

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
CARTERET COUNTY

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION
20CVS000403-150

GEORGE ROBERT ARMISTEAD,)
JR., MADISON ARMISTEAD,)
GREG RHODES, and WILLIAM)
YATES, individually and on behalf)
of all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

COUNTY OF CARTERET,)

Defendant.)

**PLAINTIFFS/CLASS
REPRESENTATIVES' UNOPPOSED
MOTION TO APPROVE CLASS
NOTICE PROGRAM**

NOW COME Plaintiffs/Class Representatives George Robert Armistead, Jr., Madison Armistead, Greg Rhodes, and William Yates, by and through Class Counsel, pursuant to Rule 23 of the North Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure, with the consent of Defendant Carteret County, and move the Court to approve the class notice program as set forth herein, and show the Court as follows:

1. The Court entered an Order on August 19, 2024 certifying this action as a class action pursuant to Rule 23, with classes defined as follows:

The Green Box Fee / Waste Collection Class

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Green Box Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.

The Landfill Fee / Waste Collection Class

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Landfill Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.

The Solid Waste Fee / Cost to Operate Class

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) were charged a Green Box and/or a Landfill Fee.

2. Defendant Carteret County appealed the Class Certification Order to the North Carolina Supreme Court. The Supreme Court issued an opinion affirming the Order on March 20, 2026.

3. After a class is certified, notice must be given to class members informing them of the existence of the class and their opportunity to opt out. *See Crow v. Citicorp Acceptance Co., Inc.*, 319 N.C. 274, 283, 354 S.E.2d 459, 466 (1987) (“[F]undamental fairness and due process dictate that adequate notice of the class action be given to [class members].”).

4. “The actual manner and form of the notice is largely within the discretion of the trial court.” *Crow*, 319 N.C. at 283. “The trial court may require, among other things, that it review the content of any notice before its dissemination.” *Id.*

5. Since the Supreme Court issued its opinion on March 20, 2026, Class Counsel has interviewed several notice administrators to develop and administer the notice program for class members in this case. The most qualified and cost-effective proposal was from Angeion Group, www.angeiongroup.com, a national leader in class action notice administration. Attached hereto as “Exhibit A” and incorporated by reference herein is the Declaration of Stephanie Saunders, Esq. setting forth Angeion’s experience and qualifications in class action notice administration. Class

Counsel has previously worked with Angeion as the notice administrator in other class actions and has found their work to be exceptional.

6. Attached hereto as “Exhibit B” and incorporated by reference herein is the notice administration proposal received from Angeion. Using the County’s class member records¹, Angeion will use reverse look-up/skip tracing to locate class member e-mail addresses. Angeion will provide e-mail notice to the class member for class members where e-mails are located, a copy of which is attached hereto as “Exhibit C” and incorporated by reference herein. For class members without e-mails, Angeion will send a post-card notice by regular mail to the class member, a copy of which is attached hereto as “Exhibit D” and incorporated by reference herein.

7. Both the e-mail and post-card notices will direct class members to a website maintained by Angeion, www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com, where additional information regarding the case will be maintained, including a long-form notice. Attached hereto as “Exhibit E” and incorporated by reference herein in the long-form notice that will be posted by Angeion on the website.

8. Angeion expects to locate e-mail addresses for approximately 40-65% of the class based on experience in other cases. (Ex. A, Saunders Dec., ¶ 16). In this case, the total cost of the notice program will be approximately \$40,000.² (See Ex. B.). Class Counsel finds this cost to be highly reasonable based on the expected size of the class (approximately 60,000).

¹ The County has supplemented the list of Class Members through May 26, 2026.

² Class Counsel will later seek reimbursement of these costs if any class-wide recovery is made from the County in this case.

9. Angeion expects to disseminate notice to class members within 30 days from the County's production of updated class member records, to allow time for data review and notice preparation.

10. Class members will have 60 days from the date of the dissemination of notice in which to opt out of the classes. As set forth in the notice, class members may opt out by filing a Notice of Exclusion with the Carteret County Clerk of Superior Court containing the class member's name, mailing address, telephone number, e-mail address, the file number of this case (No. 20-CVS-403), and identification of the class(es) from which the class member wishes to be excluded from.

11. Class Counsel will also cause the press release attached hereto as "Exhibit F" and incorporated by reference herein to be issued to the Carteret County News-Times, which directs class members to the www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com website for more information.

12. Class Counsel respectfully submits that the notice program outlined herein constitutes more than adequate notice to class members, as required by Rule 23 and applicable caselaw, and should be approved by the Court.

13. Class Counsel has conferred with the County prior to filing this motion, and the County consents to the motion.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs/Class Representatives pray that the Court enter an Order approving the class notice program as set forth herein.

This the 8th day of July, 2026.

/s/ James R. DeMay

James R. DeMay
N.C. State Bar No. 36710
jdemay@brysonpllc.com
Scott C. Harris
N.C. State Bar No. 35328
sharris@brysonpllc.com
John Hunter Bryson
N.C. State Bar No. 50602
hbryson@brysonpllc.com
BRYSON HARRIS SUCIU DEMAY, PLLC
900 W. Morgan Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
Tel: (919) 660-5000

James A. Roberts, III
N.C. State Bar No. 10495
jar@lewis-roberts.com
Matthew D. Quinn
N.C. State Bar No. 40004
mdq@lewis-roberts.com
LEWIS & ROBERTS, PLLC
3700 Glenwood Avenue, Suite 410 (27612)
P.O. Box 17529
Raleigh, NC 27619
Tel: (919) 981-0191

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing **PLAINTIFFS/CLASS REPRESENTATIVES' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO APPROVE CLASS NOTICE PROGRAM** was duly served this date on counsel for all parties listed below by email pursuant to Rule 5 of the North Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure:

WOMBLE BOND DICKSON (US), LLP
Sonny S. Haynes
sonny.haynes@wbd-us.com

This the 8th day of July, 2026.

/s/ James R. DeMay

James R. DeMay
N.C. State Bar No. 36710
jdemay@brysonpllc.com
BRYSON HARRIS SUCIU DEMAY, PLLC
900 W. Morgan Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
Tel: (919) 660-5000

EXHIBIT A

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

CARTERET COUNTY

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE

SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION

Case No. 20-CVS-403

GEORGE ROBERT ARMISTEAD, JR.
MADISON ARMISTEAD, GREG
RHODES, and WILLIAM YATES,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CARTERET COUNTY,

Defendant.

**DECLARATION OF STEPHANIE
SAUNDERS OF ANGEION GROUP, LLC
RE: QUALIFICATIONS & PROPOSED
NOTICE PLAN**

I, Stephanie Saunders, Esq., declare as follows:

1. I am a Vice President of Class Action and Mass Tort Services at the class action notice and settlement administration firm Angeion Group, LLC (“Angeion”). I am over 21 years of age and am not a party to this action. I am fully familiar with the facts contained herein based upon my personal knowledge, as well as information provided to me by my colleagues in the ordinary course of business at Angeion.

2. I am a licensed attorney in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and practiced as a class action attorney for more than eight years at a nationally recognized litigation firm. Prior to practicing law, I developed substantial professional expertise in marketing and advertising within the media and publishing industry, as well as at one of the largest financial institutions in the United States. This combined legal and marketing background uniquely positions me to evaluate and implement effective class action notice programs.

3. In my professional roles focused on marketing, advertising, and audience-driven communications, I led the development and execution of integrated, multi-channel marketing and

advertising campaigns across mass media, digital, and direct channels. I regularly translated complex, technical, and highly regulated subject matter into clear, accessible, and audience-appropriate messaging.

4. This experience is directly applicable to the design, evaluation, and implementation of class action notice programs. I routinely apply these principles to develop notice plans that are strategically targeted, legally compliant, and optimized to maximize reach, comprehension, and participation among class members. My work emphasizes clarity, accuracy, and effectiveness, consistent with due process requirements and established best practices governing class action notice.

5. I have been directly involved in the planning and execution of a wide range of court-approved notice and claims administration programs, both during my legal practice and in my current role, including some of the largest and most complex notice programs implemented by Angeion. This experience provides me with a comprehensive understanding of the practical, legal, and operational considerations necessary to design and assess notice programs in complex class action matters.

6. By way of background, Angeion is an experienced class action notice and claims administration company formed by a team of executives that have had extensive tenures at five other nationally recognized claims administration companies. Collectively, the management team at Angeion has overseen more than 2,000 class action settlements and distributed over \$15 billion to class members. The executive profiles as well as the company overview are available at www.angeiongroup.com.

7. As a class action administrator, Angeion has regularly been approved by both federal and state courts throughout the United States and abroad to provide notice of class actions and claims processing services. A comprehensive summary of judicial recognition Angeion has received is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

DATA SECURITY & INSURANCE

8. Angeion recognizes the critical need to secure our physical and network environments and protect data in our custody. It is our commitment to these matters that has made

us the go-to administrator for many of the most prominent data security matters of this decade. We are continuously improving upon our robust policies, procedures, and infrastructure by periodically updating data security policies as well as our approach to managing data security in response to changes to physical environment, new threats and risks, business circumstances, legal and policy implications, and evolving technical environments.

9. Angeion's privacy practices are compliant with the California Consumer Privacy Act, as currently drafted. Consumer data obtained for the delivery of each project is used only for the purposes intended and agreed in advance by all contracted parties, including compliance with orders issued by State or Federal courts as appropriate. Angeion imposes additional data security measures for the protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and Personal Health Information (PHI), including restricted network and physical access on a need-to-know basis, and network access tracking. Angeion requires background checks of all employees and contractors and enforces standard protocols for the rapid removal of physical and network access in the event of an employee or contractor termination.

10. Data is transmitted using Transport Layer Security (TLS) 1.3 protocols. Network data is encrypted at rest with the government and financial institution standard of AES 256-bit encryption. We maintain an offline, air-gapped backup copy of all data, ensuring that projects can be administered without interruption.

11. Further, Angeion conscientiously monitors the latest compliance requirements, such as GDPR, HIPAA, PCI DSS, and others, to ensure that our organization is meeting all necessary regulatory obligations as well as aligning to industry best practices and standards set forth by frameworks like CIS and NIST. Angeion is cognizant of the ever-evolving digital landscape and continually improves its security infrastructure and processes, including partnering with best-in-class security service providers. Angeion's robust policies and processes cover all aspects of information security to form part of an industry-leading security and compliance program, which is regularly assessed by independent third parties. Angeion is also committed to a culture of security mindfulness. All employees routinely undergo cybersecurity training to ensure that safeguarding information and cybersecurity vigilance is a core practice in all aspects of the

work our teams complete.

12. Angeion currently maintains a comprehensive insurance program, including sufficient Errors & Omissions coverage.

SUMMARY OF THE NOTICE PLAN

13. The Notice Plan provides for direct notice via email or mail to Class Members combined with the implementation of a dedicated website and toll-free telephone support to provide Class Members with pertinent information about the litigation, including their rights and options and corresponding deadlines.

DIRECT NOTICE

Class Member Contact Information

14. Angeion will receive, review, and analyze the Class Member data provided by the Defendant. Angeion performs a thorough analysis to identify duplicative records, as well as missing/incomplete data fields. Angeion will then assign identification numbers to each unique record, which will comprise the final Class Member list (the “Class List”).

15. For records that do not have a valid email address on the Class List, Angeion will cause a reverse lookup (“append”) to be performed to locate an email address associated with the corresponding Class Members. Angeion utilizes a network of data partners¹ to aggregate a combination of first- and third-party data to source, update and verify email addresses. Specifically, the append search uses available data points (*i.e.*, name, mailing address, phone number) as a validity check to identify email addresses that are associated with those data points. The Class List will be updated with the email addresses obtained via the append search.

16. Based on Angeion’s prior experience utilizing data appends, it is anticipated that the search will return email addresses for approximately 40-65% of the Class Member records submitted.²

¹ Our data partners typically include Experian, Dun & Bradstreet, LexisNexis, IDI, and Facebook.

² Append results may vary depending on the accuracy of the data provided to Angeion. Factors include, but are not limited to, the age of the file, whether the data includes consumers or businesses, and data hygiene processes performed by Defendant.

17. Angeion follows best practices to both validate emails and increase deliverability. Specifically, prior to distributing the Email Notice, Angeion subjects the email addresses on the Class List to a cleansing and validation process. The email cleansing and validation process removes extra spaces and compares each email address to known bad email addresses.³ Email addresses that are not designated as a known bad address will then be further verified by contacting the Internet Service Provider (“ISP”) to determine if the email address exists.

18. Further, Angeion designs the Email Notice to avoid many common “red flags” that might otherwise cause an email recipient’s spam filter to block or identify the email notice as spam. For example, Angeion does not include attachments like the Long Form Notice to the Email Notice, because attachments are often interpreted by various Internet Service Providers (“ISP”) as spam. Instead, the Email Notice will contain a link so Class Members can easily access the dedicated website.

19. Angeion also accounts for the real-world reality that some emails will inevitably fail to be delivered during the initial delivery attempt. Therefore, after the initial noticing campaign is complete, Angeion, after an approximate 24- to 72-hour rest period (which allows any temporary block at the ISP level to expire) causes a second round of email noticing to continue to any email addresses that were previously identified as soft bounces and not delivered. In our experience, this minimizes emails that may have erroneously failed to deliver due to sensitive servers and optimizes delivery.

20. At the completion of the email campaign, Angeion will report to the Court concerning the rate of delivered emails accounting for any emails that are blocked at the ISP level. In short, the Court will possess a detailed, verified account of the success rate of the entire direct email notice campaign.

³ Angeion maintains a database of email addresses that were returned as permanently undeliverable, commonly referred to as a hard bounce, from prior campaigns. Where an address has been returned as a hard bounce within the last year, that email is designated as a known bad email address.

Mailed Notice

21. As part of the Notice Plan, Angeion will send Notice of the class certification via first class U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid, to all Class Members whose Email Notice could not be delivered and for whom a complete mailing address is available in the data provided to Angeion. The Notice will be formatted as a single postcard and will direct Class Members to the dedicated website for additional information about the litigation.

22. Angeion will employ the following best practices to increase the deliverability rate of the Notices: (i) Angeion will cause the mailing address information for Class Members to be updated utilizing the United States Postal Service's ("USPS") National Change of Address database, which provides updated address information for individuals or entities who have moved during the previous four years and filed a change of address with the USPS; (ii) Notices returned to Angeion by the USPS with a forwarding address will be re-mailed to the new address provided by the USPS; (iii) Notices returned to Angeion by the USPS without forwarding addresses will be subjected to an address verification search (commonly referred to as "skip tracing") utilizing a wide variety of data sources, including public records, real estate records, electronic directory assistance listings, etc., to locate updated addresses; (iv) Notices will be re-mailed to Class Members for whom updated addresses were identified via the skip tracing process.

DEDICATED WEBSITE & TELEPHONE SUPPORT

23. The Notice Plan provides for the creation of a case-specific website dedicated to this litigation. The website will be designed to be user friendly so Class Members can easily find general information about this litigation, including important dates and deadlines, and answers to frequently asked questions. Class Members will be able to access, review, and/or download important documents such as the Long Form Notice, the operative complaint, applicable Court orders, and other documents as directed by the Parties and the Court. In addition, the website will include a "Contact Us" page whereby Class Members can send an email with any additional questions to a dedicated email address.

24. The website will be designed to be ADA-compliant and optimized for mobile visitors so that information loads quickly on mobile devices. Additionally, the website will be

designed to maximize search engine optimization through Google and other search engines. Keywords and natural language search terms will be included in the website's metadata to maximize search engine rankings.

25. A toll-free hotline devoted to this case will be created and provided on the dedicated website to further apprise Class Members of the rights and options in the litigation. The toll-free hotline will utilize an interactive voice response ("IVR") system to provide Class Members with responses to frequently asked questions and other essential information regarding the litigation. The hotline will be accessible 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Class Members will have the ability to request a copy of the Long Form Notice via the toll-free hotline.

CONCLUSION

26. The Notice Plan outlined above provides for the dissemination of notice via email or mail to all reasonably identifiable Class Members, combined with the implementation of a dedicated website and toll-free telephone support to further inform Class Members of their rights and options in the litigation.

27. In my professional opinion, the Notice Plan described herein will provide full and proper notice to Class Members before the applicable exclusion deadline. Moreover, it is my opinion that Notice Plan is the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, fully comports with due process and Rule 23 of the North Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure.

28. After the Notice Plan has concluded, Angeion will provide a final report verifying its effective implementation to this Court.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: May 28, 2026


STEPHANIE E. SAUNDERS

Exhibit A

INNOVATION

IT'S PART OF OUR DNA

Class Action Administration | Mass Arbitration Administration
Mass Tort Services | Regulatory Remediation

Judicial Recognition



IN RE: NOVARTIS AND PAR ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 1:18-cv-04361-AKH-SDA (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Stewart D. Aaron, United States Magistrate Judge (July 26, 2024): The Court finds that the claims process administered by Angeion has integrity and has been carried out in a diligent and thorough manner...Based upon the Court's review of the record, the Court finds that **Angeion has taken prudent and necessary steps to address the fraudulent claims submitted in this case... Angeion's fraud detection system is robust and appropriately designed to weed out fraudulent claims.**

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION

Case No. 3:18-md-02843 (N.D. Cal.)

Meta agreed to pay \$725 million to settle allegations that the social media company allowed third parties, including Cambridge Analytica, to access personal information. Angeion undertook an integrated in-app notification and media campaign to a class in the hundreds of millions of individuals and processed 28.6 million claims, the most claims filed in the history of class action. In fact, during the September 7, 2023, Final Approval Hearing, U.S. District Judge Chhabria acknowledged the record number of claims filed, stating, **"I was kind of blown away by how many people made claims."**

IN RE: FAMILY DOLLAR STORES, INC. PEST INFESTATION LITIGATION

Case No. 2:22-md-03032-SHL-TMP (W.D. Tenn.)

The Honorable Sheryl H. Lipman (May 6, 2024): **The Declaration of Steven Weisbrot of Angeion highlighted the success of the notice program.** (ECF No. 199 (sealed).) Angeion sent an email to 444,382 potential class members, along with a reminder email to 440,889 potential class members who had not yet filed a claim form. Approximately 80.62% of the target audience of the Class saw the advertisements that were part of the digital media campaign. The Settlement Website had more than 1,263,103 visits with 1,190,744 unique visitors. The toll-free telephone line received 1,123 calls totaling 4,830 minutes. (*Id.*) **This high engagement rate supports the Court's previous finding that notice was adequate in this case.**

IN RE: PHILLIPS RECALLED CPAP, BI-LEVEL PAP, AND MECHANICAL VENTILATOR PRODUCTS LITIGATION

Case No. 2:21-mc-01230 (MDL No. 3014) (W.D. Pa.)

The Honorable Joy Flowers Conti (April 25, 2024): Here, before granting preliminary approval, **the court closely scrutinized the Notice Program and notice forms**...Based on the declaration of Steven Weisbrot, Esq, President and Chief Executive Officer of the claims administrator, Angeion Group, LLC, "the Notice Plan was designed to target a wide variety of geographic and demographic markets to reach User members of the Settlement Class and deliver an approximate 86.70% reach." (ECF No. 2657-1 ¶ 31). As part of a multi-faceted approach, the Notice Plan included: mailed notice to 4,981,572 eligible users, whose addresses were verified through the United States Postal Service's National Change of Address database; emailed notice to the 2,912,887 valid email addresses identified for registered users and 2,556 valid email addresses identified as potential third-party Payers; user media notice through advertisements on Spotify, Pandora, and Sirius XM; publication notice in magazines, *i.e.*, Southern Living, Sports Illustrated, and People; media notice to Payers consisting of "digital programmatic display advertising, social media advertising via Facebook and LinkedIn, and an additional paid search campaign via Google, all of which were separate and apart from the User media campaign and were specifically designed to reach Payer Settlement Class Members;" publication notice directed toward Payers in HR Magazine; mailed notice via first-class mail to Durable Medical Equipment providers; and press releases. (*Id.* at 2-8). These efforts exceeded the desired threshold of 86.7% and reached approximately 90% of the class. (ECF No. 2657-1 ¶ 31). The Notice Plan meets all the requirements of Rule 23...Under these circumstances, the notice was directed to the putative class members in the best way practicable under the circumstances.

DECOSTANZO V. GLAXOSMITHKLINE PLC AND GLAXOSMITHKLINE LLC

Case No. 2:21-cv-04869-NJC-AYS (E.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Nusrat J. Choudhury (February 16, 2026): The Court finds that the Notice Plan...(a) will constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the

circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, the terms of the proposed settlement, and their rights under the proposed settlement, including, but not limited to, their rights to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed settlement; (c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members and other persons entitled to receive notice; (d) meet all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, Rule 23(c), the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States Constitution, and any other applicable laws...The Court further finds that all of the notices are written in simple terminology, are clear and readily understandable, and are materially consistent with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

RUGG-HARRELL v. TREEHOUSE FOODS, INC.

Case No. 1:24-cv-10992 (N.D. Ill.)

The Honorable Sharon Johnson Coleman (February 13, 2026): The Court finds that the publication of the Notice, Summary Notice, and Claim Form: (i) complied with the Preliminary Approval Order; (ii) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (iii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated to apprise Settlement Class Members of the effect of the Settlement, of the proposed Plan of Allocation, of Lead Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of Litigation Expenses incurred in connection with the prosecution of the Action, of Settlement Class Members' right to object or seek exclusion from the Settlement Class, and of their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (iv) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (v) satisfied the notice requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause).

NOBEL v. SOUTH FLORIDA STADIUM D/B/A HARD ROCK STADIUM

Case No. 1:24-cv-22751-BB (S.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Beth Bloom (November 25, 2025): The Court approves, in form and content, the Class Notice and Claim Form, attached to the Settlement Agreement as Exhibits A, B, C, and D, and finds that they meet the requirements of the Rules of Civil Procedure and satisfy Due Process requirements under the U.S. Constitution... The Court finds that the Class Notice Program as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, (a) is the best practicable notice, (b) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice, (c) is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Classes of the pendency of the Litigation and of their rights with respect to the Settlement, and (d) meets all applicable requirements of applicable law. The Class Notice Program satisfies the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process.

CAMPBELL v. SIRIUS XM RADIO, INC.

Case No. 2:22-cv-02261-CSB-EIL (C.D. Ill.)

The Honorable Colin S. Bruce (November 10, 2025): The Court finds that the proposed notice program set forth in the Settlement Agreement satisfies the requirements of due process and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Constitution of the United States (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable law and rules. The notice program provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances. It is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency and nature of this Litigation, the scope of the Settlement Class, the terms and effect of the Settlement Agreement...

MARBLE v. HALO INNOVATIONS, INC.

Case No. 1:23-cv-11048-JGLC (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Jessica G.L. Clarke (October 14, 2025): [T]he settlement administrator, Angeion, has notified Settlement Class Members of the Settlement by (a) direct notice via emailing each member of the Settlement Class for whom Angeion has an email address; (b) direct notice via mailing postcard notice to each member of the Settlement Class who did not have a valid email address but had a mailing address; (c) implementing a media campaign consisting of targeted internet banner notice, social media notice, and a paid search campaign; and (d) implementing a dedicated settlement website and toll-free telephone line

where Settlement Class Members can learn about their rights and options pursuant to the terms of the Settlement. The form and methods of notifying the Settlement Class of the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement Agreement met the requirements of Fed R. Civ. P. 23, due process, and any other applicable law, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

LOPEZ v. APPLE INC.

Case No. 4:19-cv-04577-JSW (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Jeffrey S. White (September 4, 2025): The form, manner, and content of the Email Notice, Full Class Notice, Publication Notice, and Settlement Website were the best notice practicable under the circumstances, satisfied due process, provided adequate information to the Settlement Class of all matters relating to the Settlement, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e)(1) and due process.

LE v. ZUFFA, LLC

Case No. 2:15-cv-01045 (D. Nev.)

The Honorable Richard F. Boulware, II (March 3, 2025): Upon review of the record, the Court now finds that the program for providing notice to the Class was effectuated in accordance with the Court's approved Notice Plan and thus constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice of the Settlement; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B) and 23(e)(1), due process, and any other applicable law. Therefore, the form and manner of dissemination of the notice of the Settlement to the Class are finally approved.

BROOKS v. THOMSON REUTERS CORPORATION

Case No. 3:21-cv-01418-EMC (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward M. Chen (February 21, 2025): The notice was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the proposed Settlement...Further, the Notice Plan constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and satisfied due process and provided adequate information to the Settlement Class of all matters relating to the Settlement, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e)(1) and any other applicable state and/or federal laws.

IN RE: SERESTO FLEA AND TICK COLLAR MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND PRODUCT LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 1:21-cv-04447, MDL No. 3009 (N.D. Ill.)

The Honorable John Robert Black (January 6, 2025): The Court finds that the Class Notice Program implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Order preliminarily approving the Settlement (ECF No. 192): (i) constituted the best practicable notice, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, of their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement, of their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing, and of their right to seek monetary and other relief, (iii) constituted reasonable, due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and (iv) met all applicable requirements of due process and any other applicable law.

KATZ-LACABE v. ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

Case No. 3:22-cv-04792-RS (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Richard Seeborg (November 15, 2024): The Notice Plan constituted sufficient notice practicable under the circumstances to all Settlement Class Members and was successfully implemented by the Settlement Administrator, effecting Class Notice that fully complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process....The Settlement Administrator effectively administered the Claims program pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Order Granting Preliminary Approval and that the Claims process was fair, reasonable and adequate.

BRAUN v. THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, LLC

Case No. 2:22-cv-04185 (E.D. Pa.)

The Honorable John M. Younge (August 8, 2024): The proposed form and manner of notice to members of the Settlement Class set forth in the Weisbrot Declaration...along with the proposed methods of dissemination of notice described therein, satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process, are otherwise fair and reasonable, and therefore are approved.

GUIDA v. GAIA, INC.

Case No. 1:22-cv-02350 (D. Colo.)

The Honorable Gordon P. Gallagher (July 19, 2024): The Court has carefully considered the forms and methods of notice to the Settlement Class set forth in the Settlement ("Notice Plan"). The Court finds that the Notice Plan constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and fully satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of due process, and the requirements of any other applicable law...The Court further finds that the Notice constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto, and meets the requirements of Due Process. Accordingly, the Court finds that no notice other than that specifically identified in the Settlement is necessary in this Action.

FERNANDEZ v. CORELOGIC CREDCO, LLC

Case No. 3:20-cv-01262 (S.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Jeffrey T. Miller (June 20, 2024): The court approved notice of this class action and proposed settlement in the June 16, 2024, Preliminary Approval Order. The Agreement called for sending the Notice directly to class members through email ("email notice") and/or via U.S. Mail. ("notice packet"). In support of his Motions, Plaintiff has filed the Declaration of Lacey Rose, who is employed as a "Senior Project Manager with Angeion," and the Declaration of Steven Weisbrot, the President and Chief Executive Officer of Angeion, the Settlement Administrator retained in this matter. See generally, Doc. No. 316-5, Doc. No. 329. Both declarations detail the actions taken by the Administrator...Accordingly, ***the court determines that the Notice in the case was copious, impressive, more than adequate***, and satisfied both the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, giving the settlement class members adequate notice of the Settlement.

JONES v. VARSITY BRANDS, LLC

Case No. 2:20-cv-02892 (W.D. Tenn.)

The Honorable Sheryl H. Lipman (June 18, 2024): Indirect Purchasers have retained Angeion to serve as Settlement Administrator...***Angeion has designed a multi-layered sophisticated plan*** using a combination of Internet, email, publication, social media...The Notice Plan adequately apprises all potential class members of the terms of the Settlement Agreement, provides the opportunity to make informed decisions, and comports with due process.

SALINAS v. BLOCK, INC.

Case No. 3:22-cv-04823 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Sallie Kim (June 3, 2024): The Court...(b) finds and determines that emailing the Summary Notice, reminder emails to Class Members (if available), and publication of the Settlement Agreement, Long Form Notice, Summary Notice, and Claim Form on the Settlement Website, supplemented by any social media and print media advertisements deemed appropriate by the Parties (i) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) constitutes notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action...(iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (iv) satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Constitution of the United States (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable laws and rules.

ESPOSITO v. CELLCO PARTNERSHIP D/B/A VERIZON WIRELESS

Case No. MID-L-006360-23 (N.J. Super. Ct.)

The Honorable Ana C. Viscomi (April 26, 2024): The Court finds that such Notice program, including the approved forms of notice: (a) constituted the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances; (b) included direct individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, as well as appropriate reminder notices; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members...(d) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (e) met all applicable requirements of N.J. Ct. R. 4:32-1 and 4:32-2, Due Process under the U.S. Constitution, and any other applicable law.

KUKORINIS v. WALMART, INC.

Case No. 8:22-cv-02402 (M.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Virginia M. Hernandez Covington (January 19, 2024): The Notice Plan, including the form of the notices and methods for notifying the Settlement Class of the Settlement and its terms and conditions...a. meet the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (including Rule 23 (c)-(e)), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and the Rules of this Court; b. constitute the best notice to Settlement Class Members practicable under the circumstances...

IN RE: KIA HYUNDAI VEHICLE THEFT MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 8:22-mj-03052 (C.D. Cal.)

The Honorable James V. Selna (October 31, 2023): The Court has considered the form and content of the Class notice program and finds that the Class notice program and methodology as described in the Settlement Agreement (a) meet the requirements of due process and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c) and (e); (b) constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all persons entitled to notice; and (c) satisfies the constitutional requirements regarding notice.

AMANS v. TESLA, INC.

Case No. 3:21-cv-03577 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Vince Chhabria (October 20, 2023): The Court further finds that the Notice is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that the Notice complies fully with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court also finds that the Notice constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto, and meets the requirements of Due Process. The Court further finds that the Notice is reasonably calculated, under all circumstances, to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of this case, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the right to object to the Settlement, and the right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class.

IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAMS PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 2:18-mn-02873 (D.S.C.)

The Honorable Richard Mark Gergel (August 29, 2023): The Court also approves the proposed Notice Plan set forth in Exhibit C to the Settlement Agreement...The proposed Notice Plan is the best practicable notice under the circumstances of this case; is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise potential Class Members of the Settlement Agreement and of their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement Class; is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive it; and meets all applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the United States Constitution, and other applicable laws and rules.

LUNDY v. META PLATFORMS, INC.

Case No. 3:18-cv-06793 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable James Donato (April 26, 2023): For purposes of Rule 23(e), the Notice Plan submitted with the Motion for Preliminary Approval and the forms of notice attached thereto are approved...The form, content, and method of giving notice to the Settlement Class as described in the Notice Plan submitted

with the Motion for Preliminary Approval are accepted at this time as practicable and reasonable in light of the rather unique circumstances of this case.

IN RE: FACEBOOK INTERNET TRACKING LITIGATION

Case No. 5:12-md-02314 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward J. Davila (November 10, 2022): The Court finds that Plaintiffs' notice meets all applicable requirements of due process and is particularly impressed with Plaintiffs' methodology and use of technology to reach as many Class Members as possible. Based upon the foregoing, the Court finds that the Settlement Class has been provided adequate notice.

MEHTA v. ROBINHOOD FINANCIAL LLC

Case No. 5:21-cv-01013 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Susan van Keulen (August 29, 2022): The proposed notice plan, which includes direct notice via email, will provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances. This plan and the Notice are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members...The plan and the Notice constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to Class Members and satisfy the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, and all other applicable laws and rules.

IN RE: TIKTOK, INC., CONSUMER PRIVACY LITIGATION

Case No. 1:20-cv-04699 (N.D. Ill.)

The Honorable John Z. Lee (August 22, 2022): The Class Notice was disseminated in accordance with the procedures required by the Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval...in accordance with applicable law, satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process, and constituted the best notice practicable...

ADTRADER, INC. v. GOOGLE LLC

Case No. 5:17-cv-07082 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Beth L. Freeman (May 13, 2022): The Court approves, as to form, content, and distribution, the Notice Plan set forth in the Settlement Agreement, including the Notice Forms attached to the Weisbrot Declaration, subject to the Court's one requested change as further described in Paragraph 8 of this Order, and finds that such Notice is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that the Notice complies fully with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court further finds that the Notice is reasonably calculated to, under all circumstances, reasonably apprise members...The Court also finds that the Notice constitutes valid, due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto, and meets the requirements of Due Process. The Court further finds that the Notice Plan fully complies with the Northern District of California's Procedural Guidance for Class Action Settlements.

CITY OF LONG BEACH v. MONSANTO COMPANY

Case No. 2:16-cv-03493 (C.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Fernando M. Olguin (March 14, 2022): The court approves the form, substance, and requirements of the class Notice, (Dkt.278-2, Settlement Agreement, Exh. I). The proposed manner of notice of the settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and complies with the requirements of due process.

STEWART v. LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA RETRIEVAL SERVICES, LLC

Case No. 3:20-cv-00903 (E.D. Va.)

The Honorable John A. Gibney Jr. (February 25, 2022): The proposed forms and methods for notifying the proposed Settlement Class Members of the Settlement and its terms and conditions meet the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to notice...Based on the foregoing, the Court hereby approves the notice plans developed by the Parties and the Settlement Administrator and directs that they be implemented according to the Agreement and the notice plans attached as exhibits.

WILLIAMS v. APPLE INC.

Case No. 3:19-cv-04700 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Laurel Beeler (February 24, 2022): The Court finds the Email Notice and Website Notice (attached to the Agreement as Exhibits 1 and 4, respectively), and their manner of transmission, implemented pursuant to the Agreement (a) are the best practicable notice, (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Subscriber Class of the pendency of the Action and of their right to object to or to exclude themselves from the proposed settlement, (c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and (d) meet all requirements of applicable law.

CLEVELAND v. WHIRLPOOL CORPORATION

Case No. 0:20-cv-01906 (D. Minn.)

The Honorable Wilhelmina M. Wright (December 16, 2021): It appears to the Court that the proposed Notice Plan described herein, and detailed in the Settlement Agreement, comports with due process, Rule 23, and all other applicable law. Class Notice consists of email notice and postcard notice when email addresses are unavailable, which is the best practicable notice under the circumstances...The proposed Notice Plan complies with the requirements of Rule 23, Fed. R. Civ. P., and due process, and Class Notice is to be sent to the Settlement Class Members as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and pursuant to the deadlines above.

RASMUSSEN v. TESLA, INC. D/B/A TESLA MOTORS, INC.

Case No. 5:19-cv-04596 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Beth Labson Freeman (December 10, 2021): The Court has carefully considered the forms and methods of notice to the Settlement Class set forth in the Settlement Agreement ("Notice Plan"). The Court finds that the Notice Plan constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and fully satisfies the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of due process, and the requirements of any other applicable law, such that the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the releases provided for therein, and this Court's final judgment will be binding on all Settlement Class Members.

CAMERON v. APPLE INC.

Case No. 4:19-cv-03074 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers (November 16, 2021): The parties' proposed notice plan appears to be constitutionally sound in that plaintiffs have made a sufficient showing that it is: (i) the best notice practicable; (ii) reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Class members of the proposed settlement and of their right to object or to exclude themselves as provided in the settlement agreement; (iii) reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) meet all applicable requirements of due process and any other applicable requirements under federal law.

RISTO v. SCREEN ACTORS GUILD - AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TELEVISION AND RADIO ARTISTS

Case No. 2:18-cv-07241 (C.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Christina A. Snyder (November 12, 2021): The Court approves the publication notice plan presented to this Court as it will provide notice to potential class members through a combination of traditional and digital media that will consist of publication of notice via press release, programmatic display digital advertising, and targeted social media, all of which will direct Class Members to the Settlement website...The notice plan satisfies any due process concerns as this Court certified the class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(1)...

JENKINS v. NATIONAL GRID USA SERVICE COMPANY, INC.

Case No. 2:15-cv-01219 (E.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Joanna Seybert (November 8, 2021): Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1) and 23(c)(2)(B), the Court approves the proposed Notice Plan and procedures set forth at Section 8 of the Settlement...The Court finds that the proposed Notice Plan meets the requirements of due process under the United States Constitution and Rule 23, and that such Notice Plan—which includes direct notice to Settlement Class Members sent via first class U.S. Mail and email; the establishment of a Settlement Website (at the URL, www.nationalgridtcpasettlement.com) where Settlement Class Members can view the full settlement agreement, the detailed long-form notice (in English and Spanish), and other key case documents; publication notice in forms attached as Exhibits E and F to the Settlement sent via social media (Facebook and Instagram) and streaming radio (e.g., Pandora and iHeart Radio). The Notice Plan shall also include a paid search campaign on search engine(s) chosen by Angeion (e.g., Google) in the form attached as Exhibits G and the establishment of a toll-free telephone number where Settlement Class Members can get additional information—is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

NELLIS v. VIVID SEATS, LLC

Case No. 1:20-cv-02486 (N.D. Ill.)

The Honorable Robert M. Dow, Jr. (November 1, 2021): The Notice Program, together with all included and ancillary documents thereto, (a) constituted reasonable notice; (b) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Litigation...(c) constituted reasonable, due, adequate and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) met all applicable requirements of due process and any other applicable law. The Court finds that Settlement Class Members have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice fully satisfies all requirements of law as well as all requirements of due process.

PELLETIER v. ENDO INTERNATIONAL PLC

Case No. 2:17-cv-05114 (E.D. Pa.)

The Honorable Michael M. Baylson (October 25, 2021): The Court approves, as to form and content, the Notice of Pendency and Proposed Settlement of Class Action (the “Notice”), the Proof of Claim and Release form (the “Proof of Claim”), and the Summary Notice, annexed hereto as Exhibits A-1, A-2, and A-3, respectively, and finds that the mailing and distribution of the Notice and publishing of the Summary Notice, substantially in the manner and form set forth in ¶¶7-10 of this Order, meet the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled thereto.

BIEGEL v. BLUE DIAMOND GROWERS

Case No. 7:20-cv-03032 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Cathy Seibel (October 25, 2021): The Court finds that the Notice Plan, set forth in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order: (i) was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated to provide, and did provide, due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class regarding the existence and nature of the Action...and (iii) satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable law.

QUINTERO v. SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Case No. 37-2019-00017834-CU-NP-CTL (Cal. Super. Ct.)

The Honorable Eddie C. Sturgeon (September 27, 2021): The Court has reviewed the class notices for the Settlement Class and the methods for providing notice and has determined that the parties will employ forms and methods of notice that constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances; are reasonably calculated to apprise class members of the terms of the Settlement and of their right to participate in it, object, or opt-out; are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all

persons entitled to receive notice; and meet all constitutional and statutory requirements, including all due process requirements and the California Rules of Court.

HOLVE v. MCCORMICK & COMPANY, INC.

Case No. 6:16-cv-06702 (W.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Mark W. Pedersen (September 23, 2021): The Court finds that the form, content and method of giving notice to the Class as described in the Settlement Agreement and the Declaration of the Settlement Administrator: (a) will constitute the best practicable notice; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action...(c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members and other persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) meet all applicable requirements of law, including but not limited to 28 U.S.C. § 1715, Rule 23(c) and (e), and the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States Constitution.

CULBERTSON v. DELOITTE CONSULTING LLP

Case No. 1:20-cv-03962 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Lewis J. Liman (August 27, 2021): The notice procedures described in the Notice Plan are hereby found to be the best means of providing notice under the circumstances and, when completed, shall constitute due and sufficient notice of the proposed Settlement Agreement and the Final Approval Hearing to all persons affected by and/or entitled to participate in the Settlement Agreement, in full compliance with the notice requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process of law.

PULMONARY ASSOCIATES OF CHARLESTON PLLC v. GREENWAY HEALTH, LLC

Case No. 3:19-cv-00167 (N.D. Ga.)

The Honorable Timothy C. Batten, Sr. (August 24, 2021): Under Rule 23(c)(2), the Court finds that the content, format, and method of disseminating Notice, as set forth in the Motion, the Declaration of Steven Weisbrot filed on July 2, 2021, and the Settlement Agreement and Release, including notice by First Class U.S. Mail and email to all known Class Members, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies all requirements provided in Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process.

IN RE: BROILER CHICKEN GROWER ANTITRUST LITIGATION (NO II)

Case No. 6:20-md-02977 (E.D. Okla.)

The Honorable Robert J. Shelby (August 23, 2021): The Court approves the method of notice to be provided to the Settlement Class as set forth in Plaintiffs' Motion and Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Approval of the Form and Manner of Class Notice and Appointment of Settlement Administrator and Request for Expedited Treatment and the Declaration of Steven Weisbrot on Angeion Group Qualifications and Proposed Notice Plan...The Court finds and concludes that such notice: (a) is the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, and is reasonably calculated to reach the members of the Settlement Class and to apprise them of the Action, the terms and conditions of the Settlement, their right to opt out and be excluded from the Settlement Class, and to object to the Settlement; and (b) meets the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process.

ROBERTS v. AT&T MOBILITY, LLC

Case No. 3:15-cv-03418 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward M. Chen (August 20, 2021): The Court finds that such Notice program, including the approved forms of notice: (a) constituted the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances; (b) included direct individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, as well as supplemental notice via a social media notice campaign and reminder email and SMS notices; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the nature of this Action ...(d) constituted due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice; and (e) met all applicable requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, Due Process under the U.S. Constitution, and any other applicable law.

PYGIN v. BOMBAS, LLC

Case No. 4:20-cv-04412 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Jeffrey S. White (July 12, 2021): The Court also concludes that the Class Notice and Notice Program set forth in the Settlement Agreement satisfy the requirements of due process and Rule 23 and provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice and Notice Program are reasonably calculated to apprise Settlement Class Members of the nature of this Litigation, the Scope of the Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the right of Settlement Class Members to object to the Settlement Agreement or exclude themselves from the Settlement Class and the process for doing so, and of the Final Approval Hearing. Accordingly, the Court approves the Class Notice and Notice Program and the Claim Form.

WILLIAMS v. RECKITT BENCKISER LLC

Case No. 1:20-cv-23564 (S.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Jonathan Goodman (April 23, 2021): The Court approves, as to form and content, the Class Notice and Internet Notice submitted by the parties (Exhibits B and D to the Settlement Agreement or Notices substantially similar thereto) and finds that the procedures described therein meet the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process, and provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The proposed Class Notice Plan -- consisting of (i) internet and social media notice; and (ii) notice via an established a Settlement Website -- is reasonably calculated to reach no less than 80% of the Settlement Class Members.

IN RE: APPLE INC. DEVICE PERFORMANCE LITIGATION

Case No. 5:18-md-02827 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward J. Davila (March 17, 2021): Angeion undertook a comprehensive notice campaign...The notice program was well executed, far-reaching, and exceeded both Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B)'s requirement to provide the "best notice that is practicable under the circumstances" and Rule 23(e)(1)(B)'s requirement to provide "direct notice in a reasonable manner."

IN RE: GOOGLE PLUS PROFILE LITIGATION

Case No. 5:18-cv-06164 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward J. Davila (January 25, 2021): The Court further finds that the program for disseminating notice to Settlement Class Members provided for in the Settlement, and previously approved and directed by the Court (hereinafter, the "Notice Program"), has been implemented by the Settlement Administrator and the Parties, and such Notice Program, including the approved forms of notice, is reasonable and appropriate and satisfies all applicable due process and other requirements, and constitutes best notice reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Settlement Class Members.

NELSON v. IDAHO CENTRAL CREDIT UNION

Case No. CV03-20-00831, CV03-20-03221 (Idaho Jud. Dist.)

The Honorable Robert C. Naftz (January 19, 2021): The Court finds that the Proposed Notice here is tailored to this Class and designed to ensure broad and effective reach to it...The Parties represent that the operative notice plan is the best notice practicable and is reasonably designed to reach the settlement class members. The Court agrees.

IN RE: HANNA ANDERSSON AND SALESFORCE.COM DATA BREACH LITIGATION

Case No. 3:20-cv-00812 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward M. Chen (December 29, 2020): The Court finds that the Class Notice and Notice Program satisfy the requirements of due process and Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

IN RE: PEANUT FARMERS ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 2:19-cv-00463 (E.D. Va.)

The Honorable Raymond A. Jackson (December 23, 2020): The Court finds that the Notice Program...constitutes the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances and is valid, due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto and complies fully with the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2) and the due process requirements of the Constitution of the United States.

BENTLEY v. LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC.

Case No. 2:19-cv-13554 (D.N.J.)

The Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo (December 18, 2020): The Court finds that notice of this Settlement was given to Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order and constituted the best notice practicable of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, including the Litigation, the Settlement, and the Settlement Class Members' rights to object to the Settlement or opt out of the Settlement Class, to all Persons entitled to such notice, and that this notice satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and of due process.

IN RE: ALLURA FIBER CEMENT SIDING PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 2:19-mn-02886 (D.S.C.)

The Honorable David C. Norton (December 18, 2020): The proposed Notice provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances. It allows Settlement Class Members a full and fair opportunity to consider the proposed settlement. The proposed plan for distributing the Notice likewise is a reasonable method calculated to reach all members of the Settlement Class who would be bound by the settlement. There is no additional method of distribution that would be reasonably likely to notify Settlement Class Members who may not receive notice pursuant to the proposed distribution plan.

ADKINS v. FACEBOOK, INC.

Case No. 3:18-cv-05982 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable William Alsup (November 15, 2020): Notice to the class is "reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Tr. Co.*, 399 U.S. 306, 314 (1965).

IN RE: 21ST CENTURY ONCOLOGY CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION

Case No. 8:16-md-02737 (M.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Mary S. Scriven (November 2, 2020): The Court finds and determines that mailing the Summary Notice and publication of the Settlement Agreement, Long Form Notice, Summary Notice, and Claim Form on the Settlement Website, all pursuant to this Order, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constitute due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth in the notices to all persons entitled to receive such notices, and fully satisfies the of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and all other applicable laws and rules. The Court further finds that all of the notices are written in plain language and are readily understandable by Class Members.

MARINO v. COACH INC.

Case No. 1:16-cv-01122 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Valerie Caproni (August 24, 2020): The Court finds that the form, content, and method of giving notice to the Settlement Class as described in paragraph 8 of this Order: (a) will constitute the best practicable notice; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the proposed Settlement, and their rights under the proposed Settlement, including but not limited to their rights to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement and other rights under the terms of the Settlement Agreement; (c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members and other persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) meet all applicable requirements of law, including but not limited to 28 U.S.C. § 1715, Rule 23(c) and (e), and the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States Constitution. The Court

further finds that all of the notices are written in plain language, are readily understandable by Settlement Class Members, and are materially consistent with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

BROWN v. DIRECTV, LLC

Case No. 2:13-cv-01170 (C.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Dolly M. Gee (July 23, 2020): Given the nature and size of the class, the fact that the class has no geographical limitations, and the sheer number of calls at issue, the Court determines that these methods constitute the best and most reasonable form of notice under the circumstances.

IN RE: SSA BONDS ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 1:16-cv-03711 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Edgardo Ramos (July 15, 2020): The Court finds that the mailing and distribution of the Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice substantially in the manner set forth below meet the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to notice.

KJESSLER v. ZAAPPAAZ, INC.

Case No. 4:18-cv-00430 (S.D. Tex.)

The Honorable Nancy F. Atlas (July 14, 2020): The Court also preliminarily approves the proposed manner of communicating the Notice and Summary Notice to the putative Settlement Class, as set out below, and finds it is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constitutes due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive such notice, and fully satisfies the requirements of applicable laws, including due process and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

HESTER v. WALMART, INC.

Case No. 5:18-cv-05225 (W.D. Ark.)

The Honorable Timothy L. Brooks (July 9, 2020): The Court finds that the Notice and Notice Plan substantially in the manner and form set forth in this Order and the Agreement meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled thereto.

CLAY v. CYTOSPORT INC.

Case No. 3:15-cv-00165 (S.D. Cal.)

The Honorable M. James Lorenz (June 17, 2020): The Court approves the proposed Notice Plan for giving notice to the Settlement Class through publication, both print and digital, and through the establishment of a Settlement Website, as more fully described in the Agreement and the Claims Administrator's affidavits (docs. no. 222-9, 224, 224-1, and 232-3 through 232-6). The Notice Plan, in form, method, and content, complies with the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

GROGAN v. AARON'S INC.

Case No. 1:18-cv-02821 (N.D. Ga.)

The Honorable J.P. Boulee (May 1, 2020): The Court finds that the Notice Plan as set forth in the Settlement Agreement meets the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including direct individual notice by mail and email to Settlement Class Members where feasible and a nationwide publication website-based notice program, as well as establishing a Settlement Website at the web address of www.AaronsTCPASettlement.com, and satisfies fully the requirements the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the U.S. Constitution, and any other applicable law, such that the Settlement Agreement and Final Order and Judgment will be binding on all Settlement Class Members.

CUMMINGS v. BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Case No. D-202-CV-2001-00579 (N.M. Jud. Dist.)

The Honorable Carl Butkus (March 30, 2020): The Court has reviewed the Class Notice, the Plan of Allocation and Distribution and Claim Form, each of which it approves in form and substance. The Court finds that the form and methods of notice set forth in the Agreement: (i) are reasonable and the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) are reasonably calculated to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Lawsuit, of their rights to object to or opt-out of the Settlement, and of the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) meet the requirements of the New Mexico Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of due process under the New Mexico and United States Constitutions, and the requirements of any other applicable rules or laws.

SCHNEIDER v. CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC.

Case No. 4:16-cv-02200 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. (January 31, 2020): Given that direct notice appears to be infeasible, the third-party settlement administrator will implement a digital media campaign and provide for publication notice in People magazine, a nationwide publication, and the East Bay Times. SA § IV.A, C; Dkt. No. 205-12 at ¶¶ 13–23...The Court finds that the proposed notice process is “reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances,” to apprise all class members of the proposed settlement.” Roes, 944 F.3d at 1045 (citation omitted).

HANLEY v. TAMPA BAY SPORTS AND ENTERTAINMENT LLC

Case No. 8:19-cv-00550 (M.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Charlene Edwards Honeywell (January 7, 2020): The Court approves the form and content of the Class notices and claim forms substantially in the forms attached as Exhibits A-D to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the Class Notice program described in the Settlement is the best practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice program is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to inform the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of a Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement, Class Counsel’s attorney’s fees application and the request for a service award for Plaintiff, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement. The Class notices and Class Notice program constitute sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Class notices and Class Notice program satisfy all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the Constitutional requirement of Due Process.

CORCORAN v. CVS HEALTH

Case No. 4:15-cv-03504 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers (November 22, 2019): Having reviewed the parties’ briefings, plaintiffs’ declarations regarding the selection process for a notice provider in this matter and regarding Angeion Group LLC’s experience and qualifications, and in light of defendants’ non-opposition, the Court APPROVES Angeion Group LLC as the notice provider...Having considered the parties’ revised proposed notice program, the Court agrees that the parties’ proposed notice program is the “best notice that is practicable under the circumstances.” The Court is satisfied with the representations made regarding Angeion Group LLC’s methods for ascertaining email addresses from existing information in the possession of defendants. Rule 23 further contemplates and permits electronic notice to class members in certain situations. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).

PATORA v. TARTE, INC.

Case No. 7:18-cv-11760 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Kenneth M. Karas (October 2, 2019): The Court finds that the form, content, and method of giving notice to the Class as described in Paragraph 9 of this Order: (a) will constitute the best practicable notice; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class Members...(c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members and other persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) meet all applicable requirements of law,

including but not limited to 28 U.S.C. § 1715, Rule 23(c) and (e), and the Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution. The Court further finds that all of the notices are written in simple terminology, are readily understandable by Settlement Class Members, and are materially consistent with the Federal Judicial Center's illustrative class action notices.

CARTER v. GENERAL NUTRITION CENTERS, INC., AND GNC HOLDINGS, INC.

Case No. 2:16-cv-00633 (W.D. Pa.)

The Honorable Mark R. Hornak (September 9, 2019): The Court finds that the Class Notice and the manner of its dissemination described in Paragraph 7 above and Section VII of the Agreement constitutes the best practicable notice under the circumstances and is reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise proposed Settlement Class Members of the pendency of this action, the terms of the Agreement, and their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement Class. The Court finds that the notice is reasonable, that it constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and that it meets the requirements of due process, Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any other applicable laws.

CORZINE v. MAYTAG CORPORATION

Case No. 5:15-cv-05764 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Beth L. Freeman (August 21, 2019): The Court, having reviewed the proposed Summary Notice, the proposed FAQ, the proposed Publication Notice, the proposed Claim Form, and the proposed plan for distributing and disseminating each of them, finds and concludes that the proposed plan will provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies all requirements of federal and state laws and due process.

MEDNICK v. PRECOR, INC.

Case No. 1:14-cv-03624 (N.D. Ill.)

The Honorable Harry D. Leinenweber (June 12, 2019): Notice provided to Class Members pursuant to the Preliminary Class Settlement Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual email and mail notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, including information provided by authorized third-party retailers of Precor. Said notice provided full and adequate notice of these proceedings and of the matter set forth therein, including the proposed Settlement set forth in the Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of F.R.C.P. Rule 23 (e) and (h) and the requirements of due process under the United States and California Constitutions.

GONZALEZ v. TCR SPORTS BROADCASTING HOLDING LLP

Case No. 1:18-cv-20048 (S.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Darrin P. Gayles (May 24, 2019): The Court finds that notice to the class was reasonable and the best notice practicable under the circumstances, consistent with Rule 23(e)(1) and Rule 23(c)(2)(B).

ANDREWS v. THE GAP, INC.

Case No. CGC-18-567237 (Cal. Super. Ct.)

The Honorable Richard B. Ulmer Jr. (May 10, 2019): The Court finds that (a) the Full Notice, Email Notice, and Publication constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, (b) they constitute valid, due, and sufficient notice to all members of the Class, and (c) they comply fully with the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and other applicable law.

COLE v. NIBCO, INC.

Case No. 3:13-cv-07871 (D.N.J.)

The Honorable Freda L. Wolfson (April 11, 2019): The record shows, and the Court finds, that the Notice Plan has been implemented in the manner approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order. The

Court finds that the Notice Plan constitutes: (i) the best notice practicable to the Settlement Class under the circumstances; (ii) was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of this..., (iii) due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) notice that fully satisfies the requirements of the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, and any other applicable law.

DIFRANCESCO v. UTZ QUALITY FOODS, INC.

Case No. 1:14-cv-14744 (D. Mass.)

The Honorable Douglas P. Woodlock (March 15, 2019): The Court finds that the Notice plan and all forms of Notice to the Class as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Exhibits 2 and 6 thereto, as amended (the "Notice Program"), is reasonably calculated to, under all circumstances, apprise the members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of this action, the certification of the Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the right of members to object to the settlement or to exclude themselves from the Class. The Notice Program is consistent with the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

IN RE: CHRYSLER-DODGE-JEEP ECODIESEL MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

Case No. 3:17-md-02777 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Edward M. Chen (February 11, 2019): Also, the parties went through a sufficiently rigorous selection process to select a settlement administrator. See Proc. Guidance for Class Action Sett. ¶ 2; see also Cabraser Decl. ¶¶ 9-10. While the settlement administration costs are significant – an estimated \$1.5 million – they are adequately justified given the size of the class and the relief being provided.

In addition, the Court finds that the language of the class notices (short and long-form) is appropriate and that the means of notice – which includes mail notice, electronic notice, publication notice, and social media “marketing” – is the “best notice...practicable under the circumstances.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B); see also Proc. Guidance for Class Action Sett. ¶¶ 3-5, 9 (addressing class notice, opt-outs, and objections). The Court notes that the means of notice has changed somewhat, as explained in the Supplemental Weisbrot Declaration filed on February 8, 2019, so that notice will be more targeted and effective. See generally Docket No. 525 (Supp. Weisbrot Decl.) (addressing, inter alia, press release to be distributed via national newswire service, digital and social media marketing designed to enhance notice, and “reminder” first-class mail notice when AEM becomes available).

Finally, the parties have noted that the proposed settlement bears similarity to the settlement in the Volkswagen MDL. See Proc. Guidance for Class Action Sett. ¶ 11.

RYSEWYK v. SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION

Case No. 1:15-cv-04519 (N.D. Ill.)

The Honorable Manish S. Shah (January 29, 2019): The Court holds that the Notice and notice plan as carried out satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(e) and due process. This Court has previously held the Notice and notice plan to be reasonable and the best practicable under the circumstances in its Preliminary Approval Order dated August 6, 2018. (Dkt. 191) Based on the declaration of Steven Weisbrot, Esq. of Angeion Group (Dkt. No. 209-2), which sets forth compliance with the Notice Plan and related matters, the Court finds that the multi-pronged notice strategy as implemented has successfully reached the putative Settlement Class, thus constituting the best practicable notice and satisfying due process.

MAYHEW v. KAS DIRECT, LLC, AND S.C. JOHNSON & SON, INC.

Case No. 7:16-cv-06981 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Vincent J. Briccetti (June 26, 2018): In connection with their motion, plaintiffs provide the declaration of Steven Weisbrot, Esq., a principal at the firm Angeion Group, LLC, which will serve as the notice and settlement administrator in this case. (Doc. #101, Ex. F: Weisbrot Decl.) According to Mr.

Weisbrot, he has been responsible for the design and implementation of hundreds of class action administration plans, has taught courses on class action claims administration, and has given testimony to the Judicial Conference Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure on the role of direct mail, email, and digital media in due process notice. Mr. Weisbrot states that the internet banner advertisement campaign will be responsive to search terms relevant to “baby wipes, baby products, baby care products, detergents, sanitizers, baby lotion, [and] diapers,” and will target users who are currently browsing or recently browsed categories “such as parenting, toddlers, baby care, [and] organic products.” (Weisbrot Decl. ¶ 18). According to Mr. Weisbrot, the internet banner advertising campaign will reach seventy percent of the proposed class members at least three times each. (Id. ¶ 9). Accordingly, the Court approves of the manner of notice proposed by the parties as it is reasonable and the best practicable option for confirming the class members receive notice.

IN RE: OUTER BANKS POWER OUTAGE LITIGATION

Case No. 4:17-cv-00141 (E.D.N.C.)

The Honorable James C. Dever III (May 2, 2018): The court has reviewed the proposed notice plan and finds that the notice plan provides the best practicable notice under the circumstances and, when completed, shall constitute fair, reasonable, and adequate notice of the settlement to all persons and entities affected by or entitled to participate in the settlement, in full compliance with the notice requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process. Thus, the court approves the proposed notice plan.

GOLDEMBERG v. JOHNSON & JOHNSON CONSUMER COMPANIES, INC.

Case No. 7:13-cv-03073 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable Nelson S. Roman (November 1, 2017): Notice of the pendency of the Action as a class action and of the proposed Settlement, as set forth in the Settlement Notices, was given to all Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort, consistent with the terms of the Preliminary Approval Order. The form and method of notifying the Class of the pendency of the Action as a class action and of the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement met the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, and any other applicable law in the United States. Such notice constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

HALVORSON v. TALENTBIN, INC.

Case No. 3:15-cv-05166 (N.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Joseph C. Spero (July 25, 2017): The Court finds that the Notice provided for in the Order of Preliminary Approval of Settlement has been provided to the Settlement Class, and the Notice provided to the Settlement Class constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and was in full compliance with the notice requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.

IN RE: ASHLEY MADISON CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION

MDL No. 2669/Case No. 4:15-md-02669 (E.D. Mo.)

The Honorable John A. Ross (July 21, 2017): The Court further finds that the method of disseminating Notice, as set forth in the Motion, the Declaration of Steven Weisbrot, Esq. on Adequacy of Notice Program, dated July 13, 2017, and the Parties’ Stipulation—including an extensive and targeted publication campaign composed of both consumer magazine publications in People and Sports Illustrated, as well as serving 11,484,000 highly targeted digital banner ads to reach the prospective class members that will deliver approximately 75.3% reach with an average frequency of 3.04 —is the best method of notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies all requirements provided in Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and all Constitutional requirements including those of due process.

The Court further finds that the Notice fully satisfies Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process; provided, that the Parties, by agreement, may revise the Notice, the Claim

Form, and other exhibits to the Stipulation, in ways that are not material or ways that are appropriate to update those documents for purposes of accuracy.

TRAXLER v. PPG INDUSTRIES INC.

Case No. 1:15-cv-00912 (N.D. Ohio)

The Honorable Dan Aaron Polster (April 27, 2017): The Court hereby approves the form and procedure for disseminating notice of the proposed settlement to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Agreement. The Court finds that the proposed Notice Plan contemplated constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Action and their right to object to the proposed settlement or opt out of the Settlement Class in full compliance with the requirements of applicable law, including the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution and Rules 23(c) and (e). In addition, Class Notice clearly and concisely states in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the certified Settlement Class; (iii) the claims and issues of the Settlement Class; (iv) that a Settlement Class Member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the Court will exclude from the Settlement Class any member who requests exclusion; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Rule 23(c)(3).

IN RE: THE HOME DEPOT, INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION

Case No. 1:14-md-02583 (N.D. Ga.)

The Honorable Thomas W. Thrash Jr. (March 10, 2017): The Court finds that the form, content, and method of giving notice to the settlement class as described in the settlement agreement and exhibits: (a) constitute the best practicable notice to the settlement class; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise settlement class members of the pendency of the action, the terms of the proposed settlement, and their rights under the proposed settlement; (c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to those persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) satisfy the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the constitutional requirement of due process, and any other legal requirements. The Court further finds that the notice is written in plain language, uses simple terminology, and is designed to be readily understandable by settlement class members.

ROY v. TITFLEX CORPORATION T/A GASTITE AND WARD MANUFACTURING, LLC

Case No. 384003V (Md. Cir. Ct.)

The Honorable Ronald B. Rubin (February 24, 2017): What is impressive to me about this settlement is in addition to all the usual recitation of road racing litanies is that there is going to be a) public notice of a real nature and b) about a matter concerning not just money but public safety and then folks will have the knowledge to decide for themselves whether to take steps to protect themselves or not. And that's probably the best thing a government can do is to arm their citizens with knowledge and then the citizens can make decision. To me that is a key piece of this deal. ***I think the notice provisions are exquisite.***

IN RE: LG FRONT LOADING WASHING MACHINE CLASS ACTION LITIGATION

Case No. 2:08-cv-00051 (D.N.J.)

The Honorable Madeline Cox Arleo (June 17, 2016): This Court further approves the proposed methods for giving notice of the Settlement to the Members of the Settlement Class, as reflected in the Settlement Agreement and...finds that the Members of the Settlement Class will receive the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Court specifically approves the Parties' proposal to use reasonable diligence to identify potential class members and an associated mailing and/or email address in the Company's records, and their proposal to direct the ICA to use this information to send absent class members notice both via first class mail and email. The Court further approves the plan for the Publication Notice's publication in two national print magazines and on the internet. The Court also approves payment of notice costs as provided in the Settlement. The Court finds that these procedures, carried out with reasonable diligence, will constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances and will satisfy.

FENLEY v. APPLIED CONSULTANTS, INC.

Case No. 2:15-cv-00259 (W.D. Pa.)

The Honorable Mark R. Hornak (June 16, 2016): The Court would note that it approved notice provisions of the settlement agreement in the proceedings today. That was all handled by the settlement and administrator Angeion. The notices were sent. The class list utilized the Postal Service's national change of address database along with using certain proprietary and other public resources to verify addresses. the requirements of Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(c)(2), Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(e) (l), and Due Process....

The Court finds and concludes that the mechanisms and methods of notice to the class as identified were reasonably calculated to provide all notice required by the due process clause, the applicable rules and statutory provisions, and that the results of *the efforts of Angeion were highly successful and fulfilled all of those requirements.*

FUENTES v. UNIRUSH, LLC D/B/A UNIRUSH FINANCIAL SERVICES

Case No. 1:15-cv-08372 (S.D.N.Y.)

The Honorable J. Paul Oetken (May 16, 2016): The Court approves, as to form, content, and distribution, the Claim Form attached to the Settlement Agreement as Exhibit A, the Notice Plan, and all forms of Notice to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Exhibits B-D, thereto, and finds that such Notice is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and that the Notice complies fully with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court also finds that the Notice constitutes valid, due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto, and meets the requirements of Due Process. The Court further finds that the Notice is reasonably calculated to, under all circumstances, reasonably apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Actions, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the right to object to the settlement and to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class. The Parties, by agreement, may revise the Notices and Claim Form in ways that are not material, or in ways that are appropriate to update those documents for purposes of accuracy or formatting for publication.

IN RE: WHIRLPOOL CORP. FRONTLOADING WASHER PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIG.

MDL No. 2001/Case No. 1:08-wp-65000 (N.D. Ohio)

The Honorable Christopher A. Boyko (May 12, 2016): The Court, having reviewed the proposed Summary Notices, the proposed FAQ, the proposed Publication Notice, the proposed Claim Form, and the proposed plan for distributing and disseminating each of them, finds and concludes that the proposed plan for distributing and disseminating each of them will provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies all requirements of federal and state laws and due process.

SATERIALE v. R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO CO.

Case No. 2:09-cv-08394 (C.D. Cal.)

The Honorable Christina A. Snyder (May 3, 2016): The Court finds that the Notice provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order has been successful, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances and (1) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to the Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (2) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (3) met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Due Process, and the rules of the Court.

FERRERA v. SNYDER'S-LANCE, INC.

Case No. 0:13-cv-62496 (S.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Joan A. Lenard (February 12, 2016): The Court approves, as to form and content, the Long-Form Notice and Short-Form Publication Notice attached to the Memorandum in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement as Exhibits 1 and 2 to the Stipulation of Settlement. The Court also approves the procedure for disseminating notice of the proposed settlement to the Settlement

Class and the Claim Form, as set forth in the Notice and Media Plan attached to the Memorandum in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement as Exhibits G. The Court finds that the notice to be given constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class in full compliance with the requirements of applicable law, including the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

SOTO v. THE GALLUP ORGANIZATION, INC.

Case No. 0:13-cv-61747 (S.D. Fla.)

The Honorable Marcia G. Cooke (June 16, 2015): The Court approves the form and substance of the notice of class action settlement described in ¶ 8 of the Agreement and attached to the Agreement as Exhibits A, C and D. The proposed form and method for notifying the Settlement Class Members of the settlement and its terms and conditions meet the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) and due process, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to the notice. The Court finds that the proposed notice is clearly designed to advise the Settlement Class Members of their rights.

OTT v. MORTGAGE INVESTORS CORPORATION OF OHIO, INC.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00645 (D. Or.)

The Honorable Janice M. Stewart (July 20, 2015): The Notice Plan, in form, method, and content, fully complies with the requirements of Rule 23 and due process, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and is due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court finds that the Notice Plan is reasonably calculated to, under all circumstances, reasonably apprise the persons in the Settlement Class of the pendency of this action, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the right to object to the Settlement and to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class.

IN RE: POOL PRODUCTS DISTRIBUTION MARKET ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MDL No. 2328/Case No. 2:12-md-02328 (E.D. La.)

The Honorable Sarah S. Vance (December 31, 2014): To make up for the lack of individual notice to the remainder of the class, the parties propose a print and web-based plan for publicizing notice. The Court welcomes the inclusion of web-based forms of communication in the plan. The Court finds that the proposed method of notice satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process. The direct emailing of notice to those potential class members for whom Hayward and Zodiac have a valid email address, along with publication of notice in print and on the web, is reasonably calculated to apprise class members of the settlement. Moreover, the plan to combine notice for the Zodiac and Hayward settlements should streamline the process and avoid confusion that might otherwise be caused by a proliferation of notices for different settlements. Therefore, the Court approves the proposed notice forms and the plan of notice.

EXHIBIT B

Angeion Group Project Proposal Schedule of Fees and Charges



Case/Project Name: Carteret County - Scenario #4- 60K reverse look-up
Type of Case: Class Certification Notice
Submission Date: April 29, 2026
Firm(s) Submitted to: Bryson, Harris, Suciu & DeMay, PLLC
Firm(s) Contact: Scott Harris, Esq. / Jim DeMay, Esq.
Angeion Representative: Stephanie Saunders, Esq. / Michael Lynch, Esq.
Angeion Record ID: 59021352360

Core Assumptions	
Class Size (est.)	60,000
Duration (mo.)	6
Notice Format	Email, Single Postcard
Number of Email Notices	39,000
Pct. of Undeliverable Email	8%
Number of Mailed Notices	24,120
Pct. of Undeliverable Mail	10%
Website	Yes, static
Telephone Support	Yes, IVR (automated)

Case Management Fee	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Case/project start-up fee may include pre-administration consulting, preparing the technology environment, establishing project management workflows, and database set-up/management.	1	One-Time Fee	1,500.00	1,500.00
			SUBTOTAL	1,500.00

Notification List Development & Data Enrichment	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
First Reverse look-up/Skip-trace to obtain <i>class member email addresses</i>				
Input: Names and mailing address	39,000	Per Hit	0.04	1,560.00
Output: Email Address (65% hit rate)				
Set up, formatting and proofing the email notice, <i>single postcard notice</i> , long form notice, & other notice materials	6	Per Hour	185.00	1,110.00
Generate the list of applicable addresses and standardizing the list	8	Per Hour	165.00	1,320.00
			SUBTOTAL	3,990.00

Email Notice	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Release email blast to class members with valid email	39,000	Per Email	0.05	1,950.00
<i>Estimated number of emails that did not validate and hard email bounces (est. @ 8%)</i>	3,120			
			SUBTOTAL	1,950.00

Direct Mail Notices	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
NCOA (National Change of Address)	1	One-Time Fee	195.00	195.00
Printing the Single Postcard notice	24,120	Per Notice	0.11	2,653.20
Postage estimate for notices*	24,120	Per Notice	0.43	10,371.60
			SUBTOTAL	13,219.80

Processing Undeliverables	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Process notices returned as undeliverable (est. @ 10%)	2,412	Per Notice	0.50	1,206.00
Residential Address Verification (Skip tracing) assuming a 60% hit rate on initial mail	1,448	Per Hit	0.30	434.40
Print returned notices & notices that have a forwarding address (est. @ 1%)	1,473	Per Notice	0.50	736.50
Postage estimate for remailing returned notices to a new address*	1,473	Per Notice	0.44	648.12
			SUBTOTAL	3,025.02

Processing Notice Requests & Class Member Correspondence	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Class member correspondence	15	Per Hour	85.00	1,275.00
Receive and respond to requests for Long Form Notice, and/or Special letter (includes printing and data entry)	10	Per Notice	5.00	50.00
Postage estimate for claimant responses & request for Notice*	10	Per Notice/Letter	0.74	7.40
			SUBTOTAL	1,332.40

Case Website	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Set-up fee for Angeion Group website with relevant case documents	1	One-Time Fee	1,250.00	1,250.00
Optional: Online opt-out form, if required	-	One-Time Fee	1,250.00	-
Monthly maintenance/monthly hosting	6	Per Month	250.00	1,500.00
Website Development and Additional Programming Time (if required)	2.5	Per Hour	190.00	475.00
			SUBTOTAL	3,225.00

Angeion Group Project Proposal Schedule of Fees and Charges



Case/Project Name:	Carteret County - Scenario #4- 60K reverse look-up
Type of Case:	Class Certification Notice
Submission Date:	April 29, 2026
Firm(s) Submitted to:	Bryson, Harris, Suciu & DeMay, PLLC
Firm(s) Contact:	Scott Harris, Esq. / Jim DeMay, Esq.
Angeion Representative:	Stephanie Saunders, Esq. / Michael Lynch, Esq.
Angeion Record ID:	59021352360

Call Center Requirements	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Set-up, design and implementation of IVR (Integrated Voice Response)	1	One-Time Fee	2,500.00	2,500.00
"IVR" Operating System (estimated number of minutes, 1% of class call using 3 minutes ea.)	1,800	Per Minute	0.20	360.00
Monthly Maintenance Fee	6	Per Month	125.00	750.00
Transcription Services Set Up Fee	1	One-Time Fee	450.00	450.00
Per Transcription Fee	20	Per Trans.	2.00	40.00
SUBTOTAL				4,100.00

Angeion Reporting Requirements	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Drafting court documents, affidavits, status reports and other counsel requested reporting	8	Per Hour	185.00	1,480.00
Project Management	10	Per Hour	185.00	1,850.00
Project Coordinator / Additional reporting	10	Per Hour	110.00	1,100.00
SUBTOTAL				4,430.00

Process Opt-Outs	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Review and process Opt-Outs received	10	Per Form	6.50	65.00
SUBTOTAL				65.00

Other Relevant Costs	VOLUME		RATE (\$)	TOTAL (\$)
Administration Consulting such as drafting notices and expert declarations	4	Per Hour	325.00	1,300.00
Sales tax if applicable		Estimated		-
P.O. Box for Opt-Outs	1	One-Time Fee	750.00	750.00
Photocopying			NO CHARGE	NO CHARGE
Scanning of all documents	131	Per Page	0.15	19.65
Document Storage (estimated for 6 months) (estimate 2500 documents per bankers box)	1	Per Box/Month	1.95	23.40
Data Hosting / Image Storage (estimated for 6 months)	6	Per Month	100.00	600.00
SUBTOTAL				2,693.05

ESTIMATED PROJECT FEES & COSTS (excl. postage)	28,503
ESTIMATED POSTAGE COSTS	11,027
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS	39,530

Expert & Staff Billable Rates for Additional Services			RATE (\$)
Partner / Notice Expert	Per Hour		875.00
Executive	Per Hour		600.00
Director	Per Hour		325.00
Senior Analyst	Per Hour		300.00
Operations Manager	Per Hour		290.00
Senior Programmer	Per Hour		250.00
Senior Project Manager	Per Hour		210.00
Programmer/Data Specialist	Per Hour		190.00
Project Manager / Associate Project Manager	Per Hour		185.00
Senior Staff Accountant	Per Hour		165.00
Staff Accountant	Per Hour		140.00
Senior Project Coordinator	Per Hour		140.00
Project Coordinator	Per Hour		110.00
Administrative Support	Per Hour		75.00

All notification costs (includes print/postage) must be paid 14 days prior to the inception of the program.

Notice printing costs are an estimate and are based upon volume, number of pages or other parameters. Pricing may increase or decrease if the volume, number of pages or other variable factors are altered.

Postcards/Notices are printed in one lot to achieve preferred/bulk rate pricing.

Notice cost estimates may be subject to change due to recent supply chain disruptions in the paper market.

The estimated hours listed in this proposal for services performed are minimum hourly estimates. Any additional time will be billed at the rates quoted in this proposal.

Schedule of fees is valid for ninety days, except postage. After which the estimated fees and costs may be subject to change or be withdrawn in its entirety.

The pricing contemplates that data will conform with standard data specifications. Processing non-conforming or unstructured data files may result in additional costs and/or be rejected.

* Postage costs are determined by the United States Postal Service and other postal carriers (collectively, the "Carriers") and are provided as estimates based on rates effective as of the date of this Proposal. Rates are subject to change at any time by the Carriers or other regulatory authorities without notice. All postage expenses, including rate increases, surcharges, or service adjustments, are beyond Angeion's control and must be paid to Angeion in accordance with the Terms and Conditions. Angeion is not responsible for delays, service disruptions, or delivery failures caused by the Carriers. In such cases, Angeion will make commercially reasonable efforts to mitigate the impact of such disruptions; provided, however, Angeion will have no liability related thereto, including for missed deadlines or legal obligations.

EXHIBIT C

From: NoticeAdministrator

To: «Class Member Email Address»

Subject Line: Armistead Jr. v. Carteret County – Notice of Class Action Lawsuit

Notice ID: «Notice ID»

«Class Member Name»

NOTICE OF CLASS CERTIFICATION

If you were charged or paid a Green Box Fee and/or Landfill Fee to Carteret County at any point on or after April 28, 2017, a class action lawsuit may affect your rights.

Armistead, Jr., et al. v. Carteret County
File No. 20-CVS-403

The Carteret County Superior Court has certified a class action lawsuit to litigate claims against Carteret County concerning the County's collection of Green Box Fees and Landfill Fees ("Fees"). **Your rights may be affected. Please read this notice carefully.**

What is the Lawsuit About? In the lawsuit, Plaintiffs allege that Carteret County's charges for the use and availability of its solid waste disposal sites ("Green Box Sites") violate North Carolina law. Plaintiffs are seeking monetary relief on behalf of the certified classes and injunctive relief to prevent Carteret County from continuing to charge and collect the Fees. Carteret County denies these allegations and has asserted numerous defenses. The Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiffs or Carteret County. There is no money available now and no guarantee that there will be. A tentative trial date has not been set by the Court at this time. Visit **WEBSITE** for updates and additional information about the lawsuit.

Who is Included? You are included in the lawsuit if you are a natural person, corporation, or other entity who, at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment:

- Paid a Green Box Fee to Carteret County but had a waste collection service, you are a member of The Green Box Fee/Waste Collection Class.
- Paid a Landfill Fee to Carteret County but had a waste collection service, you are a member of The Landfill Fee/Waste Collection Class.
- Were charged a Green Box and/or Landfill Fee, you are a member of The Solid Waste Fee/Cost to Operate Class.

What are your options? If you meet one of the certified class definitions, you are a Class Member in this lawsuit. As a Class Member, you can choose to remain in the lawsuit or opt-out of (or exclude yourself from) the lawsuit.

- To remain in the lawsuit, you do not have to do anything. By remaining in the lawsuit, any claims you have for damages or other relief against the County relating to the Claims alleged in this lawsuit will be determined in this case and cannot be presented in any other proceeding or lawsuit.
- If you do not want to remain in the lawsuit, you must file an Exclusion Request with the Court on or before **DEADLINE**. If you file an Exclusion Request, (a) you will not share in any recovery that might be obtained on behalf of the classes as a result of any judgment, trial, or settlement of this lawsuit, (b) you will not be bound by any decision favorable to Defendant that

may be rendered in this lawsuit, and (c) you may file your own lawsuit against Defendant, but you will be responsible for obtaining and paying your own attorney(s) to represent you and any expenses associated with your own lawsuit. Visit [WEBSITE](#) for complete details on how to exclude yourself from the lawsuit.

Do I Have a Lawyer in the Lawsuit? Yes. The Court has appointed Bryson Harris Suci Demay PLLC and Lewis & Roberts, PLLC as Class Counsel to represent members of the certified Classes. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your expense.

How Do I Get More Information? For additional information about the lawsuit, visit [WEBSITE](#) or call toll-free 1-[XXX-XXX-XXXX](#). You may also write to the Notice Administrator at: Carteret County Litigation Notice Administrator, 1650 Arch Street, Suite 2210, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

THIS NOTICE IS ONLY A SUMMARY.

For additional information, including your rights and options, answers to frequently asked questions, and important dates and deadlines, please visit [WEBSITE](#), call toll-free 1-[XXX-XXX-XXXX](#).

[Unsubscribe](#)

EXHIBIT D

COURT-APPROVED LEGAL NOTICE

Armistead, Jr., et al. v. Carteret County
File No. 20-CVS-403

If you were charged or paid a Green Box Fee and/or Landfill Fee to Carteret County at any point on or after April 28, 2017, a class action lawsuit may affect your rights.

THIS NOTICE IS ONLY A SUMMARY.

For additional information, including your rights and options, answers to frequently asked questions, and important dates and deadlines, please

visit **WEBSITE**, call toll-free
1-XXXX-XXXXXXX

Carteret County Litigation
Notice Administrator
1650 Arch Street, Suite 2210
Philadelphia, PA 19103

«ScanString»

Postal Service: Please do not mark barcode

Notice ID: «**Notice ID**»

«FirstName»«LastName»

«Address 1»

«Address 2»

«City», «StateCd»«Zip»

«CountryCd»

The Carteret County Superior Court has certified a class action lawsuit to litigate claims against Carteret County concerning the County's collection of Green Box Fees and Landfill Fees ("Fees"). **Your rights may be affected. Please read this notice carefully.**

What is the Lawsuit About? In the lawsuit, Plaintiffs allege that Carteret County's charges for the use and availability of its solid waste disposal sites ("Green Box Sites") violate North Carolina law. Plaintiffs are seeking monetary relief on behalf of the certified classes and injunctive relief to prevent Carteret County from continuing to charge and collect the Fees. Carteret County denies these allegations and has asserted numerous defenses. The Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiffs or Carteret County. There is no money available now and no guarantee that there will be. A tentative trial date has not been set by the Court at this time. Visit [WEBSITE](#) for updates and additional information about the lawsuit.

Who is Included? You are included in the lawsuit if you are a natural person, corporation, or other entity who, at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment:

- Paid a Green Box Fee to Carteret County but had a waste collection service, you are a member of The Green Box Fee/Waste Collection Class.
- Paid a Landfill Fee to Carteret County but had a waste collection service, you are a member of The Landfill Fee/Waste Collection Class.
- Were charged a Green Box and/or Landfill Fee, you are a member of The Solid Waste Fee/Cost to Operate Class.

What are your options? If you meet one of the certified class definitions, you are a Class Member in this lawsuit. As a Class Member, you can choose to remain in the lawsuit or opt-out of (or exclude yourself from) the lawsuit.

- To remain in the lawsuit, you do not have to do anything. By remaining in the lawsuit, any claims you have for damages or other relief against the County relating to the Claims alleged in this lawsuit will be determined in this case and cannot be presented in any other proceeding or lawsuit.
- If you do not want to remain in the lawsuit, you must file an Exclusion Request with the Court on or before **DEADLINE**. If you file an Exclusion Request, (a) you will not share in any recovery that might be obtained on behalf of the classes as a result of any judgment, trial, or settlement of this lawsuit, (b) you will not be bound by any decision favorable to Defendant that may be rendered in this lawsuit, and (c) you may file your own lawsuit against Defendant, but you will be responsible for obtaining and paying your own attorney(s) to represent you and any expenses associated with your own lawsuit. Visit [WEBSITE](#) for complete details on how to exclude yourself from the lawsuit.

Do I Have a Lawyer in the Lawsuit? Yes. The Court has appointed Bryson Harris Suciu Demay PLLC and Lewis & Roberts, PLLC as Class Counsel to represent members of the certified Classes. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your expense.

How Do I Get More Information? For additional information about the lawsuit, visit [WEBSITE](#) or call toll-free 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX. You may also write to the Notice Administrator at: Carteret County Litigation Notice Administrator, 1650 Arch Street, Suite 2210, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

EXHIBIT E

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CARTERET

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION
20-CVS-403

GEORGE ROBERT ARMISTEAD, JR.,
MADISON ARMISTEAD, GREG
RHODES, and WILLIAM YATES,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CARTERET COUNTY,

Defendant.

NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT

THIS NOTICE MAY AFFECT YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS.

A COURT AUTHORIZED THIS NOTICE.
THIS IS NOT A SOLICITATION FROM A LAWYER.
YOU ARE NOT BEING SUED.

PLEASE READ CAREFULLY.

If you have questions regarding the contents of this Notice, do **not** contact the Court, but instead, please contact Class Counsel as identified below in this Notice.

To Members of the Following Classes:

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Green Box Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.

and

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Landfill Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.

and

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) were charged a Green Box and/or a Landfill Fee.

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

You have been sent this Notice (the “Notice”) because you have been identified as a potential class member in the above-styled class action lawsuit among one or more of the defined classes above because Carteret County records indicate you were charged a Green Box Fee and/or Landfill Fee (collectively, the “Fees”) by Defendant Carteret County (the “County”).

Your rights may be affected by a lawsuit pending in the Superior Court of Carteret County, Case No. 20-CVS-403 (the “Lawsuit”). The Class Representatives sued the County and alleged that the Fees were not authorized by statute and/or the County’s ordinances and were thus invalid. The Court has allowed the Lawsuit to proceed as a class action on behalf of all individuals who are members of the above-defined classes.

The Court has not decided whether the County did anything wrong. The County has denied and continues to deny each and all of the claims alleged by Plaintiffs in the Lawsuit. There is no final judgment against the County. However, your legal rights are affected, and you have a choice to make now:

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS

DO NOTHING -- STAY IN THE CLASS

Stay in the Class. Await the outcome of the Lawsuit. Give up your right to file a separate lawsuit.

By doing nothing, you will share in any recovery if there is an award of damages against the County or a settlement that provides benefits to class members in the Lawsuit. You will give up any right to file a separate lawsuit on any claim that is or could have been included in this Lawsuit, and you will be bound by any final judgment entered in this case.

EXCLUDE YOURSELF FROM THE CLASS

Exclude yourself from the Class. Get no benefits from the Lawsuit. Keep your right to file a separate lawsuit.

By excluding yourself from the Class, you will not be bound by the outcome in this Lawsuit. This means that if there is an award of damages or a settlement that provides benefits to class members in the Lawsuit, you won’t share in those damages or benefits. You would maintain your right to file a separate lawsuit against the County on this issue, if you so choose.

- These rights and options – and the deadlines to exercise them – are explained in this Notice.
- Claims against the County must still be proven. If money or other benefits are in fact

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

obtained from the County, you will be notified about how your share of such money or other benefits will be distributed to you, if you have not excluded yourself from the Class.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why did I get this Notice?

The County's records indicate that you were charged and paid a Green Box Fee and/or Landfill Fee on or after April 28, 2017. The Court decided to allow a class action lawsuit to proceed against the County related to the lawfulness of charging the Fees. You have legal rights and options that you may exercise before trial. This Lawsuit will determine the outcome of the claims being made against the County. The Lawsuit may settle or be dismissed before a trial or on appeal.

North Carolina Superior Court Judge R. Kent Harrell (the "Court") is overseeing this case. The case is known as *George Robert Armistead, Jr., Madison Armistead, Greg Rhodes, and William Yates, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Carteret County*, Carteret County Case No. 20-CVS-403. The individuals who sued are called the "Plaintiffs." The County is called the "Defendant."

2. What is a class action and who is involved?

In a class action lawsuit one or more people called "Class Representatives" sue on behalf of other people who have similar claims. Together, those other people are "Class Members" and form a "Class." The Class Representatives who sued—and all the Class Members like them—are called the Plaintiffs. The entity they sued (in this case the County) is called the Defendant. One court resolves the issues for everyone in the Class—except for those people who choose to exclude themselves from the Class. The Class is represented by lawyers called "Class Counsel."

3. Why is this Lawsuit a class action?

The Court decided that this Lawsuit meets the requirements of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1A-1, Rule 23, which governs class actions in North Carolina courts. The Court's decision means the Lawsuit can proceed as a class action. Specifically, the Court found that the Class Members are sufficiently numerous, there are questions of law and fact that are common to all Class Members that predominate over questions affecting individual Class Members, the Class Representative's claims are typical of those of the Class, the Class Representative and Class Counsel are adequate to represent the Class, and proceeding as a Class is superior to the alternatives.

More information about the Court's Order Granting Motion for Class Certification is available at www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com.

THE CLAIMS IN THE LAWSUIT

4. What is the Lawsuit about?

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

This Lawsuit is about whether the County's Green Box Fees and/or Landfill Fees complied with N.C. Gen. Stat. § 153A-292(b) (the "Statute") and the County's Code of Ordinances §§ 14-56 to 14-59 (the "Ordinance") and whether the County must refund the Green Box and/or Landfill Fees. The Statute and the Ordinances govern the circumstances under which the County may charge solid waste fees.

Plaintiffs generally allege that: (1) the Green Box Fees violate the Statute and/or the Ordinance because the County charges Green Box Fees to properties receiving private waste collection service; (2) the Landfill Fees violate the Statute and/or the Ordinance because the County charges Landfill Fees to properties receiving private waste collection service; and (3) the Green Box Fees and Landfill Fees violate the Statute and/or the Ordinance because the amount of the Fees charged by the County exceed the County's costs to operate the Green Box Sites. Plaintiffs seek the refund of Green Box Fees and Landfill Fees charged and collected by the County from April 28, 2017 through the present, plus interest. These claims are described in Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint ("Complaint") at www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com.

The County denies Plaintiffs' claims and asserts multiple defenses. The County contends, among other things, that the Fees and the manner in which the County charged the fees are valid and authorized by the Statute and the Ordinance because the County properly charges the Fees absent documentation sufficient for the Tax Administrator to issue a release or exemption and the County had not collected Fees in excess of the costs of providing and operating solid waste disposal facilities. These defenses are described in Defendant's Answer to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint at www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com.

5. Has the Court decided who will win?

No. The Court has not decided and has not suggested who will win this case.

6. What are Plaintiffs asking for?

Plaintiffs are asking that the County be ordered to refund all Green Box Fees and Landfill Fees they contend were unlawfully collected, plus interest, and seek permanent injunctive relief to enjoin the County from continuing to charge and collect Fees in violation of the Statute and/or the Ordinance.

7. Is there any money available now?

No money or benefits are available now, and there is no proposed settlement of the Lawsuit at this time. The case is still in active litigation. There is no guarantee that money or benefits will be obtained by Class Members.

WHO IS IN THE CLASSES

8. Am I part of the Class(es)?

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

The Court has certified three Classes consisting of:

The Green Box Fee / Waste Collection Class

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Green Box Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.

The Landfill Fee / Waste Collection Class

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Landfill Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.

The Solid Waste Fee / Cost to Operate Class

All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) were charged a Green Box and/or a Landfill Fee

If someone who would otherwise be a Class Member is deceased, his or her legal representatives may be Class Members.

9. How can I confirm that I am in one or more Classes?

If you are not sure whether you are included in one or more Classes, you should consult the information at the website, www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com, which also contains information on how to contact Class Counsel.

YOUR RIGHTS AND OPTIONS

10. What happens if I do nothing at all?

You don't have to do anything now if you want to keep the possibility of getting money or benefits from this Lawsuit. By doing nothing you are staying in the Class(es) and you will be legally bound by the orders the Court issues and judgments the Court makes in this class action. If you stay in the Class(es) and the Class Representatives obtain money or benefits on behalf of the Class, as a result of the Lawsuit, you will either be compensated automatically or will be notified about how to apply for a share. Keep in mind that if you do nothing now, regardless of whether the Class Representatives wins or lose the Lawsuit, you will not be able to sue the County about any claim that is or could have been included in this Lawsuit.

You will be entitled to notice of, and an opportunity to be heard on, any proposed settlement of the case, if a settlement were to occur. To ensure proper notice, as well as to participate in any recovery, you are requested to notify Class Counsel of any corrections in your name or address by sending such corrections to Class Counsel, whose contact information is set out below.

11. Why would I ask to be excluded?

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

If you do not want to be a part of the Lawsuit or if want to bring your own lawsuit against the County related to the issues presented in this case, you should exclude yourself from the Class(es). Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue the County for the claims that are or could have been asserted in the Lawsuit. If you choose to exclude yourself, you will not get any money or benefits from this Lawsuit even if the Plaintiffs obtain them as a result of the Lawsuit. If you start your own lawsuit against the County after you exclude yourself, you will have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you will have to prove your claims. If you exclude yourself because you want to start your own lawsuit against the County, you should talk to your own lawyer soon, because your claims may be subject to a statute of limitations.

12. How do I ask the Court to exclude me from the Class(es)?

To ask to be excluded, also sometimes referred to as “opting out” of the Class(es), you must send the exclusion request included in this Notice (“Exclusion Request”), stating that you want to be excluded from *George Robert Armistead, Jr., Madison Armistead, Greg Rhodes, and William Yates, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Carteret County*. Be sure to include your name, the name of your company (if applicable), mailing address, telephone number, e-mail address, the file number of this case (No. 20-CVS-403), and identification of which classes you seek to exclude yourself from. Your Exclusion Request must be filed with the Carteret County Clerk of Superior Court, 300 Courthouse Square, Beaufort, NC 28516, on or before **[60 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF NOTICE MAILING]**. The form for your use is included in this Notice.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

13. Do I have a lawyer in this case?

Yes, if you choose to remain in the Class(es). The Court appointed the following lawyers as Class Counsel to represent all members of the Class(es):

James R. DeMay
Scott C. Harris
J. Hunter Bryson
BRYSON HARRIS SUCIU DEMAY PLLC
900 W. Morgan Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603
Telephone: (919) 600-5000
jdemay@brysonpllc.com
sharris@brysonpllc.com
hbryson@brysonpllc.com

Matthew D. Quinn
James A. Roberts III
LEWIS & ROBERTS, PLLC
P.O. Box 17529
Raleigh, NC 27619

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

Telephone: (919) 719-8538
mdq@lewis-roberts.com
jar@lewis-roberts.com

If you have any questions, you may contact Class Counsel. You will not be charged for contacting Class Counsel. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, however, you may hire one at your own expense.

14. Should I get my own lawyer?

You do not need to hire your own lawyer because Class Counsel are working on your behalf.

But, if you want your own lawyer, you will have to pay that lawyer. You can ask him or her to appear in court for you in this Lawsuit if you want someone other than Class Counsel to speak for you.

15. How will the lawyers be paid?

Class Counsel have not been paid or reimbursed for their time and expenses incurred in pursuing this case. You will not have to pay these fees and expenses. If Class Counsel obtains money or benefits for the Class(es), they may ask the Court for their fees and expenses. Any motion seeking fees and expenses will be available at the website, www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com. If the Court grants Class Counsel's request, the fees and expenses would be either deducted from any money obtained for the Class(es) or paid separately by the County.

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT

16. How and when will the Court decide who is right?

Unless the Lawsuit is resolved by a settlement or otherwise, Class Counsel will have to prove the Plaintiffs' claims. During the Lawsuit, a jury or the Judge will hear all the evidence and/or legal arguments to help them reach a decision about whether Plaintiffs or the County should prevail in this Lawsuit. Because the Lawsuit has not been decided, be sure to regularly check the website, www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com for updates.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

17. How do I get more information?

Visit the website, www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com, where you will find the Court's Class Certification Order, Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Defendant's Answer to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, as well as the Exclusion Request form, or call [HOTLINE NUMBER]. As the Lawsuit proceeds, be sure to check the website regularly for updates and new information.

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

[PLEASE DO NOT CALL THE COURT, THE COUNTY'S COUNSEL, OR THE COUNTY ABOUT THIS NOTICE.]

Date: Month] ___, 2026

EXCLUSION REQUEST FORM

*George Robert Armistead, Jr., Madison Armistead, Greg Rhodes, and William Yates,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated v. Carteret County,
Case No. 20-CVS-403*

**This is NOT a Claim Form. It EXCLUDES you from the Class.
DO NOT use this form if you wish to remain IN the Class.**

Name of Class Member: _____

Name of Company (if applicable): _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

I am asking to be excluded from (check all that apply):

☐ The Green Box Fee / Waste Collection Class

☐ The Landfill Fee / Waste Collection Class

☐ The Solid Waste Fee / Cost to Operate Class

I understand that by asking to be excluded from the Class(es), I will not be eligible to receive any recovery that may result from this Lawsuit, if there is any such recovery.

Date

Signed Signature of Class Member

To be effective as an exclusion from this Class Action, this form must be completed (name, company name (if applicable), and address), signed and sent by regular mail, postmarked no later than DATE to the address listed below.

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

You must act within [NOTICE PERIOD] days of the date of the Notice of Class Action Lawsuit. The consequences of returning this form are explained in the Notice of Class Action Lawsuit.

You must file this form with the Carteret County Clerk of Superior Court, 300 Courthouse Square, Beaufort, NC 28516 NO LATER THAN [60 DAYS FROM THE DATE OF NOTICE MAILING].

**QUESTIONS? CALL [HOTLINE NUMBER] or VISIT
www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com**

QUESTION? Visit www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com or call [HOTLINE NUMBER].

EXHIBIT F

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

**NOTICE OF CLASS CERTIFICATION IN CASE WITH CARTERET COUNTY
CHALLENGING GREEN BOX FEES AND LANDFILL FEES**

Attorneys for the plaintiffs in an action pending in Carteret County Superior Court, *George Robert Armistead, Jr., et al., v. Carteret County*, Carteret County File No. 20-CVS-403, announced that the case has been certified as a class action, which may affect the rights of the owners of residential and improved commercial properties in the County. Plaintiffs in the case allege that the County has charged Green Box Fees and Landfill Fees to current or former Carteret County property owners in violation of the North Carolina General Statutes and/or the County's Ordinances. The County denies these claims and allegations.

On August 19, 2024, Superior Court, the Hon. R. Kent Harrell, entered an Order certifying three classes in the case:

- (a) The Green Box Fee / Waste Collection Class: All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Green Box Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.
- (b) The Landfill Fee / Waste Collection Class: All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) paid a Landfill Fee to Carteret County, but (c) who have a waste collection service.
- (c) The Solid Waste Fee / Cost to Operate Class: All natural persons, corporations, or other entities who (a) at any point from April 28, 2017, through the date of judgment, (b) were charged a Green Box and/or a Landfill Fee.

The North Carolina Supreme Court issued an opinion affirming the Superior Court's Class Certification Order on March 20, 2026.

Proceedings in the case are ongoing and the Court has not yet finally determined whether the Green Box and/or Landfill Fees are unlawful. Current or former Carteret County property owners that are members of one or more of the classes will be bound by the ultimate outcome of the case unless they take timely action to opt-out of the classes by **[INSERT DATE]**. A detailed notice describing the case, and with instructions on how to opt-out of the classes, is available at www.carteretsolidwastelawsuit.com.

Class members may also contact Class Counsel for more information about the cases. The classes are represented by Matthew D. Quinn and James A. Roberts III of Lewis & Roberts, PLLC and James R. DeMay, Scott C. Harris, and J. Hunter Bryson of Bryson Harris Suci DeMay, PLLC.