

CAUSE NO. DC-23-20315

Linda Glass, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

Generational Equity, LLC, and Generational
Equity Group, Inc.,

Defendants.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

298th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

**PLAINTIFF’S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES, COSTS, AND
SERVICE AWARD AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

Plaintiff Linda Glass, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated (Plaintiff), hereby moves this Court for an award of attorneys’ fees, litigation costs, and expenses in the amount of \$150,000 and a service award of \$2,500 to Ms. Glass. This Motion is based upon: 1) this Motion; (2) the Memorandum in Support of the Motion; (3) the Declaration of Raina C. Borrelli filed herewith; (4) the Settlement Agreement; (5) the records, pleadings, and papers filed in this action; and (6) upon such other documentary and oral evidence or argument as may be presented to the Court at or prior to the hearing of this Motion.

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Linda Glass submits this Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs and Service Awards. Class Counsel have zealously prosecuted Plaintiff’s claims, achieving a Settlement that offers significant benefits to the Settlement Class, only after extensive research and informal exchange of information; protracted negotiations; many weeks of arm’s-length negotiations; and additional weeks of drafting and finalizing of the agreement.

On August 5, 2024, the Court issued an order preliminarily approving the Parties' Settlement and directing notice be issued to the Settlement Class. As a result of Class Counsel's efforts, a settlement is available to the Settlement Class Members from which they can claim benefits including one year of credit monitoring and up to \$1 million in identity theft and fraud insurance, ordinary and extraordinary losses to reimburse them for fraud or costs spent mitigating the risks from the data breach, and reimbursement for lost time up to \$75. Monetary claims are capped at \$275,000, virtually assuring that each valid claim will be paid in full. Additionally, Generational Equity has confirmed it has improved its cybersecurity since the data breach and commits to continuing those improvements at its own expense, ensuring that Plaintiff's and the Settlement Class's personal information is protected going forward. Finally, Generational Equity is paying all costs to administer the Settlement and Class Counsel's attorneys' fees and costs entirely separate from any benefits to the Class, so those costs will not diminish any Settlement Class Members' recovery.

As compensation for the significant benefit conferred on the 2,324 Settlement Class, Class Counsel respectfully move the Court for an award of attorneys' fees, litigation costs, and expenses in the amount of \$150,000. This request should be approved because it represents a modest positive multiplier on the lodestar incurred to-date by Class Counsel, which is appropriate here in light of the substantial risks presented in prosecuting this action in a rapidly evolving area of law, and the skills and experience required to carry out the work necessary to do so. Class Counsel also respectfully move the Court for an award of \$2,500 to Ms. Glass, the Class Representative, for her work on behalf of the Settlement Class. Defendants do not oppose Plaintiff's request for attorneys' fees, costs, and service award.¹

¹ See Settlement Agreement, filed as Exhibit 1 to Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Memorandum in Support, at ¶ 72.

I. CASE SUMMARY²

A. The Data Incident and Plaintiff's Claims.

Generational Equity is an M&A investment bank and privately held business advisory with headquarters in Texas. Plaintiff's Complaint ("Compl.") ¶¶ 1,13. To run its business, Generational Equity collects Private Information from its employees. *Id.* ¶¶ 1, 20-21. That information includes current and former employees' names and Social Security numbers. *Id.* ¶ 29. In so doing, Generational Equity promises to protect its former and current employees' data. *Id.* ¶¶ 29-31. Even so, Plaintiff allege that Generational Equity never implemented the safeguards and systems needed to fulfill those promises. *Id.* ¶¶ 4,27. As a result, Plaintiff alleges that Generational Equity misconduct led to a data breach that occurred between February 15, 2023, and February 16, 2023. *Id.* ¶¶ 1, 32.

Plaintiff is a former Generational Equity employee and data breach victim. *Id.* ¶¶ 28, 27. On December 25, 2023, Plaintiff Linda Glass sued Generational Equity in the District Court of Dallas County, Texas, 298th Judicial District, to remediate the harm the breach had caused her. *See Linda Glass v. Generational Equity LLC, and Generational Equity Group Inc.*, No. DC-23-20315. This Complaint asserted six counts and demanded that Generational Equity reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for their losses. Compl. at ¶¶ 94-151.

Prior to filing her case, Plaintiff's counsel conducted extensive pre-suit discovery to ascertain all publicly available details about the cause, scope, and result of the data breach, as well as about the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Class. Joint Declaration of Counsel in Support of Motion for Attorney's Fees, Costs, and Service Award. Dec. ¶ 3. Additionally, Plaintiff's counsel spent time interviewing Plaintiff to determine what Private Information Plaintiff and other

² This section has been adopted, in large part, from the memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, filed on or about June 21, 2024 ("MPA Memo.").

employees provided to Defendants, what promises Defendants made about data security, and to determine the specific harm suffered by Plaintiff. *Id.* ¶ 4.

On April 23, 2024, Defendants filed their General Denial pursuant to Tex. R. Civ. P. 92, generally denying each and every cause of action asserted by Plaintiff in her Complaint. *Id.* ¶ 5. Shortly after, the parties agreed to explore early resolution and work together cooperatively to resolve their claims. *Id.* ¶ 6. Plaintiff requested, and Generational Equity produced, key information to inform the settlement negotiations, including without limitation the size of the Settlement Class, facts concerning the named Plaintiff, and other pertinent facts. *Id.* Further, despite not responding to the Defendants' General Denial, Class Counsel researched the issues raised in the Preliminary Objections and analyzed the viability of each of Plaintiff's legal claims. *Id.*

On May 16, 2024, a Joint Motion to Vacate the parties' deadline for final judgment was filed in light of the parties' agreement to explore early resolution. *Id.* ¶ 7.

Following many weeks of negotiations at "arm's length," where the parties evaluated the strengths and weaknesses underlying their claims and defenses, the parties were able to make come to an agreement on the key terms of the Settlement, which was executed on June 11, 2024. *Id.* ¶ 8. While negotiations were always collegial, cordial, and professional, there is no doubt that they were adversarial in nature, with both parties forcefully advocating the position of their respective clients. *Id.* From the start, the Parties agreed they would not negotiate Settlement Class Counsel's attorney fees or Plaintiff's service award until they agreed on the settlement agreement's core terms, thus avoiding conflict between Plaintiff and the Settlement Class. *Id.*

Plaintiff's Counsel then prepared and submitted a motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement on June 21, 2024. *Id.* ¶ 9. On August 5, 2024, the Court held a preliminary approval

hearing and granted Plaintiff’s unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, ordering that the Parties and the appointed Settlement Administrator, Angeion Group, proceed with issuing notice to the Settlement Class. *Id.* ¶ 10. Since preliminary approval was granted, Class Counsel has worked with counsel for Generational Equity and with Angeion Group to finalize the notice documents and claim forms and to ensure notice was sent to the Settlement Class consistent with the Preliminary Approval Order. *Id.* ¶ 11.

C. Settlement Terms

The Parties’ settlement, negotiated by Class Counsel after extensive analysis of the strength of Plaintiff’s legal claims and the potential risks inherent in complex class actions like this one, provides significant benefits to the Settlement Class, defined as “all individuals identified by Generational Equity as being among those individuals impacted by the Data Incident which occurred in February 2023, including those were sent a notice of the Data Incident.” Settlement Agreement ¶ 35.

The settlement secures four benefits for the Settlement Class, remediating and mitigating the harms Generational Equity data breach has caused and will continue to cause:

First, Settlement Class members can file a claim to receive two years of credit monitoring through one national credit reporting bureau, at no cost if they elect to enroll. *Id.* ¶ 42. These services will come with fraud insurance, covering up to \$1 million in losses for members who enroll. *Id.*

Second, the settlement offers Settlement Class members a chance to claim losses from the breach, including “ordinary” and “extraordinary” losses. *Id.* ¶ 43. For “ordinary” losses, Settlement Class Members may claim up to \$300 for losses resulting from the breach, including identity theft, fraud, and costs spent mitigating those risks. *Id.* 43. They can also claim “lost time” dealing with

the breach at \$25/hour for up to three hours. *Id.* 43. To support their claim, a class member need only supply receipts or “documentation” evidencing the loss, though claimants need not submit evidence for “lost time” claims. *Id.* For “extraordinary losses,” Settlement Class Members may claim up to \$3,500 for documented economic losses arising from the Data Breach such as identity theft. *Id.* These claims allow claimants to recover for the varying types of losses and damages suffered as a result of the data breach.

Third, Generational Equity has confirmed it has improved its cybersecurity since the data breach, affirming that commitment in the Agreement: “Defendants implemented data security enhancements following the Data Incident.” *Id.* ¶ 45. Altogether, these improvements will safeguard the Private Information Generational Equity still possesses, including data belonging to Settlement Class members.

And fourth, Generational Equity will pay the cost to administer the settlement, including the Claims Administrator’s costs to notify the class and process claims. *Id.* ¶ 56.

D. Notice, the Claims Process, and Opt-Outs and Objections

The Parties agreed to use Angeion as the Notice Provider and Settlement Administrator in this case, which, as noted above, was approved by the Court when it granted Preliminary Approval to the Settlement. Joint Fees Dec. ¶ 11. The Settlement Administrator created, and updates as needed, the Settlement website where it posts all documents relating to this case and the settlement, including all claim forms needed to submit a claim online. Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 41, 55. Angeion has issued notice to Settlement Class members by mail using a valid mailing address. *Id.* ¶ 53. For any mailer returned as “undeliverable,” Angeion will make “reasonable efforts to identify an updated mailing address and resend the postcard notice.” *Id.* ¶ 54. Settlement Class Members have 90 days from the date Notice was sent to file a claim, or until December 3, 2024. *Id.* ¶¶ 5-6.

The Notice program also informed Settlement Class Members of their rights to opt-out or object to the Settlement. All opt-outs must be received within 60 days from when Notice was sent and must satisfy the criteria identified in the Settlement Agreement and notice, including a clear manifestation to be excluded from the Settlement. *Id.* ¶ 57. Those who validly opt-out of the Settlement are not entitled to any compensation under the Settlement Agreement and cannot object to the Settlement or otherwise participate in, or be bound by, the Settlement. *Id.* Objections to the Settlement are also due within 60 days of the Notice date and must comply with the criteria identified in the Settlement Agreement and notice. *Id.*

E. Plaintiff’s Service Awards, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs

The parties did not discuss or negotiate the fee or service award until they agreed on the terms benefiting the class. Joint Fees Dec. ¶ 8. As a result, the parties avoided conflict with the Settlement Class’s interests, thus fulfilling their responsibilities to the Settlement Class first. *Id.*

Under the Settlement, Plaintiff may petition the Court within 14 days of the objection deadline to approve their requested attorney’s fees and service award. Settlement Agreement ¶ 72. Generational Equity has agreed to pay Plaintiff’s attorney fees up to \$150,000. *Id.* As a service award, Plaintiff will request \$2,500, an amount Generational Equity has agreed not to object to. *Id.* ¶ 70. And as with the settlement’s provisions for credit monitoring and settlement administration, these payments will be “considered by the Court separately from the Court’s consideration of the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement,” meaning the Class will receive its benefits no matter how the Court decides Plaintiff’s fee and award petition. *Id.* ¶ 71.

IV. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR SERVICE AWARDS TO THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVES, ATTORNEYS' FEES, AND COSTS.

A. Plaintiff's Service Award is Justified.

Plaintiff seeks a Service Award in the amount of \$2,500. The award, if granted by this Court, will not impact the amount available to Settlement Class Members. Joint Fee Dec., ¶ 13. The Service Award (oftentimes referred to as an “incentive award”) compensates Plaintiff for her efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, including maintaining contact with counsel, assisting in the investigation of the case, remaining available for consultation throughout the mediation, reviewing pleadings and the Settlement Agreement, and answering counsel’s many questions. *Id.* ¶ 14.

The Texas Court of Appeals has noted that courts “typically award and justify incentive compensation when the named plaintiffs expend time and effort beyond that of the other class members in assisting class counsel with litigation by actively reviewing the case and advising counsel in prosecuting the case, or when the named plaintiffs faced the risk of retaliation or threats as a result of their participation as class representatives.” *Morris v. Thibodeau*, No. 05-00-01350-CV, 2001 Tex. App. LEXIS 7585, at *15 (Tex. App. Nov. 9, 2001) (approving incentive awards in varying amounts between \$6,000 and \$10,000). *Lee v. Metrocare Servs.*, Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-2349-O, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 194001, at *9 (N.D. Tex. July 1, 2015). Courts use differing factors when approving service awards, but they all consider the “risk” accepted by the representative, whether they protected the class, how they benefited from the settlement, and their effort. *Id.* (explaining five- and three-factor tests). Awarding a plaintiff for serving as a representative encourages them to participate in the action despite the work and risks involved. *Id.* Ms. Glass actively assisted Class Counsel in the litigation on behalf of Settlement Class Members. The request for a \$2,500 compares favorably to incentive awards provided by Texas Courts, and

is fair, reasonable, and adequate in light of Plaintiff's contributions on behalf of the Settlement Class.

B. Attorneys' Fees Sought by Settlement Class Counsel are Reasonable and Should be Approved.

Texas Courts calculate attorneys' fees in class action lawsuits on a lodestar basis. Rule 42(i)(2). To do so, they multiply the number of hours reasonably worked by a reasonable hourly rate. *Id.* Attorney fees are required by statute to be in the range of 25% to 400% of the lodestar figure. *Id.* In making its determination of the reasonableness of the requested lodestar, Courts must consider the factors set forth by Rule 1.04(b) of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct, namely: the time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly; the likelihood, if apparent to the client, that the acceptance of the particular employment will preclude other employment by the lawyer; the fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services; the amount involved and the results obtained; the time limitations imposed by the client or by the circumstances; the nature and length of the professional relationship with the client; the experience, reputation, and ability of the lawyer or lawyers performing the services; and whether the fee is fixed or contingent on results obtained or uncertainty of collection before the legal services have been rendered. Rule 42(i)(2); *El Apple I, Ltd. v. Olivas*, 370S.W.3d 757, 761 (Tex. 2012) (citing Rule 42(i)(2) and Rule 1.04(b) of the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct).

Thus far, Class Counsel have devoted significant time and resources to this case and have incurred a combined lodestar of \$48,742.50. Joint Fee Dec., ¶ 23. Counsel expects the lodestar to increase by approximately \$10,000 before closure of the case, due to the time required to carry out settlement administration and to prepare and argue Plaintiff's motion for Final Approval. *Id.* ¶ 24. The requested fee of \$150,000 should be approved, as it represents a modest 3.1 multiplier, which

is appropriate in light of Class Counsel's efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class that resulted in substantial relief in the face of risky litigation. The requested fee is well within the parameters permitted under the statute, and is reasonable given the factors to be considered under Rule 1.04(b).

1. Plaintiff's requested attorneys' fees are reasonable given the time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly.

The amount of work and complexity of the legal questions, as well as the experience and skills utilized by Class Counsel necessary to ensure such a significant benefit to the Settlement Class favor approval of Plaintiff's requested fees. Data breach law is rapidly evolving, as Courts and legislatures are regularly expanding their expertise and understanding of acceptable and appropriate data security protocols implemented to protect the Private Information of individuals like Settlement Class Members here. In negotiating the present Settlement, Class Counsel brought significant experience in data breach litigation to the table—a skill set unique to only a handful of firms currently litigating in this area. *See* Joint Fee Dec., ¶¶ 20, 32-40.

Specifically, Ms. Borrelli has been appointed Class Counsel in data breach class actions around the country, including *In re Netgain Tech. Consumer Data Breach Litig.*, 21-cv-1210 (D. Minn.) (appointed by the court to the Plaintiffs' Interim Executive Committee); *In re C.R. England, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 2:22-cv-374-DAK-JCB (appointed by the court as Interim Co-Lead Counsel); *Medina et al. v. PracticeMax Inc.*, 22-cv-01261-DLR (D. Ariz.) (appointed to Executive Leadership Committee); *Forslund et al. v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, 1:22-cv-04260 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed as interim co-lead class counsel); *In re Lincare Holdings, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fla.) (appointed to Interim Executive Leadership Committee); *McLaughlin v. Flagstar*, 22-cv-11470 (E.D. Mich.); *Corra et al. v. Acts Retirement Services, Inc.*,

2:22-cv-02917 (E.D. Pa.); *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp., Inc.*, 22-cv-490 (N.D. Cal.); *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.) (data breach settlement on behalf of 500,000 breach victims); *Kunkelman v. Curators of the University of Missouri, d/b/a MU Health Care*, Case No. 21BA-CV00182 (Mo. Cir. Ct., Boone Cty.); *Baldwin v. Nat'l Western Life Ins. Co.*, 21-cv-04066-WJE (W.D. Mo.) (settlement on behalf of 800,000 data breach victims). Joint Fees Dec., ¶¶32-35, Ex. B.

And finally, the expertise of Joe Kendall of Kendall Law Group, PLLC, a former United States District Judge who served on the federal bench in the Northern District of Texas from 1992-2002, was invaluable in prosecuting this case and achieving the Settlement on behalf of the Class. Joint Fees Dec., ¶¶36-40, Ex. C.

Class Counsel's experience is a huge asset, especially in a case that involves such novel and complex areas of law. *See, e.g., In re Sonic Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 1:17-md-2807, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135573, at *13 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 12, 2019) (“[D]ata breach litigation is complex and largely undeveloped.”); *Fulton-Green v. Accolade, Inc.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 164375, at *21 (E.D. Pa. Sep. 23, 2019) (“This is a complex case in a risky field of litigation because data breach class actions are uncertain and class certification is rare.”). Indeed, “many [data breach cases] have been dismissed at the pleading stage.” *In re TD Ameritrade Account Holder Litig.*, No. C 07-2852 SBA, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 103222, at *36 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 12, 2011). Further, a successful outcome could only ensue, if at all, after prolonged and arduous litigation with an attendant risk of drawn-out appeals. Joint Fees Dec. ¶ 20. Among national consumer protection class action litigation, data breach cases are some of the most complex and involve a rapidly evolving area of law. *Id.* As such, these cases are particularly risky for plaintiffs' attorneys. *Id.*; *see also Solomon v. Deer Oaks Mental Health Assocs., P.C.*, No. SA-23-CV-1465-

FB, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 180416, at *12 (W.D. Tex. Sep. 30, 2024) (dismissing data breach complaint on a motion to dismiss); [Logan v. Marker Grp., Inc., Civil Action No. 4:22-CV-00174, 2024 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 126653, at *36 \(S.D. Tex. July 18, 2024\)](#) (granting in part motion to dismiss a data breach class action). Class Counsel took on this case and zealously advocated on behalf of Settlement Class in spite of the risks and challenges posed and devoted a substantial amount of time and money to the prosecution of this case, which ultimately resulted in a Settlement this is highly beneficial to the Class, weighing in favor of awarding the requested fee.

Despite the early stage of litigation at which this case settled, Class Counsel expended significant effort—at the expense of other potentially fee-generating cases—to negotiate and finalize the Settlement Agreement on behalf of the Settlement Class. *Id.* ¶¶ 3-8,17-18. Class Counsel devoted significant time and resources to this case to date, including: conducting an investigation into the facts regarding Plaintiff’s claims and class members’ claims; researching law relevant to, and preparing, Plaintiff’s class action complaints; researching law relevant to Defendants’ preliminary objections; negotiating at arm’s length for a settlement; negotiating and preparing the Parties’ Settlement Agreement, along with the proposed class notice and claim form; negotiating with settlement administration companies to secure the best notice plan practicable; preparing Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary approval of the class action settlement and preparing a detailed declaration in support; working with the Settlement Administrator to ensure the timely completion of Notice and processing of claims; preparing the instant motion for attorneys’ fees, costs, and a service award; closely monitoring evolving law regarding data security and its potential impacts on the case; and conferring with Plaintiff throughout the case. *Id.* at ¶ 12. Counsel further anticipates completing additional work throughout settlement administration, and in preparing and arguing Plaintiff’s motion for final approval of the settlement. *Id.* at ¶ 24. Given the

skill and expertise required to successfully litigate data breach cases, the novelty of evolving questions at issue, and the time and labor required of Class Counsel, the fee request should be granted.

2. Class Counsel took this litigation on a contingency basis and spent time on this litigation that would have been spent on other potentially fee-generating cases.

Class Counsel took this case on a purely contingent basis. Joint Fee Dec., ¶ 15. This matter has required Class Counsel to spend significant time on this litigation that could have been spent on other fee-generating matters. *Id.* at ¶¶ 17-18. Because Class Counsel undertook representation of this matter on a contingency-fee basis, they shouldered the risk of expending substantial costs and time in litigating the action without any monetary gain in the event of an adverse judgment. *Id.* If not devoted to litigating this action, from which any remuneration is wholly contingent on a successful outcome, the time Class Counsel spent working on this case could and would have been spent pursuing other potentially fee generating matters. *Id.* at ¶ 17-18.

Given the risk Class Counsel took in this matter, and the time dedicated to the exclusion of other matters, these factors weigh in favor of finding the requested fee—of significantly less than the lodestar accrued during litigation—reasonable and appropriate.

3. The fees sought by Class Counsel are consistent with awards in similar cases, and the rate used by Class Counsel is consistent with that charged for similar legal services.

The fees requested by Class Counsel here are inherently reasonable when compared to fee awards in similar cases *and* in comparison with rates charged for similar legal services. In the Fifth Circuit, courts “encourage counsel” to “arrive at a settlement as to attorney’s fees.” *Johnson v. Ga. Highway Express, Inc.*, 488 F.2d 714, 720 (5th Cir. 1974). “An agreed upon award of attorneys’ fees and expenses is proper in a class action settlement, so long as the amount of the fee is

reasonable under the circumstance... In fact, courts have encouraged litigants to resolve fee issues by agreement, if possible.” *DeHoyos v. Allstate Corp.*, 240 F.R.D. 269, 322 (W.D. Tex. 2007) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h) and collecting cases). “Accordingly, courts are authorized to award attorney fees and expenses where all parties have agreed to the amount, subject to court approval.” *Id.*

Courts also recognize that data breach settlements are “difficult” to value given the benefits they provide, such as improved data security and credit monitoring. *Bowdle v. King's Seafood Co.*, No. SACV 21-01784-CJC (JDEx), 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 240383, at *19 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2022). For this reason, “the main inquiry is whether the end result is reasonable.” *Gaston v. Fabfitfun, Inc.*, No. 2:20-cv-09534-RGK-E, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 250695, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2021). Here, the result, and the attorneys’ fee request, is not only reasonable, but it is in line with other similar data breach settlements from around the country. *See Giroux v. Essex Prop. Tr.*, No. 16-cv-01722-HSG, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 41968, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2019) (awarding \$140,000 in fees from a \$350,000 settlement fund in a data breach case); *In re Ge/Cbps Data Breach Litig.*, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 53171, at *9 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 28, 2023) (attorneys’ fees of \$321,179.52 granted in data breach case offering similar class benefits).

Moreover, the rates used by Class Counsel in their fee calculations are consistent with those charged for similar legal services. In 2020, the National Association of Legal Fee Analysis issued the results of its 2020 Class Action Hourly Rate Survey, finding that hourly rates for Associates ranged from \$201-500/hour for associate attorneys, depending on years of experience, and \$501-\$900/hour for partner level attorneys, depending on years of experience.³ Fee requests based on lodestar analyses with counsel’s same rates have been accepted by Texas state courts. *See*

³ <https://www.thenalpa.org/blog/survey-class-action-defense-rates-keep-pace-with-plaintiffs-rates-in-2020/> (last visited Sept. 18, 2023).

Chatelain et al. v. C, L, and W PLLC, d/b/a Affordacare Urgent Care Clinics, Case No. 50742-A (42nd Dist. Tex.); *Stratton v. XTO Energy Inc.*, No. 02-10-00483-CV, 2012 Tex. App. LEXIS 1089, at *18 (Tex. App. Feb. 9, 2012). And Counsel’s rates are consistent with those regularly approved by Courts across the country for attorneys with similar experience, skills, and practice areas. Joint Fee Dec. ¶ 22.

Because Class Counsel’s requested fees are in line with those that would be reasonably awarded under the widely accepted percent-of-the-benefit approach, *and* the rates used in the lodestar calculation are consistent with rates charged for similar legal services, these factors weigh in favor of approval.

4. Class Counsel secured a significant benefit on behalf of the Class within a limited time frame.

As discussed above, Class Counsel here secured a significant benefit for Settlement Class Members—with individual claims valued at up to \$3,500 per person, and claims in the aggregate capped at \$275,000. In calculating the total value of a Settlement Fund, courts recognize inclusion of the fund as a whole, even if part of the fund may revert back to defendant. *Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472, 478 (1980). And even if class members do not claim the entirety of the amount available to them, their “right to share the harvest of the lawsuit upon proof of their identity, whether or not they exercise it, is a benefit in the fund created by the efforts of the class representatives and their counsel[.]” *Id.* at 480.

The Settlement’s benefits ensure that Settlement Class Members receive relief from any harm they have already suffered as a result of the Data Breach, such as the actual misuse of their personal information and compensation for time they spent dealing with any misuse. The timeliness of these reimbursements is a boon to the class; the longer they go without reimbursement, the greater the value of their damages.

As such, the benefit provided by Class Counsel is significant, and weighs in favor of granting Plaintiffs' request for attorneys' fees.

C. Costs sought by Plaintiffs are reasonable and warrant approval.

Included within the \$150,000 in attorneys' fees and costs agreed to in the Settlement, are Plaintiff's costs and litigation expenses, which total \$713.87. Joint Fees Dec., ¶ 23. These reasonable costs were necessary to litigation and included filing fees, research expenses and mediation costs. *Id.* The Settlement Class was provided notice of Plaintiff's intent to seek \$150,000 in attorneys' fees, litigation costs, and expenses. In approving class action settlements, Courts regularly award costs and expenses. *See, e.g., Northrup v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.*, 72 S.W. 3d 16, 21 (Ct. App. Tex. 2002) (upholding trial court's award of \$21,000,000 in combined fees and expenses); *Hall v. Pedernales Elec. Co-op., Inc.*, 278 S.W.3d 536 (Ct. App. Tex. 2009) (affirming trial court's approval of settlement and award of attorneys' fees and costs). Because the costs in this case were minimal, and necessary for furtherance of the litigation, they should be approved.

V. CONCLUSION

Settlement Class Counsel, with the help of Plaintiff, have made benefits of significant cash value available to class members. In return, they seek fees, costs, and service awards well within the ranges regularly approved by Texas Courts. The fees, costs, and service awards are inherently reasonable, and as such Plaintiffs respectfully request their approval.

Dated: October 21, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joe Kendall

JOE KENDALL

Texas Bar No. 11260700

KENDALL LAW GROUP, PLLC

3811 Turtle Creek Blvd., Suite 825

Dallas, Texas 75219

214-744-3000 / 214-744-3015 (Facsimile)

jkendall@kendalllawgroup.com

Raina C. Borrelli

STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC

One Magnificent Mile

980 N Michigan Avenue

Suite 1610

Chicago IL, 60611

Telephone:

raina@straussborrelli.com

***Attorneys for Plaintiff and the
Proposed Class***

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

I certify that on October 21, 2024, Raina Borrelli conferred with Amanda Harvey, counsel for Defendant, regarding the substance of this motion and she stated that Defendant does not oppose the relief requested herein.

/s/ Joe Kendall

JOE KENDALL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on all counsel of record on October 21, 2024 via e-File Texas, in accordance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

/s/ Joe Kendall

JOE KENDALL

CAUSE NO. DC-23-20315

Linda Glass, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

Generational Equity, LLC, and Generational Equity Group, Inc.,

Defendants.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

298th JUDICIAL DISTRICT

JOINT DECLARATION OF PLAINTIFF’S COUNSEL SUPPORTING THE MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARD

1. We are counsel for Plaintiff in the above-captioned case. This declaration supports Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Award. We have personal knowledge of the facts in this declaration and could testify to them if called on to do so.

LITIGATION BACKGROUND AND THE WORK OF CLASS COUNSEL

2. Plaintiff is a former Generational Equity employee and breach victim. On December 25, 2023, Plaintiff Linda Glass sued Generational Equity in the District Court of Dallas County, Texas, 298th Judicial District, to remediate the harm the breach had caused her. *See Linda Glass v. Generational Equity LLC, and Generational Equity Group Inc.*, No. DC-23-20315. This Complaint asserted six counts and demanded that Generational Equity reimburse Plaintiff and the Class for their losses.

3. Prior to filing these cases, Plaintiff’s counsel conducted extensive pre-suit discovery to ascertain all publicly available details about the cause, scope, and result of the data breach, as well as about the damages suffered by the Plaintiff and the Class.

4. Additionally, Plaintiff's counsel spent time interviewing Plaintiff to determine what Private Information Plaintiff and other employees provided to Generational Equity, what promises Generational Equity made about data security, and to determine the specific harm suffered by Plaintiff.

5. On April 23, 2024, Defendants filed their General Denial pursuant to Tex. R. Civ. P. 92, generally denying each and every cause of action asserted by Plaintiff in her Complaint.

6. Shortly after, the parties agreed to explore early resolution and work together cooperatively to resolve their claims. Plaintiff requested, and Generational Equity produced, key information to inform the settlement negotiations, including without limitation the size of the Settlement Class, facts concerning the named Plaintiff, and other pertinent facts. Further, despite not responding to the Defendants' General Denial, Class Counsel researched the issues raised in the General Denial and analyzed the viability of each of Plaintiff's legal claims.

7. On May 16, 2024, a Joint Motion to Vacate the parties' deadline for final judgment was filed in light of the parties' agreement to explore early resolution.

8. Following many weeks of negotiations at "arm's length," where the parties evaluated the strengths and weaknesses underlying their claims and defenses, the parties were able to make come to an agreement on the key terms of the Settlement, which was executed on June 11, 2024. While negotiations were always collegial, cordial, and professional, there is no doubt that they were adversarial in nature, with both parties forcefully advocating the position of their respective clients. From the start, the Parties agreed they would not negotiate Settlement Class Counsel's attorney fees or Plaintiff's service award until they agreed on the settlement agreement's core terms, thus avoiding conflict between Plaintiff and the Settlement Class.

9. Plaintiff's Counsel then prepared and submitted a motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement on June 21, 2024.

10. On August 5, 2024, the Court held a preliminary approval hearing and granted Plaintiff's unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, ordering that the Parties and the appointed Settlement Administrator, Angeion Group, proceed with issuing notice to the Settlement Class.

11. Since preliminary approval was granted, Class Counsel has worked with counsel for Generational Equity and with Angeion Group to finalize the notice documents and claim forms and to ensure notice was sent to the Settlement Class consistent with the Preliminary Approval Order.

12. We, and other attorneys at our firms, have devoted significant time and resources to this case to date, including:

- a. Conducting an investigation into the facts regarding Plaintiff's claims and class members claims;
- b. Researching law relevant to, and preparing Plaintiff's class action complaint;
- c. Negotiating and preparing the Parties' class action settlement agreement, along with the proposed class notice and claim form;
- d. Negotiating with settlement administration companies to secure the best notice plan practicable;
- e. Preparing Plaintiff's motion for preliminary approval of the class action settlement and preparing a detailed declaration in support;

- f. Working with the Settlement Administrator to ensure the timely completion of Notice and processing of claims;
- g. Appearing before the Court on the motion for preliminary approval of the modified Settlement;
- h. Closely monitoring evolving law regarding data security and its potential impacts on the case;
- i. Conferring with Plaintiff throughout the case.

PLAINTIFF'S CONTRIBUTION

13. Plaintiff seeks a Service Award in the amount of \$2,500. The award, if granted by this Court, will not impact the amount available to Settlement Class Members.

14. Throughout the litigation, Plaintiff served as a representative on behalf of the Settlement Class, including maintaining contact with counsel, assisting in the investigation of the case, remaining available for consultation throughout the mediation, reviewing pleadings and the Settlement Agreement, and answering counsel's many questions.

CONTINGENT NATURE OF ACTION

15. Our firms took on this case on a purely contingent basis.

16. This matter has required us, and other attorneys at our firms, to spend time on this litigation that could have been spent on other matters. At various times during the litigation of this class action, this lawsuit has consumed significant amounts of our time and our firms' time.

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

18. If not devoted to litigating this action, from which any remuneration to us is wholly contingent on a successful outcome, the time we spent working on this case could and would have been spent pursuing other potentially fee generating matters.

19. Litigation is inherently unpredictable and therefore risky. Therefore, despite our devotion to the case and our confidence in the claims alleged against Defendants, there were many factors beyond our control that posed significant risks.

20. Further, a successful outcome could only ensue, if at all, after prolonged and arduous litigation with an attendant risk of drawn-out appeals. Among national consumer protection class action litigation, data breach cases are some of the most complex and involve a rapidly evolving area of law. As such, these cases are particularly risky for plaintiffs' attorneys.

LODESTAR, FEES, AND EXPENSES

21. The regular practice at each of our firms is to maintain contemporaneous time records.

22. The billable rates for our firms are consistent with rates billed for similar legal services. *See* National Association of Legal Fee Analysis 2020 Class Action Hourly Rate Survey (<https://www.thenalfa.org/blog/survey-class-action-defense-rates-keep-pace-with-plaintiffs-rates-in-2020/>).

23. Through October 18, 2024, our firms worked a total of 87.1 hours on this case, incurring fees of \$48, 742.50. See lodestar breakdown by firm below.

24. We estimate that our total lodestar will increase by approximately \$10,000 by the close of this action in connection with drafting the final approval motion, preparing for argument at the final approval hearing, and miscellaneous matters, including responding to class member inquiries and claims administration.

25. Upon request, we can provide detailed contemporaneous records to the Court for review.

26. All books and records in this case regarding costs expended were maintained in the ordinary course of business, from expense vouchers and check records. We have reviewed the records of costs expended in this matter.

27. Through October 18, 2024, we have incurred \$713.87 in reasonable expenses necessary to the litigation, which include filing fees, research expenses, and mediation costs. Each firm's expenses are identified below.

Strauss Borrelli PLLC

28. Through October 18, 2024, Strauss Borrelli has worked a total of 83.6 hours on this case, incurring fees of \$45,242.50. Our lodestar was broken down as follows:

Name	Position	Hourly Rate	Number of Hours	Total
Samuel Strauss	Partner	\$700.00	11.1	\$7,700.00
Raina Borrelli	Partner	\$700.00	28.4	\$19,880
Zog Begolli	Attorney	\$425.00	0.2	\$85.00
Carolyn Chen	Attorney	\$400.00	43.6	\$17,440.00
Rachel Pollack	Paralegal	\$225.00	.3	\$67.50
TOTAL			81.6	\$44,442.50

29. Through October 18, 2024, Strauss Borrelli has incurred \$713.87 in reasonable expenses necessary to the litigation, including filing and pro hac fees.

Kendall Law Group, PLLC

30. Through October 18, 2024, Joe Kendall of Kendall Law Group, PLLC, has worked a total of 3.5 hours on this case, incurring fees of \$3,500.00. Kendall Law Group's lodestar is broken down as follows:

31. Kendall Law Group, PLLC has not incurred expenses necessary to the litigation.

Name	Position	Hourly Rate	Number of Hours	Total
Joe Kendall	Owner	\$1000.00	3.5	\$3,500.00

COUNSEL’S QUALIFICATIONS

A. Strauss Borrelli PLLC

32. Strauss Borrelli is a law firm in Chicago, Illinois, that focuses on complex civil and commercial litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection, employment, wage and hour, business, real estate, and debtor-creditor matters.

33. Raina Borrelli, the principal attorney from Strauss Borrelli assigned to this case, is a founding partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data breach, Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Borrelli received her J.D. magna cum laude from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2011. Prior to forming Strauss Borrelli, Ms. Borrelli was a partner at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Borrelli is an active member of the Minnesota Women’s Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of pro se litigants through the Pro Se Project. Ms. Borrelli has repeatedly been named to the annual Minnesota “Rising Star” Super Lawyers list (2014-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine. She has also been repeatedly certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association (2012-2015; 2018-2020) for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services. In recent years, Ms. Borrelli has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including: *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.); *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, 20-cv-01502 (JRT/HB) (D. Minn.); *In re FCA Monostable Gearshifts Litig.*, 16-md-02744 (E.D. Mich.); *Zeiger v. WellPet*

LLC, 17-cv-04056 (N.D. Cal.); *Wyoming v. Procter & Gamble*, 15-cv-2101 (D. Minn.); *In re Big Heart Pet Brands Litig.*, 18-cv-00861 (N.D. Cal.); *Sullivan v. Fluidmaster*, 14-cv-05696 (N.D. Ill.); *Rice v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc.*, 15-cv-00371 (M.D. Pa.); *Gorzynski v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.*, 18-cv-10661 (D.N.J.); *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods*, 18-cv-1736 (C.D. Cal.); *Reynolds, et al., v. FCA US, LLC*, 19-cv-11745 (E.D. Mich.).

34. Ms. Borrelli has significant experience in data privacy litigation and is currently litigating more than fifty data breach cases in courts around the country as lead counsel or co-counsel on behalf of millions of data breach victims, including *In re Netgain Tech. Consumer Data Breach Litig.*, 21-cv-1210 (D. Minn.) (appointed by the court to the Plaintiffs' Interim Executive Committee); *In re C.R. England, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 2:22-cv-374-DAK-JCB (appointed by the court as Interim Co-Lead Counsel); *Medina et al. v. PracticeMax Inc.*, 22-cv-01261-DLR (D. Ariz.) (appointed to Executive Leadership Committee); *Forslund et al. v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, 1:22-cv-04260 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed as interim co-lead class counsel); *In re Lincare Holdings, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fla.) (appointed to Interim Executive Leadership Committee); *McLaughlin v. Flagstar*, 22-cv-11470 (E.D. Mich.); *Corra et al. v. Acts Retirement Services, Inc.*, 2:22-cv-02917 (E.D. Pa.); *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp., Inc.*, 22-cv-490 (N.D. Cal.); *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.) (data breach settlement on behalf of 500,000 breach victims); *Kunkelman v. Curators of the University of Missouri, d/b/a MU Health Care*, Case No. 21BA-CV00182 (Mo. Cir. Ct., Boone Cty.); *Baldwin v. Nat'l Western Life Ins. Co.*, 21-cv-04066-WJE (W.D. Mo.) (settlement on behalf of 800,000 data breach victims).

35. The Strauss Borrelli Firm Resume is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

B. Kendall Law Group, PLLC

36. Former United States District Judge Joe Kendall is the owner of Kendall Law Group. Mr. Kendall served on the federal bench in the Northern District of Texas from 1992-2002, appointed by President George Herbert Walker Bush. He was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate. At the time of his appointment, he was the youngest U.S. District Judge in the country. He also served as a state district judge on the 195th Judicial District Court in Dallas from 1987-1992. In his judicial career, he has presided over approximately 500 jury trials and disposed of over 11,000 cases. Mr. Kendall has a B.B.A. from the Cox School of Business at Southern Methodist University and a law degree from Baylor University. Mr. Kendall served as a Commissioner on the United States Sentencing Commission from 1999 through 2002, appointed by President Bill Clinton.

37. Since leaving the bench for economic reasons and returning to trial work, Mr. Kendall has had tremendous success at the prosecution of patent and class action litigation either as lead, co-lead or local counsel.

38. While on the federal bench, Mr. Kendall handled class actions of various types and presided over numerous civil jury trials, including complex litigation, securities, antitrust, qui tam, medical malpractice, products liability, and patent infringement cases. He presided over a multi-district litigation case, and also handled environmental and CERCLA cases. Author of more than 250 judicial opinions published in the federal reporters or legal research databases, his more notable cases include, *Ozee v. American Council on Gift Annuities* (an antitrust class action against the most prominent charities in the nation), *SBC Communications v. AT&T* (to determine the constitutionality of certain provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996), *American Airlines, Inc. v. Allied Pilots Association* (the pilots sickout dispute in 1999), and *Johnson v. City of Dallas*

(a case brought by homeless persons to determine the constitutionality of a city ordinance prohibiting sleeping in public). In his career as a lawyer, Mr. Kendall has personally tried more than 100 jury trials to judgment.

39. Additionally, Mr. Kendall taught new federal judges for the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. and has taught docket management techniques to experienced federal judges throughout the country. He is a former board member of the Federal Judges Association and was editor of *In Camera*, the newsletter of the Federal Judges Association.

40. The Kendall Law Group, PLLC Firm Resume is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, we declare signed under penalty of perjury of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on October 21, 2024

/s/ Raina C. Borrelli

Raina C. Borrelli
STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC
One Magnificent Mile
980 N Michigan Avenue
Suite 1610
Chicago IL, 60611
Telephone:
raina@straussborrelli.com

/s/ Joe Kendall

JOE KENDALL
Texas Bar No. 11260700
KENDALL LAW GROUP, PLLC
3811 Turtle Creek Blvd., Suite 825
Dallas, Texas 75219
214-744-3000 / 214-744-3015 (Facsimile)
jkendall@kendalllawgroup.com

***Attorneys for Plaintiff and the
Proposed Class***

EXHIBIT A



980 N Michigan Avenue
Suite 1610
Chicago, Illinois 60611
P: 872.263.1110
F: 872.263.1109
straussborrelli.com

Our Firm

Strauss Borrelli PLLC is a premier civil litigation team focused on representing groups of individuals who have been harmed by corporate misconduct. We regularly represent clients in cases involving data misuse, illegal telemarketing, privacy intrusion, unfair employment practices, and defective products. Our efforts have earned us a reputation for achieving success in high-stakes and complex cases across the country.

At every step, we put the interests of our clients first.

We make the courtroom accessible to all.

At Strauss Borrelli, we understand that our legal system is out of reach for most individuals who have suffered at the hands of corporate wrongdoing. Time, money, and expertise act as barriers to judicial action. We confront these obstacles by empowering those affected to take collective action to seek relief.

We innovate and adapt.

As new technologies become available, our team learns and grows to make our processes faster, more effective, and less expensive. We challenge each other to continually evolve to meet the needs of our clients in an ever-changing world.

We know that people are our greatest resource.

Whether it be within our own team or with experts, co-counsel, or clients, we foster collaborative spaces. We know that good ideas can come from anyone, and the best ideas are forged when we work together. Our experiences have shown us that fresh perspectives coupled with legal expertise create smart strategies.

We understand the strength in numbers.

Too often, corporate transgressions go unchallenged. Together, we create a check against large companies' misconduct. By combining individual claims, we hold those who put profit over people accountable and achieve relief for all those injured by wrongdoings ranging from the annoyance of daily telemarketing calls to the devastation of a sudden mass layoff.

We commit to personal connections.

At every stage, we help clients understand the complex issues at hand and empower them to take an active role in their cases. We will always take the time to build relationships with our clients in order to understand what success means to them. In defining and reaching our goals, we advise with compassion and understanding.

Our Cases

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Fowler, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who were overcharged fees on FHA mortgages. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$30,000,000 in 2018, and final approval was granted in January 2019.

Jones, et al. v. Monsanto Company (W.D. Mo.)

Filed on behalf of individuals who purchased mislabeled RoundUp® products. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2020 for \$39,550,000. Final approval was granted in May 2021 and the case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit.

Crawford, et al. v. FCA US LLC (E.D. Mich.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who purchased or leased Dodge Ram 1500 and 1500 Classic vehicles equipped with 3.0L EcoDiesel engines between 2013 and 2019. Plaintiffs allege unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent practices in the Defendants' marketing and sale of vehicles with allegedly defective EGR coolers. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

In re: Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep EcoDiesel Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of consumers against Fiat Chrysler and Bosch alleging unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent practices in the Defendants' marketing and sale of certain EcoDiesel vehicles. The class contained over 100,000 vehicles, including 2014-2016 model-year Jeep Grand Cherokees and Dodge Ram 1500 trucks that were allegedly outfitted with devices that masked actual emission levels. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$307,500,000, and final approval was granted in May 2019.

Rolland, et al. v. Spark Energy, LLC (D.N.J.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who were forced to pay considerably more for their electricity than they should otherwise have paid due to Spark Energy's deceptive pricing practices. Plaintiff alleges that Spark Energy engages in a bait-and-switch deceptive marketing scheme luring consumers to switch utility companies by offering lower than local utility rates. These lower rates are fixed for only a limited number of months and then switch to a variable market rate that is significantly

higher than the rates local utilities charge. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$11,000,000 in 2022, and final approval was granted in December 2022.

Haines v. Washington Trust Bank (Wash. Sup. Ct., King Cty.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented consumers who were charged \$35 overdraft fees by Washington Trust Bank on accounts that were never actually overdrawn. Plaintiff filed suit against Washington Trust Bank for the unfair and unlawful assessment of these overdraft fees. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021, and final approval was granted in November 2021.

Pryor v. Eastern Bank (Mass. Sup. Ct., Suffolk Cty.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented consumers who were charged \$35 overdraft fees by Eastern Bank on accounts that were never actually overdrawn. Plaintiff filed suit against Eastern Bank for the unfair and unlawful assessment of these overdraft fees. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021, and final approval was granted in March 2021.

Benanav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance LLC (W.D. Wash.)

Strauss Borrelli represents consumers who were deceived by Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, an insurance provider that markets and administers pet insurance policies, regarding the true cost of its pet insurance policies. Plaintiffs allege that purchasers of Healthy Paws Pet Insurance's policies found that their policy premiums increased drastically from year to year, at a rate far outpacing the general costs of veterinary medicine, despite Healthy Paws Pet Insurance's representations to the contrary. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

DATA BREACH

Walters v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLP (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of consumers whose private information and personal identifiable information, including credit and debit card numbers, names, mailing addresses, and other personal information, was compromised and stolen from Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group by hackers. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2018, and final approval was granted in July 2019.

Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Milwaukee Cty.)

Filed on behalf of employees of Aurora Advocate Health, the 10th largest not-for-profit integrated health care system in the United States, whose personally identifiable information was breached and stolen through an email phishing campaign beginning in January 2020. Many of these individuals have lost time

and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case settled in 2023.

Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented a class of consumers whose personal health information was compromised and stolen from Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc., a Houston-based billing and collections services firm that provides billing and collection services to healthcare providers across the country. Many of these consumers have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2022 and final approval was granted in July 2022.

In re BJC Healthcare Data Breach Litigation (Mo. Cir. Ct., St. Louis Cty.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented a class of consumers whose personal health information was compromised and stolen from BJC Healthcare, a major regional health system. Many of these consumers lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021 and final approval was granted in September 2022.

Daum, et al. v. K & B Surgical Center, LLC (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented a class of consumers whose personal health information and protected health information was compromised and stolen from K & B Surgical Center. Many of these consumers have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. The case settled in 2023.

In re: Netgain Technology, LLC, Consumer Data Breach Litigation (D. Minn.)

Filed on behalf of consumers whose personal identifiable information and protected health information was breached and stolen from Netgain Technology, LLC beginning in September 2020. Strauss Borrelli partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as a member of the Plaintiffs' Interim Executive Committee in this multidistrict litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Dusterhoff, et al. v. OneTouchPoint Corp. (E.D. Wisc.)

Filed on behalf of 2.6 million consumers whose personal identifiable information and protected health information was breached and stolen from OneTouchPoint Corp., a mailing and printing services vendor, beginning in April 2022. Strauss

Borrelli partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in this litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

In re Lincare Holdings Inc. Data Breach Litigation (M.D. Fla.)

Filed on behalf of consumers whose personal identifiable information and protected health information was breached and stolen from Lincare Holdings Inc., a medical products and services provider, beginning in September 2021. Strauss Borrelli partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as a member of the Interim Executive Leadership Committee for plaintiffs and the class in this multidistrict litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida.

Forslund, et al. v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company (N.D. Ill.)

Filed on behalf of consumers whose personal identifiable information was breached and stolen from R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company, a Fortune 500 marketing, packaging, and printing company, beginning in November 2021. Strauss Borrelli partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as interim co-lead counsel for plaintiffs and the class in this litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

DATA PRIVACY

Patterson v. Respondus, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)

Filed on behalf of all persons who took an exam using Respondus' online exam proctoring software, Respondus Monitor, in the state of Illinois. Plaintiffs allege that Respondus collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Powell v. DePaul University (N.D. Ill.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented a class of DePaul University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric

information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleged that DePaul University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case settled in 2023.

Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology (N.D. Ill.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented a class of Illinois Institute of Technology students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleged that Illinois Institute of Technology collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case settled in 2023.

Harvey v. Resurrection University (N.D. Ill.)

Strauss Borrelli attorneys represented a class of Resurrection University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleged that Resurrection University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case settled in 2023.

RIGHT OF PUBLICITY

Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (N.D. California)

Filed on behalf of California residents against PeopleConnect alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that PeopleConnect violates these legal rights by using California residents' names and childhood photographs in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, classmates.com. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

Boshears, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (W.D. Wash.)

Filed on behalf of Indiana residents against PeopleConnect alleging violations of Indiana's Right of Publicity Statute and Indiana's common law prohibiting misappropriation of a name or likeness. Plaintiffs allege that PeopleConnect violates these legal rights by using Indiana residents' personalities, including their names and childhood photographs, in advertisements promoting paid

subscriptions to its website, classmates.com. The case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Loendorf v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)

Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)

Both actions were filed on behalf of Illinois residents against PeopleConnect alleging violations of Illinois' Right of Publicity Act and Illinois common law prohibiting unjust enrichment. Plaintiffs allege that PeopleConnect violates these legal rights by using Illinois residents' names, personas, and personal information in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, classmates.com, and unlawfully profiting from it. The cases are pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Sessa, et al. v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al. (D. Nev.)

Filed on behalf of Nevada residents against Ancestry.com alleging violations of Nevada's right to publicity statute, Nevada law prohibiting deceptive trade practice, Nevada common law protection against Intrusion upon Seclusion, and Nevada Unjust Enrichment law. Plaintiffs allege that Ancestry.com violates these legal rights by knowingly misappropriating the photographs, likenesses, names, and identities of Nevada residents for the commercial purpose of selling access to and advertising them in Ancestry.com products and services without their prior consent. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)

Filed on behalf of Illinois residents against Ancestry.com alleging violations of Illinois' Right of Publicity Act and Illinois common law prohibiting unjust enrichment. Plaintiffs allege that Ancestry.com violates these legal rights by knowingly misappropriating the photographs, likenesses, names, and identities of Illinois residents for the commercial purpose of selling access to and advertising them in Ancestry.com products and services without their prior consent. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Spindler v. Seamless Contacts Inc. (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of California residents against Seamless Contacts Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that Seamless Contacts violates these legal rights by using California residents' names, likenesses, photographs, and personas in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, seamless.ai. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc. (W.D. Wash.)

Filed on behalf of California residents against ZoomInfo Technologies Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that ZoomInfo Technologies violates these legal rights by using California residents' names and person information in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, zoominfo.com, as well as selling access to their names and personal information as part of its products. The case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Gbeintor v. DemandBase, Inc., et al. (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of California residents against DemandBase, Inc. and InsideView Technologies, Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that DemandBase and InsideView Technologies violate these legal rights by using California residents' names, likenesses, photographs, and personas in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, insideview.com, without their consent. The case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Kellman, et al. v. Spokeo, Inc. (N.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of California residents against Spokeo, Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that Spokeo violates these legal rights by using California residents' names, likenesses, photographs, and personas in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website without their consent. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC, et al. (S.D. Ohio)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$6,000,000, and final approval was granted in May 2019.

Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh (D. Mass.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$14,000,000 in 2020. Final approval was granted in October 2021 and the case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

Baldwin, et al. v. Miracle-Ear, Inc., et al. (D. Minn.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated or prerecorded telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$8,000,000 in 2021 and final approval was granted in October 2022.

Goodell, et al. v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC (D. Az.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case settled in 2023.

Doup v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC (N.D. Tex.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry, without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case settled in 2023.

Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al. (N.D. Ohio)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated or prerecorded telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

Learned, et al. v. McClatchy Company, LLC (E.D. Cal.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry and/or who requested Defendant stop calling them, without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case settled in 2023.

Rogers, et al. v. Assurance IQ, LLC, et al. (W.D. Wash.)

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones, some that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry, without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

Our Professionals

SAMUEL J. STRAUSS

Samuel J. Strauss is a founding member of Strauss Borrelli PLLC. Mr. Strauss concentrates his practice in class action litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection and privacy issues. Mr. Strauss has a national practice and appears in federal courts across the country. Over the course of his career, Mr. Strauss has represented plaintiffs in cases which have resulted in the recovery of hundreds of millions of dollars for consumers.

Mr. Strauss received his J.D. with honors from the University of Washington School of Law in 2013. Prior to forming Strauss Borrelli in 2024, Mr. Strauss was a founding member of Turke & Strauss in 2016, in Madison, Wisconsin, where he successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts.

Mr. Strauss is a member of bars of the states of Washington, Wisconsin, and Illinois and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

In recent years, Mr. Strauss has been actively involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Daum, et al. v. K & B Surgical Center, LLC*, No. 21STCV41347 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Joyner v. Behavioral Health Network, Inc.*, No. 2079CV00629 (Mass. Sup. Ct., Hampden Cty.)
- *In re BJC Healthcare Data Breach Litigation*, No. 2022-CC09492 (Mo. Cir. Ct., St. Louis City)
- *Baldwin, et al. v. National Western Life Insurance Company*, No. 2:21-cv-04066 (W.D. Mo.)

- *Pryor v. Eastern Bank*, No. 1984CV03467-BLS1 (Mass. Sup. Ct., Suffolk Cty.)
- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-01502 (D. Minn.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Weister v. Vantage Point AI, LLC*, No. 21-cv-01250 (M.D. Fla.).
- *Lang v. Colonial Penn Life Insurance Company*, No. 21-cv-00165 (N.D. Fla.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Uhhariet v. MyLife.com, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08229 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Crawford v. FCA US LLC*, No. 20-cv-12341 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC*, No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)
- *Jones v. Monsanto Company*, No. 19-cv-00102 (W.D. Mo.)
- *Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al.*, No. 18-cv-00182 (N.D. Ohio)
- *Rolland v. Spark Energy, LLC*, Case. No. 17-cv-02680 (D.N.J.)
- *Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC*, No. 17-cv-00515 (S.D. Ohio)
- *Fowler v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 17-cv-02092 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Wilkins v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A., et al.*, No. 14-cv-00190 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Ott v. Mortgage Investors Corporation*, No. 14-cv-00645 (D. Or)
- *Booth v. AppStack, et al.*, No. 13-cv-01533 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Melito v. American Eagle Outfitters, Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02440-VEC (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Spencer v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, No. 14-2-30110-3 SEA (Wa. Sup. Ct., King Cty.)

RAINA C. BORRELLI

Raina C. Borrelli is a founding member of Strauss Borrelli PLLC. Ms. Borrelli's practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data privacy, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Borrelli has served as lead, co-lead, and class counsel in numerous national class actions, including multi-district litigation. Additionally, Ms. Borrelli has substantial experience leading discovery teams in these complex class action matters, as well as in working with class damages experts and class damages models in consumer protection cases.

Ms. Borrelli received her J.D. *magna cum laude* from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2011. Prior to founding Strauss Borrelli, Ms. Borrelli was a partner at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Borrelli is an active member of the Minnesota Women's Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of *pro se* litigants through the *Pro Se* Project. Ms. Borrelli has repeatedly been named to the annual Minnesota "Rising Star" Super Lawyers list (2014-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine. She has also been repeatedly certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association (2012-2015; 2018-2020) for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services.

Ms. Borrelli is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

In recent years, Ms. Borrelli has been appointed to leadership positions in a number of data privacy cases, including *In re Netgain Technology, LLC Consumer Data Breach Litigation*, No. 21-cv-01210 (D. Minn.) (Interim Executive Committee); *Dusterhoff, et al. v. OneTouchPoint Corp.*, No. 2:22-cv-00882 (E.D. Wisc.) (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re Lincare Holdings Inc. Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fl.) (Interim Executive Leadership Committee); *Forslund v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company*, No. 1:22-cv-04260 (N.D. Ill.) (interim co-lead counsel); *Medina v. PracticeMax Incorporated*, No. 2:22-cv-0126 (D. Az.) (Executive Leadership Committee); *In re C.R. England, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, No. 2:22-cv-00374 (interim co-lead counsel); *Doe, et al. v. Knox College, Inc.*, No. 4:23-cv-04012 (C.D. Ill.) (co-lead counsel); and *In re OakBend Medical Center Data*

Breach Litigation, No. 4:22-cv-03740 (S.D. Tex.) (interim co-lead counsel). Ms. Borrelli has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Daum, et al. v. K & B Surgical Center, LLC*, No. 21STCV41347 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.)
- *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp*, No. 3:22-cv-00490 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Benedetto, et al. v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*, No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Reese v. Teen Challenge Training Center, Inc.*, No. 00093 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Lhota v. Michigan Avenue Immediate Care, S.C.*, No. 2022CH06616 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.)
- *Johnson, et al. v. Yuma Regional Medical Center*, No. 2:22-cv-01061 (D. Az.)
- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-01502 (D. Minn.)
- *Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Learned, et al. v. McClatchy Company LLC*, No. 2:21-cv-01960 (E.D. Cal.)
- *Lang v. Colonial Penn Life Insurance Company*, No. 21-cv-00165 (N.D. Fla.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-09203 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *DeBose v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-00209 (D.N.J.)
- *Gbeintor, et al. v. DemandBase, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-09470 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Spindler v. Seamless Contacts Inc.*, No. 4:22-cv-00787 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman, et al. v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 3:21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Brown v. Coty, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-02696 (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Benanav v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-00421 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Spindler, et al. v. General Motors LLC*, No. 3:21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Powell v. DePaul University*, No. 1:21-cv-03001 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology*, No. 1:21-cv-02512 (N.D. Ill.)

- *Harvey v. Resurrection University*, No. 1:21-cv-03203 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re FCA Monostable Gearshifts Litig.*, No. 16-md-02744 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Zeiger v. WellPet LLC*, No. 17-cv-04056 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Wyoming v. Procter & Gamble*, No. 15-cv-2101 (D. Minn.)
- *In re Big Heart Pet Brands Litig.*, No. 18-cv-00861 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Sullivan v. Fluidmaster*, No. 14-cv-05696 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Rice v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc.*, No. 15-cv-00371 (M.D. Pa.)
- *Gorzynski v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.*, No. 18-cv-10661 (D.N.J.)
- *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods*, No. 18-cv-1736 (C.D. Cal.)
- *Reynolds, et al., v. FCA US, LLC*, No. 19-cv-11745 (E.D. Mich.).

CASSANDRA MILLER

Cassandra Miller is a partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including consumer protection, privacy, data breaches, and product liability. Ms. Miller is adept at navigating the intricate legal landscapes of both state and federal courts across the nation. Additionally, Ms. Borrelli has substantial experience leading teams in these complex class action matters.

Ms. Miller received her J.D. *magna cum laude* from the University of Illinois Chicago School of Law in 2006. Prior to joining Strauss Borrelli, Ms. Miller was a managing partner at Edelman Combs Lattuner & Goodwin, LLC. There, Ms. Miller handled a wide range of consumer protection claims under key statutes such as the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), and Truth in Lending Act (TILA), as well as the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Practices Act (ICFA), alongside related state and federal consumer statutes.

Ms. Miller is a member of the Illinois State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Ms. Miller has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Pietras v. Sentry*, 513 F. Supp. 2d 983 (N.D. Ill. 2007)
- *Hernandez v. Midland Credit Mgmt.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16054 (N.D. Ill. 2007)
- *Balogun v. Midland Credit Mgmt.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 74845 (S.D. Ind. 2007)
- *Miller v. Midland Credit Mgmt.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18518 (N.D. Ill. 2009)
- *American Family Mutual Ins. Co. V. CMA Mortgage, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30233 (S.D. Ind. 2008)
- *Herkert v. MRC Receivables Corp.*, 254 F.R.D. 344 (N.D. Ill. 2008)
- *Walker v. Calusa Investments, LLC*, 244 F.R.D. 502 (S.D. Ind. 2007)
- *Frydman v. Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 69502 (N.D. Ill. 2011)
- *Webb v. Midland Credit Mgmt.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80006 (N.D. Ill. May 31,

2012)

- *Tabiti v. LVNV Funding, LLC*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5932 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 17, 2017), reconsideration denied, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 238583 (N.D. Ill., May 16, 2017)
- *Wheeler v. Midland Funding LLC*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52409 (N.D. Ill. July 31, 2017),
- *Magee v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs.*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 61389 (N.D. Ill. May 9, 2016), reconsideration denied, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 123573 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 13, 2016)

BRITTANY RESCH

Brittany Resch is a partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC. Ms. Resch's practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data breach, privacy, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Since 2022, Ms. Resch has served as an adjunct professor at the University of Minnesota Law School teaching a seminar on e-Discovery.

Ms. Resch received her J.D. from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2015, after which she clerked for the Honorable Richard H. Kyle, Senior United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota. Prior to joining Strauss Borrelli PLLC, Ms. Resch was an associate at Gustafson Gluek, where she prosecuted complex antitrust, consumer protection, and civil rights class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Resch was named one of the Attorneys of the Year in 2019 by Minnesota Lawyer for her work representing a pro se litigant in federal court through the Pro Se Project. Ms. Resch was also named a Rising Star in 2020 and 2021 and a 2021 Up & Coming Attorney by Minnesota Lawyer.

Ms. Resch has been an active member in the Federal Bar Association for a decade, holding various leadership and committee positions. Ms. Resch also assists in the representation of pro se litigants through the District of Minnesota Federal Bar Association's Pro Se Project. Ms. Resch is also an active member of Minnesota Women Lawyers. Ms. Resch has also been certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services (2023, 2021, 2020, 2019).

Ms. Resch is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Ms. Resch recently has significant experience in data privacy litigation and is currently litigating more than fifty data breach cases in courts around the country as counsel on behalf of millions of data breach victims, including *McKittrick v. Allwell Behavioral Health Services*, Case No. CH-2022-0174 (Muskingum County, Ohio) (appointed class counsel for settlement purposes); *Hall v. Centerspace, LP*, Case No. 22-cv-2028 (D. Minn.); *Morrison v. Entrust Corp., et al.*, Case No. 23-cv-415 (D. Minn.); *Batchelor v. MacMillan, et al.*, Case No. 157072/2023 (New York County, NY); *Tribbia, et al., v. Hanchett Paper Company*, Case No. 2022 CH 3677 (Cook County, IL); *Benedetto v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation*

Authority, No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.); *Corra, et al. v. ACTS Retirement Services, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-02917 (E.D. Pa.); *Lamie, et al. v. LendingTree, LLC*, No. 3:22-cv-00307 (W.D.N.C); and *In re Lincare Holdings Inc. Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fl.). Additionally, in recent years, Ms. Resch has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Emmrich v. General Motors LLC*, No. 21-cv-05990 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Spindler v. General Motors LLC*, No. 21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *DeBose v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-00209 (D.N.J.)
- *Gbeintor, et al. v. DemandBase, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-09470 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman, et al. v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 3:21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kis v. Cognism Inc.*, No. 4:22-cv-05322 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Benanav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-00421-RSM (W.D. Wash.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-09203 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Spindler v. Seamless Contacts Inc.*, No. 4:22-cv-00787 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Uhhariet v. MyLife.com, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08229 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus University, et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus University, et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation*, No. 16-cv-08637 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation*, No. 21-md-02998 (D. Minn.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.)
- *In re Asacol Antitrust Litigation*, No. 15-cv-12730 (D. Mass.)

ALEX S. PHILLIPS

Alex Phillips is a partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC. Mr. Phillips concentrates his practice in complex class action litigation and commercial litigation. He has represented both plaintiffs and defendants in high stakes litigation. Mr. Phillips has successfully obtained trial verdicts on behalf of his clients as well as negotiated numerous high-value settlements.

Mr. Phillips received his J.D. from the University of Wisconsin School of Law in 2017 and has been an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar as well as the Dane, Jefferson, and Dodge County Bar Associations.

In recent years, Mr. Phillips has been involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Benedetto v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*, No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp*, No. 3:22-cv-00490 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Koeller, et al. v. Numrich Gun Parts Corporation*, No. 1:22-cv-00675 (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Mayhood v. Wilkins Recreational Vehicles, Inc.*, No. E2022-0701 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Steuben Cty.)
- *Perkins v. WelldyneRx, LLC*, No. 8:22-cv-02051 (M.D. Fla.)
- *Batis v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 3:22-cv-09124 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Ambramson v. First American Home Warranty Corporation*, No. 2:22-cv-01003 (W.D. Pa.)
- *DeVivo v. Sovereign Lending Group Incorporated*, No. 3:22-cv-05254 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Spindler v. General Motors LLC*, No. 21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al.*, No. 18-cv-00182 (N.D. Ohio)
- *Benanav. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, LLC*, No. 20-cv-00421 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC, et al.*, No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)

EXHIBIT B



FIRM RESUME

Kendall Law Group was founded by former federal judge Joe Kendall. It is a boutique trial law firm exclusively representing plaintiffs. Led by Judge Kendall, the firm brings value-added assistance to their clients in complex class action, securities, and business litigation matters.

Since 2002, in class action cases, Joe Kendall has participated in obtaining over 1 billion dollars for clients. He has served as lead, co-lead, or local counsel in numerous merger & acquisition, derivative, securities fraud, consumer and other class action cases in both state and federal courts, including: *Gazda v. Ryan et al.*, Case No. 3:04-cv-02113-K (N.D. Tex.); *Sunset Management LLC v. American Realty Investors, Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:04-cv-02162-K (N.D. Tex.); *NECA-IBEW Pension Fund v. The Neiman Marcus Group Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:05-cv-00898-L (N.D. Tex.); *Alaska U.F.C.W Pension Trust v. Kleisner et al.*, Case No. 3:05-cv-01323-B (N.D. Tex.); *Hullung v. Bolen et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01083-N (N.D. Tex.); *Patrick Wheeler v. Frozen Food Express Industries, Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-02823-P (N.D. Tex.); *Linda K. Blankman v. Bradley et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-00339-L (N.D. Tex.); *Bazini et al v. Bradley et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-00389-L (N.D. Tex.); *Berlin v. Regency Energy Partners LP et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-00519-L (N.D. Tex.); *Budde et al v. Global Power Equipment Group Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-01679-M (N.D. Tex.); *Benouis v. Match Group Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:19-cv-02356-S (N.D. Tex.); *Harrison v. XTO Energy Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:09-cv-00768-Y (N.D. Tex.); *Atayi v. AZZ, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-00928-A (N.D. Tex.); *Erica P John Fund Inc et al. v. Halliburton Company et al.*, Case No. 3:02-cv-01152-M (N.D. Tex.); *Schwartz, et al v. TXU Corp.*, Case No. 3:02-cv-02243-K (N.D. Tex.); *Rogers v. TXU Corp, et al.*, Case No. 3:02-cv-02586-K (N.D. Tex.); *Jorgensen, et al v. TXU Corp, et al.*, Case No. 3:02-cv-

02600-K (N.D. Tex.); *Taubenfeld v. Hotels.com, et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00069-N (N.D. Tex.); *In re Michaels Stores, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00246-M (N.D. Tex.); *In re Carreker Corporation Securities Litigation*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00250-B (N.D. Tex.); *Sims v. Michaels Stores, Inc, et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00278-M (N.D. Tex.); *Green v. Hotels.com, et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00279-N (N.D. Tex.); *McKnight, et al v. TXU Corp., et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00289-K (N.D. Tex.); *JIS Trading Group v. TXU Corp., et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00290-K (N.D. Tex.); *Steele, et al v. Hotels.com, et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00323-N (N.D. Tex.); *In re Blockbuster Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00398-M (N.D. Tex.); *Massachusetts State Carpenters Pension Fund v. Fleming Companies Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00460-M (N.D. Tex.); *Heller v. Michaels Stores, Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00499-M (N.D. Tex.); *Futransky v. Michael Stores Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-00511-M (N.D. Tex.); *AIG Annuity Insurance Company et al v. Ebbers et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-01566-L (N.D. Tex.); *Robbins v. Brick et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-01687-M (N.D. Tex.); *Imperial County v. Brick et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-01688-M (N.D. Tex.); *Ryan v. Flowserve Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:03-cv-01769-B (N.D. Tex.); *TDH Partners LLP v. Ryland Group Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:04-cv-00073-B (N.D. Tex.); *Massachusetts Laborers Annuity Fund et al v. Odyssey Healthcare, Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:04- cv-00844-N(N.D. Tex.); *Caldarola v. Odyssey Healthcare, Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:04- cv-00988-N (N.D. Tex.); *In re UICI Securities Litigation*, Case No. 3:04-cv-01149-P (N.D. Tex.); *Fener v. Belo Corporation et al*, Case No. 3:04-cv-01836-D (N.D. Tex.); *In re SourceCorp Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 3:04-cv-02351-N (N.D. Tex.); *Lentz v. Citadel Security Software Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:05-cv-00100-D (N.D. Tex.); *Holland v. Citadel Security Software Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:05-cv-00184-D (N.D. Tex.); *Pipefitters Local No. 636 Defined Benefit Plan v. Ryland Group, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-00022-B (N.D. Tex.); *Laborers National Pension Fund v. AOL Time Warner Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-00220-K (N.D.

Tex.); *Hansen v. Fradella et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01096-N (N.D. Tex.); *In re Affiliated Computer Services Derivative Litigation*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01110-O (N.D. Tex.); *Galatoire v. Fradella et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01205-N (N.D. Tex.); *In re Affiliated Computer Services Derivative Litigation*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01212-M (N.D. Tex.); *Pipefitters Local No. 636 Defined Benefit Plan v. Zale Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01470-N (N.D. Tex.); *Massachusetts Laborers Annuity Fund v. Michaels Stores Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01635-N (N.D. Tex.); *Beatrice et al v. Home Solutions of America, Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01665-N (N.D. Tex.); *City of Pontiac Police and Fire Retirement System v. Kartsois et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01672-F (N.D. Tex.); *Minich v. Kartsois et al.*, Case No. 3:06-cv-01977-P (N.D. Tex.); *Crowell v. Mannatech Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:07-cv-00238-K (N.D. Tex.); *Vella v. Kartsois et al.*, Case No. 3:07-cv-00955-F (N.D. Tex.); *Rines v. Heelys Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:07-cv-01468-K (N.D. Tex.); *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Stanford International Bank Case No. Ltd et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-00298-N (N.D. Tex.); *Buettgen v. Harless et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-00791-K (N.D. Tex.); *Heffner v. Harless et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-00938-K (N.D. Tex.); *Goldberg v. Klein et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-01049-K (N.D. Tex.); *Bill Rains et al v Zale Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-02133-B (N.D. Tex.); *Lawyer v. Zale Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-02218-B (N.D. Tex.); *Hopson v. MetroPCS Communications Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:09-cv-02392-G *Richardson v. SolarWinds Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:10-cv-02085-B (N.D. Tex.); *North Port Firefighters' Pension et al v. Temple-Inland Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-03119-B (N.D. Tex.); *Bauman v. Simmons et al.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-03607-M (N.D. Tex.); *Brady v. Kosmos Energy, Ltd. et al.*, Case No. 3:12-cv-00373-B (N.D. Tex.); *Mounger v. Kosmos Energy Ltd et al.*, Case No. 3:12-cv-02383-B (N.D. Tex.); *Hohenstein v. Behringer Harvard REIT I, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:12-cv-03772-G (N.D. Tex.); *Herrley v. Frozen Food Express Industries, Inc.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-03004-B (N.D. Tex.); *Wallis v. Frozen Food Express Industries Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-03104-B (N.D.

Tex.); *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Arcturus Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:13-cv-04861-K (N.D. Tex.); *Kumar v. Santander Consumer USA Holdings Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:14-cv-03746-K (N.D. Tex.); *Panes v. Trinity Industries Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-01316-N (N.D. Tex.); *Isolde v. Trinity Industries Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-02093-K (N.D. Tex.); *Budde v. Global Power Equipment Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-02120-M (N.D. Tex.); *Steck v. Santander Consumer USA Holdings Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-02129-K (N.D. Tex.); *Kenney v. Pier 1 Imports Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-02798-D (N.D. Tex.); *Town of Davie Police Pension Plan v. Pier 1 Imports Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-03415-S (N.D. Tex.); *In re United Development Funding IV Securities Litigation*, Case No. 3:15-cv-04030-M (N.D. Tex.); *McCloskey et al v. Match Group Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:16-cv-00549-S (N.D. Tex.); *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Narayan et al.*, Case No. 3:16-cv-01417-M (N.D. Tex.); *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Faulkner et al.*, Case No. 3:16-cv-01735-D (N.D. Tex.); *Ramirez v. Exxon Mobil Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:16-cv-03111-K (N.D. Tex.); *Ashraf v. Energy Transfer Partners LP et al.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-00118-B (N.D. Tex.); *Irving Firemen's Relief & Retirement System v. Signet Jewelers Limited et al.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-00875-D (N.D. Tex.); *Sciabacucchi v. State National Companies Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-02412-C (N.D. Tex.); *Block v. Interoil Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00007-X (N.D. Tex.); *Iglesias v. Southcross Energy Partners, L.P. et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00158-N (N.D. Tex.); *Franchi v. Southcross Energy Partners LP et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00179-N (N.D. Tex.); *Cunha v. La Quinta Holdings Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00540-S (N.D. Tex.); *Rosenblatt v. La Quinta Holdings, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00558-K (N.D. Tex.); *Robinson v. RSP Permian Inc. et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-01047-L (N.D. Tex.); *Rosenblatt v. RSP Permian Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-01117-B (N.D. Tex.); *Franchi v. Nationstar Mortgage Holdings Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-01170-B (N.D. Tex.); *Chun v. Fluor Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-01338-X (N.D. Tex.); *In re*

Forterra, Inc Securities Litigation, Case No. 3:18-cv-01957-X (N.D. Tex.); *Peak et al v. Zion Oil & Gas Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-02067-X (N.D. Tex.); *Brooks v. United Development Funding III et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-03097-X (N.D. Tex.); *Strahan v. Cambium Learning Group Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-03123-K (N.D. Tex.); *Fox et al v. United Development Funding III et al.*, Case No. 3:19-cv-00274-M (N.D. Tex.); *Linenweber v. Southwest Airlines Co et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-00408-K (N.D. Tex.); *Union Asset Management Holding AG v. Fluor Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-00518-X (N.D. Tex.); *Shen v. Exela Technologies Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-00691-D (N.D. Tex.); *Schulze v. Hallmark Financial Services Inc et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-01130-X (N.D. Tex.); *Torres v. Berry Corporation et al.*, Case No. 3:20-cv-03464-S (N.D. Tex.); *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Randall*, Case No. 3:21-cv-00979-N (N.D. Tex.); *Damore v. RadioShack Corporation et al.*, Case No. 4:07-cv-00179-A (N.D. Tex.); *Pappas et al v. Simpson et al.*, Case No. 4:10-cv-00094-Y (N.D. Tex.); *Ruedelstein v. U.S. Concrete, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-00266-O (N.D. Tex.); *Mullins v. AZZ, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00025-Y (N.D. Tex.); *Fox et al v. United Development Funding III et al.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-00150-O (N.D. Tex.); *In Re Six Flags Entertainment Corporation Derivative Litigation*, Case No. 4:20-cv-00262-P (N.D. Tex.); *Martin et al v. Reid-Anderson et al.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-00311-P (N.D. Tex.); *Albayrak v. Reid-Anderson et al.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-00312-P (N.D. Tex.); *Genesee County Employees' Retirement System v. FirstCash Holdings Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:22-cv-00033-P (N.D. Tex.); *van der Gracht de Rommerswael v. Speese et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-00227-ALM-CMC (E.D. Tex.); *Alaska Electrical Pension Fund v. Brown et al.*, Case No. 6:04-cv-00464-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Wayne County Employees Retirement System v. Brown et al.*, Case No. 6:04-cv-00466-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Sippy v. Powell, et al.*, Case No. 2:03-cv-00222-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Acaldo v. Pilgrim's Pride Corporation et al.*, Case No. 2:08-cv-00419-JRG (E.D. Tex.); *Howes v. Pilgrim's Pride Corporation et al.*, Case No. 2:08-cv-00443-JRG

(E.D. Tex.); *Nemky v. Trinity Industries, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 2:15-cv-00732-JRG (E.D. Tex.); *Barry Family LP v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00300-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Braun, et al v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00304-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Harnik v. Electronic DataSys, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00308-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Bridgewater Partners v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00310-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Vanderwarter v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00314-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Thorne-Thomsen v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00321-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Britt v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00322-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Sved v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00323-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Zia v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00329-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Kluemper v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00331-LED (E.D. Tex.); *McLoughlin v. Electronic Data, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00335-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Stanton Pharmacy v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00336-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Fink v. Electronic Data, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00365-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Angeloni v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00056-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Morris v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00064-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Yakuboff v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00066-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Clark v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00082-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Xu v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00115-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Aiken v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00123-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Fontana v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00133-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Pipefitters Local v. Microtune Inc, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00158-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *Wahl, et al v. Daisytek, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00212-PNB (E.D. Tex.); *Chambers v. Daisytek, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00250-PNB (E.D. Tex.); *Sippy v. Powell, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00328-PNB (E.D. Tex.); *Morris v. Fontaine, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-00409-PNB (E.D. Tex.); *PLA LLC v. Advanced Neuromodulation Systems Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:05-cv-00078-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.); *RAI Investment Club v. Advanced Neuromodulation Systems Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:05-cv-00094-RAS-DDB (E.D. Tex.);

Hall v. Rent-A-Center, Inc. et al., Case No. 4:16-cv-00978-ALM-CMC (E.D. Tex.); *Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System v. Adeptus Health Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-00449-ALM (E.D. Tex.); *Witmer v. Dr. Pepper Snapple Group, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00209-ALM-KPJ (E.D. Tex.); *Celeste v. Intrusion Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:21-cv-00307-SDJ (E.D. Tex.); *Gaynor v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00178-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Dolan v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00190-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Sved v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00198-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Edwards v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00204-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Patterson v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00205-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Feder v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00207-DF (E.D. Tex.); *Huk v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00208-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Gordon v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00212-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Rudisill v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00218-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Eglinton v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00222-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Jackson Capital Mgt v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00223-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Horwitz, et al v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00232-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Miller v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00233-DF (E.D. Tex.); *Thompson v. Electronic Data, et al.*, Case No. 5:02-cv-00248-DF-CMC (E.D. Tex.); *Massachusetts State v. Hansen, et al.*, Case No. 5:03-cv-00083-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Massachusetts State v. Fleming Companies, et al.*, Case No. 5:03-cv-00204-TJW (E.D. Tex.); *Feder v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00110-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Horwitz, et al v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00111-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Miller v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00112-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Thompson v. Electronic Data, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00113-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Barry Family LP v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00114-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Braun, et al v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00115-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Harnik v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-

cv-00116-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Bridgewater Partners v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00117-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Vanderwarter v. Electronic Data Sys, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00118-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Thorne-Thomsen v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00119-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Britt v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00120-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Sved v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00121-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Zia v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00122-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Kluemper v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00123-LED (E.D. Tex.); *McLoughlin v. Electronic Data, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00124-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Stanton Pharmacy v. EDS, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00125-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Fink v. Electronic Data, et al.*, Case No. 6:03-cv-00128-LED (E.D. Tex.); *Marcus v. J.C. Penney Company, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:13-cv-00736-RWS-KNM (E.D. Tex.); *Gilbert v. J.C. Penney Company, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:13-cv-00810-RWS-KNM (E.D. Tex.); *Johnson v. J.C. Penney Company, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:14-cv-00722-KNM (E.D. Tex.); *PFS Investments Inc et al v. De Leeuw et al.*, Case No. 6:16-cv-00429-MHS-JDL (E.D. Tex.); *Oklahoma Law Enforcement Retirement System v. Adeptus Health Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:16-cv-01243-RWS (E.D. Tex.); *Kim v. Adeptus Health Inc. et al.*, Case No. 6:17-cv-00150-RWS (E.D. Tex.); *McKnight v. TXU Corp, et al.*, Case No. 9:02-cv-00274-JH (E.D. Tex.); *Trading Group v. TXU Corp, et al.*, Case No. 9:02-cv-00307-JH JIS (E.D. Tex.); *The Duck Pond CRT Ltd v. PAA Natural Gas Storage, L.P. et al.*, Case No. 4:13-cv-03170 (S.D. Tex.); *Rougier v. Applied Optoelectronics, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-02399 (S.D. Tex.); *Heck v. Orion Group Holdings, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-01337 (S.D. Tex.); *Hoffman v. RCI Hospitality Holdings, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-01841 (S.D. Tex.); *Ludovissy et al v. Bellicum Pharmaceuticals, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-02450 (S.D. Tex.); *Miller et al. v. Cadence Bancorporation et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-03492 (S.D. Tex.); *Miskella v. Christmann et al.*, Case No. 4:21-cv-01836 (S.D. Tex.); *Brodeen v. Christmann et al.*, Case No. 4:21-cv-02082 (S.D. Tex.); *Pirelli Armstrong, et al v. Hanover Compressor, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-00410 (S.D. Tex.);

Lampkin, et al v. UBS Painewebber Inc, et al., Case No. 4:02-cv-00851 (S.D. Tex.); *Anderson v. Hanover Compressor, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-02306 (S.D. Tex.); *Equitec-Cole Roesler v. McClanahan, et al.*, Case No. 4:02-cv-04048 (S.D. Tex.); *Securities & Exchange v. Rocky Mountain Energy, et al.*, Case No. 4:03-cv-01133 (S.D. Tex.); *Capstone Asset Management Company v. AOL Time Warner Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:06-cv-00306 (S.D. Tex.); *Brodsky v. Superior Offshore International, Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:08-cv-01297 (S.D. Tex.); *In Re: Repros Therapeutics, Inc. Securities Litigation*, Case No. 4:09-cv-02530 (S.D. Tex.); *Simpson et al v. Repros Therapeutics, Inc et al.*, Case No. 4:09-cv-03127 (S.D. Tex.); *In Re: BP plc Securities Litigation*, Case No. 4:10-md-02185 (S.D. Tex.); *Davis et al v. Duncan EnergyPartners L.P. et al.*, Case No. 4:11-cv-02486 (S.D. Tex.); *Matthews v. Rynd et al.*, Case No. 4:11-cv-02706 (S.D. Tex.); *Phillips v. Harvest Natural Resource et al.*, Case No. 4:13-cv-00801 (S.D. Tex.); *Myers v. Harvest Natural Resources, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:13-cv-01139 (S.D. Tex.); *Knoll v. Phillips et al.*, Case No. 4:13-cv-01528 (S.D. Tex.); *Wolfson v. PNGS GP LLC et al.*, Case No. 4:13-cv-03483 (S.D. Tex.); *Cady v. Key Energy Services, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:14-cv-02368 (S.D. Tex.); *Davidson v. Key Energy Service, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:14-cv-02403 (S.D. Tex.); *Ogden v. Cobalt International Energy, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:15-cv-00139 (S.D. Tex.); *John Hancock Capital Series et al v. BP, PLC et al.*, Case No. 4:15-cv-02704 (S.D. Tex.); *Ho v. Flotek Industries, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:15-cv-03327 (S.D. Tex.); *Walpole v. Flotek Industries, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:15-cv-03383 (S.D. Tex.); *Edgar v. Anadarko Petroleum Corporation et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-01372 (S.D. Tex.); *Stern v. Atwood Oceanics, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-01942 (S.D. Tex.); *Composto v. Atwood Oceanics, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-01968 (S.D. Tex.); *Carter v. Atwood Oceanics, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-02013 (S.D. Tex.); *Scarantino v. Parkway, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-02441 (S.D. Tex.); *Panella v. Tesco Corporation et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-02904 (S.D. Tex.); *The Vladimir Gusinsky Rev. Trust v. Tesco Corporation et al.*,

Case No. 4:17-cv-02918 (S.D. Tex.); *Scarantino v. Calpine Corporation et al.*, Case No. 4:17-cv-03256 (S.D. Tex.); *Paskowitz v. Dynegy Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00027 (S.D. Tex.); *McIntyre v. Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00273 (S.D. Tex.); *The George Leon Family Trust v. Chicago Bridge & Iron Company N.V. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-00314 (S.D. Tex.); *Witmer v. Layne Christensen Company et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-01051 (S.D. Tex.); *Paik v. Fair et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-02513 (S.D. Tex.); *Edwards v. McDermott International, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-04330 (S.D. Tex.); *Vladimir Gusinsky Rev. Trust v. Rowan Companies PLC et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-04341 (S.D. Tex.); *Van 'T Hoofd v. Nobilis Health Corp. et al.*, Case No. 4:18-cv-04727 (S.D. Tex.); *Manopla v. Lexicon Pharmaceuticals, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-00301 (S.D. Tex.); *Kokareva v. Bristow Group Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-00509 (S.D. Tex.); *Assad v. Penn Virginia Corporation et al.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-00656 (S.D. Tex.); *In Re: Anadarko Petroleum Corporation Securities Litigation*, Case No. 4:20-cv-00576 (S.D. Tex.); *Griggs v. Crown Castle International Corp. et al.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-00843 (S.D. Tex.); *Alexander et al v. Conn's Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-01705 (S.D. Tex.); *Ahnefeldt et al v. Dickson et al.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-02539 (S.D. Tex.); *Delaware County Employees Retirement System v. Cabot Oil & Gas Corporation et al.*, Case No. 4:21-cv-02045 (S.D. Tex.); *Coggins v. Camber Energy, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 4:21-cv-03574 (S.D. Tex.); *Justin Pierce and Hillary Kay, Derivatively on Behalf of AT&T Inc. v. Randall L. Stephenson, et al.*, Cause No. DC-14-13645, (193rd District Court, Dallas County, Texas); *Jacob Hulsebus, et al. v. Belo Corp., et al.*, Cause No. DC-13-06601, (68th District Court, Dallas County, Texas); *Ron Phillips and Scott Moorehead, Derivatively on Behalf of CLST Holdings, Inc., v. Timothy S. Durham, et al.*, Cause No. DC-10-07655 (134th District Court, Dallas County, Texas); *Regan Held, et al., v. C. Kelly Hall, et al.*, Cause No. CC-11-05258-D, (County Court No. 4, Dallas County, Texas); *David Flecker, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated and Derivatively*

on Behalf of Pioneer Southwest Energy Partners L.P., Cause No. DC-13-05371-G (134th District Court, Dallas County, Texas); *In re U.S. Home Systems, Inc. Shareholder Litigation*, Cause No. CC-12-04962-B (County Court No. 2, Dallas County, Texas); *Terry Neff, Derivatively on Behalf of Weatherford International Ltd., et al., v. Nicholas F. Brady, et al.*, Cause No. 2010-40764 (270th District Court, Harris County, Texas); *In re Burlington Northern Santa Fe Corporation Shareholder Class Action Litigation*, Cause No. 348-241465-09, (348th District Court, Tarrant County, Texas) *Dillingham v. Schmitz*, Cause No. 2005C119934 (288th District Court, Bexar County, Texas); *Holowach v. Gilliland, et al.*, Cause No. 017-221963-07 (17th District Court, Tarrant County, Texas); *Levy Investments v. Donald Steen, et al.*, Cause No. DC-07-00208 (101st District Court Dallas County, Texas); *In re Petco Animal Supplies, Inc., Shareholder Litigation*, Case No. GIC 869399 (Superior Court, San Diego, California); *Frank Capovilla v. Lone Star Technologies, Inc., et al.*, Cause No. DC-07-002979 (14th District Court, Dallas County, Texas); *Louis Dudas v. Encore Medical Corporation, et al.*, Cause No. D-1-GN-002495 (345th District Court, Travis County, Texas); *Waggoner v. Ryan, et al.*, Cause No. CC-05-13893 (County Court at Law No. 2, Dallas County, Texas); *Evans v. Paulson, et al.*, Cause No. 05-01818-JMR-FLN (D. Minn.); *In re Accuray, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, Case No. C 09 05580 CW (N.D. Cal.); *In re Microtune, Inc. Litigation*, Cause No. 219-03729-2010 (219th District Court, Collin County, Texas); *Edward Ferguson v. Louis Raspino, et al.*, Cause No. 2010-23805 (281st District Court, Harris County, Texas); *In re Duncan Energy Partners L.P. Shareholder Litigation*, Cause No. 2011-13981 (269th District Court, Harris County, Texas); and many others.

JOE KENDALL

Former United States District Judge Joe Kendall is the owner of Kendall Law Group. Mr. Kendall served on the federal bench in the Northern District of Texas from 1992-2002, appointed by President George Herbert Walker Bush. He was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate. At the time of his appointment, he was the youngest U.S. District Judge in the country. He also served as state district judge of the 195th Judicial District Court in Dallas from 1987-1992. In his judicial career, he has presided over approximately 500 jury trials and disposed of over 11,000 cases. Mr. Kendall has a B.B.A. from the Cox School of Business at Southern Methodist University and a law degree from Baylor University. Mr. Kendall served as a Commissioner on the United States Sentencing Commission from 1999 through 2002, appointed by President Bill Clinton.

Since leaving the bench for economic reasons and returning to trial work, Mr. Kendall has had tremendous success at the prosecution of patent and class action litigation either as lead, co-lead or local counsel.

While on the federal bench, Mr. Kendall handled class actions of various types and presided over numerous civil jury trials, including complex litigation, securities, antitrust, qui tam, medical malpractice, products liability, and patent infringement cases. He presided over a multi-district litigation case, and also environmental and CERCLA cases. He is the author of more than 250 judicial opinions published in the federal reporters or legal research databases. In his career as a lawyer, Mr. Kendall has personally tried more than 100 jury trials to judgment.

Additionally, Mr. Kendall taught new federal judges for the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. and has taught docket management techniques to experienced federal judges throughout the country. He is a former board member of the Federal Judges Association and was editor of *In Camera*, the newsletter of the Federal Judges Association.

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the eFiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the eFiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Joe Kendall

Bar No. 11260700

administrator@kendalllawgroup.com

Envelope ID: 93381911

Filing Code Description: Motion - Attorney Fees

Filing Description: PLAINTIFF'S UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARD AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT THEREOF

Status as of 10/21/2024 1:57 PM CST

Associated Case Party: LINDA GLASS

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Joe Kendall		jkendall@kendalllawgroup.com	10/21/2024 1:45:25 PM	SENT

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Helena Gurtu		hgurtu@kendalllawgroup.com	10/21/2024 1:45:25 PM	SENT
Amanda Harvey		aharvey@mullen.law	10/21/2024 1:45:25 PM	SENT
Amanda Nowell		anowell@mullen.law	10/21/2024 1:45:25 PM	SENT
Raina Borrelli		raina@straussborrelli.com	10/21/2024 1:45:25 PM	SENT
Min Ro		mro@straussborrelli.com	10/21/2024 1:45:25 PM	SENT