

1 THE HONORABLE JAMAL N. WHITEHEAD
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

10
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
13 AT SEATTLE
14
15

16 IN RE VALVE ANTITRUST LITIGATION
17
18

19 Case No. 2:21-cv-00563-JNW
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**PUBLISHER CLASS PLAINTIFFS’
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR
AMENDED CLASS PERIOD, ORDER
APPROVING NOTICE OF CLASS
CERTIFICATION, AND ENTRY OF
NOTICE SCHEDULE**

NOTING DATE: March 4, 2025

This Document Relates to:

Publisher Plaintiffs

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|------|--|-------------|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. | LEGAL STANDARD..... | 2 |
| III. | ARGUMENT..... | 3 |
| | A. The Court Should Amend the Class Period to Facilitate Practicable Notice..... | 3 |
| | B. The Content and Form of the Proposed Notices Use Plain, Easy-to-Understand Language and Contain the Information Required by Rule 23..... | 4 |
| | C. The Certification Notice Plan Is Tailored to This Class Action and Constitutes the Best Notice Practicable Under the Circumstances..... | 4 |
| | 1. Direct Emailed Notice to Claimants with Known Email Addresses | 5 |
| | 2. Direct Mailed Notice to Claimants with Known Mailing Addresses | 6 |
| | 3. Media Publication Campaign..... | 6 |
| | 4. Dedicated Website and Toll-Free Telephone Number | 7 |
| | D. The Court Should Enter Publisher Plaintiffs' Proposed Notice Schedule | 7 |
| IV. | CONCLUSION..... | 8 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

| | | |
|----|---|---------|
| 4 | <i>Ansoumana v. Gristede's Operating Corp.</i> , 201 F.R.D. 81 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) | 4 |
| 5 | <i>Briseno v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 1121 (9th Cir. 2017) | 2, 4 |
| 6 | <i>Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.</i> , 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004) | 4 |
| 7 | <i>Cruz v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.</i> , No. 3:07-cv-4012, 2009 WL 1974404 (N.D. Cal. July 2, 2009), <i>modified in part</i> , 270 F.R.D. 499 (N.D. Cal. 2010) | 4 |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | <i>Czuchaj v. Conair Corp.</i> , No. 3:13-cv-01901-BEN-RBB, 2016 WL 4130947 (S.D. Cal. May 13, 2016), <i>modified</i> , No. 3:13-cv-001901-BEN-RBB, 2016 WL 4272374 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2016) | 6 |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | <i>Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin</i> , 417 US 156 (1974) | 2, 5 |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | <i>Fraser v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-cv-00520-TLN-DB, 2016 WL 6208367 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2016) | 6 |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | <i>In re China Med. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 8:11-cv-01061-JST-ANX, 2013 WL 12126754 (C.D. Cal. May 16, 2013) | 8 |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | <i>In re Packaged Seafood Prods. Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 15-md-02670-DMS-MDD, 2023 WL 2487548 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2023) | 4 |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | <i>Katz v. Carte Blanche Corp.</i> , 496 F.2d 747 (3d Cir. 1974) | 8 |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | <i>Kirchner v. Shred-It USA Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-01437-WBS, 2015 WL 1499115 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2015) | 8 |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | <i>Maslic v. ISM Vuzem</i> , No. 21-cv-02556-BLF, 2023 WL 8482868 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2023) | 7 |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | <i>Mullins v. Direct Digital, LLC</i> , 795 F.3d 654 (7th Cir. 2015) | 2, 3, 5 |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | <i>N.D. v. Reykdal</i> , No. 2:22-cv-01621-LK, 2024 WL 4875055 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 22, 2024) | 3, 8 |
| 28 | | |
| 29 | <i>Peters v. Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp.</i> , 966 F.2d 1483 (D.C. Cir. 1992) | 2 |
| 30 | | |
| 31 | <i>Rannis v. Recchia</i> , 380 F. App'x 646 (9th Cir. 2010) | 2 |
| 32 | | |

| | | |
|---|---|------|
| 1 | <i>Sampson v. Knight Transportation, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 2255129 (W.D. Wash. June 3, 2021)..... | 3, 8 |
| 2 | <i>Schwarzschild v. Tse</i> , 69 F.3d 293 (9th Cir. 1995) | 8 |
| 4 | <i>Tuttle v. Audiophile Music Direct, Inc.</i> , No. 22-cv-01081-JLR, 2023 WL 8891575 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 26, 2023) | 3, 8 |
| 5 | <i>Zepeda v. Paypal, Inc.</i> , No. 10-cv-01668-SBA, 2015 WL 6746913 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2015) | 7 |

7 **Other Authorities**

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 8 | 7AA Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller, and Mary Kay Kane, <i>Federal Practice and</i> <i>Procedure Civil</i> § 1786 at 492–93 (3d ed. 2005) | 2 |
| 9 | MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION FOURTH § 21.311 at 291–92 (4th ed. 2004) | 5 |

10 **Rules**

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---------|
| 11 | Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B) | 2, 4, 5 |
| 12 | Rule 23(b)(3)..... | 2 |

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Pursuant to this Court’s November 25, 2024 Order granting Publisher Plaintiffs’ motion
 2 for class certification (ECF No. 392 at 26) (“Class Certification Order”), Plaintiffs Wolfire Games,
 3 LLC, Dark Catt Studios Holdings, Inc., and Dark Catt Studio Interactive LLC and the class they
 4 represent respectfully move the Court for an order amending the class definition and period, and
 5 approving a plan of notice of the class certification order (“Certification Notice Plan”). In support
 6 thereof, Publisher Plaintiffs state as follows:

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 Personal computer (“PC”) game Publisher Plaintiffs seek to hold Defendant Valve
 9 Corporation (“Valve”) accountable for Valve’s alleged price and content parity policies imposed
 10 on Publishers because those policies have allegedly harmed competition in the alleged third-party
 11 PC platform distribution market and damaged Publishers in the form of, *inter alia*, inflated revenue
 12 sharing to Valve as well as higher prices to game buyers.

13 On November 25, 2024, the Court granted Publisher Plaintiffs’ motion for class
 14 certification, appointed Plaintiffs Wolfire Games, LLC, Dark Catt Studios Holdings, Inc., and
 15 Dark Catt Studio Interactive LLC as class representatives, appointed co-lead class counsel, and
 16 certified the following class:

17 All persons or entities who, directly or through an agent, paid a commission to
 18 Valve in connection with the sale or use of a game on the Steam platform on or
 19 after January 28, 2017, and continuing through the present until the effects of its
 20 scheme are eliminated (the “Class Period”), and where either (1) the person or
 21 entity was based in the United States and its territories or (2) the game was
 22 purchased or acquired by a United States-based consumer during the Class Period.

23 Excluded from the Class are (a) Defendant, its parents, subsidiaries, affiliate
 24 entities, and employees, and (b) the Court and its personnel.

25 (ECF No. 392 at 26–27.)

26 Publisher Plaintiffs now propose an amended class definition and period, and a multi-
 27 method notice plan that includes direct-mailed notices, email notices, notices published online, a
 28

1 continuing informational website, and a toll-free telephone line to communicate with class
 2 members. As explained below, the Publisher Plaintiffs' proposed notice exceeds the Rule 23
 3 requirements and, therefore, they ask the Court to approve the proposed Certification Notice Plan
 4 and grant this motion. Valve does not oppose Publisher Plaintiffs' motion.

5 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

6 After certifying a Rule 23(b)(3) class, Rule 23(c)(2)(B) requires a court to "direct to class
 7 members the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to
 8 all members who can be identified through reasonable effort." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). The
 9 notice rule is designed "to afford members of the class due process which, in the context of the
 10 rule 23(b)(3) class action, guarantees them the opportunity to be excluded from the class action
 11 and not be bound by any subsequent judgment." *Peters v. Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 966 F.2d
 12 1483, 1486 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (citing *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 US 156, 173–74 (1974)).

13 Class notice "serves to inform absentees who otherwise might not be aware of the
 14 proceeding that their rights are in litigation so that they can take whatever steps they deem
 15 appropriate to make certain that their interests are protected." 7AA Charles Alan Wright, Arthur
 16 R. Miller, and Mary Kay Kane, *Federal Practice and Procedure Civil* § 1786 at 492–93 (3d ed.
 17 2005).

18 "Rule 23 requires only the 'best notice that is *practicable under the circumstances*,
 19 including individual notice to all members who can be identified through *reasonable effort*.'" *Briseno v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.*, 844 F.3d 1121, 1128–29 (9th Cir. 2017) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P.
 20 23(c)(2)(B)) (emphasis in original). "These requirements are designed to ensure that class notice
 21 procedures comply with the demands of due process." *Rannis v. Recchia*, 380 F. App'x 646, 650
 22 (9th Cir. 2010) (citing *Eisen*, 417 US at 173). "The rule does not insist on actual notice to all class
 23 members in all cases." *Mullins v. Direct Digital, LLC*, 795 F.3d 654, 665 (7th Cir. 2015). In fact,
 24 the Rule "recognizes it might be *impossible* to identify some class members for purposes of actual
 25 notice." *Id.* (emphasis in original). Similarly, "the Due Process Clause does not require actual,
 26 individual notice in all cases." *Briseno*, 844 F.3d at 1129.

1 Notice may be given by “one or more of the following: United States mail, electronic mail,
 2 or other appropriate means.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). Other appropriate means include “notice
 3 through third parties, paid advertising, and/or posting in places frequented by class members, all
 4 without offending due process.” *Mullins*, 795 F.3d at 665. The Certification Notice Plan, which
 5 utilizes a combination of direct notice to class members and publication or other similar means of
 6 notice, is commonly used in class actions like this one. *See, e.g., N.D. v. Reykdal*, No. 2:22-cv-
 7 01621-LK, 2024 WL 4875055, at *11 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 22, 2024); *Tuttle v. Audiophile Music*
 8 *Direct, Inc.*, No. 22-cv-01081-JLR, 2023 WL 8891575, at *5 (W.D. Wash. Dec. 26, 2023).

9 **III. ARGUMENT**

10 **A. The Court Should Amend the Class Period to Facilitate Practicable Notice**

11 Rule 23(c)(1)(C) permits the Court to amend aspects of the certification order—such as the
 12 class definition—prior to the entry of final judgment. Currently, the class definition provides that
 13 the class period will run through the entry of final judgment in this matter. ECF No. 392 at 26–27
 14 (“persons . . . paid a commission . . . continuing through the present until the effects of its scheme
 15 are eliminated (the ‘Class Period’”). However, allowing the class period to extend through the
 16 entry of a final judgment in this matter presents substantial and practical challenges to providing
 17 notice to class members.

18 Providing ongoing notice to future, unknown class members would be “unmanageable
 19 given Rule 23(b)(3)’s notice and opt-out requirements.” *Sampson v. Knight Transportation, Inc.*,
 20 2021 WL 2255129, at *2 (W.D. Wash. June 3, 2021) (amending class period definition that ran
 21 through the “date of final disposition”). Among other things, a class period that extends through
 22 final judgment would provide no way for future class members to consider whether to opt out prior
 23 to the Court’s decisions on dispositive motions, consistent with one-way intervention principles.
 24 The amended proposed end date allows for the orderly administration of notice and also extends
 25 the class period for as long as is reasonably practicable. Accordingly, Publisher Plaintiffs request
 26 that the Court amend the class definition so that the class period closes on November 25, 2024, the
 27 date the Court certified the class. *See e.g., Cruz v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.*, No. 3:07-cv-4012, 2009

1 WL 1974404, at *1–2 (N.D. Cal. July 2, 2009) (amending the class period to end on the date of
 2 the court’s certification order), *modified in part*, 270 F.R.D. 499 (N.D. Cal. 2010); *Ansoumana v.*
 3 *Gristede’s Operating Corp.*, 201 F.R.D. 81, 85 n.2 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (same).

4 **B. The Content and Form of the Proposed Notices Use Plain, Easy-to-Understand
 5 Language and Contain the Information Required by Rule 23**

6 Rule 23(c)(2)(B) requires that the notice “clearly and concisely state [specific information]
 7 in plain, easily understood language.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). “Notice is satisfactory if it
 8 generally describes the terms of the settlement in sufficient detail to alert those with adverse
 9 viewpoints to investigate and to come forward and be heard.” *Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*,
 10 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004) quotation omitted). District courts have “broad power and
 11 discretion vested in them by Rule 23 in determining the parameters of appropriate class notice.”
 12 *In re Packaged Seafood Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, No. 15-md-02670-DMS-MDD, 2023 WL
 13 2487548, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2023) (quotation omitted).

14 The notices in the Certification Notice Plan meet the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B).
 15 The email and postcard notices state: “(i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the class
 16 certified; (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses; (iv) that a class member may enter an
 17 appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the court will exclude from the
 18 class any member who requests exclusion; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion; and
 19 (vii) the binding effect of a class judgment on members under Rule 23(c)(3).” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P.
 20 23(c)(2)(B)(i)–(vii); Weisbrot Decl., Exs. B–C. The notices use plain language and are easy to
 21 understand. There will also be a toll-free hotline and a website containing the pleadings and orders
 22 from the case. Accordingly, the proposed notices provide the best written notice practicable to
 23 class members.

24 **C. The Certification Notice Plan Is Tailored to This Class Action and Constitutes
 25 the Best Notice Practicable Under the Circumstances**

26 Where names and addresses of known class members are reasonably available, Rule
 27 23(c)(2)(B) and due process require “individual notice to all members who can be identified
 28 through reasonable effort.” *Briseno*, 844 F.3d at 1128–29. For class members with identifiable

1 addresses, “individual notice is clearly the ‘best notice practicable’” within the meaning of Rule
 2 23(c)(2) and due process case law. *Eisen*, 417 U.S. at 175. If names and addresses cannot be
 3 identified through reasonable effort, then courts permit the use of other methods. *Mullins*, 795 F.3d
 4 at 665.

5 As described more specifically above, the Court certified a class of all persons or entities
 6 who paid a commission to Valve in connection with the sale or use of a game on the Steam platform
 7 during the class period. The target audience for this Certification Notice Plan is, essentially,
 8 businesses and individuals that sold games on Steam during that period. The proposed notice plan
 9 is designed to provide notice to these class members consistent with the requirements of Rule 23.
 10 The Certification Notice Plan is tailored to provide the best notice to class members, using email
 11 and mailed notice for class members whose email and mailing addresses can be identified through
 12 reasonable effort, supplemented by a media campaign and dedicated website for those class
 13 members who cannot be directly notified. *See* MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION FOURTH
 14 § 21.311 at 291–92 (4th ed. 2004). Valve has maintained and will produce records showing email
 15 and mailing addresses, where available, for the class members, and the Certification Notice Plan
 16 will provide notice through those means.

17 **1. Direct Emailed Notice to Claimants with Known Email Addresses**

18 Notice may be given by one or more methods, including email. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B).
 19 Under the Certification Notice Plan, Angeion Group LLC, the proposed notice provider, will send
 20 an email notice to all class members with known email addresses.¹ Weisbrot Decl., ¶ 16.

21 Angeion implements certain best practices to increase deliverability and determine how
 22 many emails are successfully delivered, and Co-Lead Class Counsel will report to the Court the
 23 rate of delivered emails. *Id.* ¶¶ 17–20. The email notice will provide class members with a
 24 hyperlink to the case-specific website. Weisbrot Decl., Ex. B. The case website will provide more
 25 detailed information, including the Long-Form Notice and case documents. Weisbrot Decl., ¶ 26.

26
 27 ¹ Angeion is an experienced provider of class action notices and administration services. Weisbrot
 28 Decl., ¶¶ 8–12; <https://www.angeiongroup.com/>.

2. Direct Mailed Notice to Claimants with Known Mailing Addresses

In addition to the direct email notice described above, Publisher Plaintiffs propose sending a postcard notice to class members with mailing addresses that are reasonably accessible based on records produced by Valve. Weisbrot Decl., ¶ 21, Ex. C. The postcard notice will list the telephone number for the toll-free hotline, as well as the case-specific website. Weisbrot Decl., Ex. C. The postcard notice will also include a QR code that takes class members directly to the dedicated website. *Id.* The postcard notice will be sent to all class members with known mailing addresses by U.S. mail. *Id.* ¶ 21. Angeion will then track mail that the United States Postal Service returns as undeliverable, and where feasible will resend postcard notices using forwarding addresses provided by the United States Postal Service or alternative addresses obtained from third-party information providers. *Id.* ¶ 22.

3. Media Publication Campaign

The Rule requires that “notice [is] given to every ‘identifiable’ class member along with some other form of notice to the unidentified members.” *Id.* (permitting newspaper publication for unidentified members); *see also Czuchaj v. Conair Corp.*, No. 3:13-cv-01901-BEN-RBB, 2016 WL 4130947, at *2 (S.D. Cal. May 13, 2016), *modified*, No. 3:13-cv-001901-BEN-RBB, 2016 WL 4272374 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2016) (permitting publication in magazines and online banner advertisements for unidentified members). “Individual notice has never been required to be given to every member of every class.” *Fraser v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, No. 2:13-cv-00520-TLN-DB, 2016 WL 6208367, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2016).

Angeion will implement a supplemental media campaign that includes posting advertisements on multiple online platforms to provide additional impressions and attempt to reach class members who may not receive direct email or mailed notice. *E.g.*, Weisbrot Decl., Ex. D. The advertisements will run on Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, and Reddit. Weisbrot Decl. ¶¶ 23–25.

4. Dedicated Website and Toll-Free Telephone Number

Angeion will also create and operate a case-specific website for the class members that gives them access to electronic copies of the Long-Form Notice and case documents. *See* Weisbrot Decl. ¶ 26, Ex. E. Angeion will also establish a toll-free hotline that provides class members with answers to frequently asked questions. *Id.* ¶ 28. The hotline will operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. *Id.* Class members will have the ability to leave a voicemail with their mailing address so that Angeion can mail them the Long-Form Notice. *Id.* ¶ 29.

D. The Court Should Enter Publisher Plaintiffs' Proposed Notice Schedule

As part of their request to the Court to approve the Certification Notice Plan, Publisher Plaintiffs also ask the Court to enter their proposed notice schedule:

| Event | Date |
|--|--|
| Valve to Provide Notice Administrator with the Pertinent Contact Information for All Class Members | 21 days after issuance of the Order approving the Certification Notice Plan |
| Publisher Plaintiffs to Provide Notice Administrator and Valve with Class Notice List | 44 days after issuance of the Order approving the Certification Notice Plan |
| Notice Date (direct notice mailed/mailed; commencement of social media/internet notice; activate case website) | 74 days after issuance of the Order approving the Certification Notice Plan |
| Opt-Out Deadline | 134 days after issuance of the Order approving the Certification Notice Plan |
| Publisher Plaintiffs to File with the Court a List of All Persons and Entities Who Timely Requested Exclusion from the Class | 148 days after issuance of the Order approving the Certification Notice Plan |

Publisher Plaintiffs’ notice schedule provides the parties and Angeion, the notice administrator, with adequate time to execute the Certification Notice Plan. And importantly, it provides class members with sufficient time—60 days—to opt out of the class. *Zepeda v. Paypal, Inc.*, No. 10-cv-01668-SBA, 2015 WL 6746913, at *8 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2015) (holding that 60 days provides class members with sufficient time to opt out); *accord Maslic v. ISM Vuzem*, No. 21-cv-02556-BLF, 2023 WL 8482868, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2023) (requiring 60 days to opt out); *Kirchner v. Shred-It USA Inc.*, No. 2:14-cv-01437-WBS, 2015 WL 1499115, at *14 (E.D.

1 Cal. Mar. 31, 2015) (same); *In re China Med. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 8:11-cv-01061-JST-ANX,
 2 2013 WL 12126754, at *9 (C.D. Cal. May 16, 2013) (same).

3 Last, Publisher Plaintiffs request that the Court defer any ruling on summary judgment
 4 until after the notice process is completed—an outcome consistent with the proposed schedule
 5 above.

6 “Rule 23(c)(2) . . . ensure[s] that” class members “receive[] notice of the action
 7 well *before* the merits of the case are adjudicated.” *Schwarzschild v. Tse*, 69 F.3d 293, 295 (9th
 8 Cir. 1995) (citations omitted). The Rule “was adopted to prevent . . . intervention of a plaintiff in
 9 a class action after an adjudication favoring the class had taken place.” *Sampson*, 2021 WL
 10 2255129, at *2 (citing *Katz v. Carte Blanche Corp.*, 496 F.2d 747, 759 (3d Cir. 1974)). “[D]istrict
 11 courts generally do not grant summary judgment” until the end of the notice period for this reason.
 12 *Schwarzschild*, 69 F.3d at 295. In light of one-way intervention principles, Publisher Plaintiffs
 13 request that the Court refrain from entering any ruling on summary judgment until after the opt
 14 out period has concluded. Publisher Plaintiffs, along with Defendants, agree—subject to the
 15 Court’s discretion—that summary judgment motions can nevertheless be filed and argued prior to
 16 the conclusion of the opt-out period.

17 **IV. CONCLUSION**

18 Publisher Plaintiffs’ Certification Notice Plan exceeds the requirements of Rule
 19 23(c)(2)(B). The Certification Notice Plan provides email notice, direct mail postcard notice,
 20 supplemental online media notices designed to notify class members, a case-specific website with
 21 the Long-Form Notice and case documents, and a toll-free hotline for class members’ inquiries.
 22 As noted above, courts in this jurisdiction have held that similar multi-method notice plans satisfy
 23 Rule 23(c)(2)(B). *See, e.g., Reykdal*, No. 2:22-cv-01621-LK, 2024 WL 4875055, at *11; *Tuttle*,
 24 No. 22-cv-01081-JLR, 2023 WL 8891575, at *5. Publisher Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request
 25 that the Court amend the class definition as specified above and enter an order approving the
 26 Certification Notice Plan.

27

28

1 DATED: March 4, 2025

2 Alicia Cobb

3 Alicia Cobb, WSBA #48685
 4 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 5 SULLIVAN, LLP
 6 1109 First Avenue, Suite 210
 7 Seattle, Washington 98101
 Phone (206) 905-7000
 Fax (206) 905-7100
 aliciacobb@quinnemanuel.com

8 Steig D. Olson (*pro hac vice*)
 9 David LeRay (*pro hac vice*)
 Nic V. Siebert (*pro hac vice*)
 10 Andrew Faisman (*pro hac vice*)
 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 11 SULLIVAN, LLP
 12 51 Madison Avenue
 New York, New York 10010
 Phone (212) 849-7231
 Fax (212) 849-7100
 steigolson@quinnemanuel.com
 davidleray@quinnemanuel.com
 nicolassiebert@quinnemanuel.com
 andrewfaisman@quinnemanuel.com

13 Adam Wolfson (*pro hac vice*)
 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 14 SULLIVAN, LLP
 15 865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90017
 Phone (213) 443-3285
 Fax (213) 443-3100
 adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com

16 Ankur Kapoor (*pro hac vice*)
 17 Noah Brecker-Redd (*pro hac vice*)
 18 CONSTANTINE CANNON LLP
 19 6 East 43rd St., 26th Floor
 New York, NY 10017
 Phone (212) 350-2700
 Fax (212) 350-2701
 akapoor@constantinecannon.com
 nbrecker-redd@constantinecannon.com

Respectfully submitted,

Tyre L. Tindall

53 Tyre L. Tindall, WSBA #56357
 McKinney Wheeler, WSBA #60635
 54 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &
 55 ROSATI P.C.
 56 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5100
 Seattle, WA 98104-7036
 Phone (206) 883-2500
 Fax (866) 974-7329
 sjensen@wsgr.com
 ttindall@wsgr.com
 mckinney.wheeler@wsgr.com

57 Kenneth R. O'Rourke (*pro hac vice*)
 58 Jordanne M. Steiner (*pro hac vice*)
 59 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &
 60 ROSATI, P.C.
 61 1700 K Street, NW, Suite 500
 Washington, DC 20006
 Phone (202) 973-8800
 Fax (866) 974-7329
 korourke@wsgr.com
 jordanne.miller@wsgr.com

62 W. Joseph Bruckner (*pro hac vice*)
 63 Joseph C. Bourne (*pro hac vice*)
 64 Laura M. Matson (*pro hac vice*)
 65 LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP
 66 100 Washington Avenue S, Suite 2200
 Minneapolis, MN 55401
 Phone (612) 339-6900
 Fax (612) 339-0981
 wjbruckner@locklaw.com
 jcbourne@locklaw.com
 lmmatson@locklaw.com

67 Kyle Pozan (*pro hac vice*)
 68 LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP
 69 1165 N. Clark Street, Suite 700
 Chicago, IL 60610
 Phone (312) 205-8968
 Fax (612) 339-0981
 kjpozan@locklaw.com

70 *Publisher Plaintiff Class Counsel*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 4, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to counsel of record.

DATED: March 4, 2025

Alicia Cobb
Alicia Cobb, WSBA #48685