fact of nor any provision contained in this Settlement Agreement nor any action taken hereunder shall constitute or be construed as an admission of the validity of any claim or any fact alleged in the Litigation or of any wrongdoing, fault, violation of law or liability of any kind on the part of Defendants. This Settlement Agreement shall not be offered or be admissible in evidence against the Parties or cited or referred to in any action or proceeding between the Parties, except in an action or proceeding brought to enforce its terms.

119. In the event that there are any developments in the effectuation and administration of this Settlement Agreement that are not dealt with by the terms of this Settlement Agreement, then such matters shall be dealt with as agreed upon by the Parties, and failing agreement, as shall be ordered by the Court. The Parties shall execute all documents and use their best efforts to perform all acts necessary and proper to promptly effectuate the terms of this Settlement Agreement and to take all necessary or appropriate actions to obtain judicial approval of this Settlement Agreement to give this Settlement Agreement full force and effect.

120. No person shall have any claim against Plaintiff, Class Counsel, Defendants, Defendants' Counsel, or the Released Entities, or any of the foregoing's agents or representatives based on the administration of the Settlement substantially in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement or any order of the Court or appellate court.

121. This Settlement Agreement constitutes the entire Settlement Agreement between and among the Parties with respect to the Settlement of the Litigation. This Settlement Agreement supersedes all prior negotiations and settlement agreements and may not be modified or amended except by a writing signed by the Parties and their respective counsel. The Parties acknowledge, stipulate, and agree that no covenant, obligation, condition, representation, warranty, inducement, negotiation, or understanding concerning any part of the subject matter of this Settlement Agreement has been made or relied on except as expressly set forth in this Settlement Agreement.

122. There shall be no waiver of any term or condition in this Settlement Agreement absent an express writing to that effect by the non-waiving Party. No waiver of any term or condition in this Settlement Agreement shall be construed as a waiver of a subsequent breach or failure of the same term or condition, or waiver of any other term or condition of this Settlement Agreement.

123. In the event a third-party, such as a bankruptcy trustee, former spouse, or other third-party has or claims to have a claim against any payment made to a Settlement Class Member, it is the responsibility of the Settlement Class Member to transmit the funds to such third-party. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the Parties will have no, and do not agree to any, responsibility for such transmittal.

124. This Settlement Agreement shall not be construed more strictly against one Party than another merely because it may have been prepared by counsel for one of the Parties, it being recognized that because of the arm's-length negotiations resulting in this Settlement Agreement, all Parties hereto have contributed substantially and materially to the preparation of the Settlement Agreement. All terms, conditions, and exhibits are material and necessary to this Settlement Agreement and have been relied upon by the Parties in entering into this Settlement Agreement.

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

126. This Settlement Agreement shall be construed under and governed by the laws of the State of California without regard to its choice of law provisions.

127. In the event that one or more of the provisions contained in this Settlement Agreement shall for any reason be held to be invalid, illegal, or unenforceable in any respect, such invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability shall not affect the other provisions of the Settlement Agreement, which shall remain in full force and effect as though the invalid, illegal, or unenforceable provision(s) had never been a part of this Settlement Agreement as long as the benefits of this Settlement Agreement to Defendants or the Settlement Class Members are not materially altered, positively or negatively, as a result of the invalid, illegal, or unenforceable provision(s).

128. If any Party institutes any legal action or other proceeding against another Party or Parties to enforce this Agreement or to declare rights and/or obligations under this Agreement, the prevailing party will be entitled to recover from the unsuccessful Party or Parties reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred in connection with any such action.

129. This Settlement Agreement will be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the successors and assigns of the Parties, Released Entities, and Settlement Class Members.

130. Information provided to Class Counsel pursuant to Evidence Code section 1152, and all copies and summaries of the Class Data provided to Class Counsel by Defendants in connection with the mediation, other settlement negotiations, or the Settlement, may be used only with respect to this Settlement and for no other purpose, and may not be used in any way that violates any existing contractual agreement, statute or the California Rules of Court. Not later than 90 days after the date when the Court discharges the Settlement Administrator's obligation to provide a declaration confirming the final pay out of all Settlement funds, Plaintiff shall destroy all paper and electronic versions of Class Data received from Defendants unless, before the Court's discharge of the Settlement Administrator's obligation, Defendants make a written request to Class Counsel for the return, rather than the destruction, of Class Data.

131. The headings used in this Settlement Agreement are for the convenience of the reader only and shall not affect the meaning or interpretation of this Settlement Agreement.

132. In construing this Settlement Agreement, the use of the singular includes the plural (and vice-versa) and the use of the masculine includes the feminine (and vice-versa).

133. The Parties stipulate to stay all proceedings in the Litigation until the approval of this Settlement Agreement has been finally determined, except the stay of proceedings shall not prevent the filing of any motions, affidavits, and other matters necessary to obtain and preserve judicial approval of this Settlement Agreement. The Parties further agree, upon the signing of this Agreement, that, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 583.330, the time to bring a case to trial under Code of Civil Procedure section 583.310 is extended for the entire period of this settlement process.

134. This Settlement Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original as against any Party who has signed it and all of which shall be deemed a single Settlement Agreement.

135. Each Party to this Settlement Agreement and the signatories thereto warrant that he, she, or it is acting upon his, her or its independent judgment and the advice of his, her, or its counsel and not in reliance upon any warranty or representation, express or implied, of any nature or kind by any other Party, other than the warranties and representations expressly made in this Settlement Agreement.

136. Each signatory below warrants that he or she has the authority to execute this Settlement Agreement and bind the Party on whose behalf he or she is executing the Settlement Agreement.

137. If any date or deadline 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 (not business days) unless otherwise specified.

138. The Parties agree not to make any knowingly false or malicious statements or to publicly make, disseminate, or cause to be disseminated any disparaging statements regarding the other Parties arising out of or relating to the Released Claims, including statements that materially harm the reputation or business interests of the other Parties. Nothing in this paragraph prohibits a Party from making truthful statements in private communications, provided such communications are not made for the purpose of public dissemination. Further, nothing in this paragraph prohibits truthful testimony, compliance with legal process, or statements protected by applicable law.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto, intending to be legally bound hereby, have duly executed this Settlement Agreement as of the date set forth below.

Plaintiff and Proposed Class Representative

Dated: 06 / 10 / 2026, 2026

By: _____

Melody Cheng

Doc ID: be6b50986098a71a09798dd3330768d91218435a

Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC, Onni Management California Inc., and Onni Properties, LLC

Dated:_____, 2026

By: _____
Name:
Title:
On behalf of Defendants

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Class Counsel

Dated: 06 / 09 / 2026, 2026

By: Christina Tusan
Christina Tusan
Tusan Law, P.C.

Counsel for Defendants

Dated:_____, 2026

By:_____
Raymond O. Aghaian
Baker & Hostetler LLP

Doc ID: be6b50986098a71a09798dd3330768d91218435a

Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC, Onni Management California Inc., and Onni Properties, LLC

Dated: June 11th, 2026

By: _____
Name: Greg Gibson
Title: VP of Finance and Business Technology
On behalf of Defendants

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Counsel for Plaintiff and Proposed Class Counsel

Dated: _____, 2026

By: _____
Christina Tusan
Tusan Law, P.C.

Counsel for Defendants

Dated: June 15, 2026

By: _____
Raymond O. Aghaian
Baker & Hostetler LLP

EXHIBIT A

COURT APPROVED NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR FINAL COURT APPROVAL

Cheng v. Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC et al.
Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No 25STCV30653

The Superior Court for the State of California authorized this Notice. Read it Carefully! It's not a junk email, spam, an advertisement, or a solicitation by a lawyer. You are not being sued.

If you are a current or former tenant or applicant of Onni, in California, who had a lease with Onni that covered any portion of the period from January 1, 2025, to March 4, 2026, or whose information was accessible to IDIQ (a third party) through the Yardi database, and you did not (i) sign an opt-in form that permitted release of your information to IDIQ, or (ii) move in after April 1, 2025, and sign a lease addendum that permitted release of your information to IDIQ, you are entitled to receive a payment in this Class Action Settlement.

The settlement resolves a class action lawsuit pending in Los Angeles County Superior Court ("Court") titled *Cheng v. Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC et al* ("Action") in which Plaintiff Melody Cheng alleges that Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC, Onni Management California LLC, and Onni Properties LLC ("Onni" or "Defendants") violated California laws that prohibit sharing of tenants and prospective tenants' private information without notice and consent. Plaintiff seeks civil penalties under the California Consumer Privacy Act (Civil Code § 1798.100, *et seq.*), damages for breach of contract, interest, and attorneys' fees and costs.

Defendant has agreed to pay to $240,000 to settle the Action. After notice and administration fees and costs, an incentive award to Plaintiff, and Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs are deducted, the entire remaining amount (estimated to be $125,000) ("Net Settlement Amount") will be available to be paid in equal shares to the estimated 2,500 Settlement Class Members (approximately $50 per Settlement Class Member). You do not have to do anything to receive payment.

The Court has already preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and approved this Notice. The Court has not yet decided whether to grant final approval. Your legal rights are affected whether you act or do not act. Read this Notice carefully. You will be deemed to have carefully read and understood it. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will decide whether to finally approve the Settlement and how much of the Settlement will be paid to Plaintiff and Plaintiff's attorneys ("Class Counsel"). The Court will also decide whether to enter a judgment that requires Onni to make payments under the Settlement and requires Class Members to give up their rights to assert certain claims against Onni.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT	
DO NOTHING AND RECEIVE PAYMENT	Get a payment, and give up your legal rights to pursue claims released by the settlement of the Lawsuit.
OPT OUT OF THE SETTLEMENT THE OPT-OUT/EXCLUSION DEADLINE IS _____	Opt-out/exclude yourself from the Settlement, get no payment, and retain your legal rights to pursue claims that would otherwise be released by the settlement of the Lawsuit. If you opt-out, you will not be able to object to any portion of the proposed settlement. See **Section 7** of this Notice.
OBJECT TO THE SETTLEMENT WRITTEN OBJECTIONS MUST BE SUBMITTED BY _____	If you do not opt out, you may object to the Settlement by mailing, e-mailing or faxing your objection to the Settlement Administrator or you may appear at the Final Approval Hearing and make an oral objection. The Court's decision whether to finally approve the Settlement will include a determination of how much will be paid to Class

	Counsel and Plaintiff who pursued the Action on behalf of the Class. You are not personally responsible for any payments to Class Counsel or Plaintiff, but every dollar paid to Class Counsel and Plaintiff reduces the overall amount paid to Settlement Class Members. You can object to the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiff if you think they are unreasonable. See **Section 8** of this Notice.
PARTICIPATE IN THE _____ FINAL APPROVAL HEARING	You may appear and address the Court during the Final Approval hearing scheduled for DATE AND TIME in Department 12 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. You don't have to attend but you do have the right to appear (or hire an attorney to appear on your behalf at your own cost), in person, by telephone or by using the Court's virtual appearance platform. You can verbally object to the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing. If the Court approves the Settlement despite your objection, you will still be bound by the Settlement. See Section **9** of this Notice.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. What is this Lawsuit about?

Plaintiff Melody Cheng ("Plaintiff") alleges that between January 1, 2025, and March 4, 2026, Defendants violated California laws that prohibit sharing of tenants and prospective tenants' private information without notice and consent. The Court has not ruled on the merits of Plaintiff's claims and Defendants deny any violations. However, to resolve the case, Defendants have agreed to settle the Action.

2. Why is there a Settlement?

So far, the Court has made no determination whether Defendants or Plaintiff are correct on the merits. In the meantime, Plaintiff and the Defendants hired an experienced, neutral mediator in an effort to resolve the Action by negotiating and agreement (settle the case) rather than continuing the expensive and time-consuming process of litigation. The negotiations were successful. By signing a settlement agreement and agreeing to ask the Court to enter a judgment ending the Action, Plaintiff and Defendants have negotiated a proposed settlement that is subject to the Court's final approval. Both sides agree the proposed settlement is a compromise of disputed claims. By agreeing to settle, Defendants do not admit any violations or concede the merit of any claims.

Plaintiff and Class Counsel strongly believe that this settlement is fair and reasonable and is in the best interests of all Class Members. Plaintiff and Class Counsel strongly believe the Settlement is a good deal for you because they believe that: (1) Defendants have agreed to pay a fair, reasonable and adequate amount considering the strength of the claims and the risks and uncertainties of continued litigation; and (2) Settlement is in the best interests of the Class Members. The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable and adequate, authorized this Notice, and scheduled a hearing to determine Final Approval.

3. What Are the Terms of the Settlement?

1. Maximum Settlement Amount: The Parties have agreed to settle the Lawsuit for a "Maximum Settlement Amount" of Two Hundred and Forty Thousand Dollars ($240,000) on a non-reversionary basis. This means that the entire Maximum Settlement Amount will be paid out, subject to various Court-approved deductions

2. Court Approved Deductions from Maximum Settlement: At the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel will ask the Court to approve the following deductions from the Maximum Settlement Amount, the amounts of which will be decided by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing:
   (a) attorneys' fees of up to $80,000 (1/3 of the Maximum Settlement Amount) and reimbursement of litigation costs of Class Counsel not to exceed $15,000. To date, Class Counsel have worked and incurred expenses on the Action without payment.
   (b) service payment to the Class Representative not to exceed $5,000 total for filing the Action, working with Class Counsel and representing the Class. A class representative award will be the only monies Plaintiff will receive other than Plaintiff's individual class payment.
   (c) all costs of third-party administration for the Settlement Administrator, not expected to exceed $15,000;
   Settlement Class Members have the right to object to any of these deductions. The Court will consider all objections.
3. Net Settlement Distributed to Class Members. What remains after these payments are made is called the "Net Settlement Amount," which is estimated to be in the amount of approximately $125,000 depending on the final Court-approved deductions as discussed above. The Net Settlement Amount shall be distributed in equal shares to each Class Member, as described in the next section.

4. How much will I get from the settlement?

1. Individual Settlement Payments. The Administrator will calculate Individual Settlement Payments by dividing the Net Settlement Amount equally among all Settlement Class Members (i.e., all Class Members who do not submit a valid and timely Request for Exclusion, discussed in Section 7, below). There are estimated to be 2,500 class members. So, the estimated Individual Settlement Payment to be sent to Settlement Class Members is $50.

5. When would I get my payment?

The Administrator will send, by U.S. mail, a single check to every Settlement Class Member (i.e., every Class Member who doesn't opt-out).

Your check will be sent to the last address for you on file with Defendants, except that the Settlement Administrator will use a national database to attempt to confirm whether there is a more up-to-date address for you. You may contact the Settlement Administrator to notify them of your current address. Section 10 of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

Need to Promptly Cash Payment Checks. The front of every check will show the date when the check expires (the void date). If you don't cash it by the void date, your check will be automatically cancelled, and the monies will irrevocably lost to you because they will be paid to a non-profit organization or foundation ("Cy Pres").

6. What claims am I releasing?

Settlement Class Members' Release. After the Judgment is final, Settlement Class Members will be legally barred from asserting any of the claims released under the Settlement. This means that unless you opted out by validly excluding yourself from the Class Settlement, you cannot sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Defendants or related entities based on the facts alleged in the Action and arising during the Class Period. The Settlement Class Members will be bound by the following release:

> Settlement Class Members (i.e. Class Members who do not opt out of the Class) shall release the Released Entities from all claims that are pled in the Action, or that could have been pled based on the facts alleged in the Action, on behalf of the Class, and that arise during the Class Period.

7. How can I opt out of this settlement?

You will be treated as a Settlement Class Member, participating fully in the Class Settlement, unless you notify the Administrator via mail, email or fax, not later than _____, that you wish to opt-out. The easiest way to notify the Administrator is to send a written and signed Request for Exclusion by the _____ Exclusion

Deadline. The Request for Exclusion should be from a Class Member, must be signed the Class Member, and must clearly indicate the Class Member's intent to opt-out of the Settlement Class. Excluded Class Members (i.e., Non-Settlement Class Members) will not receive Settlement Payments, but will preserve their rights to personally pursue claims similar to those alleged in this Action against Defendants.

8. How do I tell the Court that I do not agree with the settlement?

Only Settlement Class Members have the right to object to the Settlement. Before deciding whether to object, you may wish to see what Plaintiff and Defendants are asking the Court to approve. At least _____ days before the _____ Final Approval Hearing, Class Counsel and/or Plaintiff will file in Court (1) a Motion for Final Approval that includes, among other things, the reasons why the proposed Settlement is fair, and (2) a Motion for Fees, Litigation Expenses and Service Award stating (i) the amount Class Counsel is requesting for attorneys' fees and litigation expenses; and (ii) the amount Plaintiff is requesting as a Class Representative Service Award. Upon reasonable request, Class Counsel (whose contact information is in Section **10** of this Notice) will email you copies of these documents at no cost to you. You can also view them on the Administrator's Settlement Website _____ or the Court's website _____.

A Settlement Class Member who disagrees with any aspect of the Agreement, the Motion for Final Approval and/or Motion for Fees, Litigation Expenses and Service Award may wish to object, for example, that the proposed Settlement is unfair, or that the amounts requested by Class Counsel or Plaintiff are too high or too low. **The deadline for sending written objections to the Administrator is** _____. Be sure to tell the Administrator what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. Please also provide copies of any documents you wish to submit to support your position. Make sure you identify the Action - *Cheng v. Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC et al*, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Case No 25STCV30653 - and include your name, current address, telephone number, email address, and, if represented by Counsel, your Counsel's name, address, telephone number, and email address. Section **10** of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

Alternatively, a Settlement Class Member can object (or personally retain a lawyer to object at your own cost) by attending the Final Approval Hearing. You (or your attorney) should be ready to tell the Court what you object to, why you object, and any facts that support your objection. See Section 9 of this Notice (immediately below) for specifics regarding the Final Approval Hearing.

9. Can I attend the Final Approval Hearing?

You can, but don't have to, attend the Final Approval Hearing on _____ at _____ in Department 12 of the Los Angeles Superior Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. At the Hearing, the judge will decide whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and how much of the Maximum Settlement will be paid to Class Counsel, Plaintiff, and the Administrator. The Court will invite comment from objectors, Class Counsel and Defense Counsel before making a decision. You can attend (or hire a lawyer to attend) either personally or virtually via LACourtConnect (https://www.lacourt.org/lacc/). Check the Court's website for the most current information.

It's possible the Court will reschedule the Final Approval Hearing. You should check the Administrator's website _____ beforehand or contact Class Counsel to verify the date and time of the Final Approval Hearing.

10. Are there more details about the settlement?

The Agreement sets forth everything Defendants and Plaintiff have promised to do under the proposed Settlement. The easiest way to read the Agreement, the Judgment or any other Settlement documents is to go to the Settlement Administrator's website at _____. You can also telephone or send an email to Class Counsel or the Administrator using the contact information listed below, or consult the Superior Court website by going to (http://www.lacourt.org/casesummary/ui/index.aspx) and entering the Case Number for the Action, Case No. 25STCV30653. You can also make an appointment to personally review court documents in the Clerk's Office at the Stanley Mosk Courthouse by calling (213) 830-0800.

Class Counsel: TUSAN LAW, P.C. Christina Tusan (SBN 192203) ctusan@ctusanlaw.com Adrian Barnes (SBN 253131) abarnes@ctusanlaw.com 680 E. Colorado Blvd. #180 Pasadena, CA 91101 Tel: (626) 418-8203 Fax: (626) 619-8253
Settlement Administrator: Email Address: Mailing Address: Telephone: Fax Number:

PLEASE DO NOT CONTACT THE COURT OR DEFENDANTS WITH INQUIRIES

11. What if I lose my check?

If you lose or misplace your settlement check before cashing it, the Administrator will replace it as long as you request a replacement before the void date on the face of the original check. If your check is already void you will have no way to recover the money.

12. What if I change my address?

If you change your address or if you want to confirm that the Administrator has the correct mailing address to which the Administrator should send your check, please notify the Administrator. Section **10** of this Notice has the Administrator's contact information.

EXHIBIT B

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FAIRNESS HEARING

Why did I get this postcard? A Settlement has been proposed in a class action lawsuit pending in Los Angeles County Superior Court ("Court") titled *Cheng v. Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC et al* ("Action"). The purpose of this Postcard Notice is to inform you of the Action and the Settlement so that you may decide what steps to take in relation to it.

What is the Action about? Plaintiff Melody Cheng alleges that Onni Broadway Block Long Beach LLC, Onni Management California LLC, and Onni Properties LLC ("Onni" or "Defendants") violated California laws that prohibit sharing of tenants and prospective tenants' private information without notice and consent. The Court has not ruled on the merits and Defendants deny any violations. However, to resolve the case, Defendants have agreed to settle the Action.

Am I a Settlement Class Member? The class includes current and former tenants and applicants of Onni, in California, who had a lease with Onni that covered any portion of the period from January 1, 2025, to March 4, 2026 (the "Class Period"), or their information was accessible to IDIQ (a third party) through the Yardi database (a database that can be used to share tenant information with IDIQ). Excluded from the Class are tenants who signed an opt-in form that permitted release of their information to IDIQ and tenants who moved in after April 1, 2025, and who signed a lease addendum that permitted release of their information to IDIQ. According to Defendants' records, you may be a Settlement Class Member.

What does the Settlement Provide? Defendant has agreed to pay to $240,000 to settle the Action. After notice and administration fees and costs, an incentive award to Plaintiff, and Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs are deducted, the entire remaining amount (estimated to be $125,000) ("Net Settlement Amount") will be available to be paid in equal shares to the estimated 2,500 Settlement Class Members (approximately $50 per Settlement Class Member). Settlement Class Members do not have to do anything to receive payment.

What are my other options? If you don't want to be legally bound by the Settlement, you must exclude yourself by [date], or you won't be able to sue Defendants about the legal claims in the Action ever again. If you exclude yourself, you will not receive a payment from the Settlement. If you stay in the Settlement, you may object to it in writing by [date], or you may make an oral objection at the Final Approval Hearing. The detailed notice available at www.xxxxxxxxxxxxx.com explains how to request exclusion or object. The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on [date] at [time] to consider whether to approve the Settlement and a request by the lawyers representing all Settlement Class Members (Tusan Law P.C.) for up to $80,000 in attorneys' fees and up to $15,000 in reimbursement for litigation costs, and for the class representative's request for $5,000 for her services. You may choose to appear at the hearing, but you don't have to.

More info? You can get more information about the case and view important case documents at the Settlement website www.xxxxxxxxxxxxx.com or by calling 1-8xx-xxx-xxxx.

www.XXXXXXXXX.com 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX

EXHIBIT C

ANALYTICS

Richard W. Simmons

Richard W. Simmons is the President of Analytics Consulting LLC[1]. Mr. Simmons joined Analytics in 1990 and has more than 33 years of experience developing and implementing class action communications and settlement programs.

Mr. Simmons' first legal notice consulting engagement was the *Schwan's Salmonella Litigation* settlement (*In Re: Salmonella Litigation*, Case No. 94-cv-016304 (D. Minn.)). Since then, he has:

- Developed and implemented notice campaigns ranging in size up to 45 million known class members (and 180 million unknown class members);
- Testified regarding legal notice in building products, civil rights, consumer products, environmental pollution, privacy, and securities litigation settlements;
- Managed claims processes for settlement funds ranging up to $1 billion in value.

As part of Analytics' ongoing class action notice consulting practice, Mr. Simmons:

- testified regarding the adequacy of notice procedures in direct notice cases (including the development of class member databases);
- testified regarding the adequacy of published notice plans;
- has been appointed as a Distribution Fund Administrator by the Securities and Exchange Commission tasked with developing Distribution Plans for court approval;
- has been retained as an expert by the Federal Trade Commission to testify regarding the effectiveness of competing notice plans and procedures; and,
- acted as the primary author for the Duke Law Center's guidelines for best practices regarding the evaluation of class action notice campaigns.
- assisted in developing the George Washington University Law School's Class Action Best Practices Checklist.
- acted as the primary author for the Rabiej Litigation Law Center' Class Action Best Practices.

In addition to his class action consulting work, Mr. Simmons has taught a college course in antitrust economics, was a guest lecturer at the University of Minnesota Law School on issues of statistical and economic analysis, was a charter member of the American Academy of Economic and Financial Experts and was a former referee for the Journal of Legal Economics (reviewing and critiquing peer reviewed articles on the application of economic and statistical analysis to legal issues). Mr. Simmons is a published author on the subject of damage analysis in Rule 10b-5 securities litigation.

[1] In October 2013, Analytics Consulting LLC acquired Analytics Incorporated. I am the former President or Analytics Incorporated. References to Analytics herein include the prior legal entities.

Mr. Simmons graduated from St. Olaf College with a B.A. in Economics (with a year at University College, Dublin), pursued a PhD. in Agricultural and Applied Economics (with a concentration in industrial organization and consumer/behavioral economics) at the University of Minnesota[2], and has received formal media planning training from New York University.

APPLICATION OF TECHNOLOGY TO CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS

Mr. Simmons has been a visionary in the application of the Internet to class action notice campaigns and the management of settlements:

- In 1995, Mr. Simmons was the first in the nation to support class action settlements with an online presence, that included the ability to check online, the status of their claims.
- In 2000, Mr. Simmons invented online claims submission in class action litigation, filing a patent application governing *"Method and system for assembling databases in multiple-party proceedings"* US20010034731 A1.
- In 2002, Mr. Simmons established an online clearinghouse for class action settlements that provided the public with information regarding class action settlements and provided them with the ability to register for notification of new settlements. This clearinghouse received national press attention as a resource for class action settlements.
- From 2003 through 2013, Analytics' incremental changes in Internet support included class member verification of eligibility, locater services that identified retail outlets that sold contaminated products, secure document repositories, and multi-language support.
- In 2014, Mr. Simmons was the first to utilize and testify regarding product-based targeting in an online legal notice campaign
- In 2014, Analytics, under Mr. Simmons' leadership, released the first-class action settlement support site developed under e-commerce best practices.

SPEAKER/EXPERT PANELIST/PRESENTER

Mr. Simmons has presented to panels of judges and lawyers on issues regarding class notice, claims processing, and disbursement:

- Mr. Simmons served as a panelist for the Francis McGovern Conferences on "Distribution of Securities Litigation Settlements: Improving the Process", at which regulators, judges, custodians, academics, practitioners and claims administrators participated.
- In 2011, Mr. Simmons was a panelist at the Federal Judicial Center's workshop/meetings regarding class action notice and settlement administration.
- In 2014, Mr. Simmons was invited to be interviewed by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau as an expert on notice and claims administration in class action litigation as part of their study on arbitration and consumer class litigation waivers

[2] Mr. Simmons suspended work on his dissertation to acquire and manage Analytics.

- In 2016, Mr. Simmons presented results of research regarding the impact of forms of notice on fund participation rates to the Federal Trade Commission.
- In 2019, Mr. Simmons was the only claims administration expert invited to be a panelist to the Federal Trade Commission's Workshop on Consumers and Class Action Notices, where he spoke regarding the impact of different forms of notice on settlement participation rates and improving response rates to class action notices.
- In 2023, Mr. Simmons was a panelist for the Rabiej Litigation Law Center Bench-Bar Conference regarding Class Action Settlements where he spoke regarding maximizing claims rates in consumer class action settlements.
- In 2023, Mr. Simmons acted as the primary author for the Rabiej Litigation Law Center's Class Action Best Practices.

Mr. Simmons' speaking engagements regarding class notice and claims administration include:

- *Distribution Issues for Class Counsel and Claims Administrators in Class Settlements,* Class Action Bench/Bar Leadership Summit, Charleston School of Law (2026)
- *Ethics for Class Counsel and Claims Administrators in Class Settlements,* UC Law San Francisco Complex Litigation Ethics Conference in San Francisco (2025)
- *Current Challenges in Claims Administration related to Fraudulent Claims and Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning*, National Association of Securities and Consumer Attorneys (2024)
- *Maximizing Claims Rates in Consumer Class Actions*, Rabiej Litigation Law Center (2023)
- *Technology and Class Action Settlements*, National Association of Securities and Consumer Attorneys (2023),
- *Risks and Regulations: Best Practices that Protect Class Member Confidentiality* presented at the HB Litigation Conference on Class Action Mastery in New York City (2018)
- *Recent Developments in Class Action Notice and Claims Administration* presented at Practising Law Institute in New York City (2017)
- *The Beginning and the End of Class Action Lawsuits* presented at Perrin Class Action Litigation Conference in Chicago (2017);
- C*lass Action Administration: Data and Technology* presented at Harris Martin Target Data Breach Conference in San Diego (2014);
- *Developments in Legal Notice*, accredited CLE Program, presented at Susman Godfrey in Dallas (2014)
- *Developments in Legal Notice*, accredited CLE Program, presented at Shook Hardy & Bacon, LLP in Kansas City (2013),
- *Developments in Legal Notice*, accredited CLE Program, presented at Halunen & Associates in Minneapolis (2013),
- *Class Actions 101: Best Practices and Potential Pitfalls in Providing Class Notice*, CLE Program, presented by Brian Christensen and Richard Simmons, to the Kansas Bar Association (March 2009).

Mr. Simmons' writings regarding class notice include:

- Crafting Digital Class Notices That Actually Provide Notice - Law360.com, New York (March 10, 2016).

JUDICIAL COMMENTS AND LEGAL NOTICE CASES

In evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of Mr. Simmons' notice campaigns, courts have repeatedly recognized Mr. Simmons' work. The following excerpts provide recent examples of such judicial approval in matters where the primary issue was the provision of class notice.

Honorable Stephen J. Murphy III, *Doe 1 v. Deja vu Servs., Inc.*, No. 2:16-cv-10877, ECF No. 77 (E.D. Mich. June 19, 2017):

> *Also, the Plaintiffs certified that notice had been provided in accordance with the Court's preliminary approval order. The notices stated—in clear and easily understandable terms—the key information class members needed to make an informed decision: the nature of the action, the class claims, the definition of the class, the general outline of the settlement, how to elect for a cash payment, how to opt out of the class, how to object to the settlement, the right of class members to secure counsel, and the binding nature of the settlement on class members who do not to opt out.*
>
> * * *
>
> *In addition, the parties took additional steps to provide notice to class members, including through targeted advertisements on social media. The Court finds that the parties have provided the "best notice that is practicable under the circumstances," and complied with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, and due process.*[3]

Associate Justice Edward P. Leibensberger, *Geanacopoulos v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.*, No. 9884CV06002, Dkt. No. 230 (Mass. Super. Ct. Sept. 30, 2016):

> *The Court finds that the plan of Notice as described in paragraphs 12 through 20 of the Settlement Agreement, including the use of email, mail, publication and internet notice, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constituted due and sufficient notice to the Class.*

Honorable Edward J. Davila, *In re: Google Referrer Header Privacy Litig.*, No. 5:10-cv-04809, ECF No. 85 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2015):

---

3 Unless otherwise indicated, citations are omitted and emphasis is added.

> *On the issue of appropriate notice, the court previously recognized the uniqueness of the class asserted in this case, since it could potentially cover most internet users in the United States. On that ground, the court approved the proposed notice plan involving four media channels: (1) internet-based notice using paid banner ads targeted at potential class members (in English and in Spanish on Spanish-language websites); (2) notice via "earned media" or, in other words, through articles in the press; (3) a website decided solely to the settlement (in English and Spanish versions); and (4) a toll-free telephone number where class members can obtain additional information and request a class notice. In addition, the court approved the content and appearance of the class notice and related forms as consistent with Rule 23(c)(2)(B).*
>
> *The court again finds that the notice plan and class notices are consistent with Rule 23, and that the plan has been fully and properly implemented by the parties and the class administrator.*

Honorable Terrence F. McVerry, *Kobylanski. v. Motorola Mobility, Inc.*, No. 2:13-cv-01181, ECF No. 43 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 9, 2014):

> *The Court finds that the distribution of the Notice to Settlement Class Members Re: Pendency of Class Action, as provided for in the Order Granting Preliminary Approval for the Settlement, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all Persons within the definition of the Class and fully met the requirements of due process under the United States Constitution.*

Honorable Thomas N. O'Neill, Jr., *In re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding Litig.*, No. 2:11-md-02270, ECF No. 119 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 20, 2014):

> *Settlement class members were provided with notice of the settlement in the manner and form set forth in the settlement agreement. Notice was also provided to pertinent state and federal officials. The notice plan was reasonably calculated to give actual notice to settlement class members of their right to receive benefits from the settlement or to be excluded from the settlement or object to the settlement. The notice plan met the requirements of Rule 23 and due process.*

Honorable Robert W. Gettleman, *In re Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litig.*, No. 1:08-cv-04883, ECF No. 1031 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 25, 2012):

> *Due and adequate notice of the Settlement was provided to the Class. . . . The manner of giving notice provided in this case fully satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. A full and fair opportunity was provided to the members of the Class to be heard regarding the Settlements.*

Honorable Marco A. Roldan, *Plubell v. Merck & Co., Inc.*, NO. 04CV235817-01, Final Judgment and Order (Mo. Cir. Ct. Mar. 15, 2013):

> *Under the circumstances, the notice of this Settlement provided to Class Members in accordance with the Notice Order was the best notice practicable of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements due process and Missouri law.*

Honorable James P. Kleinberg, *Skold v. Intel Corp.*, No. 2005-CV-039231, Order on Motion for Approval (Cal. Super. Ct. Mar. 14, 2013):

> *The Court finds that Plaintiff's proposed Notice plan has a reasonable chance of reaching a substantial percentage of class members.*

Honorable J. Phil Gilbert, *Greenville IL v. Syngenta Crop Prot., Inc.*, No 3:10-cv-00188, ECF No. 325 (S.D. Ill. Oct. 23, 2012):

> *The Notice provided to the Class fully complied with Rule 23, was the best notice practicable, satisfied all constitutional due process requirements, and provides the Court with jurisdiction over the Class Members.*



Analytics Consulting LLC
Partial List of Legal Notice and Class Action Consulting Experience

2/25/2026

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
Antitrust	*All Star Carts and Vehicles, Inc., et al. v. BFI Canada Income Fund, et al.*	08-CV-1816 (E.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litigation	No. 1:08-cv-4883, MDL No. 1957 (N.D. Ill.)
	In Re: Aluminum Phosphide Antitrust Litigation	Case No. 93-cv-2452 (D. Kan.)
	In Re: Beef Antitrust Litigation	MDL No. 248 (N.D. Tex.)
	In Re: Bromine Antitrust Litigation	MDL No. 1310 (S.D. Ind.)
	In Re: Corrugated Container Antitrust Litigation	MDL. No 310 (S.D. Tex.)
	In Re: Industrial Silicon Antitrust Litigation	Case No. 95-cv-2104 (W.D. Pa.)
	In Re: Multidistrict Civil Antitrust Actions Involving Antibiotic Drugs	MDL No. 10 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Workers Compensation Insurance Antitrust Litigation	Case No. 4:85-cv-1166 (D. Minn.)
	Red Eagle Resources Corporation, Inc., et al. v. Baker Hughes Inc., et al.	Case No. 91-cv-627 (S.D. Tex.)
	Rob'n I, Inc., et al. v. Uniform Code Counsel, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-203796-1 (Spokane County, Wash.)
	Sarah F. Hall d/b/a Travel Specialist, et al. v. United Airlines, Inc., et al.,	Case No. 7:00-cv-123-BR(1) (E.D. S.C.)
Asset Forfeiture	*U.S. v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from e-Bullion, et al. ("Goldfinger")*	No. CV 09-1731 (C.D. Cal.)
	U.S. v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from e-Bullion, et al. ("Kum Ventures")	No. CV 09-1731 (C.D. Cal.)
	U.S. v. David Merrick	6:10-cr-109-Orl-35DAB
	U.S. v. Sixty-Four 68.5 lbs (Approx.) Silver Bars, et al.	(E.D. Fla)
	United States of America v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from E-Bullion, et al.	Case No. 09-cv-01731 (C.D. Cal.)
	United States of America v. Alfredo Susi, et al.	3:07-cr-119 (W.D.N.Y.)
	United States of America v. David Merrick	6:10-cr-109-Orl-35DAB
	United States of America v. Elite Designs, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-058 (D.R.I.)
	United States of America v. Evolution Marketing Group	Case No. 6:09-cv-1852 (S.D. Fla.)
	United States of America v. George David Gordon	Case No. 4:09-cr-00013-JHP-1 (N.D. Okla.)
	United States of America v. Regenesis Marketing Corporation	No. C09-1770RSM (W.D. Wash.)
	United States of America v. Sixty-Four 68.5 lbs (Approx.) Silver Bars, et al.	(E.D. FL)
	United States of America v. Zev Saltsman	Case No. 04-cv-641 (E.D.N.Y.)
Biometric Privacy	*Allen v R.J. Van Drunen & Sons, Inc.*	Case No.: 2:20cv02106-CSB-EIL (C.D. Ill.)
	Alric Howell v Lakes Venture dba Fresh Thyme Farmers Market	1:20-cv-02213 (N.D. IL)
	Andrea Jones et al. v Rosebud Restaurants, Inc.	2019CH12910 (Cook County, IL)
	Angela Karikari v Carnagio Enterprises, Inc.	Case No.: 2019L000168 Circuit Court of Dupage County, IL
	Angelica Caballero v Long Grove PAC, LLC	2021-CH-00589 State of IL Circuit Court, Cook County
	Anthony Rodriguez v Senior Midwest Direct, Inc.	Case No.: 2021-CH-00811 (Cook County, IL)
	Anton Tucker et al. v Momence Packing Co.	Case No. 2019-L-000098 (Kankakee County, IL)
	Ashley Norwood v 48Forty Solutions, LLC	2020-CH-01434 State of IL Cook County
	Belicia Cruz v The Connor Group, A Real Estate Investment Firm, LLC	Case No.: 1:22cv01966 (N.D. IL)
	Bernal, et al v Native Wholesale, Inc.	Case No. 2020 CH 04118
	Biagi v International Services, Inc	Case No. 21CH00000311 (Lake County, IL)
	Brittany Willoughby v Lincoln Insurance Agency, Inc.	Case No.: 2022CH01917 Circuit Court of Cook County, IL
	Charles Devose v Ron's Temporary Help Services, Inc. d/b/a Ron's Staffing Services, Inc.	Case No.: 19L 1022 Circuit Court of Will County Ill

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Charles Hilson v MTIL, Inc.	20 L 440 (Will County, IL)
	Charles Thurman et al. v NorthShore University HealthSystem	Case No. 2018-CH-3544 (Cook County, IL)
	Christopher Crosby et al. v Courier Express One, Inc.	2019-CH-03391 (Cook County, IL)
	Cirillo v. United RX, LLC	Case No. 2022 LA 75
	Clifford Like et al. v Professional Freezing Services LLC	2019 CH 04194 (Cook County, IL)
	Damien Woodard v Dylan's Candybar LLC	2019-CH-05158 State of IL, Cook County
	Danielle Parker v Dabecca Natural Foods, Inc.	2019 CH 1845 (Cook County, IL)
	Darrin Hall v Whiting Corporation	Case No..: 2021L000912 (Will County, IL)
	Deanna Ramirez v Greater Rockford Auto Auction, Inc.	Case No.: 2021-L-48 (Winnebago County, IL)
	Dearlo Terry v Griffith Foods	2019CH12910 (Cook County, IL)
	Demarion Robinson v Shamrock TBC, Inc.	2022CH04364 State of IL Circuit Court, Cook County
	Diahann Cook v John C. Proctor Endowment d/b/a Proctor Place, JCPE Investments, and JCPE Properties I	Case No. 21L00083 (Peoria County, IL)
	Drape et al. v S.F. Express Corporation	20-L-001094 (DuPage County, IL)
	Eslanda Bertasiute v The Hari Group, Inc.	Case No.: 2020CH07055 Circuit Court of Cook County, IL
	Flores v. Filter Technology, Inc	Case No.: 2024 CH-06990
	Francesca Graziano et al. v Royal Die and Stamping LLC dba Royal Power Solutions, LLC	2019-L-00169 (DuPage County, IL)
	Garfias v. Superior Knife, LLC	Case No: 2021-CH-03660
	Genesis Martinez v Ralph Lauren Corporation	1:21cv01181 (N.D. IL
	George Ayala v. American Louver Company and Plasticade Products Corporation	Case No. 2022LA800
	Glen Ralph v. Colony Hardware Corporation	Case No: 22 LA 656
	Gniecki Katarzyna v Columbia Sussex Management	Case No.: 2021CH00677 (Cook County, IL)
	Heard, et al. v. THC – Northshore, Inc.	Case No. 2017-CH-16918 (Cook County, IL)
	Hector Campos v Sonoco Products Company	Case No..: 2021CH01223
	Henderson v D.T. Chicagoland Express, Inc. dba CXI Trucking	No. 2021 CH 00498
	Herman v. Missouri Fiesta, Inc., et al.	Case No. 2024CH000020
	Hernandez v Niles Grocery, LLC dba Patel Brothers	Case No. 2021-CH-00552
	Hubler v Placesmart Agency d/b/a/ Nashville Material & Supply LLC	Case No.: 2021L11 (Washington County, IL)
	Jacob Weeks v Tricon Industries Manufacturing	Case No.: 2021L32 (LaSalle County, IL)
	Jada Marsh v CLS Plasma, Inc.	Case No.:1:19cv07606 (N.D. IL)
	Javier Vega v Mid-America Taping & Reeling, Inc.	Case No.: 2019CH03776 Circuit Court DuPage County, IL
	Jeremy Webb et al. v Plochman, Inc.	Case No. 2020-L-15 (Kankakee County, IL)
	Jerrod Lane et al. v Schenker, Inc.	3:19-cv-00507 NJR-MAB (S.D. IL)
	Joe Fisher v HP Property Management LLC	Case No. 2019-CH-14082
	Joseph Ross v Caremel, Inc.	2019L000010 (Kankakee County, IL)
	Joshua Eden Mims v Monda Window & Door Corp.	2019 CH 10371 (Cook County, IL)
	Katherine Martinez et al. v Nando's Restaurant Group, Inc.	1:19-cv-07012 (N.D. IL)
	Kimberly Smith v ARG Resources, LLC d/b/a Arby's	Case No. 2019-CH-12528 (Cook County, IL)
	Latonia Williams v Personalizationmall.Com, LLC	Case No.: 1:20cv00025 (N.D. IL)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Lawrence et al v Atria Management Company, LLC	Case No: 2020-ch-01384 (Cook County, IL)
	Lawrence v Capital Senior Living, Inc.	Case No.: 2021-l-000267 (Dupage County, IL)
	Leen Abusalem et al. v The Standard Market, LLC	2019L000517 (Dupage County, IL)
	Marcus McCullum v IKO Midwest, Inc.	Case No.: 2020CH05114 (Cook County, IL)
	Maria Tapia-Rendon v United Tape & Finishing Co., Inc	Case No.:1:21cv03400 (N.D. IL)
	Marquis Orr v. Crown Linen Service	Case No. 2022 LA 7
	Maurilio Ortega v Rapid Displays, Inc.	Case No.: 2020CH00140 Circuit Court of Cook County, IL (Chancery Division)
	Maysoun Abudayyeh v Envoy Air, Inc.	Case No.: 1:21cv00142 (N.D. IL)
	Melone v General RV Center	Case No.: 21L000405 (Kane County, IL)
	Michael Pfotenhauer v Alfagomma Aurora TF LLC	Case No..: 21L000251 (Kane County, IL)
	Michelle Sedory v Aldi, Inc.	Case No.: 20CH02768 (Cook County, IL) (Chancery Division)
	Mims v Trippe Manufacturing Company, d/b/a Trippe Lite	Case No.: 2019-ch-10189 (Cook County, IL)
	Morales v Graham Packing Plastic Products, LLC	Case No: 2021l000801 (Dupage County, IL)
	Neisha Torres et al. v Eataly Chicago, LLC	2020 CH 6417 (Cook County, IL)
	Nicole Kordie v HCF Management, Inc.	Case No. 3:24-cv-139
	Olman v U.S.A. Recycling, Inc. d/b/a Pallet Logistics Management, Inc.	Case No.: 21L0737 (St. Clair County, IL)
	Otilia Garcia et al. v Club Colors Buyers LLC	Case No. 2020 L 001330 (Dupage County, IL)
	Rafael Vazquez v Pet Food Experts, Inc.	2019 CH 14746 (Cook County, IL)
	Ramsey v. Daley's Medical Transportation, Inc. d/b/a Bud's Ambulance	Case No.: 2022 LA 0591
	Rea v Skolnik Industries, Inc.	Case No.: 2021-ch-00571 (Cook County, IL)
	Ricardo White v Bridgeway of Bensenville Independent Living, LLC	2019 CH 03397 (Cook County, IL
	Ricky Jones v. Whole Foods Market Group, Inc.	Case No. 22-CV -01389
	Rivera v American Freedom Insurance Co.	Case No. 2020-CH-06596 (Cook County, IL)
	Roach v. Walmart Inc.	Case No. 2019-CH-01107 (Cook County, IL)
	Robert Corey v Wireless Vision, LLC	Case No.: 2020CH1192 (Cook County, IL)
	Rosy Gomez v Resource Management Group, Inc.	Case No.: 2021ch04440 (Cook County, IL)
	Ryan Curry v County Materials Corp.BIPA	2:22cv02015 (C.D. IL)
	Sanchez v Agile Pursuits, Inc. d/b/a Tide Cleaners f/k/a Pressbox LLC	Case No. 2020-CH-02640 Circuit Court of Cook County, IL
	Seyon Haywood v Flex-n-Gate Plastics, LLC	19-CH-12933 State of IL Cook County
	Seyon Haywood v Thyssenkrupp Dynamic Components Danville, LLC	Case No.: 2021L000057 (Vermillion County, IL)
	Sheriff v Lewis Machine & Tool Co	Case No.: 2021-L-87 Cir. Ct. Rock Island Cty.
	Shonnette Banks v Meridian Lodging Associates, LLP	Case No..: 1:20cv07030 (N.D. Ill.)
	Stark v Joliet Cold Storage, LLC	Case No.: 191182 (Will County, IL)
	Steven Horn v Method Products	Case No.: 1:21cv05621 (E.D. IL)
	Stiles v. Specialty Promotions, Inc.	Case No. 2020-CH-03776 (Cook County, IL)
	Sykes v. Clearstaff, Inc.	Case No. 19-CH-03390 (Cook Co. IL)
	Tapia-Renton v Employer Solutions Staffing Group II, LLC, et al.	Case No. 21-CV-3400 (N.D. Ill.)
	Tiffanie Snider v Heartland Beef, Inc.	Case No.: 4:20cv04026 (C.D. IL)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Trayes v Midcon Hospitality Group, LLC et al.	Case No. 19-CH-11117 (Cook County, IL)
	Tylisha Allen v Flanders Corp.	Case No. 2022-LA-000154 (Sangamon County, IL)
	Tyronne L. Helm et al. v Marigold, Inc.	2020-CH-003971 (Cook County, IL)
	Villasenor v Air & Ground Services, Inc.	Case No.: 2021CH5558 (Cook County, IL)
	White v Willow Crest Nursing Pavilion, LTD	Case No: 2021CH04785 (Cook County, IL)
	William Clow v The Sygma Network, Inc.	Case No.: 1:22cv01094-CSB-EIL (C.D. IL)
	Young v Tri City Foods, Inc.	Case No. 2018 CH 13114
Business	*American Golf Schools, LLC, et al. v. EFS National Bank, et al.*	Case No. 00-cv-005208 (D. Tenn.)
	AVR, Inc. and Amidon Graphics v. Churchill Truck Lines	Case No. 4:96-cv-401 (D. Minn.)
	Buchanan v. Discovery Health Records Solutions	Case No. 13-015968-CA 25 (Miami Dade County)
	Do Right's Plant Growers, et al. v. RSM EquiCo, Inc., et al.	Case No. 06-CC-00137 (Orange County, Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Ameritel Payphone Distributors	Case No. 00-cv-514 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Cephalon	Case No. 08-cv-2141 (E.D. Pa.)
	F.T.C. v. Datacom Marketing, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-2574 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Davison & Associates, Inc.	Case No. 97-cv-01278 (W.D. Pa.)
	F.T.C. v. Fidelity ATM, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-81101 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Financial Resources Unlimited, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-8864 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. First American Payment Processing Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-0074 (D. Ariz.)
	F.T.C. v. Group C Marketing, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-6019 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Jordan Ashley, Inc.	Case No. 09-cv-23507 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Medical Billers Network, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-2014 (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. Minuteman Press Int'l	Case No. 93-cv-2496 (E.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. Netfran Development Corp	Case No. 05-cv-22223 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. USA Beverages, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-61682 (S.D. Fla.)
	Garcia, et al. v. Allergan, Inc.	11-CV-9811 (C.D. Cal.)
	Gerald Young et al. v. HealthPort Technologies, LLC, et al.	Case No. LACL130175 (Polk County, IA)
	Goldberg et al. v. HealthPort Inc. et al.	Case No L-1421-14 (Essex County, NJ)
	In Re Google AdWords Litigation	No. 5:08-cv-03369-EJD (N.D. Cal.)
	In re Syngenta Ag Mir 162 Corn Litigation	Case No 2:14-md-2591-JWL-JPO (D. Kan.)
	Law Offices of Henry E. Gare, P.A., et al. v. Healthport Technologies, LLC	No. 16-2011-CA-010202 (Duval County, FL)
	Melby et al. v. America's MHT, Inc., et al.	Case No. 3:17-CV-155-M (N.D. Texas)
	Number Queen, Ltd. et al. v. Redgear Technologies, Inc. et al.	Case No. 14-0064 (W.D. Mo.)
	Physicians of Winter Haven LLC v. STERIS Corp.	Case No. 1:10-cv-00264 (N.D. Ohio)
	Richard P. Console, JR., P.C. v. Medical Records Online Inc.	Docket No. CAM-L-2133-18 (Camden County, NJ)
	Sue Ramirez et al. v. Smart Professional Photocopy Corporation	No. 01-L-385 (Peoria County, IL)
	Terry Bishop v DeLaval, Inc.	Case No.: 5/19cv06129 (W.D. MO)
	Todd Tompkins, Doug Daug and Timothy Nelson v. BASF Corporation, et al.	Case No. 96-cv-59 (D.N.D.)
	Waxler Transportation Company, Inc. v. Trinity Marine Products, Inc., et al.	Case No. 08-cv-01363 (E.D. La.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
Civil Rights	*Bentley v. Sheriff of Essex County*	Case No. 11-01907 (Essex County, MA)
	Cazenave, et al. v. Sheriff Charles C. Foti, Jr., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-1246 (E.D. La.)
	Garcia, et al v. Metro Gang Strike Force, et al.	Case No. 09-cv-01996 (D. Minn.)
	Gregory Garvey, Sr., et al. v. Frederick B. MacDonald & Forbes Byron	3:07-cv-30049 (S.D. Mass.)
	McCain, et al. v. Bloomberg, et al.	Case No. 41023/83 (New York)
	Minich, et al. v Spencer, et al.	Civil Action No. 1584cv00278 (Suffolk Superior Court, Mass.)
	Nancy Zamarron, et al. v. City of Siloam Springs, et al.	Case No. 08-cv-5166 (W.D. Ark.)
	Nathan Tyler, et al. v. Suffolk County, et al.	Case No. 1:06-cv-11354 (S.D. Mass.)
	Nilsen v. York County	Case No. 02-cv-212 (D. Me.)
	Richard S. Souza et al. v. Sheriff Thomas M. Hodgson	2002-0870 BRCV (Superior Ct., Mass.)
	Taha v. County of Bucks	Case No. 12-6867 (E.D. Pa.)
	Travis Brecher, et al. v. St. Croix County, Wisconsin, et al.	Case No. 02-cv-0450-C (W.D. Wisc.)
	Tyrone Johnson et al. v CoreCivic et al.	2:20-cv-01309 RFB-NJK (D. NV)
Consumer	*Adam Berkson, et al. v. Gogo LLC and Gogo Inc.,*	Case No. 1:14-cv-01199-JBW-LB (S.D.N.Y.)
	Alimi v Integrity Management Group, LLC et al.	Case No.: 2021-CH-03274 (Cook County, IL)
	Andrew J. Hudak, et al. y. United Companies Lending Corporation	Case No. 334659 (Cuyahoga County, Ohio)
	Angela Doss, et al. v. Glenn Daniels Corporation	Case No. 02-cv-0787 (E.D. Ill.)
	Angell v. Skechers Canada	8562-12 (Montreal, Quebec)
	Ann McCracken et al. v Verisma Systems, Inc.	6:14-cv-06248 (W.D. N.Y.)
	Anthony Talalai, et al. v. Cooper Tire & Rubber Company	Case No. L-008830-00-MT (Middlesex County, NJ)
	Ballard, et al. v. A A Check Cashiers, Inc., et al.	Case No. 01-cv-351 (Washingotn County, Ark.)
	Belinda Peterson, et al. v. H & R Block Tax Services, Inc.	Case No. 95-CH-2389 (Cook County, Ill.)
	Boland v. Consolidated Multiple Listing Service, Inc.	Case No. 3:19-cv-01335-SB (D.S.C.)
	Braulio M. Cuesta, et al. v. Ford Motor Company, Inc., and Williams Controls, Inc.	CIV-06-61-S (E.D. Okla.)
	Caprarola, et al. v. Helxberg Diamond Shops, Inc.	Case No. 13-06493 (N.D. Ill.)
	Carideo et al. v. Dell, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-1772 (W.D. Wash.)
	Carnegie v. Household International, Inc.	No. 98-C-2178 (N.D. Ill.)
	Che Clark v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.. et al.	Case No. 0:17-cv-01069 (D. Minn.)
	Christine Gambino et al. v CIOX Health, LLC	2015-CA-006038-B (District of Columbia)
	Clair Loewy v. Live Nation Worldwide Inc.	Case No. 11-cv-04872 (N.D. Ill.)
	Conradie v. Caliber Home Loans	Case No. 4:14-cv-00430 (S.D. Iowa)
	Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc.	Case No. 1:14-cv-07194 (N.D. Ill.)
	Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Park View Law	Case No. 2:17-cv-04721 (N.D. Cal.)
	Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Prime Credit, L.L.C., et al.	Case No. 2:17-cv-04720 (N.D. Cal.)
	Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Prime Marketing Holdings	Case No. 2:16-cv-07111 (C.D. Cal.)
	Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Prime Marketing Holdings	1:15-cv-23070-MGC (S.D. Fl)
	Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Security National Automotive Acceptance	Civil Action No. 1 :15-cv-401 (S.D. Ohio)
	Covey, et al. v. American Safety Council, Inc.	2010-CA-009781-0 (Orange County, FL)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Cummins, et al. v. H&R Block, et al.	Case No. 03-C-134 (Kanawha County, W.V.)
	David and Laurie Seeger, et al. v. Global Fitness Holdings, LLC	No. 09-CI-3094, (Boone Circuit Court, Boone County, Ky.)
	District of Columbia v Maplebear, Inc.	2020CA00377B Superior Court of the District of Columbia
	Don C. Lundell, et al. v. Dell, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-03970 (N.D. Cal.)
	Duffy v. Security Pacific Autmotive Financial Services Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:93-cv-00729 (S.D. Cal.)
	Edward Hawley, et al. v. American Pioneer Title Insurance Company	No. CA CE 03-016234 (Broward County, Fla.)
	Evans, et al. v. Linden Research, Inc., et al.	Case No. 4:11-cv-1078-DMR (N.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. and The People of the State of New York v. UrbanQ	Case No. 03-cv-33147 (E.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v A1 DocPrep Inc. et.al.	Case No. 2:17-cv-07044 SJO-JC (C.D. CA)
	F.T.C. v First Universal Lending, LLC et al.	Case No. 9:09-cv-82322 ZLOCH (S.D. FL)
	F.T.C. v Student Debt Doctor, LLC et al.	Case No. 17-cv-61937 WPD (S.D. FL)
	F.T.C. v. 1st Beneficial Credit Services LLC	Case No. 02-cv-1591 (N.D. Ohio)
	F.T.C. v. 9094-5114 Quebec, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-7486 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Ace Group, Inc.	Case No. 08-cv-61686 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Affordable Media LLC	Case No. 98-cv-669 (D. Nev.)
	F.T.C. v. AmeraPress, Inc.	Case No. 98-cv-0143 (N.D. Tex.)
	F.T.C. v. American Bartending Institute, Inc., et al.	Case No. 05-cv-5261 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. American International Travel Services Inc.	Case No. 99-cv-6943 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Asset & Capital Management Group	Case No. 8:13-cv-1107 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Bigsmart.com, L.L.C., et al.	Case No. 01-cv-466 (D. Ariz.)
	F.T.C. v. Broadway Global Master Inc	Case No. 2-cv-00855 (E.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Call Center Express Corp.	Case No. 04-cv-22289 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Capital Acquistions and Management Corp.	Case No. 04-cv-50147 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Capital City Mortgage Corp.	Case No. 98-cv-00237 (D.D.C.)
	F.T.C. v. Centro Natural Corp	Case No. 14:23879 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Certified Merchant Services, Ltd., et al.	Case No. 4:02-cv-44 (E.D. Tex.)
	F.T.C. v. Check Inforcement	Case No. 03-cv-2115 (D.N.J.)
	F.T.C. v. Chierico et al.	Case No. 96-cv-1754 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Clickformail.com, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-3033 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Consumer Credit Services	Case No. 96-cv-1990 (S.D. N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. Consumer Direct Enterprises, LLC.	Case No. 07-cv-479 (D. Nev.)
	F.T.C. v. Debt Management Foundation Services, Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-1674 (M.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Delaware Solutions	Case No. 1:15-cv-00875-RJA (W.D.N.Y)
	F.T.C. v. DeVry Education Group Inc.	Case No. 2:16-cv-579 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Digital Enterprises, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-4923 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Dillon Sherif	Case No. 02-cv-00294 (W.D. Wash.)
	F.T.C. v. Discovery Rental, Inc., et al.	Case No: 6:00-cv-1057 (M.D. of Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. EdebitPay, LLC.	Case No. 07-cv-4880 (C.D. Cal.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	F.T.C. v. Electronic Financial Group, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-211 (W.D. Tex.)
	F.T.C. v. Eureka Solutions	Case No. 97-cv-1280 (W.D. Pa.)
	F.T.C. v. Federal Data Services, Inc., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-6462 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Financial Advisors & Associates, Inc.	Case No. 08-cv-00907 (M.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. First Alliance Mortgage Co.	Case No. 00-cv-964 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. First Capital Consumer Membership Services Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:00-cv-00905 (W.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. First Capital Consumers Group, et al.	Case No. 02-cv-7456 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Franklin Credit Services, Inc.	Case No. 98-cv-7375 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Global Web Solutions, Inc., d/b/a USA Immigration Services, et al.	Case No. 03-cv-023031 (D. D.C.)
	F.T.C. v. Granite Mortgage, LLC	Case No. 99-cv-289 (E.D. Ky.)
	F.T.C. v. Herbalife International of America	Case No. 2:16-cv-05217 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. ICR Services, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-5532 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. iMall, Inc. et al.	Case No. 99-cv-03650 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Inbound Call Experts, LLC	Case No. 9:14-cv-81395-KAM (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Information Management Forum, Inc.	Case No. 2-cv-00986 (M.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Ira Smolev, et al.	Case No. 01-cv-8922 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Jeffrey L. Landers	Case No. 00-cv-1582 (N.D. Ga.)
	F.T.C. v. Jewelway International, Inc.	Case No. 97-cv-383 (D. Ariz.)
	F.T.C. v. Kevin Trudeau	Case No. 98-cv-0168 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Komaco International, Inc., et al.	Case No. 02-cv-04566 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. LAP Financial Services, Inc.	Case No. 3:99-cv-496 (W.D. Ky.)
	F.T.C. v. Lumos Labs, Inc.	Case No. 3:16-cv-00001 (N.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Marketing & Vending, Inc. Concepts, L.L.C., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-1131 (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. Mercantile Mortgage	Case No. 02-cv-5078 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Merchant Services Direct, LLC	Case No. 2:13-cv-00279 (E. D. Wa.)
	F.T.C. v. Meridian Capital Management	Case No. 96-cv-63 (D. Nev.)
	F.T.C. v. NAGG Secured Investments	Case No. 00-cv-02080 (W.D. Wash.)
	F.T.C. v. National Consumer Counsil, Inc., et al.	Case No. 04-cv-0474 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. National Credit Management Group	Case No. 98-cv-936 (D.N.J.)
	F.T.C. v. National Supply & Data Distribution Services	Case No. 99-cv-128-28 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Nationwide Information Services, Inc.	Case No. 00-cv-06505 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. NBTY, Inc.	No. 05-4793 (E.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. NetSpend	Case No. 1:16-cv-04203-AT (N.D. Ga.)
	F.T.C. v. NutriMost LLC	Case No. 2:17-cv-00509-NBF (W.D. Pa.)
	F.T.C. v. One Technologies, LP	Case No. 3:14-cv-05066 (N.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Oro Marketing	Case No. 2:13-CV-08843 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Pace Corporation	Case No. 94-cv-3625 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Paradise Palms Vacation Club	Case No. 81-1160D (W.D. Wash.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	F.T.C. v. Patrick Cella, et al.	Case No. 03-cv-3202 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Platinum Universal, LLC	Case No. 03-cv-61987 (S. D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Raymond Urso	Case No. 97-cv-2680 (S.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Rincon Management Services, LLC	Case No. 5:11-cv-01623-VAP-SP (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Robert S. Dolgin	Case No. 97-cv-0833 (N.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Southern Maintenance Supplies	Case No. 99-cv-0975 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Star Publishing Group, Inc.	Case No. 00-cv-023D (D. Wy.)
	F.T.C. v. Stratford Career Institute	Case No. 1:16-cv-00371 (N.D. Ohio)
	F.T.C. v. Stuffingforcash.com Corp.	Case No. 02-cv-5022 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Target Vending Systems, L.L.C., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-0955 (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. The College Advantage, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-179 (E.D. Tex.)
	F.T.C. v. The Crescent Publishing Group, Inc., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-6315 (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. The Tax Club	Case No. 13-cv-210 (JMF) (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. The Tungsten Group, Inc.	Case No. 01-cv-773 (E.D. Va.)
	F.T.C. v. Think Achievement Corp.	Case No. 2:98-cv-12 (N.D. Ind.)
	F.T.C. v. Think All Publishing	Case No. 07-cv-11 (E.D. Tex.)
	F.T.C. v. Tracfone	Case No. 3:15-cv-00392 (N.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Trustsoft, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-1905 (S.D. Tex.)
	F.T.C. v. Unicyber Gilboard, Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-1569 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. US Grant Resources, LLC.	Case No. 04-cv-0596 (E.D. La.)
	F.T.C. v. Verity International, Ltd., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-7422-LAK (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. Wellquest International, Inc.	Case No. 2:03-cv-05002 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Wolf Group	Case No. 94-cv-8119 (S.D. Fla.)
	Federal Trade Commission v Nutraclick, LLC	Case No.: 2:20cv08612 (C.D. CA)
	Fernando N. Lopez and Mallory Lopez, et al. v. City Of Weston	Case No. 99-8958 CACE 07 (FL 17th Jud Dist)
	Fiori, et al. v. Dell Inc., et al.	Case No. 09-cv-01518 (N.D. Cal.)
	FMS, Inc. v. Dell, Inc. et al.,	Case No. 03-2-23781-7SEA (King County, Wash.)
	Frederick v Manor Care of Hemet CA, LLC	MCC2000202 (Riverside County, CA)
	FTC v 9140-9201 Quebec Inc. dba Premium Business Pages, Inc.	1:18-cv-04115 (E.D. IL)
	FTC v Elite IT Partners, Inc.	2:19-cv-00125 (D. UT)
	FTC v Fat Giraffe Marketing Group LLC	2:19-cv-00063 CW (C.D. Utah)
	FTC v Grand Teton Professionals, LLC et al.	3:19-cv-00933 VAB (D. CT)
	FTC v Manhattan Beach Venture LLC	Case No. 2:19cv7849 (C.D. CA)
	FTC v Physician's Technology, LLC	2:20-cv-11694 NGE-RSW (E.D. MI)
	FTC v Renaissance Health Publishing, LLC dba Renown Health Products	9:20-cv-80640 DMM (S.D. FL)
	FTC v Slac, Inc.	5:20-cv-00470 (C.D. CA)
	FTC v Zycal Bioceuticals Healthcare Company, Inc.	1:20-cv-10249 (D. MA)
	Galatis, et al. v. Psak, Graziano Piasecki & Whitelaw, et. al.	No. L-005900-04 (Middlesex County, NJ)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Garcia v. Allergan	11-cv-9811 (C.D. Cal.)
	Gloria Lopez et al. v Progressive County Mutual Insurance Company	5:19-cv-00380 FB-ESC (W.D. TX)
	Grabowski v. Skechers U.S.A., Inc.	No. 3:12-cv-00204 (W.D. Ky.)
	Greg Benney, et al. v. Sprint International Communications Corp. et al.	Case No. 02-cv-1422 (Wyandotte County, KS)
	Griffin v. Dell Canada Inc	Case No. 07-cv-325223D2 (Ontario, Superio Court of Justice)
	Haas and Shahbazi vs. Navient Solutions and Navient Credit Finance Corporation	Case No. 15-35586 (DRJ) (S.D. Texas)
	Harris, et al. v. Roto-Rooter Services Company	Case No. 00-L-525 (Madison County, IL)
	Harrison, et al. v. Pacific Bay Properties	No. BC285320 (Los Angeles County, CA)
	Henderson, et al . V. Volvo Cars of North America, LLC, et al.	09-04146 (D.N.J.)
	In re H&R Block IRS Form 8863 Litigation	Case No. 4:13-MD-02474-FJG. (W.D. MO)
	In Re: Bancomer Transfer Services Mexico Money Transfer Litigation	BC238061, BC239611(Los Angeles County, CA)
	In Re: Certainteed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation	MDL 2270 (E.D. PA)
	In Re: H&R Block Express IRA Marketing Litigation	Case No. 06-md-01786 (W.D. Mo.)
	In Re: High Carbon Concrete Litigation	Case No. 97-cv-20657 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: High Sulfur Content Gasoline Products Liability Litigation	MDL No. 1632 (E.D. La.)
	In Re: Ria Telecommunications and Afex Mexico Money Transfer Litigation	Case No. 99-cv-0759 (San Louis Obispo, Cal.)
	In Re: Salmonella Litigation	Case No. 94-cv-016304 (D. Minn.)
	In the Matter of Kushly Industries LLC	FTC File No.: 202-3111
	In the Matter of Lions Not Sheep Products, LLC	FTC Case # 222 3023
	Janet Figueroa, et al. v. Fidelity National Title Insurance Company	Case No. 04-cv-0898 (Miami Dade County, Fla.)
	Jerome H. Schlink v. Edina Realty Title	Case No. 02-cv-18380 (D. Minn.)
	Joe Key v Lon Smith & Associates, Inc.	236-267881-13 District Court of Tarrant County Texas
	Joel E. Zawikowski, et al. v. Beneficial National Bank, et al.	Case No. 98-cv-2178 (N.D. Ill.)
	John Babb, et al. v. Wilsonart International, Inc.	Case No. CT-001818-04 (Memphis, Tenn.)
	John Colin Suttles, et al. v. Specialty Graphics, Inc.,	Case No. 14-505 (W.D. TX)
	Johnson v Healdsburg Senior Living Community et al.	Case No. SCV-269797
	Kenneth Toner, et al. v. Cadet Manufacturing Company	Case No. 98-2-10876-2SEA (King County, Wash.)
	Kiefer, et al. v. Ceridian Corporation, et al.	Case No. 3:95-cv-818 (D. Minn.)
	Kim Schroll et al. v Lakewood Residential Care LLC dba Lakewood Park Manor	18STCV29819 (Los Angeles County, CA)
	Kobylanski et al. v. Motorola Mobility, Inc. et al.	No. 13-CV-1181 (W.D. Pa.)
	Linda Horsley v Shakespeare Street Associates	GD-18-012027 State of PA Court of Common Pleas, Allegheny County
	Lisa Ranieri et al.v AdvoCare International, L.P.	Case No. 3:17-cv-00691 B (N.D. TX)
	Long et al v. Americredit Financial Services, Inc.	0:2011-02752 (Hennepin County, MN)
	Louis Thula, et al. v. Lawyers Title Insurance Corporation	Case No. 0405324-11 (Broward County, Fla.)
	Lynn Henderson, et al. v. Volvo Cars of North America, LLC, et al.	No. 2:09-cv-04146-CCC-JAD (D.N.J.)
	Lynnette Lijewski, et al. v. Regional Transit Board, et al.	Case No. 4:93-cv-1108 (D. Minn.)
	Mark Laughman, et al. v. Wells Fargo Leasing Corp. et al.	Case No. 96-cv-0925 (N.D. Ill.)
	Mark Parisot et al v. US Title Guaranty Company	Case No. 0822-cc-09381 (St. Louis Circuit Court, Mo.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Mark R. Lund v. Universal Title Company	Case No. 05-cv-00411 (D. Minn.)
	Marks, et al. v. The Realty Associates Fund X, et al.	CA No. SUCV2018-00056-BLS1 (Suffolk County, MA)
	Maturo v CF Eagle Brook ARCIS, LLC dba Eagle Brook Country Club	Case No. 2023 MR 255
	Mazloom v Navient Solutions	Case No. 20-80033-6
	Melissa Castille Dodge, et al. v. Phillips College of New Orleans, Inc., et al.	Case No. 95-cv-2302 (E.D. La.)
	Michael Drogin, et al. v. General Electric Capital Auto Financial Services, Inc.	Case No. 95-cv-112141 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Michael Sutton v. DCH Auto Group, et al.	(Essex County, NJ)
	Michael T. Pierce et al. v. General Electric Capital Auto Lease	CV 93-0529101 S
	Mitchem, et al v. Illinois Collection Service, Inc.	Case No. 09-cv-7274 (N.D. Ill.)
	Northcoast Financial Services v. Marcia Webster	2004 CVF 18651 (Cuyahoga County, OH)
	Olivia Savarino et al. v Lincoln Property Co.	14-1122C (Essex County, MA)
	Oubre v. Louisiana Citizens Fair Plan	No. 625-567 (Jefferson Parish, LA)
	Potricia Faircloth, et a. v. Certified Finance, Inc., et al.	Case No. 99-cv-3097 (E.D. La.)
	Pistilli v. Life Time Fitness, Inc.	Case No. 07-cv-2300 (D. Minn.)
	Precision Healthcare Group v mdINR LLC dba mdINR	Case No. 22SL-CC01943
	Rawlis Leslie, et al. v. The St. Joe Paper Company	Case No. 03-368CA (Gulf County, Fla.)
	Regayla Loveless, et al. v. National Cash, Inc, et al.	Case No. 2001-cv-892-2 (Benton County, Ark.)
	Ricci, et al., v. Ameriquest Mortgage Co.	Case No. 27-cv-05-2546 (D. Minn.)
	Ronnie Haese, et al. v. H&R Block, et al.	Case No. 96-cv-423 (Kleberg County, Tex.)
	Sandra Arnt, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A.	No. 27-cv-12-12279 (Hennepin County, MN)
	Sara Khaliki, et al. v. Helzberg Diamond Shops, Inc.	4:11-cv-00010 (W.D. Mo.)
	Shepherd, et al. v. Volvo Finance North America, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:93-cv-971 (D. Ga.)
	Skusenas v. Linebarger, Goggan, Blair & Sampson, LLC.	Case No. 1:10-cv-8119 (N.D. Ill.)
	Smith v. NRT Settlement Services of Missouri, LLC	Case No. 06-cv-004039 (St. Louis County, MO)
	Steve Rojas v Bosch Solar Energy Corporation	5:18cv05841 (N.D. CA)
	Steven Staubus v Regents of the University of Minnesota	27-CV-20-8546 State of Minnesota, County of Hennepin
	Terrell Ervin v. Nokia Inc. et al.	Case No. 01-L-150 (St. Clair County, Ill.)
	The People of the State of California v. Rainbow Light Nutritional Systems, LLC, et al.	Case No. 19STCV28214 (Los Angeles County, CA)
	Theresa Boschee v. Burnet Title, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-016986 (D. Minn.)
	Thomas Geanacopoulos v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.	Civil Action No. 98-6002-BLS1 (MA Superior Court)
	Thomas Losgar, et al. v. Freehold Chevrolet, Inc., et al.	Case No. L-3145-02 (Monmouth County, NJ)
	Tiffany Ellis, et al. v. General Motors LLC	Case No. 2:16-cv-11747 (E.D. Mich.)
	Tom Lundberg, et al. v. Sprint Corporation, et al.	Case No. 02-cv-4551 (Wyandotte County, Kan.)
	Truc-way, Inc., et al. v. General Electric Credit Auto Leasing	Case No. 92-CH-08962 (Cook County, Ill.)
	Trudy Latman, et al. vs. Costa Cruise Lines, N.V., et al	Case No. 96-cv-8076 (Dade County, Fla.)
	U.S. v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from e-Bullion, et al. ("Goldfinger")	No. CV 09-1731 (C.D. Cal.)
	U.S. v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from e-Bullion, et al. ("Kum Ventures")	No. CV 09-1731 (C.D. Cal.)
	U.S. v. David Merrick	6:10-cr-109-Orl-35DAB

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	U.S. v. Sixty-Four 68.5 lbs (Approx.) Silver Bars, et al.	(E.D. Fla)
	United States of America v. Alfredo Susi, et al.	3:07-cr-119 (W.D.N.Y.)
	United States of America v. David Merrick	6:10-cr-109-Orl-35DAB
	United States of America v. Elite Designs, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-058 (D. R.I.)
	United States of America v. Evolution Marketing Group	Case No. 6:09-cv-1852 (S.D. Fla.)
	United States of America v. Regenesis Marketing Corporation	No. C09-1770RSM (W.D. Wash.)
	United States of America v. Sixty-Four 68.5 lbs (Approx.) Silver Bars, et al.	(E.D. Fla.)
	Van Zanten v KCL	
	Vicente Arriaga, et al. v. Columbia Mortgage & Funding Corp, et al.	Case No. 01-cv-2509 (N.D. Ill.)
	Vittorio Blaylock v LVNV Funding LLC, et al.	Case No. 13-L-562 (St. Clair County, IL)
	William R. Richardson, et al., v. Credit Depot Corporation of Ohio, et al.	Case No. 315343 (Cuyahoga County, Ohio)
	Zyburo v. NCSPlus Inc.	Case No. 12-cv-06677 (S.D.N.Y.)
CryptoCurrency	*In the Matter of ShipChain, Inc.*	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-20185
	U.S. v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from e-Bullion, et al. ("Goldfinger")	No. CV 09-1731 (C.D. Cal.)
	U.S. v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from e-Bullion, et al. ("Kum Ventures")	No. CV 09-1731 (C.D. Cal.)
	United States of America v. $1,802,651.56 in Funds Seized from E-Bullion, et al.	Case No. 09-cv-01731 (C.D. Cal.)
Data Breach	*AFCU v v. Hudson's Bay Company, et al.*	No. 19-cv-4492 (PKC) (S.D.N.Y.)
	American Bank Systems Data Security Incident	
	Billy Perry v. Bay & Bay Transportation Services, Inc.	No. 22-CV-973 (JRT/ECW) (D. Minn.)
	Biscan et al. v. Shields Health Care Group, Inc	CASE NO. 1:22-cv-10901-PBS (Federal), CASE NO. 2382-cv-0023 (Massachusetts)
	Boykin v Choice Health Insurance LLC	No. 4:22-cv-03940 (D.S.C.)
	De Stefano v Sovos Compliance LLC	1:23cv12100 (D. MA)
	Elizabeth Lutz v Electromed, Inc.	0:21cv02198 (D. MN
	F.T.C. v. Choicepoint	Case No. 06-cv-0198 (N.D. Ga.)
	First Choice Federal Credit Union v. The Wendy's Company	Case No. 2:16-cv-00506-NBF-MPK (W.D. Pa.)
	Fitton v. Pinnacle Propane, LLC	Case No. 3:23cv1559 (N.D. Tex.)
	Gero, et al., v. MedInform, Inc.	No. 23CV981382 (Cuyahoga County, Ohio)
	In Re Equifax, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation	1:17-md-2800 TWT (N.D. GA)
	In Re Hudson's Bay Company Data Security Incident Consumer Litigation	Case No. 1:18-cv-08472 PKC (S.D. N.Y.)
	In re WaWa Data Security Litigation	2:19cv06019-GEKP (E.D. PA)
	In re Wawa, Inc. Data Security Litigation (Financial Institution Track)	Case No. 2:19-CV-06019 (W. D. Pa.)
	In re: Equifax, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation	Case No. 1:17-md-2800-TWT (N.D. Ga)
	Linman v. Marten Transport, Ltd.	Case No. 3:22-cv-00204 (W.D. Wis.)
	Mitchell Lautman v American Bank Systems, Inc.	Case No.: 2:20cv1959 (W.D. PA)
	Pascute et al. v. Amotec, Inc.	Case No. CV23965539 (Cuyahoga County, Ohio)
	Patricia Marshall v. Lamoille Health Partners, Inc.	No. 2:22-cv-00166-wks (D. Vt.)
	Pederson, et al. v. AAA Collections, Inc.	No. 4:22-cv-04166 (D.S.D.)
	Quaife v. Brady Martz & Associates, P.C.	Case No. 3:23-cv-00176-PDW-ARS (D.N.D.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Roper v. Rise Interactive Media & Analytics, LLC	No. 1:23-cv-1836 (N. D. Ill.)
	Sheffler v Activate Healthcare, LLC	No. 1:23-cv-01206-SEB-TAB (S.D. Ind.)
	Sterling et al. v. Strategic Forecasting, Inc. et al.	No. 2:12-cv-00297-DRH-ARL (E.D.N.Y.)
	Stone v. Gardner Resources Consulting LLC	Case No. 2282CV00845 (Norfolk County, Mass.)
	Taylor v. Columbus Aesthetic and Plastic Surgery, Inc.	No. 24CV2201 (Franklin County, Ohio)
	Veridian Credit Union v. Eddie Bauer LLC	No. 2:17-cv-00356 (W.D. Wash.)
	Village Bank et al. v Caribou Coffee Company, Inc.	0:19-cv-01640 (D. MN)
Data Breach/Privacy	*Anderson, et al. v. United Retail Group, Inc., et al.*	Case No. 37-cv-89685 (San Diego County, Cal.)
	Baby Doe v Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago	Case No.: 2020CH04123 Circuit Court Cook County IL (Chancery Division)
	F.T.C. v. CEO Group, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-60602 (S.D. Fla.)
	In Re: U.S. Bank National Association Litigation	Case No. 99-cv-891 (D. Minn.)
	Julie Jones v Arhaus, LLC	23cv0984 (S.D. CA)
Discrimination	*Chicago Teachers Union, Local.1, v Board of Education of the City of Chicago*	Case No.: 1:12cv01311 (N.D. Ill.)
Elder Abuse	*Blaine Johnson v Napaidence Opco, LLC d/b/a Napa Post Acute*	Case No.: 21CV001248 (Napa County, CA)
	Brinkerhoff v Lifehouse San Diego operations LLC d/b/a The Shores Post-Acute	Case No.: 202100021078 (San Diego, CA)
Employment	*Aaron Riffle et al. v Cristy's Pizza, Inc.*	2:19-cv-04750 GCS-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Aaron Riley v Timiny R/R Construction, Inc.	Case No.: 3:21cv02288 (N.D. OH)
	Adam P. Kelly, et al v. Bank of America, N.A., et al.	No. 10-CV-5332 (E.D. Ill.)
	Addison v Mars Petcare US, Inc.	Case No. 25-cv-456-MN
	Alequin, et al. v. Darden Restaurants, Inc. et al.	Case No.: 12-61742-CIV (S.D. Fla.)
	Alfonso Rios v CoreCivic of Tennessee, LLC	1:21cv02295 (D. CO)
	Alice Williams, et a. v. H&R Block Enterprises	RG 08366506, (County of Alameda, CA)
	Alicia Ousley v CG Consulting d/b/a Scores Columbus	Case No. 2:19-cv-01744 SDM-KAJ (S.D. OH)
	Alma Anguiano v. First United Bank and Trust Co.	Case No. CIV-12-1096 (D. Okla.)
	Alona Brank v Med1Care, Ltd	Case No.: 3:22cv00384-JZ (N.D. OH)
	Amanda Fortin v Dedicated Nursing Associates, Inc.	2:21cv02836 (S.D. OH)
	Amanda Fortin v Wise Medical Staffing, Inc.	Case No.: 2:21cv01467 (S.D. OH)
	Amber Oaks v Auria Holmesville, LLC	Case No.: 3:22cv0008-JZ (N.D. Ohio)
	Amber Young v I Love This Bar LLC	Case No.: 2:20cv3971 (S.D. Ohio)
	Amiee Tracy v Quantum Health, Inc.	Case No.: 2:22cv00294-MHW-KAJ (E.D. Ohio)
	Amy Brailer v Clearcomm Bawa, Inc.	Case No.: 1:17cv01391-JFM (D. MD
	Andrew R. Rondomanski, et al. v. Midwest Division, Inc.	No. 11-cv-00887 (W.D. Mo.)
	Anita Adams v Aztar Indiana Gaming Company LLC d/b/a Tropicana Evansville	Case No.: 2:20cv00143-RLY-MPB (S.D. Ind.)
	Ann Ford v U.S. Foods, Inc.	Case No.: 1:19cv05967 (N.D. Ill.)
	Antonio Onate, Jr. v AHRC Health Care, Inc.	20cv8292 (S.D. NY)
	Antwaun Jones et al. v United American Security LLC	Case No. 1:20cv00440 JG (N.D. OH)
	Archer v. Robinson Mechanical Contractors, Inc.	1:24-cv-00015-MTS
	Arnett v BEF Foods, Inc.	CASE NO. 2:24-CV-1992

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Arturo Reyes et al. v Ivary Management Co. dba Renaissance Stone Care and Waterproofing	19CV340357 (Santa Clara, CA)
	Ashanti Sanchez v Agile Pursuits, Inc.	Case No.: 2020CH02640 Circuit Court Cook County, IL
	Balandran, et al. v. Labor Ready, et al.	BC 278551 (Losa Angeles County, Cal.)
	Ballard, et al. v. CoreCivic of Tennessee, LLC	Case No. 3:20cv418 (M.D. Tenn.)
	Ballard, et al., v. Fogo de Chao, LLC	Case No. 09-cv-7621 (D. Minn.)
	Barbara Jane Freck et al. v Cerner Corporation	4:20-cv-00043 BCW (W.D. MO)
	Batiste v. TopGolf International Inc. and TopGolf USA Spring Holdings, LLC	Civil Action 4:20-cv-00655 (S.D. Tx.)
	Beasley, et al. v. GC Services LP	Case No. 09-cv-01748 (E.D. Mo.)
	Bernarda Torres Angon v Fay Da Maufacturing Corp.	1:21cv04777 (E.D. NY)
	Berry v. Farmers Bank & Trust, N.A.	Case No. 13-02020
	Berte v. WIS Holdings Corporation	07-cv-1932 (S.D. Cal.)
	Bishop et al. v. AT&T Corp.	Case No. 08-cv-00468 (W.D. Pa.)
	Bobbi Hardisky et al. v Gateway Health LLC	Case No. 2:20-cv-01483 MPK (W.D. PA)
	Bobbie Jarrett v. GGNSC Holdings, LLC	Case No.: 12-CV-4105-BP (W.D. Mo.)
	Bobbi-Jo Smiley et al. v E.I. Dupont De Nemours and Company	3:12-cv-02380 (M.D. PA)
	Bonnie J.Pasquale v Tropicana Atlantic City Corporation	Case No.: 1:20cv06909 (D. NJ)
	Brandy Chase v ViaQuest Residential Services, LLC	2:22cv1974 (E.D. OH)
	Brenda Wickens, et al. v Thyssenkrupp Crankshaft Co. LLC	Case No. 1:19-cv-06100 (S.D. IL)
	Brian R. Vaughn v Biomat USA, Inc.	1:20cv04241 (N.D. IL)
	Brian Smith et al. v Kellogg Company	1:18-cv-01341 PLM-RSK (D. NV)
	Brian Smith v VCA, Inc.	2:21cv09140-GW-AGR (W. D. CA)
	Brittanee Tupitza et al. v Texas Roadhouse Management Corporation	Case No. 1:20-cv-00002 (W.D. PA)
	Burbran Pierre v City of New York, et al.	Civil Action No.: 20-cv-05116(ALC)(DCF) (S.D.N.Y.)
	Butler v. Village Caregiving, LLC	Case No. 2:22-cv-04359
	Camran Rezapourian v Third Bridge (US), Inc.	603785/2022 State of NY, Nassau County
	Cara Nasisi et al.v Comprehensive Health Management, Inc.	Case No. 1:19-cv-4132 KPF (S.D. N.Y.)
	Carlos Calderas, et al. v AK Tube, LLC	Case No. 3:19-cv-02431 JZ (W.D. OH)
	Carolyn Bledsoe at al. v LHC Group, Inc.	2:18-cv-02863 (D. AZ)
	Carolyn M. Nicholson et al. v IOC-Boonville, Inc. dba Isle of Capri Casino Hotel, Boonville	2:19-cv-04084 (W.D. MO)
	Carr v Austin Powder Company	Case No. 2:21-cv-5140
	Chandler Glover and Dean Albrecht, et al., v. John E. Potter	EEOC No. 320-A2-8011X; Agency No. CC-801-0015-99
	Chantel Headspeth et al. v TPUSA, Inc. dba Teleperformance USA	2:19-cv-02062 ALM-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Charles Fravel, et al. v General Mills Operations, LLC	Case No. 2:20-cv-01094 EAS-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Cheyenne Seiber at al.vManagement and Training Corporation	3:19-cv-02983 (N.D. OH)
	Christian Alesius v Pitsburgh Logistics Systems, Inc. d/b/a PLS Logistics Services	Case No.: 2:20cv01067 (W.D. PA)
	Christopher Evins v. Glow Networks, Inc.	Case No. 14-cv-00544 (W.D. Mo.)
	Christopher Johnson v Trinity Couriers, Inc.	1:19cv00686 (S.D. OH)
	Christopher McCarthy v Hinjuda Global Solutions, Inc.	1:21cv01016 (C.D. IL)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Christopher Rawlings ae al. v BMW Financial Services NA, LLC	2:20-cv-02289 EAS-KAJ (S.D. OH)
	Claudine Wilfong, et al. v. Rent-A-Center, Inc.	Case No. 00-cv-680 (S.D. Ill.)
	Clement v KPG Northeast LLC and KPG Management LLC	Case No. 230501850
	Coltogirone, et al. v. Gateway Health, LLC	Case No. 2:20-cv-00605-MJH (W.D. Pa.)
	Copher v. Motor City Auto Transport, Inc.	15-2500-CK (Macomb County, MI)
	Cory McDaniel v Recon Oilfield Services, Inc.	2:20cv04497 - ALM-CMV (S.D. Ohio)
	Creed, et al. v. Benco Dental Supply Co.	3:12-CV-1571 (E.D. Pa.)
	Dania Pruess, et al. v Presbyterian Health Plan, Inc.	Case No. 1:19-cv-629 KG-JFR (D. New Mexico)
	Daniel O'Malley v Kass Management Services, Inc.	Case No.: 1:20cv01331 (N.D. IL)
	Darrin Dickerson et al. v Zayo Group, LLC	1:20-cv-02490 (D. CO)
	Davis et al. v. Charter Foods, et al.	Case No. 2:20-cv-00159-CEA-CRW
	Dawn Bellan, et al. v Capital Blue Cross	Case No. 1:20-cv-00744 YK (M.D. PA)
	Dawon Wordlaw v Enterprise Leasing Co. of Chicago, LLC	1:20cv0:3200 (N.D. IL)
	Day, et al. v. KASA Delivery LLC.	Case No. 01-17-0000-2142 (AAA)
	DCWP v Haenyeo Corp. dba Haenyeo	2021-00950-ENF
	DCWP v Shake Shack Enterprises, LLC	2018-00448-ENF
	DCWP v Stat Medical	
	De La Torre v. Colburn Electric Company	Civil Action No. 4:20-cv-00127-JED-JFJ (N.D. Okla.)
	De Stefano v ActiveCampaign LLC	
	Dean v Cumulus Media, Inc.	1:22cv04956-TWT (N.D. GA)
	Deborah Roberts v Arrow Senior Living Management, Inc.	Case No.: 4:21cv01370 (E.D. MO)
	DeGidio v. Crazy Horse Saloon & Restaurant, Inc.	Case No. 4:13-cv-02136-BHH (D.S.C.)
	Department of Consumer and Worker Protection v Dunkin Donuts	
	Doe, et al. v. Cin-Lan, Inc, et al.	Case No. 4:08-cv-12719 (E.D. Mich.)
	Doe, et al. v. Déjà Vu Services, Inc., et al.	No. 2:16-cv-10877 (E.D. Mich.)
	Dominique Delva v Toast, Inc.	Case No. C.A. 2284-CV-01464H (Suffolk County, MA)
	Don Brooks et al. v C.H. Robinson International, Inc. et al.	4:16-cv-00939 (W.D. MO)
	Donna Disselkamp at al. v Norton Healthcare, Inc.	3:18-cv-00048 CRS (W.D. KY)
	Donna Marcum v Lakes Venture LLC dba Fresh Thyme Farmers Market LLC	3:19-cv-00231 DJH (W.D. KY)
	DuBeau et al v. Sterling Savings Bank et al.	No. 12-cv-1602 (D. Or.)
	Dzianis Huziankou et al. v NY Sweet Spot Café Inc. dba Sweetspot Café	1:18-cv-05715 (E.D. N.Y.)
	Ebony Jones at al. v CBC Restaurant Corp. dba Corner Bakery Cafe	1:19-cv-06736 (N.D. IL)
	Edward Watson at al. v Tennant Company, a Minnesota Corporation	2:18-cv-02462 WBS-DB (E.D. CA)
	EEOC v Oceanic Time Warner Cable LLC, et al.	Case No. CV -18-00357 DKW-KJM (D. Hawaii)
	Eli Balderas v Schutz Container Systems, Inc.	Case No.: 3:21cv02427 (N.D. OH
	Elizabeth Border et al. v Alternate Solutions Health Network LLC	Case No. 2:20-cv-01273 ALM-KAJ (S.D. OH)
	Elizabeth Yorba v Barrington School, LLC	Case No.: 2:21cv691 (S.D. OH)
	Elvia Boyzo et al. v United Service Companies, Inc.	1:18-cv-6854 (N.D. IL)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Emma Guertin v Melbo Franchise Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Chick-fil-A Fulton Street	Case No..: 604316/2022 (Nassau County, NY)
	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) v. Star Tribune Company	Case No. 08-cv-5297(D. Minn.)
	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission v Faribault Foods, Inc.	Case No. 07-cv-3976 (D. Minn.)
	Eric Eisenberg v Conrad's Tire Service,Inc.	Case No. CV-21-949506 (Cuyahoga County, OH)
	Feiertag v. DDP Holdings, LLC d/b/a Apollo Retail Specialists, LLC,	Case No. 2:14-cv-2643 (S.D. Ohio)
	Felina Robinson v The Buffalo News, Inc.	Case No. 801427/2019 (Erie County, NY)
	Ferreras, et. al v. American Airlines, Inc.	16-cv-2427 (D.N.J.)
	Fisher, et al. v. Michigan Bell Telephone Company	Case No. 09-cv-10802 (E.D. Mich.)
	Franchini v Accu-Time Systems, Inc.	Case No.: 1:21-cv-05075
	Frank De La Paz v. Accurate Courier NCA LLC	Case No. 16CV00555 (County of Santa Cruz, CA)
	Frank, Peasley, Waters, and Wilhelm, v Gold'n Plump Poultry, Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-1018 (D. Minn.)
	Frederick v CCH Healthcare OH, LLC	Case No.: 3:22cv00699 (N.D. OH
	French v. Midwest Health Management, Inc.	Case No.: 2:14-cv-2625
	Garriott v Food Movers Two Limited Partnership	20-CH-07030 State of IL Circuit Court, Cook County
	Gary Miller v Agrana Fruit US, Inc.	1:21cv01919 (N.D. OH)
	Geelan, et al. v. The Mark Travel Coporation	Case No. 03-cv-6322 (D. Minn.)
	Gibbons v Bakerly Barn LLC	Civil Action No. 240203173
	Gina Lipari-Williams v Penn National Gaming, Inc.	5:20cv06067 (W.D. MO)
	Gipson, et al. v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	Case No. 08-cv-2017 (D. Kan.)
	Glenn v Monterrey Security Consultants, Inc.	No. 24-cv-8260
	Goelz v Bud Antle, Inc.	Case No.: 2022 CV 02 0068 (Tuscarawas County, OH)
	Greene, et al. v. Shift Operations LLC, et al.	Case No. CGC 16-552307 (County of San Francisco, CA)
	Gregory Graham v Zekelman Industries, Inc.	Case No. 2:21cv05484 (S.D. OH
	Gregory Hernandez v. The Children's Place	No. CGC 04-4300989 (San Francisco, CA)
	Gretchen Valencia et al. v Armada Skilled Home Care of NM LLC	1:18-cv-01071 KG-JFR (D. NM)
	Hall v City of New York	Case No. 1:22-cv-10193-BCM
	Harrison v Blackline Systems, Inc.	Arbitration
	Hawkins v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.	Case No. 8:19-cv-02174 (M.D. Fla.)
	Heather Betts et. al. v Central Ohio Gaming Ventures, LLC	2:16-cv-00373 EAS-EPD (S. D. OH)
	Heather Fitzgerald v Forest River Manfacturing LLC	Case No.: 3:20cv01004 (N.D. IN)
	Heather Lawrence v Benesys, Inc.	Case No.: 1:22cv11517 (E.D. Mich)
	Hector Farias v Strickland Waterproofing Company, Inc.	Case No.: 3:20cv00076 (W.D. VA)
	Helen Bernstein, et al. v. M.G. Waldbaum	Case No. 08-cv-0363 (D. Minn.)
	Helen Hamlin v Gorant Chocolatier, LLC	4:20-cv-00117 (N.D. OH)
	Herzfeld v. 1416 Chancellor, Inc.	No. 14-4966 (E.D. Pa.)
	Holt v. Living Social	1:2012cv00745 (D.D.C.)
	Hopkins, et al. v Bassett Services, et al	Case No 2:24-cv-03681
	Isabella Savini Merante v American Institute for Foreign Study, Inc.	Case No.: 3:21cv03234 (N.D. CA)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Jacob Bartakovits et al. v Wind Creek Bethlehem LLC dba Wind Creek Bethlehem	5:20-cv-01602 (E.D. PA)
	James Meyers et al. v Boomerang Rubber, Inc.	3:19-cv-00070 WHR (S.D. OH)
	James Oakley et al. v The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Ctr.	2017-00845 (Oh state Court of Claims)
	James Smith et al. v Oakley Transport, Inc.	3:19-cv-05854 EMC (N.D. CA)
	James Walters v Professional Labor Group, LLC	Case No.: 1:21cv02831-JRS-MJD (S.D. Ind.)
	Jamise Collins et al. v Goodwill Industries of Greater Cleveland & East Central Ohio	1:19-cv-01433 (N.D. OH)
	Janae Miller v HG Ohio Employee Holding Corporation	Case No.: 2:21cv3978 (E.D. OH)
	Jane Does v. The Coliseum Bar and Grill	Case No: 17-cv-12212 (E.D. Mich.)
	Jason Adams et al. v Wenco Ashland, Inc.	1:19-cv-1544 CEH (N.D. OH)
	Jason Mass et al. v the Regents of the University of California et al.	RG17-879223 (Alameda County, CA)
	Javier Garza et al. v Wood Group USA, Inc.	4:20-cv-00253 (S.D. TX)
	Jeffrey Allen Jones v Amazon	Case No.: 1:15cv01106
	Jeffrey Willis v CommonBond Communities	State of MN, Ramsey County; 62-CV-21-4916
	Jennifer Dennis et al. v Greatland Home Health Services, Inc.	1:19-cv-05427 (N.D. IL)
	Jennifer Hardy et al. v DuPage Medical Group, LTD	1:19-cv-02265 (N.D. IL)
	Jennifer Hayes, et al. v Thor Motor Coach Inc.	Case No. 3:19-cv-375 DRL-MGG (N.D. IN)
	Jeremiah Smith et al. v PPG Industries, Inc.	1:19-cv-01518 (N.D. OH)
	Jessica Owens et al. v Hearthside Food Solutions, LLC	3:19-cv-02479 (N.D. OH)
	Jessse Pierce v Wyndham Vacation Resorts, Inc.	Case No. 3:13cv00641 (E.D. TN)
	Jimmy West v. PSS World Medical, Inc.	Case No. 4:13-cv-00574 (E.D. Mo.)
	John Alba, et al. v. Papa John's USA, Inc.	Case No. 05-cv-7487 (W.D. Cal.)
	John Lewis et al. v Sentry Electrical Group, Inc.	1:19-cv-00178 WOB (S.D. OH)
	Johnson, et al v. General Mills, Inc.	Case No. 10-cv-1104 (W.D. Mo.)
	Jordan Purvis v OSL Retail Services Corporation	Case No.: 3:21cv01738-JZ (N.D. OH)
	Joseph Connors v American Medical Response, Inc. Services, Inc.	1:20-cv-05046 (S.D. N.Y.)
	Joseph Gallant et al. v Arrow Consultation Services, Inc.	1:19-cv-00925 (S.D. IN)
	Joseph Sannutti v WB Mason Company, Inc.	3:21cv10955 (D. NJ)
	Joshua Walter v Kerry, Inc.	21cv0539 (E.D. WI)
	Juan Sanchez v S&P Data New Mexico, LLC	Case No.: 1:20cv00979 (D. New Mexico)
	Justice v. Associated Materials, LLC	Case No. 5:20-cv-00410-SL (N.D. Ohio)
	Justin Tyson v Shake Shack Enterprises, LLC	Case No.: 514220/2022 (Kings County, NY)
	Karen Lichtman and Samantha Reese, et al. v. Whole Foods Market Group, Inc.	Index No: 516852/2024
	Kariseli Quinones v Magic Cleaning Solutions LLC	Case No.: 1:22cv00197 (E.D.N.Y.)
	Karyn Petersen, et al. v EmblemHealth, Inc. et al.	Case No. 1:20-cv-2568 CBA-RLM (E.D.N.Y.)
	Kelly Marie Camp, et al. v. The Progressive Corporation, et al.	Case No. 01-cv-2680 (E.D. La.)
	Kelly, et al v. Bank of America, N.A. et al.	No. 10-5332 (N.D. Ill.)
	Kendall Olin-Marquez v Arrow senior Living Management, LLC	Case No.: 2:21cv00996-EAS-CMV (S.D. Ohio)
	Kendra Brown v Rush Street Gaming, LLC	Case No.: 1:22cv00392 (N.D. NY)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Kendra Brown v Rush Street Gaming, LLC	Case No.: 1:22cv00392 (N.D. NY)
	Kenyona Eubanks v Aurora Health Care, Inc.	Case No.: 2:20cv01253 (E.D. WI)
	Kevin Moitoso et al. v FMR LLC	1:18-cv-12122 WGY (D. MA)
	Kevin Winking v Smithfield Fresh Meats Corp.	1:22cv01937 (N.D. IL)
	Khadeza Pyfrom v ContactUS, LLC d/b/a ContactUS Communications	Case No..: 2:21cv04293-EAS-CMV (S.D. Oio)
	Kiley Thornburg v Reflektions, LTD	2:21cv3905 (S.D. OH)
	Kim Anderson v Rent-A-Daughter Corporation	Case No.: 1:22cv00143 (N.D. OH)
	Kimario Anderson v Coca-Cola Bottlers' Association	2:21cv02054 (D. KS)
	Kimberly Smith v ARG Resources, LLC	Case No.: 2019CH12528 Circuit Court Cook County, IL
	Kovacs et al v Film Forum, Inc.	Index No: 650686/2024
	Kristin Swearingen v Amazon.com Services, Inc.	Case No.: 3:19cv01156-JR (D. OR)
	Kristina Drake v Chop Hospitality LLC	Case No.: 1:20cv01574 (E.D. Ill.)
	Krystal Wright v Majestic Care Staff LLC	Case No.: 2:21cv02129-MHW-EPD (S.D. Ohio)
	Kulauzovic et al. v. Citibank, N.A.	Index No. 507538/2018 (County of Kings, NY)
	Kusinski v. MacNeil Automotive Products Limited	Case No. 17-cv-3618 (N.D. Ill.)
	Lang, et al v DirecTV, Inc., et al.	No. 10-1085 (E.D. La.)
	Latanya Miles et al. v Variety Wholesalers, Inc.	1:19-cv-01714 PAB (N.D. OH)
	Lavar Martin et al. v Summit County	5:19-cv-02641 JRA (N.D. OH)
	Lee and Campion v. The City of Philadelphia	NO. 001125 (Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County)
	Lee Stephens v Auto Systems Centers, Inc. d/b/a/ Midas	Case No.: 2:21cv05131-ALM-CMV (S.D. Ohio)
	Leslie Avant v VXL Enterprises, LLC	Case No.: 3:21cv2016 (N.D. Cal.)
	Leslie Bethel v Bluemercury, Inc.	Case No.: 21cv2743 (S.D. NY)
	Linda J. Calhoun et al. v Aon Hewitt Health Insurance Solution, Inc.	Case No. 1:19-cv-01810 (N.D. IL)
	Linda Woznicki v Aurora Health Care, Inc.	2:20cv01246 (E.D. WI)
	Lucas v Miller Products, Inc.	Case No.: 4:21-cv-2355 (N.D. OH)
	Luis Zhibri v Optimum Logistics Group, LLC	Case No.: 2:21cv05877 (E.D. NY)
	Lynn Lietz, et al. v. Illinois Bell Telephone Company, et al.	No. 1:11-cv-0108 (N.D. Ill.)
	Mallory v. Aclara Smart Grid Solutions, LLC	Case No. 2:20-cv-0240 (S.D. Ohio)
	Marcos D. Doglio v Boasso America Corporation	Case No.: 2:18cv13448-KM- MAH (D. NJ)
	Marcos v Blue Line Security Solutions, LLC	Case No. 1:21cv6815 (N.D. IL)
	Mariah Smith v Advocate Health Care Network	Case No.: 1:19cv05148 (E.D. IL)
	Mark Jackson v HyperSport Industries, LLC	2:22cv00537 (S. D. OH)
	Mark Satterly et al. v Airstream, Inc.	3:19-cv-00032 WHR (S.D. OH)
	Martinez-Camarena v KLEO Community Family Life Center	Case No. 1:24-cv-13225
	Mary Hutkai, et al. v. Penn National Gaming, Inc., et al.	Case No. 4:16-cv-00906 (W.D. Mo.)
	Mary Walburn et al. v Lend-A-Hand Services, LLC	2:19-cv-00711 ALM-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Matthew Dionysius v HankookTire Manufacturing Tennessee, LP	Case No.: 3:20cv00091 (M.D.TN)
	Michael A. Rivota et al. v Bank of America Corporation	1:18-cv-03843 (N. D. IL)

Practice Area	*Engagement*	Citation
	Michael Fisher et al. v Dura-Line Corporation	1:19-cv-00286 (N. D. OH)
	Michael Haenlein v Remington Seeds LLC	Case No.: 1:22cv2849 (N.D. IL)
	Michael Levine, et al. v Vitamin Cottage Natural Food Markets, Inc.	Case No. 1:20-cv-00261 STV (D. CO)
	Michelle Jackson, et al. v. Jamba Juice Company	Case No. 8:02-cv-00381 (C.D. Cal.)
	Mi'Jette Sirmons v Star Multi Care Holding Corporation	Case No.: 2:21cv00456-CB (W.D. PA)
	Molina v GES Logistics Inc, et al.	Case No. 21-cv-5962
	Monica Brunty et al. v Optima Health Plan	2:19-cv-00255 (E.D. VA)
	Monte Endris v Hubler Chevrolet, Inc.	Cause No.: 49D12-1810-PL-040781 Superior Court, Marion County, IN
	Mudrich v The SYGMA Network, Inc.	Case No. 2:21-cv-4932 (S.D. OH)
	Nathaniel Boyce v SSP America MDW, LLC	Case No.: 1:19cv02157 (N.D. IL)
	Nicholas Jones v Memoryblue, Inc.	Case No.: 2022-00319306-CV Superior Court. Sacramento County, CA
	Nicholas O'Neil et al. v Miller Pipeline LLC	Case No. 2:20-cv-04034 MHW-CMV (E.D. OH)
	Nicole Kordie v Ohio Living	Case No.: 2:21cv03791-SDM-CMV (S.D. Ohio)
	Nikia Edwards v Optima Health Plan	Case No.: 2:20cv00192 (E.D. VA)
	Nikiesha Cleveland v Foundations Health Solutions, Inc.	Case No.: 1:21cv01713 (N.D. OH)
	Norma Marquez et al. v RCKC Corporation et al.	1:18-cv-07977 (N.D. IL)
	OFCCP v. B&H Foto & Electronics Corp.	Case No. 2016-OFC-0004 (Department of Labor)
	Omar Malcolm v The City of New York	Case No.: 1:20cv9641-ALC (S.D. NY)
	Owen, et al. v. Punch Bowl Minneapolis, LLC	Case No. 19-cv-0955 (D. Minn)
	Pamela Adams, et al., v. MedPlans Partners, Inc	Case No. 3:07-cv-259 (W.D. Ky.)
	Parnell, et al. v. Academy Mortgage Corporation	Case No. 01-17-0004-5311 (AAA)
	Pedro Rodriguez Martinez v Alpha Technologies Services, Inc.	5:17-cv-628 (E.D. NC)
	Phajeemas Sarahong v Smartlink, LLC	1:22cv00328
	Phillip Busler, et al. v. Enersys Energy Products Inc., et al.	Case No. 09-cv-0159 (W.D. Mo.)
	Powell v. The Kroger Company and Dillon Companies, LLC	Case No. 1:20-cv-01983 (D. Colo.)
	Prentis Walton et al. v Oldcastle Building Envelope, Inc.	3:18-cv-02936 (N. D. OH)
	Ranita Railey v Sunset Food Mart, Inc.	1:20cv06758 (N. D. IL)
	Ray Cruz-Perez v Penn National Gaming, Inc.	1:20-cv-02577 (N.D. IL)
	Reeves, et al., v P&E Logistics, et al.	Case No. 2025-cv-05-0477
	Reginald Pierre v Stephen's Automotive Transport, Inc.	1781CV03444 Superior Court Commonwealth of Massachusetts
	Rhonda Gresky v Checker Notions Company, Inc. d/b/a/Checker Distributors	Case No.: 3:21cv1203 (N.D. Ohio)
	Richard Johnson v Asset Management Group, LLC	State of Minnesota County of Ramsey 62-CV-21-4860
	Robert Eddings v. General Aluminum Manufacturing Company	Case No. 1:17-CV-00362 (N.D. Ohio)
	Robert Ford v Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc.	1:21cv10090 (D. MA)
	Robert Stock et al. v Xerox Corporation	Case No. 6:16-cv-06256 EAW (W.D. N.Y.)
	Rocher, et al. v. Sav-on Drugs, et al.	Case No. BC 227551 (Los Angeles County, Cal.)
	Roger James v Boyd Gaming Corporation	Case No.: 2:19cv02260-DDC-JPO (D. KS)
	Roger Stiles v Specialty Promotions, Inc.	Case No.: 2020CH03766 Circuit Court Cook County, IL

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Rogers v. Border Foods, Inc., et al.	2021-L-0000019
	Ronnie Loschiavo v Advanced Drainage Systems, Inc.	Case No.: 2:21cv05069-MHW-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Rosann Biagi v International Services, Inc.	Case No.: 21CH00000311 Circuit Court of Lake County, IL
	Rowe v DataRobot , Inc.	Civil Action No. 2384-CV-00268
	Ruotolo v Twin River Worldwide Holdings, Inc.	1:20cv00530 (D. RI)
	Russell Cain v JB Hunt Transport, Inc.	Case No. D-202-CV-2019-00710 (Bernalillo County, NM)
	Russell, et al. v. Illinois Bell Telephone Company	Case No. 08-cv-1871 (N.D. Ill.)
	Ryan Cocca v Ping Identity Corporation	Arbitration
	Ryan Ransom et al. v Burrows Paper Corporation	Case No. 2:20-cv-03824 MHW-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Sakinah Kelly at al. v Evolent Health LLC	1:19-cv-00500 (N. D. IL)
	Salamon v. Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC	No. 01-17-0002-1424 (AAA)
	Samuel Lovell v Park Place Technologies, LLC	1:22cv00595 (N.D. OH)
	Sarah Cabrera v. Elsa's Mexican Enterprises, Inc., et al.,	3:23-cv-00254
	Scott Snider et at. V Quantum Health, Inc.	2:20-cv-02296 CMV (E.D. OH)
	Sequoia Moss-Clark, et al. v. New Way Services, Inc., et al.	Case No. C12-1391 (Contra Costa County, CA)
	Sergio Moreno et al. v Silvertip Completion Services Operating LLC	Case No. 7:19-cv-00240 (W.D. TX)
	Shannon Wheeler v. Cobalt Mortgage, Inc. et al.	Case No. 2:14-cv-B1847-JCC (W.D. WA)
	Shari Ahrendesn v Prudent Fiduciary Services, LLC	2:21cv02157 - HB (E. D. PA)
	Sherman Wright et al. v The Kroger Co.	1:19-cv-00761 MRB (S.D. OH)
	Smallwood, et al. v. Illinois Bell Telephone Company,	Case No. 09-cv-4072 (N.D. Ill.)
	Smith v. Family Video	No. 11-cv-01773 (N.D. Ill.)
	Smith v. Pizza Hut, Inc.	No. 09--cv-01632-CMA-BNB (D. Colo.)
	Speraneo v. BJC Health Systems, Inc. d/b/a BJC HealthCare	Case No. 1322-CC09701 (St. Louis County, MO)
	Stephanie Sanz, et al. v. Johny Utah 51, LLC	Case No. 14-cv-4380 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Stephen DiGiorgio et al. v EOS Holdings, Inc.	1:16-cv-11069 (D. MA)
	Steven Belt v P.F. Chang's China Bistro, Inc.	2:18-cv-03831 AB (E.D. PA)
	Surette, et al. v SmartBear Software, Inc.	Civil Action No. 2281-cv-00802 Middlesex County Superior Court
	Susan McNeilly v Spectrum Health System	1:20cv00870 (W.D. MI)
	Tamare Fry v Pilot Plastics, Inc.	Case No.: 5:22cv00465 (N.D. OH)
	Tanielle Thomas vWalmart, Inc.	18-cv-4717 (E.D. PA)
	Taryn Dietrich v C.H. Robinson Worldwide, Inc.	1:18cv04871 (N.D. IL)
	Tasha Smith v Acceptance Solutions Group, Inc.	Case No.: 1:21cv01675 (N.D. Ill.)
	Teeter v. NCR Corporation	Case No. 08-cv-00297 (C.D. Cal.)
	Teresa Joseph v Majestic Care Staff LLC	1:22cv01631 (S.D. IN)
	Terri Powell et al. v IKEA Industry Danville, LLC	4:18-cv-00058 (W.D. VA)
	Terrie Gammon et al. v Marietta OPCO, LLC dba Arbors at Marietta	2:19-cv-05140 JLG-EPD (S.D. OH)
	The Fortune Society, Inc. et al. v. Macy's, Inc. et al.	No. 19 Civ. 5961 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Thomas Cramer et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. et al.	Case No. 12-08681 (N.D. Ill.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Thomas Dege, et al., v. Hutchinson Technology, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-3754 (D. Minn.)
	Thomas v Candid Care Co.	Case No.: 2:21cv05472 (S. D. OH
	Thomas v. Kellogg Company et al.	Case No. 3:13 Civ. 05136 (W.D. Wash.)
	Thomas, et al. v. TEKsystems, Inc	2:21-cv-00460-WSS
	Thompson v. Qwest Corporation, et al.	Civil Action No.: 1:17-cv-1745 (D. Colo.)
	Tiffany Williams v Bob Evans Farms, Inc.	Case No.: 2:18cv01353 (W.D. PA)
	Todd Coleman v Trophy Nut Co.	3:19-cv-00374 TMR (S.D. OH)
	Tompkins et al. v. Ferny Properties, LLC et. al.,	No. 3:18-cv-00190 (D.N.D.)
	Toth v Double H Plastics, Inc., et al	Case No. 2022 CV 08 0502
	Tracie Ford et al. v Cardinal Innovations Healthcare Solutions	Case No. 1:20-cv-00736 (M.D. NC)
	Tracy Mattison et al. v Trubridge, Inc.	5:19-cv-01618 JRA (N.D. OH)
	Trevon Estes v Peloton Interactive, Inc.	Case No.: 62-cv-21-5746 State of Minnesota County of Ramsey
	Tripline v The Grove, Inc.	Case No. 240502550
	Trista L.Freeman, et al. v Crossroads Hospice of Northeast Ohio LLC	Case No. 5:20-cv-01579 BYP (E.D. OH)
	Twohill, et al. v. First Acceptance Corporation	Case No. 3:17−cv−00284 (M.D. Tenn.)
	Tyler Mudrich v The Sygma Network, Inc.	Case No.: 2:21cv04932-EAS-CMV (S.D. OH)
	Tylisha Allen v Flanders Corporation	Case No. 2022-LA-154 Circuit Court Sangamon, IL
	Vanecia Brown v Syntruck, LLC	MSC18-02499 Superior Court of the State of California, Contra Costa County
	Vernon Roberts v Techserv Consulting and Training, LTD	Case No.: 6:21cv00406 (E.D. Tex.)
	Victor Sanchez v Gold Standard Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a/ Binny's Beverage Depot	Case No.: 1:21cv03349 (N.D. Ill)
	Wallace Pitts at al. v. G4s Secure Solutions (USA), Inc.	2:19-cv-02650 MHW-CMV (E.D. OH)
	Walsh v Columbus Electric, Inc. et al	Case No. 2:20-cv-2857
	Watkins, et al. v. I.G. Incorporated, etl a.	Case No. 27-13-15361 (Hennepin County, MN)
	Weeks v. Matrix Absence Management, Inc.	Case No. 2:20-cv-884 (D. Arizona)
	Wendy Berry v FirstGroup America, Inc.	1:18cv00326 (S.D. OH)
	White et al. v. Edward Jones Co., L.P. dba Edward Jones	No. 17 Civ. 02004 (N.D. Ohio)
	Wilkinson, et al. v. NCR Corporation	Case No. 1:08-cv-5578 (N.D. Ill.)
	William Perrin, et al. v. Papa John's International	No. 4:09-CV-01335 (E.D. Mo.)
	William Whitlock, et. al v. FSH Management, LLC, et. al.	3:10-cv-00562-M
	Williams v. DH Pace	Case No. 4:14-cv-00161 (W.D. Mo.)
	Williams, et al. v. Dollar Financial Group, et al.	Case No. RG03099375 (Alameda County, CA)
	Williams, et al. v. G4S Secure Solutions (USA) Inc.	Civil Action No. 1:17-CV-00051 (M.D.N.C)
	Williams, et al. v. H&R Block Enterprises, Inc.	No. RG 08366506 (Alameda County, CA)
	Wise v. PACCAR Inc	Case No. 2:22-cv-2689
	Wittemann, et al. v. Wisconsin Bell, Inc.	Case No. 09-cv-440 (W.D. Wisc.)
	Wlotkowski, et al. v. Michigan Bell	Case No. 09-cv-11898 (E.D. Mich.)
	Yekaterina Bassman v Guidepoint Global LLC	
	Zorski, et al. v. Catamorphic company dba LaunchDarkly	Civil Action No. 2584CV02328

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
Environmental	*Bernice Samples, et al. v. Conoco, Inc., et al.*	Case No. 01-0631-CA-01 (Escambia Country, Fla.)
	Billieson, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	No. 94-19231 (Orleans Parish, LA)
	Charles Grasley v Chemtool, Inc.	21 L 162 State of Illinois Circuit Court, Winnebago County
	City of Greenville, et al., v. Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., and Syngenta AG	No. 3:10-cv-00188-JPG-PMF (S. D. Ill.)
	In Re: Duluth Superior Chemical Spill Litigation	Case No. 92-cv-503 (W.D. Wis.)
	Keltner, et al., v. SunCokeEnergy, Inc., et al.	Case No.: 2014-L-1540 (Madison County, IL)
	Latta, et al. v. Hannibal Board of Public Works, et al.	Case No. 16SL-CC01881 (St. Louis, MO)
	McGruder, et al. v. DPC Enterprises	No. CV2003-022677 (Maricopa County, AZ)
	Mehl v. Canadian Pacific Railway, Limited	Case No. 02-cv-009 (D.N.D.)
	Michelle Marshall, et al. v. Air Liquide -- Big Three, Inc. et al.	No. 2005-08706 (Orleans Parish, LA)
	Perrine, et al. v. E.I. Dupont De Nemours and Company, et al.	01-0631-CA-01 (Harrison C., WV)
ERISA	*Colon, et al. v. Johnson, et al.*	Case No. 8:22-cv-888-TPB-TGW (M.D. Fla.)
	Cothran v. Adams, et al.	Case No. 8:2023-cv-00518 (M.D. Fl.)
	In Re: Broadwing Inc ERISA Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-00857 (S.D. Ohio)
	Leslie D. Nolan v The Detroit Edison Company	Case No.: 2:18cv13359-DML-SDD (E.D. MI)
	Michael Marzec v Reladyne, LLC	Case No.: 2018CH14101 Circuit Court of Cook County, IL (Chancery Division)
	Quince Rankin v. Charles C. Conway (Kmart ERISA Litigation)	Case No. 02-cv-71045 (E.D. Mich.)
ERISA - 401k/403b Fee	*Anderson, et al. v. Coca-Cola Bottlers' Association, et al.*	Case No. 21-cv-02054 (D. Kan.)
	André Clark, et al., v. Oasis Outsourcing Holdings, Inc., et al.	Case No. 9:18-cv-81101- RLR (S.D. Fla.)
	Anthony Abbott, et al. v. Lockheed Martin Corp., et al.	Case No. 06-701 (S.D. Ill.)
	Bacon, et al., v. Board of Pensions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Case No. 27-CV-15-3425 (Hennepin County, MN)
	Baker, et al. v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.), et al.	Civil Action 1:20-cv-10397-RGS (D. Minn.)
	Beach, et al.v JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al.	Case No. 17-00563-JMF (S.D.N.Y.)
	Becker v. Wells Fargo & Co. et al	Case No. 0:20-cv-02016 (D. Minn.)
	Berry, et al. v. FirstGroup America, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:18-cv-00326-JPH (S.D. Ohio)
	Bhatia, et al. v. McKinsey & Company, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:19-cv-01466-GHW-SN (S.D.N.Y.)
	Bouvy v. Analog Devices, Inc., et al.	Case No. 19-cv-881-DMS-BLM (S.D. Cal.)
	Brian Loomis v Nextep, Inc.	Case No.: 5:21cv00199-HE (W.D. OK)
	Brotherston, et al. v. Putnam Investments, LLC, et al.	Civil Action No. 15-13825-WGY (D. Mass.)
	Brown et al. v. The MITRE Corporation, et al.	Case No. 1:22-cv-10976-DJC (D. Mass.)
	Brown-Davis et al v. Walgreen Co. et al	Case No. 1:19-cv-05392 (N.D. Ill.)
	Carrigan, et al. v. Xerox Corporation, et al.	No. 3:21-cv- 01085 (D. Conn.)
	Chechile et al v. Baystate Health, Inc. et al.	No. 22-cv-30155-KAR (D. Mass.)
	Cheryl Kehrer v. Giant Eagle, Inc. et al	Civil Action No. 2:24-cv-01211
	Clifton Marshall, et al. v. Northrop Grumman Corp., et al.	Case No. 16-6794 (C.D. Cal.)
	Conte v. WakeMed	Case No. 5:21-cv-00190-D (E.D.N.C.)
	Coviello, et al. v. BHS Management Services, Inc., et al.	No. 3:20-cv-30198-MGM (D. Mass.)
	Cunningham, et al., v. Cornell University, et al.	Case No. 16-cv-6525 (S.D.N.Y.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	David Clark, et al, v. Duke University, et al.	Case No. 1:16-CV-01044-CCE-LPA (M.D.N.C.)
	David Kinder, et al. v. Koch Industries, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:20 cv 02973 MHC (N.D. Ga.)
	Davis v. Magna International of America, Inc.	Case No. 2:20-cv-11060 (E.D. Mich.)
	Dean et al. v. Cumulus Media, Inc. et al.	No. 1:22-cv-04956-TWT (D. Ga)
	Dennis Gordan, et al. v. Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., et al.	Case No. 13-cv-30184-MAP (D. Mas.)
	Diego Cervantes v. Invesco Holding Company (US), Inc., et al.	Civil Action No. 1:18 cv-02551-AT (N.D. Ga.)
	Dustin S. Soulek v Costco Wholesale Corporation	Case No.: 20cv937 (E. D. Wis.)
	Ford, et al. v. Takeda Pharmaceuticals U.S.A., Inc., et al	No. 21-cv-10090 (D. Mass.)
	Fritton, et al. v. Taylor Corporation, et al.	No. 22-cv-00415 (D. Minn.)
	Garcia et al. v. Alticor, Inc. et al.,	Case No. 1:20-cv-01078-PLM-PJG (W.D. Mich.)
	Garnick, et al. v. Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center, et al.	Case No. 1:21-CV-00454- WO-JLW (M.D.N.C.)
	Gleason et al v. Bronson Healthcare Group, Inc. et al.	Case No. 1:21-cv-00379 (W. D. Mich.)
	Gomes, et al. v. State Street Corporation, et al.	Case No. 1:21-cv-10863-MLW (D. Mass.)
	Gruber v. Grifols Shared Services North America, Inc. et. al.	Case No: 2:22-cv-02621-SPG-AS (C.D. Cal.)
	Harvey Miller et al. v. Packaging Corporation of America, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:22-cv-00271 (W.D. Mich.)
	Hawkins, et al. v. Cintas Corporation, et al.	No. 1:19-cv-01062-JPH
	Henderson et al. v. Emory University et al.	Case No. 16-cv-2920 (N.D. Ga.)
	Hill et al v. Mercy Health System Corporation et al	Case No. 3:20-cv-50286 (N.D. Ill.)
	Hundley et al., v. Henry Ford Health System et al	Case No. 2:21-cv-11023-SFC (E.D. Mich.)
	Imber v Lackey	Case No. 1:22-cv-00004-KES-HBK
	In re GE ERISA Litigation	Master File No. 1:17-cv-12123-IT (D. Mass)
	In re M&T Bank Corporation ERISA Litigation	Case No. 1:16-cv-375 (W.D.N.Y.)
	In re Northrop Grumman Corporation ERISA Litigation	Case. No. 06-CV-6213 AB (JCx) (C.D. Cal.)
	Intravaia, et al. v. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, et al.	Case No. 1:19-cv-00973-LO-IDD (E.D. Va.)
	John Muir ERISA	
	Johnson, et al v. Fujitsu Technology and Business of America, Inc. et al.	Case No.: 5:16-cv-03698 NC (N.D. Cal.)
	Karg et al v. Transamerica Corporation et al	Case No. 1:18-cv-00134 (N.D. Iowa)
	Karolyn Kruger, et al. v. Novant Health Inc., et al.	Case No. 14-208 (M.D.N.C.)
	Karpik, et al. v. Huntington Bancshares Incorporated, et al.	Case No. 2:17-cv-01153-MHW-KAJ (S.D. Ohio)
	Khan, et al. v Board of Directors of the Pentegra Defined Contribution Plan, et al.	Case No. 7:20-cv-07561
	Kimberly D. Traczyk v Aspirus, Inc.	Case No.: 2:21cv00077 (W.D. MI)
	Kinder et al v. Koch Industries, Inc. et al	Case No. 1:20-cv-02973 (N.D. Ga.)
	Kirk, et al. v. Retirement Committee of CHS/Community Health Systems, Inc., et al.	Civil Action No. 3:19-cv-00689 (M.D. Tenn.)
	Kruzell v. Clean Harbors Environmental Services, Inc. et al.,	Case No: 1:22-cv-10524-GAO (D. Mass.)
	Lauren Bence, et al. v. Presence Health Network, et al.	Case No. 1:17-cv-08315 (N.D. Ill.)
	Law et al v. Estee Lauder Inc. et al.	No. 1:20-cv-04770-JLR (S.D.N.Y.)
	Leon v. Maersk, Inc. et al.	Case No. 3:23-cv-00602-RJC-SCR (W.D.N.C.)
	Loomis, et al. v. Nextep Inc., et al.	Case No. 5:21-cv-00199-HE (W.D.Ok)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Loren L. Cassell, et al. v. Vanderbilt University, et al.	Case No. 3:16-CV-02086 (M.D. Tenn.)
	Main, et al. v. American Airlines, Inc. et al.	Civil Action No.: 4:16-cv-00473-O (N.D. Texas)
	Marcia McGowan v Barnabas Health, Inc.	Case No.: 2:20cv13119-KM-JRA (D.N.J.)
	Mazza v. Pactiv Evergreen Services, Inc., et al.	No. 1:22-cv-5052 (N.D. Ill.)
	McNeilly, et al. v. Spectrum Health System, et al.	No. 1:20-cv-00870 (W.D. Mich.)
	Miguel, et al. v. Salesforce.com Inc., et al.	Civil Action No. 3:20-cv-01753-MMC (N.D. Cal.)
	Miller et al. v. Packaging Corporation of America, Inc., et al.,	Case No. 1:22-cv-00271 (W.D. Mich.)
	Moitoso, et al. v. FMR LLC, et al.	Civil Action No. 1:18-cv-12122-WGY (D. Mass.)
	Munro v University of Southern California	2:16cv06191 (S.D. CA)
	Munro v. University of Southern California	Case No. 16-6191 (C.D. Cal.)
	Murphy v The Auto Club Group	CASE NO.: 5:24-cv-11168-JEL-CI
	Parker et al., v. GKN North America Services, Inc.et al.	Case No. 2:21-cv-12468-SFC (E.D. Mich.)
	Pat Beesley, et al v. International Paper Co. et al.	Case No. 06-703-DRH (S.D. Ill.)
	Paul Andrus, et al. v. New York Life Insurance Company, et al.	Case. No. 1:16-cv-05698 (KPF) (S.D.N.Y.)
	Perkins, et al. v. United Surgical Partners International, Inc	Civil Action No. 3:21-CV-00973-X
	Pledger, et al. v. Reliance Trust, et al.	Case No. 1:15-cv-4444-MHC (N.D. Ga.)
	Price v. Eaton Vance Corp., et al.	Civil Action No. 18-12098-WGY (D. Mass.)
	Ramos et al. v. Banner Health et al. (Judgement)	Case No. 1:15-cv-02556 (D. Colo.)
	Ramos et al. v. Banner Health et al. (Slocum)	Case No. 1:15-cv-02556 (D. Colo.)
	Reetz v. Lowe's Companies, Inc. et al.	No. 5:18-cv-075-RJC-DCK (W.D.N.C.)
	Reichert, et al. v. Juniper Networks, Inc. et. al.	Case No: 3:21-cv-06213-JD (N.D. Cal.)
	Robert Sims, et al, v. BB&T Corporation, et al.	Case No. 1:15-cv-732-CCE-JEP (M.D.N.C.)
	Robert Stengl, et al. v. L3Harris Technologies, Inc	No. 6:22-cv-00572-PGB-LHP (M.D. Florida)
	Rocke, et al. v. Allianz Asset Management of America LLC, et al.	Case No. 8:23-cv-00098-CJC-KES (C.D. Cal.)
	Ronald Tussey, et al. v. ABB Inc., at al.	Case No. 2:06-cv-4305-NKL (W.D. Mo.)
	Rosenkranz, et al. v. Altru Health System, et al.,	No. 3:20-cv-00168-PDW-ARS (D.N.D.)
	Rubke, et al. v Servicenow, Inc. et al	Case No. 24-cv-01050-TLT
	Shaw v. Quad/Graphics Inc et al	Case No. 2:20-cv-01645-PP
	Smith et al. v. OSF Healthcare System, et al.	Case No. 3:16-cv-00467-SMY-RJD (S.D. Ill.)
	Smith v. GreatBanc Tr. Co.	No. 1:20-cv-02350-FUV (N.D. Ill.)
	Smith, et al. v. VCA Inc., et al.	No. 2:21-cv-09140-GW-AGR (C.D. Cal.).
	Soulek v. Costco Wholesale Corporation et al	Case No. 1:20-cv-00937 (E.D. Wis.)
	Stacy Schapker v. Waddell & Reed Financial, Inc., et al.	Case No. 17-cv-2365 (D. Kan.)
	Stevens v. SEI Investments Company, et al.	Case No. 2:18-CV-09936 (E.D. Pa.)
	Todd Ramsey, et al., v. Philips North America LLC	Case No. 3:18-cv-01099-NJR-RJD (S.D. Ill.)
	Toomey, et al. v. Demoulas Super Markets, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:19-CV-11633-LTS (D. Mass.)
	Tracey, et al. v. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, et al.	Case No. 1:16-cv-11620 (D. Mass.)
	Traczyk v.Aspirus, Inc. et al.	Case No. 2:21-cv-00077-RJJ-MV (W.D. Mich.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Troudt et al v. Oracle Corporation et al.	Case No. 16-cv-00175 (D. Colo.)
	Urlaub, et al. v. CITGO Petroleum Corp., et. al.	Case No. 21-cv-04133 (N.D. Ill.)
	Velazquez, et al. v. Massachusetts Financial Services Company	Case No. 1:17-CV-11249 (D. Mass.)
	Walter v. Kerry Inc., et al.	2:21-cv-539-BHL (E.D. Wis.)
	Williams, et al. v. Centerra Group, LLC, et al.	Civil Case No.: 1:20-cv-04220-SAL (N.D.S.C.)
	Winkelman et al. v. Whole Foods Market Inc.et al	Case No.: 1:21-cv-05075
	Woznicki v. Aurora Health Care, Inc.	Case No. 20-cv-1246 (E.D. Wis.)
FACTA	*Albright v. Metrolink*	No. 4:11-CV-01691AGF (E.D. Mo.)
	Ebert, et al. v. Warner's Stellian	No. 11-cv-02325 JRT/ SER (D. Minn.)
	Fouks, et al. v. Red Wing Hotel Corporation	Case No. 12-cv-02160 (D. Minn.)
	Jones v. Dickinson	No. 11 CV 02472 (D. Mo.)
	Linda Todd, et al. v. Medieval Times	Case No. 1:10-cv-00120 (D. N.J.)
	Masters v. Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.	Case No. 3:09-cv--255 (S.D. Ill.)
	Seppanen et al. v. Krist Oil Company	Case No. 2:09-cv-195 (W.D. Mich.)
	Waldman v. Hess Corporation	Case No. 07-cv-2221 (D. N.J.)
FCRA	*Michael Stoner, et al. v. CBA Information Services*	Case No. 04-cv-519 (E.D. Pa.)
Insurance	*Ann Castello v. Allianz Life Insurance Company*	Case No. 03-cv-20405 (D. Minn.)
	Boyd Demmer, et al. v. Illinois Farmers Insurance Company	Case No. MC 00-017872 (Hennepin County, Minn.)
	Christopher Meek v Kansas City Life Insurance Company	Case No.: 4:19cv00471 (W.D. MO)
	Chultem v. Ticor Title Insur. Co., et al.	Case No. 2006-CH-09488 ((Cook County, IL)l.)
	Colella v. Chicago Title Insur. Co., et al.	Case No. 2006-CH-09489 ((Cook County, IL)l.)
	Daluge, et. al., v. Continental Casualty Company	No. 3:15-cv-00297 (W.D. Wis.)
	Deborah Hillgamyer, et al. v. Reliastar Life Insurance Company, et al.	No. 11-cv-729 (W.D. Wis.)
	Doan v. State Farm	108CV129264 (Santa Clara Co, CA)
	Dorothea Pavlov v. Continental Casualty Company	Case No. 07-cv-2580 (N.D. Ohio)
	Earl L. McClure v State Farm Insurance Company	Case No.: 2:20cv01389-SMB (D. AZ)
	Frank Rose, et al. v. United Equitable Insurance Company, et al.	Case No. 00-cv-02248 (Cass County, ND)
	Froeber v. Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company	Case No. 00C15234 (Marion County, OR)
	Garrison, et al., v. Auto-Owners Insurance Company	Case No. 02-cv-324076 (Cole County, Mo.)
	Harold Hanson, et al. v. Acceleration Life Insurance Company, et al.	Case No. 3:97-cv-152 (D.N.D.)
	In Re: Lutheran Brotherhood Variable Insurance Products Co. Sales Practices Litigation	Case No. 99-md-1309 (D. Minn.)
	Irene Milkman, et al. v. American Travellers Life Insurance Company, et al.	No. 03775 (Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas, Pa.)
	J. Gregory Sheldon v Kansas City Life Insurance Company	Case No.: 1916CV26689 Circuit Court of Jackson County, MO
	Jacobs v. State Farm General Insurance Company	No. CJ-96-406 (Sequoyah County, Okla.)
	James M. Wallace, III, et al. v. American Agrisurance, Inc., et al.	Case No. 99-cv-669 (E.D. Ark.)
	James Ralston, et al. v. Chrysler Credit Corporation, et al.	Case No. 90-cv-3433 (Lucas County, Ohio)
	Michael T. McNellis, et al. v. Pioneer Life Insurance Company, et al.	CV 990759 (County of San Luis Obispo, Cal.)
	Morris v. Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company	CJ-03-714 (Pottawatomie County, OK)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Paul Curtis, et al v. Northern Life Insurance Company	Case No. 01-2-18578 (King County, Wash.)
	Ralph Shaffer v. Continental Casualty Company and CNA Financial Corp	Case No. 06-cv-2253 (C.D. Cal.)
	Raymond Arent, et al. v. State Farm Mutual Insurance Company	Case No. 00-mc-16521 (D. Minn.)
	Roy Whitworth, et al. v. Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company, et al.	Case No. 00CVH-08-6980 (Franklin County, Ohio)
	Sonia Gonzalez, et al. v. Rooms to Go, Inc., et al.	Case No. 97-cv-3146 (S.D. Fla.)
	Taqueria El Primo, LLC v Farmers Group, Inc.	Case No.: 19cv03071 (D. MN)
	Tow Distributing, Inc., et al. v. BCBSM, Inc., d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota	Case No. 02-cv-9317 (D. Minn.)
Insurance	*Grant Bauserman v Unemployment Insurance Agency*	State of Michigan Court of Claims, Case# 2015-000202-MM
	Scott Craven v Cameron Mutual Insurance Co.	20CY-CV06381 Circuit Court of Clay County, MO
	Simeon Penton v Centennial Bank	4:18cv450 (N.D. FL)
	The People of The State of California v Jeff Toll MD, Inc.	
Insurance - Force Placed	*Arnett v. Bank of America, N.A.*	No. 3:11-CV-01372-SI (D. OR)
	Clements, et al. v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al.	No. 3:12-cv-02179-JCS (N.D. Cal.)
	Hofstetter, et al. v. Chase Home Finance, LLC., et al.	Case No. 10-cv-1313 (N.D. Cal.)
	Jerome Walls, et al. v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A., et al.	Case No. 11-00673 (W.D. KY)
Legal Notice	*Anderson et al. v. Canada (Attorney General)*	2011 NLCA 82
	Angell v. Skechers Canada	8562-12 (Montreal, Quebec)
	Billieson, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	No. 94-19231 (Orleans Parish, LA)
	Carnegie v. Household International, Inc.	No. 98-C-2178 (N.D. Ill.)
	Cazenave, et al. v. Sheriff Charles C. Foti, Jr., et al.	Case No. 00-cv-1246 (E.D. La.)
	City of Greenville, et al., v. Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc., and Syngenta AG	No. 3:10-cv-00188-JPG-PMF (S. D. Ill.)
	Evans, et al. v. Linden Research, Inc., et al.	Case No. 4:11-cv-1078-DMR (N.D. CA)
	F.T.C. v. NBTY, Inc.	No. 05-4793 (E.D.N.Y.)
	George Williams, et al. v. BestComp, Inc., et al.	No. 09-C-5242-A (Parish of St. Landry, LA)
	Griffin v. Dell Canada Inc	Case No. 07-cv-325223D2 (Ontario, Superio Court of Justice)
	In Re: Aftermarket Filters Antitrust Litigation	No. 1:08-cv-4883, MDL No. 1957 (N.D. Ill.)
	In Re: Asia Pulp & Paper Securities Litigation	Case No. 01-cv-7351 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Certainteed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation	MDL 2270 (E.D. PA)
	In Re: Duluth Superior Chemical Spill Litigation	Case No. 92-cv-503 (W.D. Wis.)
	In Re: Google Referrer Header Privacy Litigation	No. 10-04809 (N.D. Cal.)
	In Re: Salmonella Litigation	Case No. 94-cv-016304 (D. Minn.)
	Jerome H. Schlink v. Edina Realty Title	Case No. 02-cv-18380 (D. Minn.)
	Joel E. Zawikowski, et al. v. Beneficial National Bank, et al.	Case No. 98-cv-2178 (N.D. Ill.)
	Joshua Wasser, et al. v. All Market, Inc.,	Case No. 1:16-CV-21238 (S.D. Fla.)
	Kobylanski et al. v. Motorola Mobility, Inc. et al.	No. 13-CV-1181 (W.D. Pa.)
	Mary Plubell, et al. v. Merck and Co., Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-235817 (Jackson County, MO)
	McGruder, et al. v. DPC Enterprises	No. CV2003-022677 (Maricopa County, AZ)
	Mehl v. Canadian Pacific Railway, Limited	Case No. 02-cv-009 (D.N.D.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Michelle Marshall, et al. v. Air Liquide -- Big Three, Inc. et al.	No. 2005-08706 (Orleans Parish, LA)
	Pat Beesley, et al v. International Paper Co. et al.	Case No. 06-703-DRH (S.D. Ill.)
	Perrine, et al. v. E.I. Dupont De Nemours and Company, et al.	01-0631-CA-01 (Harrison C., WV)
	Red Eagle Resources Corporation, Inc., et al. v. Baker Hughes Inc., et al.	Case No. 91-cv-627 (S.D. Tex.)
	Skold, et al. v Intel Corporation, et al.	Case No. 1-05-cv-039231 (County of Santa Clara, CA)
	The People of the State of California v. Rainbow Light Nutritional Systems, LLC, et al.	Case No. 19STCV28214 (Los Angeles County, CA)
	Thomas Geanacopoulos v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.	Civil Action No. 98-6002-BLS1 (MA Superior Court)
Medical/Drug	*F.T.C. v. CHK Trading Corp.*	Case No. 04-cv-8686 (S.D.N.Y.)
	F.T.C. v. Christopher Enterprises, Inc.	Case No. 2:01-cv-0505 (D. Utah)
	F.T.C. v. Conversion Marketing, Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-1264 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Enforma Natural Products, Inc.	Case No. 00-cv-04376 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Goen Technologies	FTC File No. 042 3127
	F.T.C. v. Great American Products	Case No. 05-cv-00170 (N.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. Kevin Trudeau, et al.	Case No. 03-cv-3904 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Latin Hut, Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-0830 (S.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. QT, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-3578 (N.D. Ill.)
	F.T.C. v. Seasilver USA, Inc.	Case No. 03-cv-0676 (D. Nev.)
	F.T.C. v. Smart Inventions, Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-4431 (C.D. Cal.)
	F.T.C. v. Sunny Health Nutrition Technology & Products, Inc.	Case No. 06-cv-2193 (M.D. Fla.)
	F.T.C. v. United Fitness of America, LLC	Case No. 02-cv-0648 (D. Nev.)
	In Re: Guidant Corp Implantable Defibrillators Products Liability Litigation	Case No. 05-cv-1708 (D. Minn.)
	In re: Nuvaring Products Liability Litigation	08-MDL-1964
	Karen Wright, et al. v. Milan Jeckle	Case No. 98-2-07410-2 (Spokane County, Wash.)
	Mary Plubell, et al. v. Merck and Co., Inc.	Case No. 04-cv-235817 (Jackson County, MO)
Privacy	*S.A. et al. v Minnesota Department of Public Safety, et al.*	62-CV-23-2275
Privacy/FCRA	*St. Clair, et al. v MRB, et al.*	Case No. 12-cv-1572 (D. Minn.)
Product Liability	*Jared Kruger v Lely North America, Inc.*	0:20cv00629 (D. MN)
Securities	*Adam C. Kassab , et al. v. Francis D. John, et al.*	Case No. 2:16-cv-00613-AJS (W.D. Pa.)
	Alan Freberg, et al. v. Merrill Corporation, et al.	Case No. 99-cv-010063 (D. Minn.)
	Anderson v. Investors Diversified Services	Case No. 4:79-cv-266 (D. Minn.)
	Arkansas Teacher Retirement System, et al. v. Insulet Corp., et al.	Civil Action No. 15-12345-MLW (D. Mass)
	Bottlebrush Investments, LP, et al. v. The Lambveth Company, et al.	Case No BC 407967 (County of Los Angeles, CA)
	Charter Township Of Clinton v. OSI Restaurants	Case No. 06-CA-010348 (Hillsborough County, Fla.)
	Christopher Carmona, et al. v. Henry I. Bryant, et al. (Albertson's Securities Litigation)	Case No. 06-cv-01251 (Ada County, Idaho)
	Daryl L. Cooper, et al. v. Miller Johnson Steichen Kinnard, Inc.	Case No. 02-cv-1236 (D. Minn.)
	Dutton v. Harris Stratex Networks, Inc. et al	08-cv-00755-LPS (D. Del.)
	Edith Gottlieb v. Xcel Energy, Inc., et al.	Case No. 02-cv-2931 (D. Minn.)
	Family Medicine Specialsts, et al. v. Abatix Corp., et al.	Case No. 3:04-cv-872B (N.D. Tex.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Fisk, et al. v. H&R Block Inc., et al.	1216-CV20418 (Jackson County, MO)
	Friedman, et al. v. Penson Worldwide, Inc.	11-cv-02098 (N.D. Tex.)
	In Re Allergan PLC Securities Litigation	Case No.: 18cv12089-CM-GWG (S.D. NY)
	In re FX Energy Stockholders Litigation	Case No. A-15-726409-B (Clark County, NV)
	In Re Regulus Therapeutics Inc. Securities Litigation	3:17-cv-00182 BTM-RBB (S.D. CA)
	In Re Universal Health Services, Inc. Derivative Litigation	Case No.: 2:17cv02187 (E.D. PA)
	In Re: American Adjustable Rate Term Trust Securities Litigation	Case No. 4:95-cv-666 and 4:95-cv-667 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Ancor Communications, Inc Securities Litigation	Case No. 97-cv-1696 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Asia Pulp & Paper Securities Litigation	Case No. 01-cv-7351 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Bayer AG Secuirites	Case No. 03-cv-1546 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Bio-One Securities Litigation	Case No. 05-cv-1859 (M.D. Fla.)
	In Re: Bioplasty Securities Litigation	Case No. 4:91-cv-689 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Citi-Equity Group, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 94-cv-012194 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Citi-Equity Group, Inc., Limited Partnerships Securities Litigation	MDL No. 1082 (C.D. Cal.)
	In Re: Control Data Corporation Securities Litigation	Case No. 3:85-cv-1341 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Cray Research Securities Litigation	Case No. 3:89-cv-508 (D. Minn.)
	In re: CV Sciences, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No.: 2:18cv01602-JAD-BNW (D. NV)
	In Re: Cybex International Securities Litigation	No. 653794/2012 (County of New York, NY)
	In Re: E.W. Blanch Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 01-cv-258 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Encore Computer Corporation Shareholder Litigation	Case No. 16044 (New Castle County, Del.)
	In Re: EVCI Career Colleges Holding Corp Securities Litigation	Case No. 05-cv-10240 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Flight Transportation	MDL No. 517 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Frontier Oil Corporation	Case No. 2011-11451 (Harris County, Tex.)
	In Re: HeartWare International, Inc. Securities Litigation	No. 1:16-cv-00520-RA (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Hennepin County 1986 Recycling Bond Litigation	Case No. 92-cv-22272 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: McCleodUSA Incorporated Securities Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-0001 (N.D. Iowa)
	In Re: McKesson HBOC, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 99-cv-20743 (N.D. Cal.)
	In Re: Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Securities Derivative and ERISA Litigation	07-cv-9633 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Merrill Lynch Research Reports Securities Litigation	Case No. 02-md-1484 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Micro Component Technology, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 4:94-cv-346 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: National City Corp. Securities, Derivative and Erisa Litig.	MDL No. 2003 (N.D. Ohio)
	In Re: New Century	No. 07-CV-0931 (C.D. Cal.)
	In Re: Novastar Financial, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 04-cv-0330 (W.D. Mo.)
	In Re: OCA, Inc. Securities and Derivative Litigation	Case No. 05-cv-2165 (E.D. La.)
	In Re: Raytheon Company Securities Litigation	Case No. 99-cv-12142 (D. Mass.)
	In Re: Reliance Group Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 00-cv-4653 (S.D.N.Y.)
	In Re: Retek Inc Securities Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-4209 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Salomon Analyst Metromedia Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-7966 (S.D.N.Y.)

Practice Area	*Engagement*	Citation
	In re: Sauer-Danfoss, Inc. Stockholder Litigation	C.A. No. 8396-VCL (Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware)
	In Re: Scimed Life Systems, Inc. Shareholders Litigation	Case No. 94-mc-17640 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Sourcecorp Securities Litigation	Case No. 04-cv-02351 (N.D. Tex.)
	In re: Spectrum Pharmaceuticals Securities Litigation	Case No. 2:13-cv-00433-LDG (D. Nev.)
	In Re: SS&C Technologies, Inc. Shareholders Litigation	Case No. 05-cv-1525 (D. Del.)
	In re: SunEdison, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 1:16-md-2742-PKC (S.D.N.Y)
	In Re: Tellium Inc Securities Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-5878 (D. N.J.)
	In Re: The Sportsman's Guide, Inc. Litigation	Case No. 06-cv-7903 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Tonka Corporation Securities Litigation	Case No. 4:90-cv-002 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Tonka II Securities Litigation	Case No. 3:90-cv-318 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Tricord Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 3:94-cv-746 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: VistaCare, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 04-cv-1661 (D. Ariz.)
	In Re: Williams Securities Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-72(N.D. Okla.)
	In Re: Xcel Energy, Inc. Securities Litigation	Case No. 02-cv-2677 (D. Minn.)
	In Re: Xcelera.Com Securities Litigation	Case No. 00-cv-11649 (D. Mass.)
	In Re: Xybernaut Corp. Securities MDL Litigation	Case No. 05-mdl-1705 (E.D. Va.)
	In the Matter of BKS Advisors, LLC	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18648
	In the Matter of Covia Holdings Corp. and Fairmount Santrol Holdings Inc.	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-20163
	In the Matter of David F. Bandimere	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-15124
	In the Matter of deVere USA, Inc.	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18527
	In the Matter of Fiat Chrysler Automobiles N.V.	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-200092
	In the Matter of Focus Media Holding Limited, et al.	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-16852
	In the Matter of Frontier Wealth Management, LLC, et al.	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-20526
	In the Matter of Howard Richards and In the Matter of James Goodland, et al.	Admin. Proc. Files No. 3-16877 and 3-16878
	In the Matter of James Goodland and Securus Wealth Management, LLC	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-16878
	In the Matter of JL Capital Management	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-18171
	In the Matter of Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-19793
	In the Matter of Nikola Corporation	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-20687
	In the Matter of Ross, Sinclaire & Associates, LLC, et al.	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-17315
	In the Matter of Securities America Advisors, Inc.	SEC File No.: 3-20381
	In the Matter of ShipChain, Inc.	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-20185
	In the Matter of SICA Wealth Management, LLC and Jeffrey C. Sica	SEC Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-19716
	In the Matter of Signator Investors, Inc, et al.	SEC Admin. Proc. AP No. 3-16753
	In the Matter of William D. King, CPA	SEC Administrative Proceeding File No. 3-19991
	Inchen Huang v Assertio Therapeutics, Inc.	Case No.: 4:17cv04830-JST (N.D. Cal.)
	Ivy Shipp, et al. v. Nationsbank Corp.	19,002 (TX 12th Jud Dist)
	Karl E. Brogen and Paul R. Havig, et al. v. Carl Pohlad, et al.	Case No. 3:93-cv-714 (D. Minn.)
	Kevin D. Mayer et al. v United Microelectronics Corporation	19-cv-02304 (S.D. N.Y.)

Practice Area	Engagement	Citation
	Lori Miller, et al. v. Titan Value Equities Group Inc., et al.	Case No. 94-mc-106432 (D. Minn.)
	Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd., et al. v. Tellabs, Inc., et al.	02-C-4356 (N.D. Ill.)
	Montoya, et al. v. Mamma.com, Inc., et al.	Case No. 1:05-cv-02313 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Norwood v Lee, et al.	C.A. No.: 2018-0056-KSJM Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware
	Partridge v GreenStar Agricultural Corporation, et al.	Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Toronto Region)
	Paskowitz v James J. Hill	Case No. 715541/2018 (Queens County, NY)
	Resendes, et al.; Maher, et al.; Hawkins, et al.; Schooley, et al. v. Thorp, et al.	Case No. 84-cv-03457, 84-cv-11251, 85-cv-6074, 86-cv-1916L (D. Minn.)
	Richard Donal Rink, et al. v. College Retirement Equities Fund	No. 07-CI-10761, (Jefferson County, KY)
	Robert Trimble, et al. v. Holmes Harbor Sewer District, et al.	Case No. 01-2-00751-8 (Island County, Wash.)
	Sandi Roper, et al. v. SITO Mobile, Ktd., et al.	NO. 2:17-CV-01106-ES-MAH (D.N.J.)
	SEC v Arista Power	
	SEC v Seaforth Meridian, Ltd.	06cv4107 (D. KS)
	SEC v Westport Capital markets LLC	3:17cv2064 (D. CT)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. A Chicago Convention Center, LLC, et al.	Civil No. 13-cv-00982 (N.D. Ill.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. AIMSI Technologies, Inc., et al.	05 CV 4724 (LLS) (S.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Alderson et al.	No. 18-04930 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Al-Raya Investment Company, et. al.	No. 109-CV-6533
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Arista Power, Inc., et al.	Case No. 17-cv-04598 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Bowser, et al.	Case No. 2:20-cv-00918-TS (D. Utah)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Broadwind Energy, Inc.	Case No.: 1:15cv01142 (N.D. IL)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Broadwind Energy, Inc. et al.	Civ. Act. No. 1:15-cv-01142 (N.D. Ill.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. CKB168 Holdings Ltd., et al.	Civil Action No. 1:13-cv-5584 (E.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Colonial Tidewater Realty Income Partners, LLC	1:15-cv-2401 (D. MD)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Harrison Katzen	Case No. 16-cv-06606 (E.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Intercontinental Regional Center Trust of Chicago, LLC	Civil Action No. 13-cv-982 (N.D. Ill.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Jay Daniel Seinfeld, et al.	Case Number: 1:19-cv-910 (W.D. Tex.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. McDermott	Civ. Act. No. 19-04229-JFL (E.D. Pa.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. MMR Investment Bankers LLC dba MMR, Inc.	SEC Admin. Proc. File No. 3-16753 and 3-16754
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Myron Weiner	11-CV-05731 (E.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Rockford Funding Group, LLC, et al.	09-10047 (S.D.N.Y.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Seaforth Meridian, Ltd., et al.,	CA No. 5:06-cv-04107 (D.Kan)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Swapnil J. Rege, et al.	3:21-CV-19313-ZNQ-TJB (DNJ)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. United American Ventures, LLC, et al.	Case No. 10-cv-00568-JCH-LFG (D.N.M.)
	Securities and Exchange Commission v. Westport Capital Markets	Case No. 2:21-CV-19313-ZNQ-TJB (DNJ)
	Superior Partners, et al. v. Rajesh K. Soin, et al.	Case No. 08-cv-0872 (Montgomery County, Ohio)
	Svenningsen, et al. v. Piper Jaffray & Hopwood, et al.	Case No. 3:85-cv-921 (D. Minn.)
	Three Bridges Investment Group, et al. v. Honeywell, et al.	Case No. 88-cv-22302 (D. Minn.)
	Tietz v Bridgemark Financial Corp.	Action No.: S-197731 The Supreme Court of British Columbia

Practice Area	*Engagement*	Citation
	United States of America v. George David Gordon	Case No. 4:09-cr-00013-JHP-1 (N.D. Okla.)
	United States of America v. Zev Saltsman	Case No. 04-cv-641 (E.D.N.Y.)
	William Steiner, et al. v. Honeywell, Inc. et al.	Case No. 4:88-cv-1102 (D. Minn.)
Test Score	*David Andino, et al. v. The Psychological Corporation, et al.*	Case No. A457725 (Clark County, Nev.)
	Frankie Kurvers, et al. v. National Computer Systems	No. MC00-11010 (Hennepin County, Minn)

EXHIBIT 2

TUSAN LAW ATTORNEYS

EXAMPLES OF CLASS ACTION EXPERIENCE

This document contains a list of cases in which Tusan Law attorneys have been appointed lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or class counsel. In cases marked with an asterisk, the firm for which the respective attorney was working at the time was appointed as class counsel without individual attorneys being identified, but the respective attorney was one of the attorneys most involved in the litigation and settlement of the case.

Christina Tusan

Christina Tusan has been appointed as co-lead/interim co-lead counsel in the following cases:

- *In re BetterHelp, Inc. Data Disclosure Cases*, No. 23-cv-01033-RS (N.D. Cal.);
- *In re Igloo Products Cooler Recall Litigation*, No. 25-298-JLH-EGT (D. Del).

Ms. Tusan has also served as class counsel in the following cases, including while working for firms other than Tusan Law:

- *Smith-Washington et al. v. TaxAct, Inc.*, No. 3:23-CV-00830-VC (N.D. Cal.).

Ms. Tusan has also served as outside counsel for Los Angeles County Counsel in the following privacy-related actions:

- *People of the State of California v. TaxSlayer Inc.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 24STCV34102; and
- *Federal Trade Commission et al v. Hims & Hers Health, Inc.*, No. 3:26-cv-7871 (N.D. Cal.).

Adrian Barnes

Adrian Barnes has served as class counsel in the following cases, including while working for firms other than Tusan Law:

- *Parsons v. La Sierra University*, Riverside County Superior Court Case No. CVRI200104;*
- *Dominguez et al v. All-Pro Bail Bonds, Inc. et al.*, Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 21CV381890;
- *Marantz et* al v. Laguna College of Art and Design*,* Orange County Superior Court Case No. 30-2021-01194814-CU-OE-CXC;*

- *Fligsten v. Musicians Institute, Inc.*, Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 21STCV38365;*
- *Mayer v. Visa Inc. et al*, San Francisco County Superior Court Case No. CGC-21-593058;* and
- *Teraoka v. California Baptist University*, Riverside County Superior Court Case No. CVRI2201866.

Mr. Barnes has also served as outside counsel for Los Angeles County Counsel in the following privacy-related actions:

- *People of the State of California v. TaxSlayer Inc.,* Los Angeles County Superior Court Case No. 24STCV34102; and
- *Federal Trade Commission et al v. Hims & Hers Health, Inc.*, No. 3:26-cv-7871 (N.D. Cal.).