

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

DAVID AMBROSE, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS,  
LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS

Hon. Richard G. Stearns

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES, COSTS,  
EXPENSES, AND INCENTIVE AWARD**

Plaintiff David Ambrose (“Plaintiff”) hereby moves this Court for an order (i) approving the payment of attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses in the amount of one-third of the Settlement Benefit, (ii) granting Mr. Ambrose an incentive award of \$5,000 in recognition of his efforts on behalf of the class, and (iii) awarding such other and further relief as the Court deems reasonable and just.

Submitted in support of the Motion are Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Incentive Award, the Declaration of Philip L. Fraietta in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Incentive Award and accompanying exhibits, and the Declaration of David Ambrose in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Incentive Award.

Dated: July 28, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

By:           /s/ Philip L. Fraietta            
Philip L. Fraietta

Joshua D. Arisohn (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Philip L. Fraietta (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (646) 837-7150  
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163  
Email: jarisohn@bursor.com  
pfraietta@bursor.com

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Christopher R. Reilly (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420  
Miami, FL 33131  
Telephone: (305) 330-5512  
Facsimile: (305) 676-9006  
Email: creilly@bursor.com

*Class Counsel*

**BIRNBAUM & GODKIN, LLP**

David S. Godkin (BBO#196530)  
James E. Kruzer (BBO#670827)  
1 Marina Park Drive, Suite 1410  
Boston, MA 02210  
Telephone: (617) 307-6100  
Email: godkin@birnbaumgodkin.com  
kruzer@birbnaumgodkin.com

*Local Counsel for Plaintiff and the Settlement  
Class*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

DAVID AMBROSE, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS,  
LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS

Hon. Richard G. Stearns

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
ATTORNEY'S FEES, COSTS, EXPENSES, AND INCENTIVE AWARD**

Dated: July 28, 2023

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Joshua D. Arisohn (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Philip L. Fraietta (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (646) 837-7150  
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163  
Email: jarisohn@bursor.com  
pfraietta@bursor.com

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Christopher R. Reilly (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420  
Miami, FL 33131  
Telephone: (305) 330-5512  
Facsimile: (305) 676-9006  
Email: creilly@bursor.com

*Class Counsel*

[Local Counsel on Signature Page]

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A.    Factual Background .....	2
B.    Procedural History .....	3
C.    History of Settlement Discussions .....	4
I.    THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS’ FEES ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED .....	5
A.    The Court Should Utilize The Percentage Of The Fund Method .....	5
B.    The Reasonableness Of The Requested Fee Is Supported By The Relevant Factors.....	7
1.    Factor 1: The Size of the Fund and the Number of Persons Benefitted.....	7
2.    Factor 2: Counsel for Both Parties are Highly Competent, Experienced, And Efficiently Prosecuted This Case.....	8
3.    Factor 3: This Class Action is Complex .....	9
4.    Factor 4: The Risk of Non-Payment.....	10
5.    Factor 5: Class Counsel Dedicated Significant Time and Labor to This Case .....	11
6.    Factor 6: The Requested Award is Aligned with Awards in Comparable Cases.....	14
7.    Factor 7: Public Policy Considerations .....	15
II.    PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO AN INCENTIVE AWARD IN THE AMOUNT REQUESTED.....	16
CONCLUSION.....	17

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## PAGE(S)

## CASES

<i>Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners LLC</i> , 2022 WL 4329373 (D. Mass. Sept. 19, 2022).....	9, 10
<i>Beckman v. KeyBank, N.A.</i> , 293 F.R.D. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	12
<i>Bezdek v. Vibram USA INC.</i> , 79 F. Supp. 3d 324 (D. Mass. 2015).....	16
<i>Carnegie v. Household Int’l, Inc.</i> , 376 F.3d 656 (7th Cir. 2004).....	15
<i>Gordan v. Massachusetts Mut. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 2016 WL 11272044 (D. Mass. Nov. 3, 2016).....	6, 7
<i>In re Asacol Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2017 WL 11475275 (D. Mass. Dec. 7, 2017).....	6
<i>In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.</i> , 830 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (S.D. Fla. 2011).....	13, 14
<i>In re Continental Ill. Sec. Litig.</i> , 962 F.2d 566 (7th Cir. 1992).....	6
<i>In re Google LLC Street View Elec. Commc’ns Litig.</i> , 2020 WL 1288377 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2020).....	15
<i>In re Heritage Bond Litig.</i> , 2005 WL 1594403 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005).....	9
<i>In re Lupron Mktg. &amp; Sales Pracs. Litig.</i> , 2005 WL 2006833 (D. Mass. Aug. 17, 2005).....	7, 9, 10
<i>In re Nat’l Football League Players’ Concussion Injury Litig.</i> , 2018 WL 1635648 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 5, 2018).....	13
<i>In re Relafen Antitrust Litig.</i> , 231 F.R.D. 52 (D. Mass. 2005).....	7
<i>In re Sequoia Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 1993 WL 616694 (D. Mass. Sept. 10, 1993).....	12

*In re StockerYale, Inc. Sec. Litig.*,  
2007 WL 4589772 (D.N.H. Dec. 18, 2007) ..... 7

*In re Thirteen Appeals*,  
56 F.3d 295 (1st Cir. 1995)..... 6, 12

*In re TikTok, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.*,  
617 F. Supp. 3d 904 (N.D. Ill. July 28, 2022) ..... 14

*In re: Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.*,  
2019 WL 12966638 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2019)..... 15

*Kondash v. Citizens Bank, National Association*,  
2020 WL 7641785 (D.R.I. Dec. 23, 2020) ..... 5, 7

*Kristian v. Comcast Corp.*,  
446 F.3d 25 (1st Cir. 2006)..... 15

*Lane v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
2010 WL 9013059 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2010) ..... 14

*Maley v. Del Glob. Techs. Corp.*,  
186 F. Supp. 2d 358 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) ..... 12

*Medoff v. CVS Caremark Corp.*,  
2016 WL 632238 (D.R.I. Feb. 17, 2016) ..... 11

*Roberts v. TJX Companies, INC.*,  
2016 WL 8677312 (D. Mass Sept. 30, 2016)..... 11, 12

*Rogers v. BNSF Railway Co.*,  
2023 WL 4297654 (N.D. Ill. June 30, 2023)..... 10

*Scovil v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*,  
2014 WL 1057079 (D. Me. Mar. 14, 2014) ..... 16

*Sylvester v. Cigna Corp.*,  
401 F. Supp. 2d 147 (D. Me. 2005)..... 7

*Wakefield v. ViSalus, Inc.*,  
51 F.4th 1109 (9th Cir. 2022)..... 11

*Williamson v. Microsemi Corp.*,  
2015 WL 13650045 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2015)..... 13

**STATUTES**

18 U.S.C. § 2710..... 1

**RULES**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h) ..... 5  
Fed. R. Civ. P. 26..... 4

## INTRODUCTION

In this putative class action, Plaintiff David Ambrose (“Plaintiff”) alleges that Defendant Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC (“Defendant”) violated the Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710 (the “VPPA”) by installing and running the Facebook Tracking Pixel on its website, thereby causing its subscribers’ personally identifiable information – which the VPPA defines as including information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider – to be disclosed to Facebook. Although dozens of similar cases have since been filed across the country, this was the first ever Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case, thus pioneering the field.

After extensive arms’ length negotiations, including a mediation with The Honorable Frank Maas (Ret.) – formerly of the Southern District of New York and now a mediator at JAMS (New York), the Parties agreed to a Class Action Settlement (the “Agreement” or “Settlement”)<sup>1</sup> that requires Defendant to establish a \$4 million all-cash, non-reversionary Settlement Fund from which Settlement Class Members may file claims for a *pro rata* cash recovery, which Class Counsel estimates will amount to payments of approximately \$20-\$40 each. Additionally, Defendant has agreed to provide up to \$1 million of In Kind Relief, which will consist of an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* for a maximum of seven days past its current expiration date for no additional payment. And equally important, Defendant has agreed to meaningful prospective relief as it will suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated, or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, all capitalized terms herein have the same meaning as ascribed to them in the “Definitions” section of the Settlement Agreement.



content viewed to Facebook.

The Settlement provides that Class Counsel may seek up to one-third of the Settlement Benefit in attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses, and a \$5,000 incentive award for Plaintiff. This Court preliminarily approved the Settlement on May 25, 2023 (*see* ECF No. 52), and also approved a detailed Notice of Settlement of Class Action ("Notice") that outlined the Settlement terms, including attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and incentive award. So far, the Class response has been overwhelming: Class Members resoundingly approve the Settlement—not a single Class Member has objected to the Settlement.

Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks (1) reasonable attorneys' fees and costs totaling \$1,666,666.67, or one-third of the Settlement Benefit; and (2) an incentive award of \$5,000 for Plaintiff in recognition of his contributions to the case, his service to the Class Members, and the efforts and risks he undertook in bringing this litigation.

## **FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

### **A. Factual Background**

Plaintiff alleges that Defendant is a "multimedia organization that provides news, entertainment, and commentary across multiple brands and platforms." (ECF No. 22) (the "FAC") ¶ 8 (quoting Defendant's press release). According to Plaintiff, Defendant's website, [bostonglobe.com](http://bostonglobe.com), features "national and local content daily," including "news articles, photographs, images, illustrations, audio clips and video clips." *Id.* ¶ 9. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant incorporates the code for the Facebook Tracking Pixel on its website, which, when activated "tracks the people and type of actions they take." *Id.* ¶ 25 (quoting Facebook's documentation). According to Plaintiff, when a visitor navigates to [bostonglobe.com](http://bostonglobe.com), Defendant transmits certain event data to Facebook "permit[ing] an ordinary person to identify what video an individual has watched." *Id.* ¶ 32. Plaintiff further alleges that Defendant sends this data to

Facebook alongside the `c_user` cookie, which contains an “unencrypted Facebook ID.” *Id.* ¶¶ 33, 47. Thus, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant “knowingly discloses information sufficiently permitting an ordinary person to identify a specific individual’s video viewing behavior.” *Id.* ¶¶ 52-55. Defendant has denied, and continues to deny, many of these allegations.

## **B. Procedural History**

Prior to filing this matter, Class Counsel undertook an extensive pre-suit investigation, which included identifying the Facebook Tracking Pixel and developing a methodology to test for the Pixel’s use on various websites. Declaration of Philip L. Fraietta In Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Incentive Award (“Fraietta Decl.”) ¶ 4. That process was technical and required substantial labor and technological knowledge. *Id.* From there, Class Counsel developed a legal theory of the case pursuant to the VPPA, and on February 5, 2022, Class Counsel filed the first ever Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case, thus pioneering the field. ECF No. 1. The detailed, technical research included in the Complaint and the FAC speaks for itself and provided a roadmap that has led to dozens of similar Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA cases being filed in courts across the country. Fraietta Decl. ¶ 5; *see also generally* Compl.; FAC.

Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint on May 20, 2022, which is the operative complaint in this matter. ECF No. 22. On June 21, 2022, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint, which was accompanied by a 20-page memorandum of law. ECF No. 25. On July 19, 2022, Plaintiff filed his opposition to Defendant’s motion to dismiss, which comprised of a 19-page memorandum of law. ECF No. 28. On August 17, 2022, Defendant filed its reply memorandum of law in support of its motion to dismiss. ECF No. 29. The issues briefed in the motion to dismiss were novel. Indeed, at the time, no court had ever addressed a motion to dismiss a Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case. Fraietta Decl. ¶ 11

On September 19, 2022, this Court issued a Memorandum and Order denying Defendant's motion to dismiss. ECF No. 31. On October 12, 2022, Defendant answered the Amended Complaint by denying the allegations generally and raising nine affirmative defenses. ECF No. 36. Thereafter, the Parties engaged in written and document discovery, which included meet-and-confer conferences, and exchanged initial disclosures pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26. *See Fraietta Decl.* ¶ 14. Class Counsel also engaged a consulting expert who assisted in preparing discovery and tailoring Plaintiff's theory of the case. *See id.* ¶ 15.

### **C. History of Settlement Discussions**

Mindful that, as with any litigation, there is significant risk to both sides, from the outset of the case, the Parties engaged in direct communications, and as part of their obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, discussed the prospect of resolution. *Id.* ¶ 16. Those discussions led to an agreement between the Parties to engage in mediation, which the Parties agreed would take place before Judge Maas. *Id.* ¶ 17. The Parties stipulated to stay the case pending the mediation and the Court granted that stipulation on January 18, 2023. ECF No. 39.

In advance of the mediation, the Parties exchanged informal discovery, including on the size of the potential class. *Fraietta Decl.* ¶ 19. The parties also exchanged detailed mediation statements, airing their respective legal arguments and theories on potential damages. *Id.* Given that this information was the same or largely similar to discovery that would be produced in formal discovery related to class certification and summary judgment, the Parties were able to sufficiently assess the strengths and weaknesses of their cases. *Id.* ¶ 20.

On February 8, 2023, the Parties participated in a mediation before Judge Maas. *Id.* ¶ 21. While the Parties engaged in good faith negotiations, which at all times were at arms' length, they failed to reach an agreement that day. *Id.* However, because the Parties felt they had made progress, they stipulated to extend the stay to continue their mediation efforts, which the Court

granted. ECF Nos. 41, 43, 45. Over the next several weeks, the Parties engaged in additional rounds of arms' length negotiations facilitated by Judge Maas, and, on March 31, 2023, reached agreement on all material terms of a class action settlement and executed a term sheet. Fraietta Decl. ¶ 22; *see also* ECF No. 46. Thereafter, Class Counsel negotiated the full-form Settlement Agreement, selected a Settlement Administrator after a competitive bidding process, prepared a motion for preliminary approval, worked with the Settlement Administrator to effectuate the Notice, and has fielded calls from Settlement Class Members answering their questions and assisting them in filing claims. Fraietta Decl. ¶¶ 23, 25. Class Counsel has also worked with the Settlement Administrator on a weekly basis to monitor settlement claims and any other issues that may arise. *Id.* ¶ 26.

## ARGUMENT

### I. THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEES ARE REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The requested fee award of \$1,666,666.67, representing one-third of the common fund, is reasonable and merits approval. Under Rule of Civil Procedure 23(h), courts may award “reasonable attorney’s fees and nontaxable costs that are authorized by law or the parties’ agreement.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h).<sup>2</sup> Here, the Settlement Agreement between the Parties provides that Class Counsel may petition the Court for an award up to one-third of the Settlement Benefit. Agreement ¶ 8.1.

#### A. The Court Should Utilize The Percentage Of The Fund Method

The First Circuit recognizes that “use of the POF [percentage of the fund] method in

---

<sup>2</sup> The requested fee award also encompasses unreimbursed litigation expenses. Agreement ¶ 8.1. Reasonable litigation-related expenses are customarily awarded in common fund cases and include costs such as expert fees, mediation fees, and travel. *Kondash v. Citizens Bank, National Association*, 2020 WL 7641785, at \*6 (D.R.I. Dec. 23, 2020).

common fund cases is the prevailing praxis” and has “distinct advantages.” *In re Thirteen Appeals*, 56 F.3d 295, 307 (1st Cir. 1995). Specifically, the First Circuit has noted that:

[U]sing the POF method in a common fund case enhances efficiency, or, put in the reverse, using the lodestar method in such a case encourages inefficiency. Under the latter approach, attorneys not only have a monetary incentive to spend as many hours as possible (and bill for them) but also face a strong disincentive to early settlement. ... If the POF method is utilized, a lawyer is still free to be inefficient or to drag her feet in pursuing settlement options – but, rather than being rewarded for this unproductive behavior, she will likely reduce her own return on hours expended.

*Id.* (citations omitted). Moreover, “because the POF technique is result-oriented rather than process-oriented, it better approximates the workings of the marketplace. We think Judge Posner captured the essence of the point when he wrote that ‘the market in fact pays not for the individual hours but for the ensemble of services rendered in a case of this character.’ In fine, the market pays for the result achieved.” *Id.* (quoting *In re Continental Ill. Sec. Litig.*, 962 F.2d 566, 572 (7th Cir. 1992)). “Indeed, there is a clear consensus among federal and state courts that the percentage of the fund approach is the more efficient, better reasoned, and effective method.” *Gordan v. Massachusetts Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 2016 WL 11272044, at \*2 (D. Mass. Nov. 3, 2016).

Against that backdrop, courts throughout the First Circuit routinely approve fee awards of one-third of a common fund. *See Sullivan v. Sleepy’s LLC*, No. 1:17-cv-12009-RGS, ECF No. 66 (D. Mass. Dec. 18, 2019) (awarding one-third of \$3.9 million settlement); *Lapan v. Dick’s Sporting Goods, Inc.*, No. 1:13-cv-11390-RGS, ECF No. 220 (D. Mass. April. 19, 2016) (awarding one-third of \$10 million settlement); *Gordan*, 2016 WL 11272044, at \*3 (awarding one-third of \$30.9 million settlement); *In re Asacol Antitrust Litig.*, 2017 WL 11475275, at \*4 (D. Mass. Dec. 7, 2017) (awarding one-third of \$15 million settlement); *Matamoros v. Starbucks*

*Corporation*, No. 08-cv-10772-NMG, ECF No.169 (D. Mass. 2013) (awarding one-third of \$23.5 million settlement); *In re Relafen Antitrust Litig.*, 231 F.R.D. 52, 82 (D. Mass. 2005) (awarding one-third of \$67 million settlement and noting that “the one-third percentage of fund fee is not unreasonable as matter of law.”); *Sylvester v. Cigna Corp.*, 401 F. Supp. 2d 147, 151 (D. Me. 2005) (awarding one-third of \$2.3 million settlement); *Kondash v. Citizens Bank, National Association*, 2020 WL 7641785, at \*4-5 (D.R.I. Dec. 23, 2020) (awarding one-third of \$1,837,500 settlement fund and noting that “the traditional one-third of the fund has been routinely approved as appropriate” in similar federal statutory litigation under the TCPA); *In re StockerYale, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2007 WL4589772, at \*6-7 (D.N.H. Dec. 18, 2007) (awarding 33% of \$3.4 million settlement).

**B. The Reasonableness Of The Requested Fee Is Supported By The Relevant Factors**

“While the First Circuit does not mandate the weighing of any specific set of factors in assessing a common fund fee request, typical considerations include: (1) the size of the fund and the number of persons benefitted; (2) the skill, experience, and efficiency of the attorneys involved; (3) the complexity and duration of the litigation; (4) the risks of the litigation; (5) the amount of time devoted to the case by counsel; (6) awards in similar cases; and (7) public policy considerations, if any.” *In re Lupron Mktg. & Sales Pracs. Litig.*, 2005 WL 2006833, at \*3 (D. Mass. Aug. 17, 2005) (Stearns, J.). Here, each of the factors weighs in support of the requested fee award.

**1. Factor 1: The Size of the Fund and the Number of Persons Benefitted**

The Settlement provides significant and immediate relief to the Class Members: a \$4

million non-reversionary cash payment, plus up to \$1 million of In Kind Relief,<sup>3</sup> plus meaningful prospective relief in the form of an agreement to suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on Defendant's website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated, or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook. In total, the Settlement provides \$5 million of monetary benefit, plus meaningful prospective relief.

And while it is not possible to state with precision how many Settlement Class Members there are, it is clear that the Settlement Class includes at least thousands of people. To elaborate, Defendant's records ultimately showed that approximately 522,145 *Boston Globe* subscribers visited Defendant's website during the class period, but not every one of those subscribers is necessarily a Settlement Class Member (for example, a subscriber may not have had a Facebook account or may not have watched videos on Defendant's website). Fraietta Decl. ¶ 30. Still, the total subscriber figure makes clear that the Settlement Class includes at least thousands of people. *Id.* And the benefits to the Settlement Class are particularly exceptional in light of the risks involved with continued litigation (which are explained in more detail below). This factor therefore weighs in favor of the requested fee.

## **2. Factor 2: Counsel for Both Parties are Highly Competent, Experienced, And Efficiently Prosecuted This Case**

Class Counsel is highly skilled and experienced in class action litigation, particularly in the consumer privacy context, and has achieved a number of exceptional results throughout the country over the last several years. *See id.* ¶ 34 and Firm Resume attached thereto. The same is

---

<sup>3</sup> It bears noting that the In Kind Relief is *in addition to* the cash relief; not in lieu of. Thus, a claiming Settlement Class Member who files a valid claim for a cash payment will also receive In Kind Relief.

true of Defendant's counsel. *Id.* ¶ 37. Drawing on that experience and expertise, Class Counsel and Defendant's counsel worked to efficiently prosecute this case through motion practice, written discovery, and ultimately mediation and settlement. Accordingly, this factor weighs heavily in favor of the requested fee.

### 3. Factor 3: This Class Action is Complex

The complex nature of this litigation favors the requested fee award. The claims and legal theories at issue are novel, complicated, and unsettled. Indeed, this was the first ever Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case filed and it produced the first ever decision on a motion to dismiss in this arena. *Id.* ¶¶ 5, 11-12; *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners LLC*, 2022 WL 4329373 (D. Mass. Sept. 19, 2022). This litigation was thus inherently “a complex case raising difficult and in some instances novel legal issues” as well as “thorny issues of fact.” *In re Lupron Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, 2005 WL 2006833, at \*4. And “[c]ourts have recognized that the novelty, difficulty and complexity of the issues involved are significant factors in determining a fee award.” *In re Heritage Bond Litig.*, 2005 WL 1594403, at \*20 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005) (awarding one-third of the \$27.8 million fund where the class action “concerned relatively uncharted territory” and “cannot be considered a garden variety ... class action” ... “Cases of first impression generally require more time and effort on the attorney’s part ... [counsel] should not be penalized for undertaking a case which may make new law, [but] appropriately compensated for accepting the challenge.”). Indeed, other Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA cases have failed at the motion to dismiss stage, and none have progressed to class certification, summary judgment, or trial. *Fraietta Decl.* ¶ 32 (citing cases). Those later stages of the litigation would present additional risks, including, but not limited to, ascertaining the class and demonstrating predominance, given different browser settings that may be utilized by *Boston Globe* subscribers, and even proving the elements of the underlying VPPA claim.



*See, e.g., Ambrose*, 2022 WL 4329373, at \*2 (noting that factual disputes that were inappropriate for disposition at the motion to dismiss stage could have resulted in summary judgment later on).

In addition to the legal complexities, the case also involved factual complexities, including identifying the Facebook Tracking Pixel, its operation on Defendant’s website, and what data (if any) it was causing Facebook to receive. This factor favors the requested fee.

#### 4. Factor 4: The Risk of Non-Payment

“Many cases recognize that the risk assumed by an attorney is perhaps the foremost factor in determining an appropriate fee award.” *In re Lupron*, 2005 WL 2006833, at \*4.<sup>4</sup> Class Counsel took this case on a pure contingency basis and committed substantial resources of attorney and staff time, in addition to out-of-pocket costs and expenses, towards investigating, litigating, and settling this action. Fraietta Decl. ¶ 33. In doing so, Class Counsel “bore the risk of the case being dismissed at the pretrial stage, of losing at trial, or of failing to prove damages.” *In re Lupron*, 2005 WL 2006833, at \*4. Indeed, Class Counsel recognizes that Plaintiff faced considerable risks in establishing class-wide liability and obtaining Rule 23 certification of the proposed class action (and perhaps opposing a motion for decertification or a Rule 26(f) petition). Fraietta Decl. ¶¶ 31-32, 36-37. Class Counsel also assumed the risk of the significant delay associated with achieving a final resolution through trial and any appeals. *Id.* ¶ 33. And even if Plaintiff and the Class won a trial an award of statutory damages was not guaranteed. *See, e.g., Rogers v. BNSF Railway Co.*, 2023 WL 4297654, at \*13 (N.D. Ill. June 30, 2023)

---

<sup>4</sup> “A contingency fee arrangement often justifies an increase in the award of attorneys’ fees. This rule helps assure that the contingency fee arrangement endures. If this ‘bonus’ methodology did not exist, very few lawyers could take on the representation of a class client given the investment of substantial time, effort, and money, especially in light of the risks of recovering nothing.” *In re Lupron*, 2005 WL 2006833, at \*4 (quoting *Behrens v. Wometco Enterprises, Inc.*, 118 F.R.D. 534, 548 (S.D. Fla. 1988), *aff’d*, 899 F.2d 21 (11th Cir.1990)).

(vacating jury’s statutory damages award in statutory privacy class action and ordering a new trial on damages); *Wakefield v. ViSalus, Inc.*, 51 F.4th 1109, 1125 (9th Cir. 2022) (vacating and remanding district court’s denial of post-trial motion challenging the constitutionality of statutory damages award in statutory privacy class action and ordering the district court to reassess the question with new appellate guidance). “Where, as here, lead counsel undertook this action on a contingency basis and faced a significant risk of non-payment, this factor weighs more heavily in favor of rewarding litigation counsel.” *Medoff v. CVS Caremark Corp.*, 2016 WL 632238, at \*9 (D.R.I. Feb. 17, 2016); *see also Roberts*, 2016 WL 8677312, at \*13 (awarding one-third and citing “the significant risk [class counsel] assumed in taking the case on a wholly contingent basis”).

Moreover, given that Defendant was represented by highly sophisticated and renowned counsel, this was clearly a high-risk case whose outcome was unprecedented. Accordingly, the fee requested by Class Counsel is reasonable for a complex, high risk action such as this one.

**5. Factor 5: Class Counsel Dedicated Significant Time and Labor to This Case**

As detailed herein and in the Fraietta Declaration, Class Counsel has dedicated substantial time, effort, and resources to bringing this complex litigation to a successful resolution. That time includes a thorough pre-suit investigation into an allegedly undisclosed practice that led to this being the first ever Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case filed. From there, Class Counsel overcame a motion to dismiss raising novel legal issues. Class Counsel then engaged a consulting expert, conducted written and document discovery, and participated in exhaustive settlement negotiations, including a mediation with Judge Maas. And since that time, Class Counsel has worked to finalize the Settlement Agreement, move for preliminary approval, effectuate the Notice program, and assist Settlement Class Members in

filing claims. Finally, Class Counsel will continue to devote significant time and resources to obtaining final approval of the Settlement and seeing the administration process to its conclusion. *See Roberts*, 2016 WL 8677312, at \*13 (awarding one-third and noting that class counsel has “already committed, and anticipate continuing to commit, additional time to the administration of the claims”).

Class Counsel is cognizant that this case settled at a relatively early stage of the litigation. However, the timing of this settlement does not suggest a reduced percentage fee. *See Roberts*, 2016 WL 8677312, at \*13 (where case settled shortly after pleadings stage, awarding one-third of the total settlement fund based on counsel’s efforts and the risk assumed in taking the case on a contingency basis); *In re Sequoia Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 1993 WL 616694, at \*1 (D. Mass. Sept. 10, 1993) (awarding one-third and finding that “the speed with which relatively complex litigation has been resolved” was “a function of the quality of the counsel involved, their ability to get to the core of the case, the jugular of the case promptly, and effect a prompt resolution. That prompt resolution is a time value to the members of the class themselves.”); *Beckman v. KeyBank, N.A.*, 293 F.R.D. 467, 482 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) (declining to “penaliz[e] plaintiffs’ counsel for achieving an early settlement, particularly where, as here, the settlement amount was substantial”). Indeed, as the First Circuit has explained, the “percentage of fund” method is preferable because it avoids acting as a “strong disincentive to early settlement” and instead rewards efficiency. *In re Thirteen Appeals*, 56 F.3d at 307.

It is axiomatic that Class Counsel should be rewarded rather than penalized for efficiently reaching an excellent settlement that provides immediate benefits to the Settlement Class. *See, e.g., Maley v. Del Glob. Techs. Corp.*, 186 F. Supp. 2d 358, 373 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (awarding one-third of \$11.5 million fund, noting “such efficient prosecution of plaintiffs’

claims weighs in favor of a finding of the quality of [Class Counsel's] representation here . . . [A] prompt and efficient attorney who achieves a fair settlement without litigation serves both his client and the interests of justice.' In the context of a complex class action, early settlement has far reaching benefits in the judicial system."); *see also In re Nat'l Football League Players' Concussion Injury Litig.*, 2018 WL 1635648, at \*5-6 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 5, 2018) (awarding over \$100 million in attorneys' fees in "mega-fund" case even where the settlement "was secured without formal discovery, with limited litigation of motions, and with no bellwether trials"; because class counsel "mastered the intricacies of this case," they were able to reach a "relatively quick resolution" that allowed class members to receive compensation "as quickly as possible"); *Williamson v. MicrosemiCorp.*, 2015 WL 13650045, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2015) ("This Court will not . . . punish [attorneys] for resolving matters quickly, when such quick resolution is, as here, highly beneficial to the class. Indeed, if Class Counsel had not managed to resolve the case so quickly, the case might have bogged down in expensive and protracted litigation."); *In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.*, 830 F. Supp. 2d 1330, 1365 (S.D. Fla. 2011) (awarding 30% of a \$410 million "mega-fund" settlement: "this is one of the occasions when an early resolution may demonstrate that the parties and their counsel are well prepared and well aware of the strength and weaknesses of their positions and of the interests to be served by an amicable end to the case.") (quotations omitted).

And the need to reward rather than penalize efficient settlement is exacerbated in a case like this where precedent is lacking at every juncture. Simply put, Class Counsel – drawing on its experience and expertise in similar class action litigation – recognized that continued litigation may have reasonably resulted in the Settlement Class receiving nothing. Rather than risk such an adverse outcome, Class Counsel acted responsibly in negotiating an excellent

settlement with the assistance of a well-regarded former federal Magistrate Judge. This factor therefore weighs in favor of the requested fee award.

**6. Factor 6: The Requested Award is Aligned with Awards in Comparable Cases**

Courts in this Circuit routinely award one-third of the total fund in attorneys' fees. *See supra* Argument § I.A (collecting cases in this Circuit and throughout the country awarding one-third in attorneys' fees). Class Counsel's fee request for one-third of the total fund is in line with fee awards in other complex class action settlements within this Circuit. *See id.* And it is also in line with fee awards in other privacy class actions across the country. *See, e.g., Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-01812-KMK, dkt. 87 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 1, 2018) (awarding one-third of \$8.225 million settlement under Michigan state analog to the VPPA where case settled before a decision on the motion to dismiss); *Moeller v. Am. Media, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-11367-JEL, dkt. 42 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 28, 2017) (awarding 35% of \$7.6 million settlement under Michigan state analog to the VPPA where case settled shortly after a decision on the motion to dismiss); *Crumpton v. Octapharma Plasma, Inc.*, No. 19-cv-08402-VMK, dkt. 92 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 16, 2022) (awarding one-third of approximately \$9.98 million settlement under Illinois biometric privacy law); *In re TikTok, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.*, 617 F. Supp. 3d 904, 941 (N.D. Ill. July 28, 2022) (awarding one-third of approximately \$87.84 million settlement in data privacy class action and noting that "a flat percentage fee of one-third of the net common fund is typical in other data privacy settlements").

It also bears noting that this Settlement vastly outperforms the VPPA settlements and many other privacy settlements that came before it. *See, e.g., Lane v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2010 WL 9013059 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2010), *aff'd* 696 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2012) (approving settlement in VPPA case that only provided *cy pres* relief with no monetary relief to Settlement Class

Members); *In re: Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.*, 2019 WL 12966638, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2019) (approving settlement in VPPA case that provided each claimant with an estimated \$16.50 at a claims rate of 4.1%); *In re Google LLC Street View Elec. Commc'ns Litig.*, 2020 WL 1288377, at \*11–14 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2020) (approving, over objections of class members and state attorney general, a settlement providing only *cy pres* relief for violations of Electronic Communications Privacy Act); *Adkins v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 18-cv-05982-WHA, dkts. 350, 369 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2021) (approving settlement for injunctive relief only, in class action arising out of Facebook data breach).

### 7. Factor 7: Public Policy Considerations

Public policy considerations also favor Class Counsel's fee request. There is a public interest in having experienced counsel undertake the risk of pursuing complex class actions. This is particularly true where it is unlikely that the Class Members will pursue litigation on their own for economic or personal reasons. *See Kristian v. Comcast Corp.*, 446 F.3d 25, 54 (1st Cir. 2006) (“It would hardly be an improvement to have in lieu of this single class action 17,000,000 suits each seeking damages of \$15.00 to \$30.00. ... The *realistic* alternative to a class action is not 17,000,000 individual suits, but zero individual suits, as only a lunatic or a fanatic sues for \$30.00.”) (quoting *Carnegie v. Household Int'l, Inc.*, 376 F.3d 656, 661 (7th Cir. 2004)).

Moreover, society undoubtedly has a strong interest in incentivizing lawyers to bring complex litigation that is necessary to protect the privacy of consumers' personal viewing habits. In fact, class action litigation in this area is the most realistic means of safeguarding the privacy of viewers under the VPPA, especially because consumers are generally unaware that their privacy rights are allegedly being violated by Defendant's utilization of the Facebook Tracking Pixel. Thus, the realistic alternative to a class action in this case would have been no enforcement at all, and Defendant's allegedly unlawful conduct would have continued unabated. This factor thus

supports the requested fee award.

## **II. PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO AN INCENTIVE AWARD IN THE AMOUNT REQUESTED**

The Settlement states that Plaintiff may seek an incentive award of \$5,000. Agreement ¶ 8.3. This incentive award is fair and reasonable in light of the time and effort Plaintiff expended for the benefit of the Class, and the risks he assumed by initiating the litigation and publicly representing the Class. Further, the award is not excessive in light of the overall Settlement Fund.

Courts recognize that named plaintiffs are “an essential ingredient of any class action” and that “an incentive award can be appropriate to encourage or induce an individual to participate in the suit.” *Scovil v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, 2014 WL 1057079 \*6 (D. Me. Mar. 14, 2014). Incentive awards are viewed favorably because they encourage “named plaintiffs to participate actively in class action litigation in exchange for reimbursement for their pursuits on behalf of the class overall.” *Bezdek*, 79 F. Supp. 3d at 351. Plaintiff has actively pursued this litigation from the outset. His initiative, time, and effort were essential to the successful prosecution of the case. He: (1) worked with Class Counsel to investigate and develop the case; (2) participated in discovery and provided counsel with necessary documents, communications, and information; and (3) conferred with Class Counsel during the litigation and settlement negotiations. Declaration of David Ambrose In Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Motion for Attorneys’ Fees ¶¶ 3-7; Fraietta Decl. ¶¶ 39-41. An incentive award is appropriate in light of the efforts made by Plaintiff to protect the interests of the other Settlement Class members, the time and effort he expended pursuing this matter, and the substantial benefit he helped achieve for the other Settlement Class members. An incentive award of \$5,000 is well-deserved, reasonable, and equivalent to awards approved by other courts in this Circuit. *See Scovil*, 2014 WL 1057079 at \*6 (citing a 2006 study of

incentive awards during 1993-2002 found the median incentive payment to be \$4,537, with the average being \$15,992). Based on the foregoing, Class Counsel respectfully request that the Court approve an incentive award of \$5,000 for Plaintiff.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Plaintiff's application for attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and an incentive award to the Plaintiff.

Dated: July 28, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By:           /s/ Philip L. Fraietta            
Philip L. Fraietta

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Joshua D. Arisohn (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Philip L. Fraietta (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (646) 837-7150  
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163  
Email: jarisohn@bursor.com  
          pfraietta @bursor.com

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

Christopher R. Reilly (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420  
Miami, FL 33131  
Telephone: (305) 330-5512  
Facsimile: (305) 676-9006  
Email: creilly@bursor.com

*Class Counsel*

**BIRNBAUM & GODKIN, LLP**

David S. Godkin (BBO#196530)  
James E. Kruzer (BBO#670827)  
1 Marina Park Drive, Suite 1410  
Boston, MA 02210  
Telephone: (617) 307-6100  
Email: godkin@birnbaumgodkin.com  
          kruzer@birbnaumgodkin.com

*Local Counsel for Plaintiff and the Settlement  
Class*



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

DAVID AMBROSE, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS,  
LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS

Hon. Richard G. Stearns

**DECLARATION OF PHILIP L. FRAIETTA IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS, EXPENSES, AND INCENTIVE AWARD**

I, Philip L. Fraietta, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a partner at Bursor & Fisher, P.A., and I am Class Counsel in this action. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the States of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and Michigan, and I am admitted in this action *pro hac vice*. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.

2. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, Expenses, and Incentive Award, filed herewith.

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Parties' Class Action Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement"), and the exhibits attached thereto.

4. Beginning in June 2021, Class Counsel commenced an extensive pre-suit investigation, which included identifying the Facebook Tracking Pixel and developing a methodology to test for the Pixel's use on various websites. That process was technical and required substantial labor and technological knowledge.

5. Following that investigation, on February 5, 2022, Plaintiff David Ambrose filed a putative class action on behalf of digital subscribers to the *Boston Globe* who have a Facebook account and viewed videos on Defendant's website pursuant to the Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710, *et. seq.* (the "VPPA"). ECF No. 1. To my knowledge, this was the first ever Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case filed across the country, thus pioneering the field. Indeed, since that time, dozens of Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA cases have been filed across the country.

6. On April 29, 2022, in response to the Complaint, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). ECF No. 12.

7. On May 20, 2022, Plaintiff filed the operative First Amended Complaint (the "FAC") pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B) to address the purported deficiencies in the original Complaint. ECF No. 22.

8. On June 21, 2022, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss Plaintiff's FAC, which was accompanied by a 20-page memorandum of law. ECF No. 25.

9. On July 19, 2022, Plaintiff filed his opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss, which comprised of a 19-page memorandum of law. ECF No. 28.

10. On August 17, 2022, Defendant filed its reply memorandum of law in support of its motion to dismiss. ECF No. 29.

11. The issues briefed in the motion to dismiss were novel. Indeed, at the time, no court had ever addressed a motion to dismiss a Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case.

12. On September 19, 2022, the Court issued a Memorandum and Order denying Defendant's motion to dismiss in its entirety. ECF No. 31.

13. On October 12, 2022, Defendant answered the FAC by denying the allegations

generally and raising nine affirmative defenses. ECF No. 36.

14. Thereafter, the Parties engaged in written and document discovery, which included meet-and-confer conferences, and exchanged initial disclosures pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.

15. My firm also engaged a consulting expert who assisted us in preparing discovery and tailoring our theory of the case.

16. Mindful that, as with any litigation, there is significant risk to both sides, from the outset of the case, the Parties engaged in direct communications, and as part of their obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, discussed the prospect of resolution.

17. Those discussions led to an agreement between the Parties to engage in mediation, which the Parties agreed would take place before The Honorable Frank Maas (Ret.) – formerly of the Southern District of New York and now a mediator at JAMS (New York).

18. The Parties stipulated to stay the case pending the mediation and the Court granted that stipulation on January 18, 2023. ECF No. 39.

19. As part of the mediation, the Parties exchanged informal discovery, including on issues such as the size of the potential class. The parties also exchanged detailed mediation statements, airing their respective legal arguments and theories on potential damages.

20. Given that this information was the same or largely similar to discovery that would be produced in formal discovery related to class certification and summary judgment, the Parties were able to sufficiently assess the strengths and weaknesses of their cases.

21. The mediation took place on February 8, 2023. While the Parties engaged in good faith negotiations, which at all times were at arms' length, they failed to reach an agreement that day. However, because the Parties felt they had made progress, they stipulated to

extend the stay to continue their mediation efforts, which the Court granted. ECF Nos. 41, 43, 45.

22. Over the next several weeks, the Parties engaged in additional rounds of arms' length negotiations facilitated by Judge Maas, and, on March 31, 2023, reached agreement on all material terms of a class action settlement and executed a term sheet. ECF No. 46.

23. In the weeks following, my firm negotiated and finalized the full-form Settlement Agreement, which is attached to this Declaration as Exhibit 1, selected a Settlement Administrator after a competitive bidding process, and prepared a motion for preliminary approval.

24. On May 25, 2023, the Court issued an Order Granting Preliminary Approval. ECF No. 52.

25. Since that time, my firm has worked with the Settlement Administrator, Epiq, to effectuate the court-ordered Notice, and has fielded calls from Settlement Class Members answering their questions and assisting them in filing claims.

26. Since class notice has been disseminated, my firm has also worked with Epiq on a weekly basis to monitor settlement claims and any other issues that may arise.

27. The resulting Settlement secures an excellent recovery for the Settlement Class. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendant will establish a non-reversionary cash Settlement Fund in the amount of \$4,000,000. Settlement ¶ 1.32. Settlement Class Members will be entitled to submit claims against the Settlement Fund. *Id.* ¶ 2.1. All Settlement Class Members who submit a valid claim will be entitled to a *pro rata* portion of the Settlement Fund after payment of Settlement Administration Expenses, attorneys' fees and costs, and any incentive award, if approved by the Court. *Id.* Class Counsel estimates that each claiming Settlement Class

Member will receive a net payment of \$20-\$40.

28. In addition to the monetary relief described above, Defendant will also provide up to \$1,000,000 of In Kind Relief, in the form of an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* of whatever type enjoyed by the claiming Settlement Class Member for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment. *Id.* ¶ 1.16.

Settlement Class Members will have the ability to select In Kind Relief in addition to a monetary payment, or as a stand-alone remedy. *Id.* ¶ 2.1(b).

29. As part of the Settlement, within 45 days of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant will also agree to suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated (including by judicial decision on the use of website pixel technology by the United States Supreme Court, any federal court of appeals, a U.S. federal district court in Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts state court of general jurisdiction), or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook. *Id.* ¶ 2.2.

30. Based on Defendant's records there were approximately 522,145 *Boston Globe* subscribers<sup>1</sup> who visited Defendant's website during the class period, although not every subscriber is necessarily a Settlement Class Member (for example, a subscriber may not have had a Facebook account or may not have watched videos on Defendant's website). Still, even if a small percentage of those subscribers are Settlement Class Members the Settlement Class

---

<sup>1</sup> At preliminary approval, the Parties estimated that there were approximately 485,000 subscribers, but further confirmatory discovery confirmed 522,145 was the more precise measure. Due to these additional subscribers, Class Counsel has revised its estimate of per-claimant recovery from \$22-\$44 to \$20-\$40. As will be detailed in the forthcoming final approval motion, all disseminated class notices provided the \$20-\$40 estimated per-claimant recovery range.

would still number in the thousands.

31. From the outset of the case, Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognized that the case presented substantial and novel litigation risks. As aforementioned, this was the first ever Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA case to be filed across the country, and therefore the case necessarily presented novel and complex legal issues. For example, Defendant contends that: (i) it is not a “video tape service provider” within the meaning of the VPPA; (ii) the information it allegedly disclosed to Facebook does not constitute PII within the meaning of the VPPA; and (iii) any disclosures of PII to Facebook were not made by Defendant “knowingly,” as required by the VPPA. An adverse decision on any of these contentions would deprive Plaintiff and the Settlement Class of any recovery whatsoever.

32. Indeed, other Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA cases have failed at the motion to dismiss stage. *See, e.g., Gardener v. MeTV*, 2023 WL 4365901, at \*5 (N.D. Ill. July 6, 2023) (granting the motion to dismiss and “find[ing] dispositive MeTV’s argument that Plaintiffs are not consumers under the Act”); *Carter v. Scripps Networks, LLC*, 2023 WL 3061858, at \*6 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 24, 2023) (granting motion to dismiss because “[t]he Complaint describes plaintiffs as subscribers of hgtv.com newsletters, but does not plausibly allege that they were subscribers of hgtv.com video services”); *Martin v. Meredith Corp.*, 2023 WL 2118074, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 17, 2023) (“The plaintiff’s VPPA claim is dismissed because the complaint itself shows that the defendants do not disclose information showing that a person has ‘requested or obtained specific video materials or services.’”); *Hunthausen v. Spine Media, LLC*, 2023 WL 4307163, at \*3 (S.D. Cal. June 21, 2023) (granting motion to dismiss because “[r]enting, purchasing or subscribing for goods or services from a third party connected to a [video tape service provider] is insufficient to make someone a ‘consumer’ under the VPPA”); *Cantu v.*

*Tapestry, Inc.*, 2023 WL 4440662, at \*10 (S.D. Cal. July 10, 2023) (“[T]he Court finds Plaintiff has failed to state a claim on the basis that he has not properly alleged that Defendant is a ‘video tape service provider.’”); *Carroll v. General Mills, Inc.*, 2023 WL 4361093, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. June 26, 2023) (granting motion to dismiss because “[p]laintiffs do not allege any facts suggesting that the delivery of audiovisual material is General Mills’ particular field of endeavor or that General Mills’ products are specifically tailored to serve audiovisual material”). And while other Facebook Tracking Pixel-based VPPA cases have not reached class certification or summary judgment, similar Pixel and VPPA cases have failed at those stages of the litigation. *See, e.g., Doe v. Medstar Health, Inc.*, 23-C-20-000591, Dkt. Nos. 70-71, at p. 1 (Md. Cir. Ct. 2023) (denying a motion for class certification in Pixel case); *In re Hulu Priv. Litig.*, 86 F. Supp. 3d 1090, 1097 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (denying a motion for summary judgment in VPPA Facebook cookie case because “there [was] no evidence that Hulu knew that Facebook might combine a Facebook user’s identity (contained in the c\_user cookie) with the watch-page address”).

33. Despite the clear risks, my firm undertook this matter on a contingency basis with no guarantee of recovery and has committed substantial resources of attorney and staff time, in addition to out-of-pocket costs and expenses, towards investigating, litigating, and settling the matter. In doing so, my firm also assumed the risk of the significant delay associated with achieving a final resolution through trial or any appeals.

34. My firm, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., and I have significant experience in litigating class actions of similar size, scope, and complexity to the instant action. (*See Firm Resume of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.*, a true and accurate copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit 2**). My firm and I regularly engage in major complex litigation involving consumer privacy, have the resources necessary to conduct litigation of this nature, and have frequently been appointed lead

class counsel by courts throughout the country. *See* Ex. 2; *see also Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561, 566 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014) (“Bursor & Fisher, P.A., are class action lawyers who have experience litigating consumer claims. ... The firm has been appointed class counsel in dozens of cases in both federal and state courts, and has won multi-million dollar verdicts or recoveries in five class action jury trials since 2008.”).

35. The Parties agreed to the terms of the Settlement through experienced counsel who possessed all the information necessary to evaluate the case, determine all the contours of the proposed class, and reach a fair and reasonable compromise after negotiating the terms of the Settlement at arm’s length and with the assistance of a neutral mediator.

36. Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize that despite our belief in the strength of Plaintiff’s claims, and Plaintiff’s and the Class’s ability to ultimately each secure a \$2,500 statutory award under the VPPA, the expense, duration, and complexity of protracted litigation would be substantial and the outcome uncertain.

37. Plaintiff and Class Counsel are also mindful that absent a settlement, the success of Defendant’s various defenses in this case could deprive the Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members of any potential relief whatsoever. Defendant is represented by highly experienced attorneys who have made clear that absent a settlement, they were prepared to continue their vigorous defense of this case. Plaintiff and Class Counsel are also aware that Defendant would continue to challenge liability, as well as assert a number of defenses. *See supra* ¶ 30. Plaintiff and Class Counsel are also aware that Defendant would oppose class certification vigorously, and that Defendant would prepare a competent defense at trial. Looking beyond trial, Plaintiff is also aware that Defendant could appeal the merits of any adverse decision, and that in light of the statutory damages in play, it would argue – in both the trial and appellate courts – that the award



of any statutory damages is not warranted or for a reduction of damages based on due process concerns. *See, e.g., Rogers v. BNSF Railway Co.*, 2023 WL 4297654, at \*13 (N.D. Ill. June 30, 2023) (vacating jury's statutory damages award in statutory privacy class action and ordering a new trial on damages); *Wakefield v. ViSalus, Inc.*, 51 F.4th 1109, 1125 (9th Cir. 2022) (vacating and remanding district court's denial of post-trial motion challenging the constitutionality of statutory damages award in statutory privacy class action and ordering the district court to reassess the question with new appellate guidance).

38. Plaintiff and Class Counsel believe that the relief provided by the Settlement weighs heavily in favor of a finding that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and well within the range of approval.

39. I am of the opinion that Mr. Ambrose's active involvement in this case was critical to its ultimate resolution. He took his role as class representative seriously, devoting significant amounts of time and effort to protecting the interests of the class. Without his willingness to assume the risks and responsibilities of serving as class representative, I do not believe such a strong result could have been achieved.

40. Mr. Ambrose equipped my firm with critical details regarding his experiences with Defendant. He assisted my firm in investigating his claims, detailing his digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, how he registered for Facebook, and how he would watch videos on the *Boston Globe* website. Mr. Ambrose also assisted my firm by supplying supporting documentation, aiding in drafting the Complaint and the First Amended Complaint, and preparing to respond to written interrogatories, and produce documents in formal discovery. Mr. Ambrose was also prepared to testify at deposition and trial, if necessary. And he was actively consulted during the settlement process.

41. In short, Mr. Ambrose assisted my firm in pursuing this action on behalf of the Class, and his involvement in this case has been nothing short of essential.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above and foregoing is true and accurate.

Executed this 28th day of July 2023 at New York, New York.

/s Philip L. Fraietta

Philip L. Fraietta

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

DAVID AMBROSE, individually and on behalf of  
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS, LLC,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 22-cv-10195-RGS

**DECLARATION OF DAVID AMBROSE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT  
AND MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES**

I, David Ambrose, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an adult over the age of 18 and a resident of the State of California. I am a Class Representative in the lawsuit entitled *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC*, Case No. 22-cv-10195-RGS, currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. I make this Declaration in support of (i) the Motion for Final Approval of Settlement, and (ii) the forthcoming Motion for Attorneys' Fees. The statements made in this Declaration are based on my personal knowledge and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify thereto.

2. I had a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, a Facebook account, and I viewed videos on *Boston Globe's* website between February 5, 2020 and May 25, 2023.

3. I assisted with the litigation of this case by detailing my digital subscription, my Facebook membership, and my video viewing behavior. Specifically, I described to my lawyers how I subscribed to the *Boston Globe*, how I registered for Facebook, and how I would watch

videos on the *Boston Globe* website. I also informed my counsel that I did not agree in writing or otherwise to allow Defendant to disclose my personally identifiable information to Facebook, that I did not receive notice of such disclosures, and that I was unaware of such disclosures entirely.

4. I also worked with my attorneys to prepare the Class Action Complaint and the First Amended Class Action Complaint. I carefully reviewed the Complaints for accuracy and approved them before they were filed.

5. During the course of this litigation, I kept in regular contact with my lawyers. Specifically, I conferred with them regularly by phone and e-mail to discuss the status of the case. We also discussed case strategy, document discovery, preparation for deposition discovery, mediation, and the prospects of settlement. Furthermore, when appropriate, I informed my attorneys of additional facts for their research and consideration.

6. I also coordinated with my lawyers to search for documents that Defendant requested in formal discovery. I was also prepared to testify at deposition and trial, if necessary.

7. My lawyers have kept me well informed in regard to the efforts to resolve this matter. I discussed the Class Action Settlement Agreement with them and gave my approval prior to signing it.

8. Based on the interactions and my relationship with my attorneys, I believe they have fairly and adequately represented me and the Settlement Class and will continue to do so.

9. Throughout this litigation, I understood that, as a Class Representative, I have an obligation to protect the interests of other Settlement Class Members and not act just for my own personal benefit. I do not have any conflicts with other Settlement Class Members. I have done my best to protect the interests of other Settlement Class Members and will continue to fairly and

adequately represent the Settlement Class to the best of my ability.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above and foregoing is true and accurate.

Executed this \_\_\_\_ day of July 2023 at Irvine, California.

David Ambrose Jul 26, 2023  
David Ambrose (Jul 26, 2023 09:52 PDT)  
David Ambrose



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

DAVID AMBROSE, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS

**AMENDED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

This Agreement (“Agreement” or “Settlement Agreement”) is entered into by and among (i) Plaintiff, David Ambrose (“Plaintiff”); (ii) the Settlement Class (as defined herein); and (iii) Defendant, Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC (“Defendant”). The Settlement Class and Plaintiff are collectively referred to as the “Plaintiffs” unless otherwise noted. The Plaintiff and the Defendant are collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.” This Agreement is intended by the Parties to fully, finally and forever resolve, discharge, and settle the Released Claims (as defined herein), upon and subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and subject to the final approval of the Court.

**RECITALS**

A. This putative class action was filed on February 5, 2022, in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. The material allegations of the complaint center on Defendant’s alleged disclosure of its subscribers’ personally identifiable information to Facebook without permission in violation of Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710 *et seq.* (the “VPPA”) (ECF No. 1.)

**B.** In response to the complaint, on April 29, 2022, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), arguing, *inter alia*, that Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. (ECF No. 12.).

**C.** In response to the motion to dismiss, on May 20, 2022, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint as of right pursuant to Rule 15(a)(1)(B). (ECF No. 22).

**D.** In response to the First Amended Complaint, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), arguing, *inter alia*, that Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. (ECF No. 24). Plaintiff filed his opposition brief on July 19, 2022 (ECF No. 28), and Defendant filed its reply brief on August 17, 2022. (ECF No. 29).

**E.** On September 19, 2022, the Court denied Defendant's motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 31).

**F.** Defendant thereafter answered Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint on October 12, 2022 by denying the allegations generally and raising nine (9) affirmative defenses. (ECF No. 36.)

**G.** Thereafter, the Parties engaged in written discovery, which included the exchange of initial disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1), requests for production and interrogatories, meet-and-confer conferences regarding the same, and the production of documents.

**H.** From the outset of the case, and including during the pendency of the motion to dismiss, the Parties engaged in direct communications, and as part of their obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26, discussed the prospect of resolution. Those discussions led to an agreement between the Parties to engage in mediation, which the Parties agreed would take place before The Honorable Frank Maas (Ret.) of JAMS New York, who is a former United States Magistrate Judge for the Southern District of New York and a neutral at JAMS New York. The Parties



stipulated to stay the case pending the mediation and the Court granted that stipulation on January 18, 2023 (ECF No. 39).

**I.** As part of the mediation, and in order to competently assess their relative negotiating positions, the Parties exchanged informal discovery, including on issues such as the size and scope of the putative class, and certain facts related to the strength of Defendants' defenses. Given that the information exchanged was similar to the information that would have been provided in formal discovery related to the issues of class certification and summary judgment, the Parties had sufficient information to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses.

**J.** The mediation took place on February 8, 2023. While the Parties engaged in good faith negotiations, which at all times were at arms' length, they failed to reach an agreement that day. However, because the Parties felt they had made progress, they stipulated to extend the stay to continue their mediation efforts, which the Court granted. (ECF Nos. 41, 43, 45).

**K.** Over the next several weeks, the Parties engaged in additional rounds of arms' length negotiations facilitated by Judge Maas, and, on March 31, 2023, reached agreement on all material terms of a class action settlement and executed a term sheet.

**L.** At all times, Defendant has denied and continues to deny any wrongdoing whatsoever and has denied and continues to deny that it committed, or threatened or attempted to commit, any wrongful act or violation of law or duty alleged in the Action. Nonetheless, taking into account the uncertainty and risks inherent in any litigation, Defendant has concluded it is desirable and beneficial that the Action be fully and finally settled and terminated in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement. This Agreement is a compromise, and the Agreement, any related documents, and any negotiations resulting in it shall not be construed as or deemed to be evidence of or an admission or concession of liability or

wrongdoing on the part of Defendant, or any of the Released Parties (defined below), with respect to any claim of any fault or liability or wrongdoing or damage whatsoever.

**M.** Plaintiff believes that the claims asserted in the Action against Defendant have merit and that he would have prevailed at summary judgment and/or trial. Nonetheless, Plaintiff and Class Counsel recognize that Defendant has raised factual and legal defenses that present a risk that Plaintiff may not prevail. Plaintiff and Class Counsel also recognize the expense and delay associated with continued prosecution of the Action against Defendant through class certification, summary judgment, trial, and any subsequent appeals. Plaintiff and Class Counsel have also taken into account the uncertain outcome and risks of litigation, especially in complex class actions, as well as the difficulties inherent in such litigation. Therefore, Plaintiff believes it is desirable that the Released Claims be fully and finally compromised, settled, and resolved with prejudice. Based on their evaluation, Class Counsel have concluded that the terms and conditions of this Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and that it is in the best interests of the Settlement Class to settle the claims raised in the Action pursuant to the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among Plaintiff, the Settlement Class, and each of them, and Defendant, by and through its undersigned counsel that, subject to final approval of the Court after a hearing or hearings as provided for in this Settlement Agreement, in consideration of the benefits flowing to the Parties from the Agreement set forth herein, that the Action and the Released Claims shall be finally and fully compromised, settled, and released, and the Action shall be dismissed with prejudice, upon and subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

## AGREEMENT

### 1. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Settlement Agreement, the following terms have the meanings specified below:

**1.1 “Action”** means *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

**1.2 “Approved Claim”** means a Claim Form submitted by a Settlement Class Member that: (a) is submitted timely and in accordance with the directions on the Claim Form and the provisions of the Settlement Agreement; (b) is fully and truthfully completed by a Settlement Class Member with all of the information requested in the Claim Form; (c) is signed by the Settlement Class Member, physically or electronically; and (d) is approved by the Settlement Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Agreement. For the purpose of filing an Approved Claim, no proof of qualification for In Kind Relief shall be required. However, to receive a *pro rata* cash payment, each claimant must fill out an attestation that they viewed a video on the Boston Globe site using the same browser they use to access their Facebook account, and must provide information sufficient to identify their current or former Facebook page, such as a screenshot showing that they were a Facebook member during the class period or other similar proof

**1.3 “Claim Form”** means the document substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit A, as approved by the Court. The Claim Form, to be completed by Settlement Class Members who wish to file a Claim for a payment, shall be available in electronic and paper format in the manner described below.

**1.4 “Claims Deadline”** means the date by which all Claim Forms must be postmarked or received to be considered timely and shall be set as a date no later than forty-five

(45) days after entry of the Final Approval Hearing. The Claims Deadline shall be clearly set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order as well as in the Notice and the Claim Form.

**1.5 “Class Counsel”** means Philip L. Fraietta, Joshua D. Arisohn, and Christopher R. Reilly of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.

**1.6 “Class Representative”** means the named Plaintiff in this Action, David Ambrose.

**1.7 “Court”** means the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, the Honorable Richard G. Stearns presiding, or any judge who shall succeed him as the Judge in this Action.

**1.8 “Defendant”** means Boston Globe Media Partners LLC.

**1.9 “Defendants’ Counsel”** means Marc J. Zwillinger and Jeffrey G. Landis of ZwillGen PLLC.

**1.10 “Effective Date”** means the date ten (10) days after which all of the events and conditions specified in Paragraph 9.1 have been met and have occurred.

**1.11 “Escrow Account”** means the separate, interest-bearing escrow account to be established by the Settlement Administrator under terms acceptable to all Parties at a depository institution insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Settlement Fund shall be deposited by Defendants into the Escrow Account in accordance with the terms of this Agreement and the money in the Escrow Account shall be invested in the following types of accounts and/or instruments and no other: (i) demand deposit accounts and/or (ii) time deposit accounts and certificates of deposit, in either case with maturities of forty -five (45) days or less. The costs of establishing and maintaining the Escrow Account shall be paid from the Settlement Fund. The Escrow Account shall be maintained by the Settlement Administrator.

**1.12 “Fee Award”** means the amount of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of expenses awarded by the Court to Class Counsel, which will be paid out of the Settlement Fund.

**1.13 “Final”** means one business day following the latest of the following events: (i) the date upon which the time expires for filing or noticing any appeal of the Court’s Final Judgment approving the Settlement Agreement; (ii) if there is an appeal or appeals, other than an appeal or appeals solely with respect to the Fee Award, the date of completion, in a manner that finally affirms and leaves in place the Final Judgment without any material modification, of all proceedings arising out of the appeal or appeals (including, but not limited to, the expiration of all deadlines for motions for reconsideration or petitions for review and/or *certiorari*, all proceedings ordered on remand, and all proceedings arising out of any subsequent appeal or appeals following decisions on remand); or (iii) the date of final dismissal of any appeal or the final dismissal of any proceeding on *certiorari*.

**1.14 “Final Approval Hearing”** means the hearing before the Court where the Parties will request the Final Judgment to be entered by the Court approving the Settlement Agreement, the Fee Award, and the incentive award to the Class Representative.

**1.15 “Final Judgment”** means the Final Judgment and Order to be entered by the Court approving the Agreement after the Final Approval Hearing.

**1.16 “In Kind Relief”** means an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* of whatever type enjoyed by the claiming Settlement Class Member for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment. The maximum value of In Kind Relief to be distributed shall be one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00 USD).

**1.17 “Notice”** means the notice of this proposed Class Action Settlement Agreement and Final Approval Hearing, which is to be sent to the Settlement Class substantially in the

manner set forth in this Agreement, is consistent with the requirements of Due Process, Rule 23, and is substantially in the form of Exhibits B, C, and D hereto.

**1.18 “Notice Date”** means the date by which the Notice set forth in Paragraph 4.1 is complete, which shall be no later than thirty (30) days after Preliminary Approval.

**1.19 “Objection/Exclusion Deadline”** means the date by which a written objection to this Settlement Agreement or a request for exclusion submitted by a Person within the Settlement Class must be made, which shall be designated as a date no later than forty-five (45) days after the Notice Date and no sooner than fourteen (14) days after papers supporting the Fee Award are filed with the Court and posted to the settlement website listed in Paragraph 4.1(d), or such other date as ordered by the Court.

**1.20 “Person”** shall mean, without limitation, any individual, corporation, partnership, limited partnership, limited liability company, association, joint stock company, estate, legal representative, trust, unincorporated association, government or any political subdivision or agency thereof, and any business or legal entity and their spouses, heirs, predecessors, successors, representatives, or assigns. “Person” is not intended to include any governmental agencies or governmental actors, including, without limitation, any state Attorney General office.

**1.21 “Plaintiffs”** means David Ambrose and the Settlement Class Members.

**1.22 “Preliminary Approval”** means the Court’s certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes, preliminary approval of this Settlement Agreement, and approval of the form and manner of the Notice.

**1.23 “Preliminary Approval Order”** means the order preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement, certifying the Settlement Class for settlement purposes, and directing notice thereof to the Settlement Class, which will be agreed upon by the Parties and submitted to the Court in conjunction with Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary approval of the Agreement.

**1.24 “Released Claims”** means any and all actual, potential, filed, known or unknown, fixed or contingent, claimed or unclaimed, suspected or unsuspected, claims, demands, liabilities, rights, causes of action, contracts or agreements, extra contractual claims, damages, punitive, exemplary or multiplied damages, expenses, costs, attorneys’ fees and or obligations (including “Unknown Claims,” as defined below), whether in law or in equity, accrued or unaccrued, direct, individual or representative, of every nature and description whatsoever, whether based on the VPPA or other state, federal, local, statutory or common law or any other law, rule or regulation, against the Released Parties, or any of them, arising out of any facts, transactions, events, matters, occurrences, acts, disclosures, statements, representations, omissions or failures to act regarding the alleged disclosure of the Settlement Class Members’ personally identifiable information and video viewing behavior to any third party, including all claims that were brought or could have been brought in the Action relating to the disclosure of such information belonging to any and all Releasing Parties. Nothing herein is intended to release any claims any governmental agency or governmental actor has against Defendants.

**1.25 “Released Parties”** means Defendant Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC, as well as any and all of its respective present or past heirs, executors, estates, administrators, predecessors, successors, assigns, parent companies, subsidiaries, licensors, licensees, associates, affiliates, employers, employees, agents, consultants, independent contractors, insurers, directors, managing directors, officers, partners, principals, members, attorneys, accountants, financial and other advisors, underwriters, shareholders, lenders, auditors, investment advisors, legal representatives, successors in interest, assigns and companies, firms, trusts, and corporations.

**1.26 “Releasing Parties”** means Plaintiffs, those Settlement Class Members who do not timely opt out of the Settlement Class, and all of their respective present or past heirs, executors, estates, administrators, predecessors, successors, assigns, parent companies,

subsidiaries, associates, affiliates, employers, employees, agents, consultants, independent contractors, insurers, directors, managing directors, officers, partners, principals, members, attorneys, accountants, financial and other advisors, underwriters, shareholders, lenders, auditors, investment advisors, legal representatives, successors in interest, assigns and companies, firms, trusts, and corporations.

**1.27 “Settlement Administration Expenses”** means the expenses incurred by the Settlement Administrator in providing Notice (including CAFA notice), processing claims, responding to inquiries from members of the Settlement Class, mailing checks for Approved Claims, and related services.

**1.28 “Settlement Administrator”** means Epiq or such other reputable administration company that has been selected by the Parties and approved by the Court to oversee the distribution of Notice, as well as the processing and payment of Approved Claims to the Settlement Class as set forth in this Agreement.

**1.29 “Settlement Benefit”** means the Settlement Fund (\$4,000,000.00 USD) plus the In Kind Relief (up to \$1,000,000.00 USD), which totals five million dollars (\$5,000,000.00 USD).

**1.30 “Settlement Class”** means all persons in the United States who, from February 5, 2020, to and through the Preliminary Approval date: (1) have or had a Facebook account; (2) also had a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, or a home delivery subscription to the *Boston Globe* that includes digital access; and (3) who viewed videos on Boston Globe’s website while their Facebook membership was active. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, its subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents,



attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; and (4) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons.

**1.31 “Settlement Class Member”** means a Person who falls within the definition of the Settlement Class as set forth above and who has not submitted a valid request for exclusion.

**1.32 “Settlement Fund”** means the non-reversionary cash fund that shall be established by or on behalf of Defendant in the total amount of four million dollars (\$4,000,000.00 USD) to be deposited into the Escrow Account, according to the schedule set forth herein, plus all interest earned thereon. From the Settlement Fund, the Settlement Administrator shall pay all Approved Claims made by Settlement Class Members, Settlement Administration Expenses, any incentive award to the Class Representative, and any Fee Award to Class Counsel. The Settlement Fund shall be kept in the Escrow Account with permissions granted to the Settlement Administrator to access said funds until such time as the above-listed payments are made. The Settlement Fund includes all interest that shall accrue on the sums deposited in the Escrow Account. The Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for all tax filings with respect to any earnings on the Settlement Fund and the payment of all taxes that may be due on such earnings. The Settlement Fund represents the total extent of Defendant’s monetary obligations under this Agreement. In no event shall Defendant’s total monetary obligation with respect to this Agreement exceed or be less than four million dollars (\$4,000,000.00 USD), plus the interest earned on such sum.

**1.33 “Unknown Claims”** means claims that could have been raised in the Action and that any or all of the Releasing Parties do not know or suspect to exist, which, if known by him or her, might affect his or her agreement to release the Released Parties or the Released Claims or might affect his or her decision to agree, object or not to object to the Settlement. Upon the

Effective Date, the Releasing Parties shall be deemed to have, and shall have, expressly waived and relinquished, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the provisions, rights and benefits of § 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties also shall be deemed to have, and shall have, waived any and all provisions, rights and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States, or principle of common law, or the law of any jurisdiction outside of the United States, which is similar, comparable or equivalent to § 1542 of the California Civil Code. The Releasing Parties acknowledge that they may discover facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of this release, but that it is their intention to finally and forever settle and release the Released Claims, notwithstanding any Unknown Claims they may have, as that term is defined in this Paragraph.

## **2. SETTLEMENT RELIEF.**

### **2.1 Payments to Settlement Class Members.**

(a) Defendants shall pay or cause to be paid into the Escrow Account the amount of the Settlement Fund (\$4,000,000.00 USD), as specified in Paragraph 1.32 of this Agreement, within twenty-eight (28) days after Preliminary Approval.

(b) Settlement Class Members shall have until the Claims Deadline to submit an Approved Claim. Each Settlement Class Member with an Approved Claim shall be entitled to:

- a. In Kind Relief to extend any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* of whatever type enjoyed by the Approved Claimant

for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment.

- b.** For those that satisfy the criteria for the cash payment portion set out in the definition of Approved Claim, a *pro rata* portion of the Settlement Fund by check after deducting the Settlement Administration Expenses, any Fee Award, and any incentive award.

**(c)** The Settlement Administrator shall pay from the Settlement Fund all Approved Claims by check with said checks being sent via first class U.S. mail to the Settlement Class Members who submitted such Approved Claims. Payments to all Settlement Class Members with Approved Claims shall be made within ninety (90) days after the Effective Date.

**(d)** The In Kind Relief shall be available to all claiming Settlement Class Members within ninety (90) days after the Effective Date. Within seven (7) days of the In Kind Relief becoming available, Defendant will send or cause to be sent by the Settlement Administrator email notice to all claiming Settlement Class Members advising as to the availability of the In Kind Relief and instructions for accessing the same. No payment or billing information, or proof of Facebook usage, will be required for a Settlement Class Member to use the In Kind Relief. The In Kind Relief will not expire.

**(e)** All cash payments issued to Settlement Class Members via check will state on the face of the check that it will expire and become null and void unless cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) days after the date of issuance. To the extent that any checks issued to a Settlement Class Member are not cashed within one-hundred eighty (180) days after the date of issuance, such uncashed check funds shall be redistributed on a *pro rata* basis (after first deducting any necessary settlement administration expenses from such uncashed check funds) to all Settlement Class Members who cashed checks during the initial distribution, but

only to the extent each Settlement Class Member would receive at least \$5.00 in any such secondary distribution and if otherwise feasible. To the extent each Settlement Class Member would receive less than \$5.00 in any such secondary distribution or if a secondary distribution would be otherwise infeasible, any uncashed check funds shall revert to a non-sectarian, not-for-profit organization, agreed upon by counsel for the class and Boston Globe Media Partners and approved by the Court.

(f) Upon payment of the Settlement Fund into the Escrow Account, all risk of loss with respect to the cash portion of the Settlement shall pass to the Escrow Account, and any and all remaining interest or right of Defendant in or to the Escrow Account, if any, shall be extinguished.

**2.2 Prospective Relief.** Within 45 days of the Preliminary Approval Order, Defendant will suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated (including by judicial decision on the use of website pixel technology by the United States Supreme Court, any federal court of appeals, a U.S. federal district court in Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts state court of general jurisdiction), or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook. Nothing herein shall prohibit the use of the Facebook Tracking Pixel where the disclosure of information to Facebook does not identify specific video materials that a user has requested or obtained.

### **3. RELEASE.**

**3.1** The obligations incurred pursuant to this Settlement Agreement shall be a full and final disposition of the Action and any and all Released Claims, as against all Released Parties.

**3.2** Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties, and each of them, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Final Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims against the Released Parties, and each of them. Further, upon the Effective Date, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, each Settlement Class Member, shall, either directly, indirectly, representatively, or in any capacity, be permanently barred and enjoined from filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in, or participating (as a class member or otherwise) in any lawsuit, action, or other proceeding in any jurisdiction (other than participation in the Settlement as provided herein) against any Released Party based on the Released Claims.

**4. NOTICE TO THE CLASS.**

**4.1** The Notice Plan shall consist of the following:

**(a)** *Settlement Class List.* No later than fourteen (14) days after Preliminary Approval, Defendant shall produce an electronic list from its records that includes the names, email addresses, and last known U.S. Mail addresses, , to the extent available, belonging to Persons within the Settlement Class. Class Counsel’s assent to this Agreement shall constitute consent on behalf of the Settlement Class to disclose this information, consistent with the written consent provisions of the VPPA. This electronic document shall be called the “Class List,” and shall be provided to the Settlement Administrator with a copy to Class Counsel. Class Counsel shall not use the Settlement Class List, or any information contained within it, for any other purposes other than administering the settlement, and shall take reasonable measures to protect the information from any third-party disclosure. Class Counsel may not send advertisements, solicitations, or communications to the Settlement Class to solicit Class members to retain Class Counsel for any other matters or disputes.

(b) *Direct Notice.* In the event that the Court preliminarily approves the Settlement, no later than the Notice Date, the Settlement Administrator shall send Notice via email substantially in the form attached as Exhibit B, along with an electronic link to the Claim Form, to all Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Class List. In the event transmission of email notice results in any “bounce-backs,” the Settlement Administrator shall, where reasonable: (i) correct any issues that may have caused the “bounce-back” to occur and make a second attempt to re-send the email notice, and (ii) send Notice substantially in the form attached as Exhibit C via First Class U.S. Mail.

(c) *Update Addresses.* Prior to mailing any Notice, the Settlement Administrator will update the U.S. mail addresses of persons on the Class List using the National Change of Address database and other available resources deemed suitable by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator shall take all reasonable steps to obtain the correct address of any Settlement Class members for whom Notice is returned by the U.S. Postal Service as undeliverable and shall attempt re-mailings.

(d) *Reminder Notice.* Both thirty (30) days prior to the Claims Deadline and seven (7) days prior to the Claims Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall again send Notice via email substantially in the form attached as Exhibit B (with minor, non-material modifications to indicate that it is a reminder email rather than an initial notice), along with an electronic link to the Claim Form, to all Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Class List

(e) *Settlement Website.* Within ten (10) days from entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Notice shall be provided on a website at [www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com](http://www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com) which shall be administered and maintained by the Settlement Administrator and shall include

the ability to file Claim Forms on-line. The Notice provided on the Settlement Website shall be substantially in the form of Exhibit D hereto.

(f) *CAFA Notice.* Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1715, not later than ten (10) days after the Agreement is filed with the Court, the Settlement Administrator shall cause to be served upon the Attorneys General of each U.S. State in which Settlement Class members reside, the Attorney General of the United States, and other required government officials, notice of the proposed settlement as required by law.

(g) *Contact from Class Counsel.* Class Counsel, in their capacity as counsel to Settlement Class Members, may from time to time contact Settlement Class Members to provide information about the Settlement Agreement and to answer any questions Settlement Class Members may have about the Settlement Agreement.

**4.2** The Notice shall advise the Settlement Class of their rights, including the right to be excluded from, comment upon, and/or object to the Settlement Agreement or any of its terms. The Notice shall specify that any objection to the Settlement Agreement, and any papers submitted in support of said objection, shall be considered by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing only if, on or before the Objection/Exclusion Deadline approved by the Court and specified in the Notice, the Person making the objection files notice of an intention to do so and at the same time (a) files copies of such papers he or she proposes to be submitted at the Final Approval Hearing with the Clerk of the Court, or alternatively, if the objection is from a Class Member represented by counsel, files any objection through the Court's CM/ECF system, and (b) sends copies of such papers by mail, hand, or overnight delivery service to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel.

**4.3** Any Settlement Class Member who intends to object to this Agreement must present the objection in writing, which must be personally signed by the objector, and must

include: (1) the objector's name and address; (2) an explanation of the basis upon which the objector claims to be a Settlement Class Member, including information sufficient to identify her current Facebook page or a screenshot showing that she was a Facebook member during the class period; (3) all grounds for the objection, including all citations to legal authority and evidence supporting the objection; (4) the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting the objector in connection with the preparation or submission of the objection or who may profit from the pursuit of the objection (the "Objecting Attorneys"); and (5) a statement indicating whether the objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either personally or through counsel who files an appearance with the Court in accordance with the Local Rules).

**4.4** If a Settlement Class Member or any of the Objecting Attorneys has objected to any class action settlement where the objector or the Objecting Attorneys asked for or received any payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection, or any related appeal, without any modification to the settlement, then the objection must include a statement identifying each such case by full case caption and amount of payment received. Any challenge to the Settlement Agreement, the Final Order, or the Final Judgment shall be pursuant to appeal under the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and not through a collateral attack.

**4.5** A Settlement Class Member may request to be excluded from the Settlement Class by sending a written request postmarked on or before the Objection/Exclusion Deadline approved by the Court and specified in the Notice. To exercise the right to be excluded, a Person in the Settlement Class must timely send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator as specified in the Notice, providing his/her name and address, a signature, the name and number of the case, and a statement that he or she wishes to be excluded from the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement. A request to be excluded that does not include



all of this information, or that is sent to an address other than that designated in the Notice, or that is not postmarked within the time specified, shall be invalid, and the Person(s) serving such a request shall be a member(s) of the Settlement Class and shall be bound as a Settlement Class Member by this Agreement, if approved. Any member of the Settlement Class who validly elects to be excluded from this Agreement shall not: (i) be bound by any orders or the Final Judgment; (ii) be entitled to relief under this Settlement Agreement; (iii) gain any rights by virtue of this Agreement; or (iv) be entitled to object to any aspect of this Agreement. The request for exclusion must be personally signed by the Person requesting exclusion. So-called “mass” or “class” opt-outs shall not be allowed. To be valid, a request for exclusion must be postmarked or received by the date specified in the Notice.

**4.6** The Final Approval Hearing shall be no earlier than ninety (90) days after the Notice described in Paragraph 4.1(e) is provided.

**4.7** Any Settlement Class Member who does not, using the procedures set forth in this Agreement and the Notice, either seek exclusion from the Settlement Class or timely file a valid Claim Form shall not be entitled to receive any payment or benefits pursuant to this Agreement, but will otherwise be bound by all of the terms of this Agreement, including the terms of the Final Judgment to be entered in the Action and the Releases provided for in the Agreement, and will be barred from bringing any action against any of the Released Parties concerning the Released Claims.

## **5. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.**

**5.1** The Settlement Administrator shall, under the supervision of the Court, administer the relief provided by this Settlement Agreement by processing Claim Forms in a rational, responsive, cost effective, and timely manner. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain reasonably detailed records of its activities under this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator

shall maintain all such records as are required by applicable law in accordance with its normal business practices and such records will be made available to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel upon request. The Settlement Administrator shall also provide reports and other information to the Court as the Court may require. The Settlement Administrator shall provide Class Counsel and Defendants Counsel with information concerning Notice, administration, and implementation of the Settlement Agreement. Should the Court request, the Parties shall submit a timely report to the Court summarizing the work performed by the Settlement Administrator, including a report of all amounts from the Settlement Fund paid to Settlement Class Members on account of Approved Claims. Without limiting the foregoing, the Settlement Administrator shall:

(a) Forward to Defendant's Counsel, with copies to Class Counsel, all original documents and other materials received in connection with the administration of the Settlement, and all copies thereof, within thirty (30) days after the date on which all Claim Forms have been finally approved or disallowed in accordance with the terms of this Agreement;

(b) Receive requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class and other requests and promptly provide to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel copies thereof. If the Settlement Administrator receives any exclusion forms or other requests after the deadline for the submission of such forms and requests, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly provide copies thereof to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel;

(c) Provide weekly reports to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel, including without limitation, reports regarding the number of Claim Forms received, the number approved by the Settlement Administrator, and the categorization and description of Claim Forms rejected, in whole or in part, by the Settlement Administrator; and

(d) Make available for inspection by Class Counsel or Defendants Counsel the Claim Forms received by the Settlement Administrator at any time upon reasonable notice.

**5.2** The Settlement Administrator shall be obliged to employ reasonable procedures to screen claims for abuse or fraud and deny Claim Forms where there is evidence of abuse or fraud. The Settlement Administrator will reject any claim that does not comply in any material respect with the instructions on the Claim Form or the terms of Paragraphs 1.2 and/or 1.3, above, or is submitted after the Claims Deadline. Each claimant who submits an invalid Claim Form to the Settlement Administrator must be given a notice of the Claim Form's deficiency and an opportunity to cure the deficiency within twenty-one (21) days of the date of the notice. The Settlement Administrator may contact any Person who has submitted a Claim Form to obtain additional information necessary to verify the Claim Form.

**5.3** Defendant's Counsel and Class Counsel shall have the right to challenge the acceptance or rejection of a Claim Form submitted by Settlement Class Members and to obtain and review supporting documentation relating to such Claim Form. The Settlement Administrator shall follow any agreed decisions of Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel as to the validity of any disputed submitted Claim Form. To the extent Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel are not able to agree on the disposition of a challenge, the disputed claim shall be submitted to The Honorable Frank Maas of JAMS for binding determination.

**5.4** In the exercise of its duties outlined in this Agreement, the Settlement Administrator shall have the right to reasonably request additional information from the Parties or any Settlement Class Member.

## **6. TERMINATION OF SETTLEMENT.**

**6.1** Subject to Paragraphs 9.1-9.3 below, Defendant or the Class Representative on behalf of the Settlement Class, shall have the right to terminate this Agreement by providing written notice of the election to do so ("Termination Notice") to all other Parties hereto within twenty-one (21) days of any of the following events: (i) the Court's refusal to grant Preliminary

Approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (ii) the Court's refusal to grant final approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (iii) the Court's refusal to enter the Final Judgment in this Action in any material respect; (iv) the date upon which the Final Judgment is modified or reversed in any material respect by the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court; or (v) the date upon which an Alternative Judgment, as defined in Paragraph 9.1(d) of this Agreement is modified or reversed in any material respect by the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court.

6.2 Subject to Paragraphs 9.1-9.3 below, Defendant shall have the right, but not the obligation, in its sole discretion, to terminate this Agreement by providing written notice to Class Counsel within twenty-five (25) days of the following events: (i) individuals comprising more than three percent (3%) of the Settlement Class in total have timely and validly opted out of and/or objected to the Agreement; or (ii) the Class Representative and his agents, or any other individuals operating at his direction or in coordination with him, or Class Counsel, file or threaten to file any arbitrations or additional lawsuits against Defendant related to the Released Claims at any time prior to Final Approval.

6.3 If Defendant seeks to terminate the Agreement on the basis of 6.2 above, the Parties agree that any dispute as to whether Defendant may invoke section 6.2 to terminate the Agreement that they cannot resolve on their own after reasonable, good faith efforts, will be submitted to the Honorable Frank Maas of JAMS for binding determination.

6.4 The Parties agree that the Court's failure to approve, in whole or in part, the attorneys' fees payment to Class Counsel and/or the incentive award set forth in Paragraph 8 below shall not prevent the Agreement from becoming effective, nor shall it be grounds for termination. The procedures for any application for approval of attorneys' fees, expenses, or

Incentive Awards are to be considered by the Court separately from the Court's consideration of the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of the Settlement.

**7. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER AND FINAL APPROVAL ORDER.**

**7.1** Promptly after the execution of this Settlement Agreement, Class Counsel shall submit this Agreement together with its Exhibits to the Court and shall move the Court for Preliminary Approval of the settlement set forth in this Agreement; certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only; appointment of Class Counsel and the Class Representative; and entry of a Preliminary Approval Order, which order shall set a Final Approval Hearing date and approve the Notice and Claim Form for dissemination substantially in the form of Exhibits A, B, C, and D hereto. The Preliminary Approval Order shall also authorize the Parties, without further approval from the Court, to agree to and adopt such amendments, modifications and expansions of the Settlement Agreement and its implementing documents (including all exhibits to this Agreement) so long as they are consistent in all material respects with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and do not limit or impair the rights of the Settlement Class.

**7.2** Defendant's agreement as to certification of the Settlement Class is solely for purposes of effectuating the Settlement and no other purpose. Defendant retains all of its objections, arguments, and defenses with respect to class certification and any other issue, and reserves all rights to contest class certification and any other issue if the Settlement set out in this Agreement does not result in entry of the Final Approval Order and Final Judgment, if the Court's approval is reversed or vacated on appeal, if this Settlement is terminated as provided herein, or if the Settlement set forth in this Settlement otherwise fails to become effective. The Parties acknowledges that there has been no stipulation to any classes or certification of any classes for any purpose other than effectuating the Settlement, and that if the Settlement set forth

in this Settlement Agreement is not finally approved, if the Court's approval is reversed or vacated on appeal, if this Settlement Agreement is terminated as provided herein, or if the Settlement set forth in this Settlement Agreement otherwise fails to become effective, this agreement as to certification of the Settlement Class becomes null and void ab initio, and this Settlement Agreement or any other settlement-related statement may not be cited regarding certification of the Class, or in support of an argument for certifying any class for any purpose related to this Action or any other proceeding.

7.3 At the time of the submission of this Agreement to the Court as described above, Class Counsel shall request that, after Notice is given, the Court hold a Final Approval Hearing and approve the settlement of the Action as set forth herein.

7.4 After Notice is given, the Parties shall request and seek to obtain from the Court a Final Judgment, which will (among other things):

(a) find that the Court has personal jurisdiction over all Settlement Class Members and that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction to approve the Agreement, including all exhibits thereto;

(b) approve the Settlement Agreement and the proposed settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to, and in the best interests of, the Settlement Class Members; direct the Parties and their counsel to implement and consummate the Agreement according to its terms and provisions; and declare the Agreement to be binding on, and have *res judicata* and preclusive effect in all pending and future lawsuits or other proceedings maintained by or on behalf of Plaintiffs and Releasing Parties;

(c) find that the Notice implemented pursuant to the Agreement (1) constitutes the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (2) constitutes notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency

of the Action, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Agreement, and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (3) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (4) meets all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the rules of the Court;

(d) find that the Class Representatives and Class Counsel adequately represent the Settlement Class for purposes of entering into and implementing the Agreement;

(e) dismiss the Action (including all individual claims and Settlement Class Claims presented thereby) on the merits and with prejudice, without fees or costs to any party except as provided in the Settlement Agreement;

(f) incorporate the Release set forth above, make the Release effective as of the date of the Effective Date, and forever discharge the Released Parties as set forth herein;

(g) permanently bar and enjoin all Settlement Class Members who have not been properly excluded from the respective Settlement Class from filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in, or participating (as class members or otherwise) in, any lawsuit or other action in any jurisdiction based on the Released Claims;

(h) without affecting the finality of the Final Judgment for purposes of appeal, retain jurisdiction as to all matters relating to administration, consummation, enforcement, and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement and the Final Judgment, and for any other necessary purpose; and

(i) incorporate any other provisions, as the Court deems necessary and just.

**8. CLASS COUNSEL'S ATTORNEYS' FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES; INCENTIVE AWARD.**

**8.1** Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(h), Defendant agrees that Class Counsel shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs out of the Settlement Fund in an

amount determined by the Court as the Fee Award. With no consideration given or received, Class Counsel will limit its petition for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to no more than one-third of the Settlement Benefit (i.e., \$1,666,666.67). Payment of the Fee Award shall be made from the Settlement Fund and should the Court award less than the amount sought by Class Counsel, the difference in the amount sought and the amount ultimately awarded pursuant to this Paragraph shall remain in the Settlement Fund for distribution to eligible Settlement Class Members.

**8.2** The Fee Award shall be payable within ten (10) days after entry of the Court's Final Judgment, subject to Class Counsel executing the Undertaking Regarding Attorneys' Fees and Costs (the "Undertaking") attached hereto as Exhibit E, and providing all payment routing information and tax I.D. numbers for Class Counsel. Payment of the Fee Award shall be made by wire transfer to Bursor & Fisher, P.A. in accordance with wire instructions to be provided to the Settlement Administrator by Bursor & Fisher, P.A., and completion of necessary forms, including but not limited to W-9 forms. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if for any reason the Final Judgment is reversed or rendered void as a result of an appeal(s) then Class Counsel shall return such funds to the Settlement Fund. Additionally, should any parties to the Undertaking dissolve, merge, declare bankruptcy, become insolvent, or cease to exist prior to the final payment to Settlement Class Members, those parties shall execute a new undertaking guaranteeing repayment of funds within fourteen (14) days of such an occurrence.

**8.3** Class Counsel intends to file a motion for Court approval of an incentive award for the Class Representative, to be paid from the Settlement Fund, in addition to any funds the Class Representative stands to otherwise receive from the Settlement. With no consideration having been given or received for this limitation, the Class Representative will seek no more than \$5,000 as an incentive award. Should the Court award less than this amount, the difference in



the amount sought and the amount ultimately awarded pursuant to this Paragraph shall remain in the Settlement Fund for distribution to eligible Settlement Class Members. Such award shall be paid from the Settlement Fund (in the form of a check to the Class Representative that is sent care of Class Counsel), within thirty (30) days after the Effective Date.

**9. CONDITIONS OF SETTLEMENT, EFFECT OF DISAPPROVAL, CANCELLATION OR TERMINATION.**

**9.1** The Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement shall not occur unless and until each of the following events occurs and shall be the date upon which the last (in time) of the following events occurs:

- (a) The Parties and their counsel have executed this Agreement;
- (b) The Court has entered the Preliminary Approval Order;
- (c) The Court has entered an order finally approving the Agreement,

following Notice to the Settlement Class and a Final Approval Hearing, as provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and has entered the Final Judgment, or a judgment consistent with this Agreement in all material respects; and

(d) The Final Judgment has become Final, as defined above, or, in the event that the Court enters an order and final judgment in a form other than that provided above (“Alternative Judgment”) and that has the consent of the Parties, such Alternative Judgment becomes Final.

**9.2** If some or all of the conditions specified in Paragraph 9.1 are not met, or in the event that this Agreement is not approved by the Court, or the settlement set forth in this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective in accordance with its terms, then this Settlement Agreement shall be canceled and terminated subject to Paragraph 6.1 unless Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel mutually agree in writing to proceed with this Agreement. If any Party is in material breach of the terms hereof, and fails to cure such material breach within

30 days of notice, any other Party, provided that it is in substantial compliance with the terms of this Agreement, may terminate this Agreement on notice to all of the Settling Parties.

**9.3** If this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 6.1 and 9.1-9.2 above, the Parties shall be restored to their respective positions in the Action as of the date of the signing of this Agreement. In such event, any Final Judgment or other order entered by the Court in accordance with the terms of this Agreement shall be treated as vacated, *nunc pro tunc*, and the Parties shall be returned to the *status quo ante* with respect to the Action as if this Agreement had never been entered into.

**10. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.**

**10.1** The Parties (a) acknowledge that it is their intent to consummate this Settlement Agreement; and (b) agree, subject to their fiduciary and other legal obligations, to cooperate to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate and implement all terms and conditions of this Agreement, to exercise their reasonable best efforts to accomplish the foregoing terms and conditions of this Agreement, to secure final approval, and to defend the Final Judgment through any and all appeals. Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel agree to cooperate with one another in seeking Court approval of the Settlement Agreement, entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, and the Final Judgment, and promptly to agree upon and execute all such other documentation as may be reasonably required to obtain final approval of the Agreement.

**10.2** The Parties intend this Settlement Agreement to be a final and complete resolution of all disputes between them with respect to the Released Claims by Plaintiff, the Settlement Class and each or any of them, on the one hand, against the Released Parties, and each or any of the Released Parties, on the other hand. Accordingly, the Parties agree not to assert in any forum that the Action was brought by Plaintiff or defended by Defendant, or each or any of them, in bad faith or on a frivolous basis.

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

**10.4** Whether or not the Effective Date occurs or the Settlement Agreement is terminated, neither this Agreement nor the settlement contained herein, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of this Agreement or the settlement:

(a) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission, concession or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claims, the truth of any fact alleged by the Plaintiff, the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in the Action, the violation of any law or statute, the reasonableness of the settlement amount or the Fee Award, or of any alleged wrongdoing, liability, negligence, or fault of the Released Parties, or any of them;

(b) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against Defendant, as an admission, concession or evidence of any fault, misrepresentation or omission with respect to any statement or written document approved or made by the Released Parties, or any of them;

(c) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission or concession with respect to any liability, negligence, fault or wrongdoing as against any Released Parties, in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal. However, the settlement, this Agreement, and any acts performed and/or documents executed in furtherance of or pursuant to this Agreement and/or Settlement may be used in any proceedings as may be

necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Agreement. Further, if this Settlement Agreement is approved by the Court, any Party or any of the Released Parties may file this Agreement and/or the Final Judgment in any action that may be brought against such Party or Parties in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, or any other theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim;

(d) is, may be deemed, or shall be construed against Plaintiff, the Settlement Class, the Releasing Parties, or each or any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission or concession that the consideration to be given hereunder represents an amount equal to, less than or greater than that amount that could have or would have been recovered after trial; and

(e) is, may be deemed, or shall be construed as or received in evidence as an admission or concession against Plaintiff, the Settlement Class, the Releasing Parties, or each and any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, that any of Plaintiff's claims are with or without merit or that damages recoverable in the Action would have exceeded or would have been less than any particular amount.

**10.5** The headings used herein are used for the purpose of convenience only and are not meant to have legal effect.

**10.6** The waiver by one Party of any breach of this Agreement by any other Party shall not be deemed as a waiver of any other prior or subsequent breaches of this Agreement.

**10.7** All of the Exhibits to this Agreement are material and integral parts thereof and are fully incorporated herein by this reference.

**10.8** This Agreement and its Exhibits set forth the entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the matters set forth herein, and supersede all prior negotiations,

agreements, arrangements and undertakings with respect to the matters set forth herein. No representations, warranties or inducements have been made to any Party concerning this Settlement Agreement or its Exhibits other than the representations, warranties and covenants contained and memorialized in such documents. This Agreement may be amended or modified only by a written instrument signed by or on behalf of all Parties or their respective successors-in-interest.

**10.9** Except as otherwise provided herein, each Party shall bear its own costs.

**10.10** Plaintiff represents and warrants that he has not assigned any claim or right or interest therein as against the Released Parties to any other Person or Party and that he is fully entitled to release the same.

**10.11** Each counsel or other Person executing this Settlement Agreement, any of its Exhibits, or any related settlement documents on behalf of any Party hereto, hereby warrants and represents that such Person has the full authority to do so and has the authority to take appropriate action required or permitted to be taken pursuant to the Agreement to effectuate its terms. Class Counsel in particular warrants that they are authorized to execute this Settlement Agreement on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class (subject to final approval by the Court after notice to all Settlement Class Members), and that all actions necessary for the execution of this Settlement Agreement have been taken.

**10.12** This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. Signature by digital means, facsimile, or in PDF format will constitute sufficient execution of this Agreement. All executed counterparts and each of them shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument. A complete set of original executed counterparts shall be filed with the Court if the Court so requests.

**10.13** This Settlement Agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors and assigns of the Parties hereto and the Released Parties.

**10.14** The Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to implementation and enforcement of the terms of this Agreement, and all Parties hereto submit to the jurisdiction of the Court for purposes of implementing and enforcing the settlement embodied in this Agreement.

**10.15** This Settlement Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

**10.16** This Agreement is deemed to have been prepared by counsel for all Parties, as a result of arm's-length negotiations among the Parties. Because all Parties have contributed substantially and materially to the preparation of this Agreement, it shall not be construed more strictly against one Party than another.

**10.17** Where this Agreement requires notice to the Parties, such notice shall be sent to the undersigned counsel: Philip L. Fraietta, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor, New York, NY 10019; Marc Zwillinger, ZwillGen PLLC, 1900 M Street NW, Suite 250, Washington, D.C. 20036.

**10.18** Plaintiff and/or Class Counsel shall not, at any time, issue press releases or make other public statements regarding the Settlement or the Action (apart from filings with the Court as necessary to obtain Preliminary or Final Approval of the Settlement) unless Defendant agrees to such press releases or public statements in advance; provided that Class Counsel may post Court orders regarding the Action and brief summaries of those orders on their website(s) without permission from Defendant, so long as any reference in such order(s) to materials subject to any confidentiality obligations are properly redacted. This provision shall not prohibit

Class Counsel from communicating with any person in the Settlement Class regarding the Settlement (subject to compliance with any and all applicable confidentiality obligations).

**IT IS SO AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES:**

Dated: May 24, 2023

**DAVID AMBROSE**

By: *David Ambrose*  
By: David Ambrose (May 24, 2023 08:27 PDT)

David Ambrose, individually and as representative of the Class

Dated: May 24, 2023

**BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS, LLC**

By: *Dan Krockmalnic*

Name: Dan Krockmalnic

Title: EVP, New Media & General Counsel

**IT IS SO STIPULATED BY COUNSEL:**

Dated: May 24, 2023

**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.**

By: *Philip L. Fraietta*

Philip L. Fraietta  
pfraietta@bursor.com  
Joshua D. Arisohn  
jarisohn@bursor.com  
BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.  
1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel: 646.837.7150  
Fax: 212.989.9163

Christopher R. Reilly  
creilly@bursor.com  
BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.  
701 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1420  
Miami, FL 33131  
Tel: 305.330.5512  
Fax: 305.679.9006

*Class Counsel*

Dated: May 24, 2023

**ZWILLGEN PLLC**

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Marc J. Zwilling  
marc@zwillgen.com

Jeff Landis  
jeff@zwillgen.com

ZWILLGEN, PLLC

1900 M St. SW

Suite 250

Washington, DC 20036

Tel: 202.296.3585

Fax: 202.706-5298

*Attorneys for Defendant*



**EXHIBIT A**

**Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners LLC**

In the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts

Case No. 22-10810-RGS

**Settlement Claim Form**

**If you are a Settlement Class Member and wish to receive a payment, your completed Claim Form must be postmarked on or before [REDACTED], or submitted online on or before [REDACTED].**

Please read the full notice of this settlement (available at [\[hyperlink\]](#)) carefully before filling out this Claim Form.

To be eligible to receive any benefits from the settlement obtained in this class action lawsuit, you must submit this completed Claim Form online or by mail:

**ONLINE:** Submit this Claim Form.

**MAIL:** [\[ADDRESS\]](#)

---

**PART ONE: CLAIMANT INFORMATION**

Provide your name and contact information below. It is your responsibility to notify the Settlement Administrator of any changes to your contact information after the submission of your Claim Form.

FIRST NAME

LAST NAME

STREET ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

EMAIL ADDRESS

---

**PART TWO: SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION**

To qualify for a seven-day extension of your digital *Boston Globe* subscription, you must you must have as of [\[Preliminary Approval Date\]](#), had either a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, or a home delivery subscription to the *Boston Globe* that includes digital access and viewed videos on Boston Globe’s website.

To qualify for a cash payment in addition to the seven-day extension you **must also** provide proof of your Facebook account, by completing the “Proof of Facebook Account” portion of this Claim Form.

**PROOF OF FACEBOOK ACCOUNT:** You may submit proof of your Facebook account by providing your Facebook Profile URL or by uploading a screenshot of your Facebook Profile [\[here\]](#).

To provide your Facebook Profile URL:

1. Open Facebook in a web browser and log in.

QUESTIONS? VISIT [\[hyperlink\]](#) OR CALL [\[NUMBER\]](#) TOLL-FREE

2. Navigate to your Facebook Profile.
3. Once on your Facebook Profile, look at the URL in your browser's address bar.
4. Write your Facebook Profile URL here: <https://facebook.com/>

To upload a screenshot of your Facebook Profile:

1. Open Facebook in a web browser and log in.
2. Navigate to your Facebook Profile.
3. Take a screenshot of your Facebook Profile.
4. Upload the screenshot [[here](#)].

**POTENTIAL CASH PAYMENT:** You may be entitled to receive a cash payment, which Class Counsel estimates will be between \$22-44. You are only entitled to the cash payment if you **submit proof of Facebook account**, such as your Facebook Profile URL or a screenshot of your Facebook Profile.

The cash will be sent in the form of a check, unless otherwise indicated. If you would like payment in a different form, please select from the options below:

- Check
- Venmo  Venmo Username: \_\_\_\_\_
- PayPal  PayPal Email: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**PART THREE: ATTESTATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY**

---

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that I viewed a video on the *Boston Globe* site while using the same browser I used to access my Facebook account between February 5, 2020 through [[Preliminary Approval Date](#)], and that all of the information on this Claim Form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I also declare under penalty of perjury that the Facebook account identified in this form belongs to me and no one else. I understand that my Claim Form may be subject to audit, verification, and Court review.

**SIGNATURE**

**DATE**

**Please keep a copy of your Claim Form for your records.**

**EXHIBIT B**

From: MagazineSettlement@bostonglobevppasettlement.com  
To: JonQClassMember@domain.com  
Re: Legal Notice of Class Action Settlement

**NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**  
*Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS  
**(United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts)**

**Our Records Indicate You Have Subscribed to the *Boston Globe* and May Be Entitled to a Payment From a Class Action Settlement.**

*A court authorized this notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.*

This notice is to inform you that a settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC, disclosed its subscribers' personally identifiable information ("PII") to Facebook via the Facebook Tracking Pixel without consent in violation of the Video Privacy Protection Act (the "VPPA"). The VPPA defines PII to include information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider. Defendant denies that it violated any law, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

**Am I a Class Member?** Our records indicate you may be a Class Member. Class Members are all persons in the United States who, from February 5, 2020, to and through the [Preliminary Approval Date], have or had a Facebook account, a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, or a home delivery subscription to the *Boston Globe* that includes digital access and who viewed videos on Boston Globe's website.

**What Can I Get?** If approved by the Court, Defendant will establish a Settlement Fund of \$4,000,000.00 to pay all valid claims submitted by the Settlement Class, together with notice and administration expenses, attorneys' fees and costs, and an incentive award. Defendant will also provide in kind relief of up to \$1,000,000.00 (together with the Settlement Fund, the "Settlement Benefit") as an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* enjoyed by you for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment. If you are entitled to relief, you may submit a claim to receive a *pro rata* share of the Settlement Fund, estimated at \$22-44 per class member. You may also submit a claim to receive an extension of your existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*. The Settlement also requires Defendant to suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated (including by judicial decision on the use of website pixel technology by the United States Supreme Court, any federal court of appeals, a U.S. federal district court in Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts state court of general jurisdiction), or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook.

**How Do I Get a Payment?** You must submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than [claims deadline]**. You can file a claim by clicking [here.] Your payment will come by check unless you elect to receive payment electronically by PayPal or Venmo. In kind relief will be provided by email with instruction access.

**What are My Other Options?** You may exclude yourself from the Class by sending a letter to the settlement administrator no later than **[objection/exclusion deadline]**. If you exclude yourself, you cannot get a settlement payment, but you keep any rights you may have to sue the Defendant over the legal issues in the lawsuit. You and/or your lawyer have the right to appear before the Court and/or object to the proposed settlement. Your written objection must be filed no later than **[objection/exclusion deadline]**. Specific instructions about how to object to, or exclude yourself from, the Settlement are available at **www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com**. If you file a claim or do nothing, and the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by all of the Court's orders and judgments. In addition, your claims relating to the alleged disclosure of subscriber information to Facebook in this case against the Defendant will be released.

**Who Represents Me?** The Court has appointed lawyers Philip L. Fraietta, Joshua D. Arisohn, and Christopher R. Reilly of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to represent the class. These attorneys are called Class Counsel. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

**When Will the Court Consider the Proposed Settlement?** The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at \_\_\_\_\_m. on [date] in Courtroom 21 at the John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse, 1 Courthouse Way, Boston, MA 02210. At that hearing, the Court will: hear any objections concerning the fairness of the settlement; determine the fairness of the settlement; decide whether to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs; and decide whether to award the Class Representative \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his service in helping to bring and settle this case. Defendant has agreed to pay Class Counsel reasonable attorneys' fees in an amount to be determined by the Court. Class Counsel is entitled to seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Benefit, but the Court may award less than this amount.

**How Do I Get More Information?** For more information, including the full Notice, Claim Form and Settlement Agreement go to **www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com**, contact the settlement administrator at 1-\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_ or Boston Globe Privacy Settlement Administrator, [address], or call Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150.

**EXHIBIT C**

Boston Globe Privacy Settlement  
Settlement Administrator  
P.O. Box 0000  
City, ST 00000-0000

OUR RECORDS  
INDICATE YOU HAVE  
SUBSCRIBED TO THE  
BOSTON GLOBE AND  
MAY BE ENTITLED TO  
A PAYMENT FROM A  
CLASS ACTION  
SETTLEMENT.



Postal Service: Please do not mark barcode

XXX—«ClaimID» «MailRec»

«First1» «Last1»

«C/O»

«Addr1» «Addr2»

«City», «St» «Zip» «Country»

By Order of the Court Dated: [date]



A settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC, disclosed its subscribers' personally identifiable information ("PII") to Facebook via the Facebook Tracking Pixel without consent in violation of the Video Privacy Protection Act (the "VPPA"). The VPPA defines PII to include information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider. Defendant denies that it violated any law, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.

**Am I a Class Member?** Our records indicate you may be a Class Member. Class Members are all persons in the United States who, from February 5, 2020, to and through the [Preliminary Approval Date](#), have or had a Facebook account, a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, or a home delivery subscription to the *Boston Globe* that includes digital access and who viewed videos on Boston Globe's website.

**What Can I Get?** If approved by the Court, Defendant will establish a Settlement Fund of \$4,000,000.00 to pay all valid claims submitted by the Settlement Class, together with notice and administration expenses, attorneys' fees and costs, and an incentive award. Defendant will also provide in kind relief of up to \$1,000,000.00 (together with the Settlement Fund, the "Settlement Benefit") as an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* enjoyed by you for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment. If you are entitled to relief, you may submit a claim to receive a *pro rata* share of the Settlement Fund, estimated at \$22-44 per class member. You may also submit a claim to receive an extension of your existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*. The Settlement also requires Defendant to suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated (including by judicial decision on the use of website pixel technology by the United States Supreme Court, any federal court of appeals, a U.S. federal district court in Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts state court of general jurisdiction), or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook.

**How Do I Get a Payment?** You must submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than [claims deadline](#)**. You may submit a Claim Form either electronically on the Settlement Website by visiting [insert hyperlink](#), or by printing and mailing in a paper Claim Form, copies of which are available for download at the Settlement Website. Your payment will come by check unless you elect to receive payment electronically by PayPal or Venmo. In kind relief will be provided by email with instruction access.

**What are My Other Options?** You may exclude yourself from the Class by sending a letter to the settlement administrator no later than [objection/exclusion deadline](#). If you exclude yourself, you cannot get a settlement payment, but you keep any rights you may have to sue the Defendant over the legal issues in the lawsuit. You and/or your lawyer have the right to appear before the Court and/or object to the proposed settlement. Your written objection must be filed no later than [objection/exclusion deadline](#). Specific instructions about how to object to, or exclude yourself from, the Settlement are available at [www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com](http://www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com). If you file a claim or do nothing, and the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by all of the Court's orders and judgments. In addition, your claims relating to the alleged disclosure of subscriber information to Facebook in this case against the Defendant will be released.

**Who Represents Me?** The Court has appointed lawyers Philip L. Fraietta, Joshua D. Arisohn, and Christopher R. Reilly of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to represent the class. These attorneys are called Class Counsel. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

**When Will the Court Consider the Proposed Settlement?** The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at [\[time\]](#) m. on [\[date\]](#) in Courtroom 21 at the John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse, 1 Courthouse Way, Boston, MA 02210. At that hearing, the Court will: hear any objections concerning the fairness of the settlement; determine the fairness of the settlement; decide whether to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs; and decide whether to award the Class Representative \$5,000 from the Settlement Fund for his service in helping to bring and settle this case. Defendant has agreed to pay Class Counsel reasonable attorneys' fees in an amount to be determined by the Court. Class Counsel is entitled to seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Benefit, but the Court may award less than this amount.

**How Do I Get More Information?** For more information, including the full Notice, Claim Form and Settlement Agreement go to [www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com](http://www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com), contact the settlement administrator at 1-[\[phone number\]](#) or Boston Globe Privacy Settlement Administrator, [\[address\]](#), or call Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Boston Globe Privacy Settlement Administrator  
c/o [Settlement Administrator]  
PO Box 0000  
City, ST 00000-0000

**XXX**

**EXHIBIT D**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**  
*Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS

**Our Records Indicate You Have Subscribed to the *Boston Globe* and May Be Entitled to a Payment From a Class Action Settlement.**

*A court authorized this notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.*

- A settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit against Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC. The class action lawsuit accuses Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC of disclosing its subscribers’ personally identifiable information (“PII”) to Facebook via the Facebook Tracking Pixel without consent in violation of the Video Privacy Protection Act (the “VPPA”). The VPPA defines PII to include information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider. Defendant denies that it violated any law, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with continuing the case.
- You are included if you are a person in the United States who, from February 5, 2020, to and through the [Preliminary Approval Date], have or had a Facebook account, a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, or a home delivery subscription to the *Boston Globe* that includes digital access and who viewed videos on Boston Globe’s website.
- Persons included in the Settlement will be eligible to receive a *pro rata* (meaning equal) portion of the Settlement Fund, which Class Counsel anticipates to be approximately \$22-44. Persons included in the Settlement will also be eligible to receive in kind relief as an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* enjoyed by you for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment. The Settlement also requires Defendant to suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated (including by judicial decision on the use of website pixel technology by the United States Supreme Court, any federal court of appeals, a U.S. federal district court in Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts state court of general jurisdiction), or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook.
- Read this notice carefully. Your legal rights are affected whether you act, or don’t act.

<b>YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT</b>	
<b>SUBMIT A CLAIM FORM BY [DATE]</b>	This is the only way to receive a payment.
<b>EXCLUDE YOURSELF BY [DATE]</b>	You will receive no benefits, but you will retain any rights you currently have to sue the Defendant about the claims in this case.
<b>OBJECT BY [DATE]</b>	Write to the Court explaining why you don’t like the Settlement.

QUESTIONS? CALL 1-800-000-0000 TOLL FREE, OR VISIT [WWW.BOSTONGLOBEVPPASETTLEMENT.COM](http://WWW.BOSTONGLOBEVPPASETTLEMENT.COM)

<b>GO TO THE HEARING BY [DATE]</b>	Ask to speak in Court about your opinion of the Settlement.
<b>DO NOTHING</b>	You won't get a share of the Settlement benefits and will give up your rights to sue the Defendant about the claims in this case.

Your rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this Notice.

## BASIC INFORMATION

### 1. Why was this Notice issued?

A Court authorized this notice because you have a right to know about a proposed Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your options, before the Court decides whether to give final approval to the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, and your legal rights.

The Honorable Richard G. Stearns, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, is overseeing this case. The case is called *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS. The person who have sued is called the Plaintiff. The Defendant is Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC.

### 2. What is a class action?

In a class action, one or more people called the class representative (in this case, David Ambrose) sue on behalf of a group or a “class” of people who have similar claims. In a class action, the court resolves the issues for all class members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Class.

### 3. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit claims that Defendant violated the Video Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2710, *et seq.* (“VPPA”) by disclosing its subscribers’ personally identifiable information (“PII”) to Facebook via the Facebook Tracking Pixel without consent. The VPPA defines PII to include information which identifies a person as having requested or obtained specific video materials or services from a video tape service provider. The Defendant denies that it violated any law. The Court has not determined who is right. Rather, the Parties have agreed to settle the lawsuit to avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with ongoing litigation.

### 4. Why is there a Settlement?

The Court has not decided whether the Plaintiffs or the Defendant should win this case. Instead, both sides agreed to a Settlement. That way, they avoid the uncertainties and expenses associated with ongoing litigation, and Class Members will get compensation sooner rather than, if at all, after the completion of a trial.

## WHO'S INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

### 5. How do I know if I am in the Settlement Class?

The **Settlement Class** is defined as:

All persons in the United States who, from February 5, 2020, to and through the [Preliminary Approval Date], have or had a Facebook account, a digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*, or a home delivery subscription to the *Boston Globe* that includes digital access and who viewed videos on Boston Globe's website.

## THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

### 6. What does the Settlement provide?

**Monetary Relief:** Defendant has created a Settlement Fund totaling \$4,000,000.00. Class Member payments, and the cost to administer the Settlement, the cost to inform people about the Settlement, attorneys' fees, and an award to the Class Representative will also come out of this fund (*see* Question 13).

**In Kind Relief:** Defendant will also provide in kind relief of up to \$1,000,000.00 as an extension of any existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe* enjoyed by the Settlement Class Member for a maximum of 7 days past its current expiration date for no additional payment.

**Prospective Changes:** In addition to this monetary relief, the Settlement also requires Defendant to suspend operation of the Facebook Tracking Pixel on any pages on its website that both include video content and have a URL that substantially identifies the video content viewed, unless and until the VPPA is amended, repealed, or otherwise invalidated (including by judicial decision on the use of website pixel technology by the United States Supreme Court, any federal court of appeals, a U.S. federal district court in Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts state court of general jurisdiction), or until Defendant obtains VPPA-compliant consent for the disclosure of the video content viewed to Facebook.

A detailed description of the settlement benefits can be found in the Settlement Agreement. [insert hyperlink]

### 7. How much will my payment be?

If you are member of the Settlement Class you may submit a Claim Form to receive a portion of the Settlement Fund. The amount of this payment will depend on how many of the Class Members file valid claims. Each Class Member who files a valid claim will receive a proportionate share of the Settlement Fund, which Class Counsel anticipates will be approximately \$22-\$44. You can contact Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150 to inquire as to the number of claims filed.

Additionally, Settlement Class Members may also submit a claim to receive an extension of their existing digital subscription to the *Boston Globe*. Instructions for how to submit such a claim will be provided to eligible Settlement Class Members via Email.

#### 8. When will I get my payment?

The hearing to consider the fairness of the settlement is scheduled for [Final Approval Hearing Date]. If the Court approves the settlement, eligible Class Members whose claims were approved by the Settlement Administrator will receive their payment 90 days after the Settlement has been finally approved and/or any appeals process is complete. The payment will be made in the form of a check, unless you elect to receive payment by PayPal or Venmo, and all checks will expire and become void 180 days after they are issued.

### HOW TO GET BENEFITS

#### 9. How do I get a payment?

If you are a Class Member and you want to get a payment, you **must** complete and submit a Claim Form by [Claims Deadline]. Claim Forms can be found and submitted by clicking [here](#) [hyperlink], or by printing and mailing a paper Claim Form, copies of which are available for download [here](#) [hyperlink].

We also encourage you to submit your claim on-line. Not only is it easier and more secure, but it is completely free and takes only minutes!

### REMAINING IN THE SETTLEMENT

#### 10. What am I giving up if I stay in the Class?

If the Settlement becomes final, you will give up your right to sue Defendant for the claims this Settlement resolve. The Settlement Agreement describes the specific claims you are giving up against the Defendants. You will be “releasing” the Defendant and certain of its affiliates described in Section 1.25 of the Settlement Agreement. Unless you exclude yourself (*see* Question 14), you are “releasing” the claims, regardless of whether you submit a claim or not. The Settlement Agreement is available through the “court documents” link on the website.

The Settlement Agreement describes the released claims with specific descriptions, so read it carefully. If you have any questions you can talk to the lawyers listed in Question 12 for free or you can, of course, talk to your own lawyer if you have questions about what this means.

#### 11. What happens if I do nothing at all?

If you do nothing, you won't get any benefits from this Settlement. But, unless you exclude yourself, you won't be able to start a lawsuit or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendants for the claims being resolved by this Settlement.

## THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

### 12. Do I have a lawyer in the case?

The Court has appointed Philip L. Fraietta, Joshua D. Arisohn, and Christopher R. Reilly of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to be the attorneys representing the Settlement Class. They are called "Class Counsel." They believe, after conducting an extensive investigation, that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

### 13. How will the lawyers be paid?

Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses will be paid from the Settlement Fund in an amount determined and awarded by the Court. Class Counsel is entitled to seek no more than one-third of the \$5 million Settlement Benefit, but the Court may award less than this amount.

As approved by the Court, the Class Representative will be paid an Incentive Award from the Settlement Fund for helping to bring and settle the case. The Class Representative will seek no more than \$5,000 as an incentive award, but the Court may award less than this amount.

## EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

### 14. How do I get out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must mail or otherwise deliver a letter (or request for exclusion) stating that you want to be excluded from the *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS settlement. Your letter or request for exclusion must also include your name, your address, your signature, the name and number of this case, and a statement that you wish to be excluded. You must mail or deliver your exclusion request no later than **[objection/exclusion deadline]** to:

Boston Globe Privacy Settlement  
0000 Street  
City, ST 00000

### 15. If I don't exclude myself, can I sue the Defendant for the same thing later?



No. Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue the Defendant for the claims being resolved by this Settlement.

**16. If I exclude myself, can I get anything from this Settlement?**

No. If you exclude yourself, do not submit a Claim Form to ask for benefits.

**OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT**

**17. How do I object to the Settlement?**

If you're a Class Member, you can object to the Settlement if you don't like any part of it. You can give reasons why you think the Court should not approve it. The Court will consider your views. To object, you must file with the Court a letter or brief stating that you object to the Settlement in *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS and identify all your reasons for your objections (including citations and supporting evidence) and attach any materials you rely on for your objections. Your letter or brief must also include your name, an explanation of the basis upon which you claim to be a Settlement Class Member, including information sufficient to identify your current Facebook page or a screenshot showing that you were a Facebook member during the class period, the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting you in connection with your objection, and your signature. If you, or an attorney assisting you with your objection, have ever objected to any class action settlement where you or the objecting attorney has asked for or received payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection (or any related appeal) without modification to the settlement, you must include a statement in your objection identifying each such case by full case caption. You must also mail or deliver a copy of your letter or brief to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel listed below.

Class Counsel will file with the Court and post on this website its request for attorneys' fees by [two weeks prior to objection deadline].

If you want to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing to object to the Settlement, with or without a lawyer (explained below in answer to Question Number 21), you must say so in your letter or brief. File the objection with the Court and mail a copy to these two different places postmarked no later than [objection deadline].

Court	Class Counsel	Defendant's Counsel
The Hon Richard G. Stearns John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 2300	Philip L. Fraietta Bursor & Fisher PA 1330 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor New York, NY 10019	Marc J. Zwillinger ZwillGen PLLC 1900 M St NW Suite 250 Washington, DC 20036

Boston, MA 02210		
------------------	--	--

### **18. What's the difference between objecting and excluding myself from the Settlement?**

Objecting simply means telling the Court that you don't like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Class. Excluding yourself from the Class is telling the Court that you don't want to be part of the Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you.

## **THE COURT'S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING**

### **19. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?**

The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at [time] on **Month 00, 2023** in Courtroom 21 at the John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse, 1 Courthouse Way, Boston, MA 02210. The purpose of the hearing will be for the Court to determine whether to approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Class; to consider the Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and expenses; and to consider the request for an incentive award to the Class Representative. At that hearing, the Court will be available to hear any objections and arguments concerning the fairness of the Settlement.

The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time without notice, so it is a good idea to check [[www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com](http://www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com)] or call 1-646-837-7150. If, however, you timely objected to the Settlement and advised the Court that you intend to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing, you will receive notice of any change in the date of such Final Approval Hearing.

### **20. Do I have to come to the hearing?**

No. Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. But, you are welcome to come at your own expense. If you send an objection or comment, you don't have to come to Court to talk about it. As long as you filed and mailed your written objection on time, the Court will consider it. You may also pay another lawyer to attend, but it's not required.

### **21. May I speak at the hearing?**

Yes. You may ask the Court for permission to speak at the Fairness Hearing. To do so, you must include in your letter or brief objecting to the settlement a statement saying that it is your "Notice of Intent to Appear in *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC*, Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS." It must include your name, address, telephone number and signature as well as the name and address of your lawyer, if one is appearing for you. Your objection and notice of intent to appear must be filed with the

Court and postmarked no later than **[objection deadline]**, and be sent to the addresses listed in Question 17.

## GETTING MORE INFORMATION

### **22. Where do I get more information?**

This Notice summarizes the Settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You can get a copy of the Settlement Agreement at **www.bostonglobevppasettlement.com**. You may also write with questions to Boston Globe Privacy Settlement, P.O. Box 0000, City, ST 00000. You can call the Settlement Administrator at **1-800-000-0000** or Class Counsel at 1-646-837-7150, if you have any questions. Before doing so, however, please read this full Notice carefully. You may also find additional information elsewhere on the case website.

**EXHIBIT E**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

DAVID AMBROSE, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BOSTON GLOBE MEDIA PARTNERS, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:22-cv-10195-RGS

**STIPULATION REGARDING UNDERTAKING RE: ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS,  
AND EXPENSES**

Plaintiff David Ambrose (“Plaintiff”) and Defendant Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC, (“Defendant”) (collectively, “the Parties”), by and through and including their undersigned counsel, stipulate and agree as follows:

WHEREAS, Bursor & Fisher P.A. (the “Firm”) desires to give an undertaking (the “Undertaking”) for repayment of its share of the award of attorneys’ fees, costs, and expenses approved by the Court, and

WHEREAS, the Defendant does not object to the Undertaking.

NOW, THEREFORE, Plaintiff’s counsel, on behalf of himself as individual and as agent for his law firm, hereby submits himself and his law firm to the jurisdiction of the Court for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Undertaking.

Capitalized terms used herein without definition have the meanings given to them in the Settlement Agreement.

By receiving any payments pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Firm and its shareholders, members, and/or partners submit to the jurisdiction of the United States District

Court for the District of Massachusetts for the enforcement of and any and all disputes relating to or arising out of the reimbursement obligation set forth herein and the Settlement Agreement.

In the event that the Final Settlement Order and Judgment or any part of it is vacated, overturned, reversed, or rendered void as a result of an appeal, or the Settlement Agreement is voided, rescinded, or otherwise terminated for any other reason, the Firm shall, within thirty (30) days repay to Defendant or Defendant's insurer, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the full amount of the attorneys' fees and costs paid to the Firm from the Settlement Fund, including any accrued interest.

In the event the Final Settlement Order and Judgment are upheld, but the attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses awarded by the Court or any part of them are vacated, modified, reversed, or rendered void as a result of an appeal, the Firm shall within thirty (30) days repay to the Settlement Fund, based upon written instructions provided by the Settlement Administrator, the attorneys' fees and costs paid to the Firm from the Settlement Fund in the amount vacated or modified, including any accrued interest.

This Undertaking and all obligations set forth herein shall expire upon finality of all direct appeals of the Final Settlement Order and Judgment.

In the event the Firm fails to repay to Defendant or to the Settlement Fund any of attorneys' fees and costs that are owed to either pursuant to this Undertaking, the Court shall, upon application of Defendant, and notice to the Firm, summarily issue orders, including but not limited to judgments and attachment orders against the Firm, and may make appropriate findings for sanctions for contempt of court.

The undersigned stipulate, warrant, and represent that he has both actual and apparent authority to enter into this stipulation, agreement, and undertaking on behalf of the Firm.

This Undertaking may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

Signatures by facsimile shall be as effective as original signatures.

The undersigned declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that they have read and understand the foregoing and that it is true and correct.

IT IS SO STIPULATED THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD:

DATED: May 24, 2023

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.



By: Scott A. Bursor, on behalf of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff David Ambrose and Class Counsel

DATED: May 24, 2023

ZWILLGEN PLLC



By: Marc J. Zwillinger  
Attorneys for Defendant Boston Globe Media Partners,  
LLC







[www.bursor.com](http://www.bursor.com)

701 BRICKELL AVENUE  
MIAMI, FL 33131

1330 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 10019

1990 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD.  
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

## **FIRM RESUME**

With offices in Florida, New York, and California, BURSOR & FISHER lawyers have represented both plaintiffs and defendants in state and federal courts throughout the country.

The lawyers at our firm have an active civil trial practice, having won multi-million-dollar verdicts or recoveries in six of six class action jury trials since 2008. Our most recent class action trial victory came in May 2019 in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel and won a \$267 million jury verdict against a debt collector found to have violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. During the pendency of the defendant's appeal, the case settled for \$75.6 million, the largest settlement in the history of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

In August 2013 in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel, we won a jury verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (II)*, we obtained a \$50 million jury verdict in favor of a certified class of 150,000 purchasers of the Avacor Hair Regrowth System. The legal trade publication VerdictSearch reported that this was the second largest jury verdict in California in 2009, and the largest in any class action.

The lawyers at our firm have an active class action practice and have won numerous appointments as class counsel to represent millions of class members, including customers of Honda, Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, Sprint, Haier America, and Michaels Stores as well as purchasers of Avacor™, Hydroxycut, and Sensa™ products. Bursor & Fisher lawyers have been court-appointed Class Counsel or Interim Class Counsel in:

1. *O'Brien v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.* (D.N.J. Dec. 16, 2010) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of LG French-door refrigerators,
2. *Ramundo v. Michaels Stores, Inc.* (N.D. Ill. June 8, 2011) to represent a certified nationwide class of consumers who made in-store purchases at Michaels Stores using a debit or credit card and had their private financial information stolen as a result,
3. *In re Haier Freezer Consumer Litig.* (N.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2011) to represent a certified class of purchasers of mislabeled freezers from Haier America Trading, LLC,
4. *Rodriguez v. CitiMortgage, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 14, 2011) to represent a certified nationwide class of military personnel against CitiMortgage for illegal foreclosures,

5. *Rossi v. The Procter & Gamble Co.* (D.N.J. Jan. 31, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Crest Sensitivity Treatment & Protection toothpaste,
6. *Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp. et al.* (D.N.J. Feb. 21, 2012) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of mislabeled Maytag Centennial washing machines from Whirlpool Corp., Sears, and other retailers,
7. *In re Sensa Weight Loss Litig.* (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Sensa weight loss products,
8. *In re Sinus Buster Products Consumer Litig.* (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers,
9. *Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Capatriti 100% Pure Olive Oil,
10. *Forcellati v. Hyland's, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of children's homeopathic cold and flu remedies,
11. *Ebin v. Kangadis Family Management LLC, et al.* (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Capatriti 100% Pure Olive Oil,
12. *In re Scotts EZ Seed Litig.* (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 26, 2015) to represent a certified class of purchasers of Scotts Turf Builder EZ Seed,
13. *Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., et al.* (E.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2015) to represent a certified class of purchasers of mislabeled KitchenAid refrigerators from Whirlpool Corp., Best Buy, and other retailers,
14. *Hendricks v. StarKist Co.* (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2015) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of StarKist tuna products,
15. *In re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Card Litig.* (N.D. Cal. May 8, 2015) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of NVIDIA GTX 970 graphics cards,
16. *Melgar v. Zicam LLC, et al.* (E.D. Cal. March 30, 2016) to represent a certified ten-jurisdiction class of purchasers of Zicam Pre-Cold products,
17. *In re Trader Joe's Tuna Litigation* (C.D. Cal. December 21, 2016) to represent purchaser of allegedly underfilled Trader Joe's canned tuna.
18. *In re Welspun Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. January 26, 2017) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of Welspun Egyptian cotton bedding products,
19. *Retta v. Millennium Products, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. January 31, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of Millennium kombucha beverages,
20. *Moeller v. American Media, Inc.,* (E.D. Mich. June 8, 2017) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
21. *Hart v. BHH, LLC* (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2017) to represent a nationwide class of purchasers of Bell & Howell ultrasonic pest repellers,
22. *McMillion v. Rash Curtis & Associates* (N.D. Cal. September 6, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received calls from Rash Curtis & Associates,

23. *Lucero v. Solarcity Corp.* (N.D. Cal. September 15, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received telemarketing calls from Solarcity Corp.,
24. *Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2017) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
25. *Gasser v. Kiss My Face, LLC* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2017) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of cosmetic products,
26. *Gastelum v. Frontier California Inc.* (S.F. Superior Court February 21, 2018) to represent a certified California class of Frontier landline telephone customers who were charged late fees,
27. *Williams v. Facebook, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2018) to represent a proposed nationwide class of Facebook users for alleged privacy violations,
28. *Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2018) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
29. *Bayol v. Health-Ade* (N.D. Cal. August 23, 2018) to represent a proposed nationwide class of Health-Ade kombucha beverage purchasers,
30. *West v. California Service Bureau* (N.D. Cal. September 12, 2018) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received calls from California Service Bureau,
31. *Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corporation* (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 14, 2018) to represent a nationwide class of purchasers of protein shake products,
32. *Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2018) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
33. *Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel Inc. d/b/a Holiday Cruise Line* (N.D. Ill. Mar. 21, 2019) to represent a certified class of individuals who received calls from Holiday Cruise Line,
34. *Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson* (E.D. Cal. March 29, 2019) to represent a certified class of purchasers of Benecol spreads labeled with the representation “No Trans Fat,”
35. *Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. April 24, 2019) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
36. *Galvan v. Smashburger* (C.D. Cal. June 25, 2019) to represent a proposed class of purchasers of Smashburger’s “Triple Double” burger,
37. *Kokoszki v. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Feb. 7, 2020) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
38. *Russett v. The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.* (S.D.N.Y. May 28, 2020) to represent a class of insurance policyholders that were allegedly charged unlawful paper billing fees,
39. *In re: Metformin Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (D.N.J. June 3, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of generic diabetes medications that were contaminated with a cancer-causing carcinogen,

40. *Hill v. Spirit Airlines, Inc.* (S.D. Fla. July 21, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of passengers whose flights were cancelled by Spirit Airlines due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19, and whose tickets were not refunded,
41. *Kramer v. Alterra Mountain Co.* (D. Colo. July 31, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers to recoup the unused value of their Ikon ski passes after Alterra suspended operations at its ski resorts due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
42. *Qureshi v. American University* (D.D.C. July 31, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by American University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
43. *Hufford v. Maxim Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2020) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
44. *Desai v. Carnegie Mellon University* (W.D. Pa. Aug. 26, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Carnegie Mellon University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
45. *Heigl v. Waste Management of New York, LLC* (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 27, 2020) to represent a class of waste collection customers that were allegedly charged unlawful paper billing fees,
46. *Stellato v. Hofstra University* (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Hofstra University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
47. *Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), to represent consumers who purchased defective chainsaws,
48. *Soo v. Lorex Corporation* (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), to represent consumers whose security cameras were intentionally rendered non-functional by manufacturer,
49. *Miranda v. Golden Entertainment (NV), Inc.* (D. Nev. Dec. 17, 2020), to represent consumers and employees whose personal information was exposed in a data breach,
50. *Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, Inc.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Feb. 4, 2021), to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received text messages from SmileDirectClub, in alleged violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act,
51. *Suren v. DSV Solutions, LLC* (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Apr. 8, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
52. *De Lacour v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.* (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 23, 2021), to represent a certified class of consumers who purchased allegedly “natural” Tom’s of Maine products,
53. *Wright v. Southern New Hampshire University* (D.N.H. Apr. 26, 2021), to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Southern New Hampshire University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,

54. *Sahlin v. Hospital Housekeeping Systems, LLC* (Cir. Ct. Williamson Cnty. May 21, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
55. *Landreth v. Verano Holdings LLC, et al.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. June 2, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.
56. *Rocchio v. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey*, (Sup. Ct., Middlesex Cnty. October 27, 201), to represent a certified nationwide class of students for fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Rutgers due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
57. *Malone v. Western Digital Corp.*, (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2021), to represent a class of consumers who purchased hard drives that were allegedly deceptively advertised,
58. *Jenkins v. Charles Industries, LLC*, (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Dec. 21, 2021) to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
59. *Frederick v. Examsoft Worldwide, Inc.*, (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Jan. 6, 2022) to represent a certified class of exam takers who used virtual exam proctoring software, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
60. *Isaacson v. Liqui-Box Flexibles, LLC, et al.*, (Cir. Ct. Will Cnty. Jan. 18, 2022) to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
61. *Goldstein et al. v. Henkel Corp.*, (D. Conn. Mar. 3, 2022) to represent a proposed class of purchasers of Right Guard-brand antiperspirants that were allegedly contaminated with benzene,
62. *McCall v. Hercules Corp.*, (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Westchester Cnty. Mar. 14, 2022) to represent a certified class of who laundry card purchasers who were allegedly subjected to deceptive practices by being denied cash refunds,
63. *Lewis v. Trident Manufacturing, Inc.*, (Cir. Ct. Kane Cnty. Mar. 16, 2022) to represent a certified class of workers who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
64. *Croft v. Spinx Games Limited, et al.*, (W.D. Wash. Mar. 31, 2022) to represent a certified class of Washington residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Washington law,
65. *Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC*, (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022) to represent a certified class of Illinois residents whose identities were allegedly used without their consent in alleged violation of the Illinois Right of Publicity Act,
66. *Rivera v. Google LLC*, (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Apr. 25, 2022) to represent a certified class of Illinois residents who appeared in a photograph in Google Photos, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
67. *Loftus v. Outside Integrated Media, LLC*, (E.D. Mich. May 5, 2022) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,



68. *D’Amario v. The University of Tampa*, (S.D.N.Y. June 3, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by The University of Tampa due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
69. *Fittipaldi v. Monmouth University*, (D.N.J. Sept. 22, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Monmouth University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
70. *Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al.* (Cir. Ct. Henderson Cnty. Oct. 3, 2022) to present a certified class of Kentucky residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Kentucky law,
71. *Cruz v. The Connor Group, A Real Estate Investment Firm, LLC*, (N.D. Ill. Oct. 26, 2022) to represent a certified class of workers who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act;
72. *Delcid et al. v. TCP HOT Acquisitions LLC et al.* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Sure and Brut-brand antiperspirants that were allegedly contaminated with benzene,
73. *Kain v. The Economist Newspaper NA, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Dec. 15, 2022) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
74. *Strano v. Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Jan. 6, 2023) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
75. *Moeller v. The Week Publications, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Jan. 6, 2023) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act.
76. *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC* (D. Mass. May 25, 2023) to represent a class of newspaper subscribers who were also Facebook users under the Video Privacy Protection Act.
77. *In re: Apple Data Privacy Litigation*, (N.D. Cal. July 5, 2023) to represent a putative nationwide class of all persons who turned off permissions for data tracking and whose mobile app activity was still tracked on iPhone mobile devices.

### **SCOTT A. BURSOR**

Mr. Bursor has an active civil trial practice, having won multi-million verdicts or recoveries in six of six civil jury trials since 2008. Mr. Bursor’s most recent victory came in May 2019 in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel and won a \$267 million jury verdict against a debt collector for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA).

In *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.* (2013), where Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel, the jury returned a verdict defeating Sprint’s \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class’s recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc.* (2009), the jury returned a \$50 million verdict in favor of the plaintiff and class represented by Mr. Bursor. The legal trade publication VerdictSearch reported that this was the second largest jury verdict in California in 2009.

Class actions are rarely tried to verdict. Other than Mr. Bursor and his partner Mr. Fisher, we know of no lawyer that has tried more than one class action to a jury. Mr. Bursor's perfect record of six wins in six class action jury trials, with recoveries ranging from \$21 million to \$299 million, is unmatched by any other lawyer. Each of these victories was hard-fought against top trial lawyers from the biggest law firms in the United States.

Mr. Bursor graduated from the University of Texas Law School in 1996. He served as Articles Editor of the Texas Law Review, and was a member of the Board of Advocates and Order of the Coif. Prior to starting his own practice, Mr. Bursor was a litigation associate at a large New York based law firm where he represented telecommunications, pharmaceutical, and technology companies in commercial litigation.

Mr. Bursor is a member of the state bars of New York, Florida, and California, as well as the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits, and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, and the Eastern District of Michigan.

### Representative Cases

Mr. Bursor was appointed lead or co-lead class counsel to the largest, 2nd largest, and 3rd largest classes ever certified. Mr. Bursor has represented classes including more than 160 million class members, roughly 1 of every 2 Americans. Listed below are recent cases that are representative of Mr. Bursor's practice:

Mr. Bursor negotiated and obtained court-approval for two landmark settlements in *Nguyen v. Verizon Wireless* and *Zill v. Sprint Spectrum* (the largest and 2nd largest classes ever certified). These settlements required Verizon and Sprint to open their wireless networks to third-party devices and applications. These settlements are believed to be the most significant legal development affecting the telecommunications industry since 1968, when the FCC's Carterfone decision similarly opened up AT&T's wireline telephone network.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum, L.P.* representing a class of approximately 2 million California consumers who were charged an early termination fee under a Sprint cellphone contract, asserting claims that such fees were unlawful liquidated damages under the California Civil Code, as well as other statutory and common law claims. After a five-week combined bench-and-jury trial, the jury returned a verdict in June 2008 and the Court issued a Statement of Decision in December 2008 awarding the plaintiffs \$299 million in cash and debt cancellation. Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel for this class again in 2013 during a month-long jury trial in which Sprint asserted a \$1.06 billion counterclaim against the class. Mr. Bursor secured a verdict awarding Sprint only \$18.4 million, the exact amount calculated by the class's damages expert. This award was less than 2% of the damages Sprint sought, less than 6% of the amount of the illegal termination fees Sprint charged to class

members. In December 2016, after more than 13 years of litigation, the case was settled for \$304 million, including \$79 million in cash payments plus \$225 million in debt cancellation.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *White v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* representing a class of approximately 1.4 million California consumers who were charged an early termination fee under a Verizon cellphone contract, asserting claims that such fees were unlawful liquidated damages under the California Civil Code, as well as other statutory and common law claims. In July 2008, after Mr. Bursor presented plaintiffs' case-in-chief, rested, then cross-examined Verizon's principal trial witness, Verizon agreed to settle the case for a \$21 million cash payment and an injunction restricting Verizon's ability to impose early termination fees in future subscriber agreements.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *Thomas v. Global Visions Products Inc.* Mr. Bursor represented a class of approximately 150,000 California consumers who had purchased the Avacor® hair regrowth system. In January 2008, after a four-week combined bench-and-jury trial. Mr. Bursor obtained a \$37 million verdict for the class, which the Court later increased to \$40 million.

Mr. Bursor was appointed class counsel and was elected chair of the Official Creditors' Committee in *In re Nutraquest Inc.*, a Chapter 11 bankruptcy case before Chief Judge Garrett E. Brown, Jr. (D.N.J.) involving 390 ephedra-related personal injury and/or wrongful death claims, two consumer class actions, four enforcement actions by governmental agencies, and multiple adversary proceedings related to the Chapter 11 case. Working closely with counsel for all parties and with two mediators, Judge Nicholas Politan (Ret.) and Judge Marina Corodemus (Ret.), the committee chaired by Mr. Bursor was able to settle or otherwise resolve every claim and reach a fully consensual Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, which Chief Judge Brown approved in late 2006. This settlement included a \$12.8 million recovery to a nationwide class of consumers who alleged they were defrauded in connection with the purchase of Xenadrine® dietary supplement products.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *In re: Pacific Bell Late Fee Litigation*. After filing the first class action challenging Pac Bell's late fees in April 2010, winning a contested motion to certify a statewide California class in January 2012, and defeating Pac Bell's motion for summary judgment in February 2013, Mr. Bursor obtained final approval of the \$38 million class settlement. The settlement, which Mr. Bursor negotiated the night before opening statements were scheduled to commence, included a \$20 million cash payment to provide refunds to California customers who paid late fees on their Pac Bell wireline telephone accounts, and an injunction that reduced other late fee charges by \$18.6 million.

### **L. TIMOTHY FISHER**

L. Timothy Fisher has an active practice in consumer class actions and complex business litigation and has also successfully handled a large number of civil appeals.

Mr. Fisher has been actively involved in numerous cases that resulted in multi-million dollar recoveries for consumers and investors. Mr. Fisher has handled cases involving a wide range of issues including nutritional labeling, health care, telecommunications, corporate



governance, unfair business practices and consumer fraud. With his partner Scott A. Bursor, Mr. Fisher has tried five class action jury trials, all of which produced successful results. In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products*, Mr. Fisher obtained a jury award of \$50,024,611 — the largest class action award in California in 2009 and the second-largest jury award of any kind. In 2019, Mr. Fisher served as trial counsel with Mr. Bursor and his partner Yeremey Krivoshey in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, where the jury returned a verdict for \$267 million in statutory damages under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Mr. Fisher was admitted to the State Bar of California in 1997. He is also a member of the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, the Northern District of Illinois, the Eastern District of Michigan, and the Eastern District of Missouri. Mr. Fisher taught appellate advocacy at John F. Kennedy University School of Law in 2003 and 2004. In 2010, he contributed jury instructions, a verdict form and comments to the consumer protection chapter of Justice Elizabeth A. Baron's *California Civil Jury Instruction Companion Handbook* (West 2010). In January 2014, Chief Judge Claudia Wilken of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California appointed Mr. Fisher to a four-year term as a member of the Court's Standing Committee on Professional Conduct.

Mr. Fisher received his Juris Doctor from Boalt Hall at the University of California at Berkeley in 1997. While in law school, he was an active member of the Moot Court Board and participated in moot court competitions throughout the United States. In 1994, Mr. Fisher received an award for Best Oral Argument in the first-year moot court competition.

In 1992, Mr. Fisher graduated with highest honors from the University of California at Berkeley and received a degree in political science. Prior to graduation, he authored an honors thesis for Professor Bruce Cain entitled "The Role of Minorities on the Los Angeles City Council." He is also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

### **Representative Cases**

*Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc.* (Alameda County Superior Court). Mr. Fisher litigated claims against Global Vision Products, Inc. and other individuals in connection with the sale and marketing of a purported hair loss remedy known as Avacor. The case lasted more than seven years and involved two trials. The first trial resulted in a verdict for plaintiff and the class in the amount of \$40,000,000. The second trial resulted in a jury verdict of \$50,024,611, which led to a \$30 million settlement for the class.

*In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases - Handset Locking Actions* (Alameda County Superior Court). Mr. Fisher actively worked on five coordinated cases challenging the secret locking of cell phone handsets by major wireless carriers to prevent consumers from activating them on competitive carriers' systems. Settlements have been approved in all five cases on terms that require the cell phone carriers to disclose their handset locks to consumers and to provide unlocking codes nationwide on reasonable terms and conditions. The settlements fundamentally changed the landscape for cell phone consumers regarding the locking and unlocking of cell phone handsets.

*In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* - Early Termination Fee Cases (Alameda County Superior Court and Federal Communications Commission). In separate cases that are a part of the same coordinated litigation as the Handset Locking Actions, Mr. Fisher actively worked on claims challenging the validity under California law of early termination fees imposed by national cell phone carriers. In one of those cases, against Verizon Wireless, a nationwide settlement was reached after three weeks of trial in the amount of \$21 million. In a second case, which was tried to verdict, the Court held after trial that the \$73 million of flat early termination fees that Sprint had collected from California consumers over an eight-year period were void and unenforceable.

**Selected Published Decisions**

*Melgar v. Zicam LLC*, 2016 WL 1267870 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2016) (certifying 10-jurisdiction class of purchasers of cold remedies, denying motion for summary judgment, and denying motions to exclude plaintiff's expert witnesses).

*Salazar v. Honest Tea, Inc.*, 2015 WL 7017050 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2015) (denying motion for summary judgment).

*Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 2015 WL 1932484 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2015) (certifying California class of purchasers of refrigerators that were mislabeled as Energy Star qualified).

*Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc.*, 78 F.Supp.3d 1252 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (denying motion to dismiss claims alleging unlawful late fees under California Civil Code § 1671).

*Forcellati v. Hyland's, Inc.*, 2015 WL 9685557 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2015) (denying motion for summary judgment in case alleging false advertising of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

*Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc.*, 2014 WL 4793935 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2014) (denying motion to transfer venue pursuant to a forum selection clause).

*Forcellati v. Hyland's Inc.*, 2014 WL 1410264 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) (certifying nationwide class of purchasers of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

*Hendricks v. StarKist Co.*, 30 F.Supp.3d 917 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (denying motion to dismiss in case alleging underfilling of 5-ounce cans of tuna).

*Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 2013 WL 5781673 (E.D. Cal. October 25, 2013) (denying motion to dismiss in case alleging that certain KitchenAid refrigerators were misrepresented as Energy Star qualified).

*Forcellati v. Hyland's Inc.*, 876 F.Supp.2d 1155 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (denying motion to dismiss complaint alleging false advertising regarding homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

*Clerkin v. MyLife.com*, 2011 WL 3809912 (N.D. Cal. August 29, 2011) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss in case alleging false and misleading advertising by a social networking company).

*In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases*, 186 Cal.App.4th 1380 (2010) (affirming order approving \$21 million class action settlement).

*Gatton v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, 152 Cal.App.4th 571 (2007) (affirming order denying motion to compel arbitration).

**Selected Class Settlements**

*Melgar v. Zicam* (Eastern District of California) - \$16 million class settlement of claims alleging cold medicine was ineffective.

*Gastelum v. Frontier California Inc.* (San Francisco Superior Court) - \$10.9 million class action settlement of claims alleging that a residential landline service provider charged unlawful late fees.

*West v. California Service Bureau, Inc.* (Northern District of California) - \$4.1 million class settlement of claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

*Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp.* (Southern District of New York) - \$9 million class settlement of false advertising claims against protein shake manufacturer.

*Morris v. SolarCity Corp.* (Northern District of California) - \$15 million class settlement of claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

*Retta v. Millennium Products, Inc.* (Central District of California) - \$8.25 million settlement to resolve claims of bottled tea purchasers for alleged false advertising.

*Forcellati v. Hyland's* (Central District of California) – nationwide class action settlement providing full refunds to purchasers of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children.

*Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool* (Eastern District of California) – class action settlement providing \$55 cash payments to purchasers of certain KitchenAid refrigerators that allegedly mislabeled as Energy Star qualified.

*In Re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation* (Northern District of California) - \$4.5 million class action settlement of claims alleging that a computer graphics card was sold with false and misleading representations concerning its specifications and performance.

*Hendricks v. StarKist Co.* (Northern District of California) – \$12 million class action settlement of claims alleging that 5-ounce cans of tuna were underfilled.

*In re Zakskorn v. American Honda Motor Co. Honda* (Eastern District of California) – nationwide settlement providing for brake pad replacement and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses in case alleging defective brake pads on Honda Civic vehicles manufactured between 2006 and 2011.

*Correa v. Sensa Products, LLC* (Los Angeles Superior Court) - \$9 million settlement on behalf of purchasers of the Sensa weight loss product.

*In re Pacific Bell Late Fee Litigation* (Contra Costa County Superior Court) - \$38.6 million settlement on behalf of Pac Bell customers who paid an allegedly unlawful late payment charge.

*In re Haier Freezer Consumer Litigation* (Northern District of California) - \$4 million settlement, which provided for cash payments of between \$50 and \$325.80 to class members who purchased the Haier HNCM070E chest freezer.

*Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc.* (Alameda County Superior Court) - \$30 million settlement on behalf of a class of purchasers of a hair loss remedy.

*Guyette v. Viacom, Inc.* (Alameda County Superior Court) - \$13 million settlement for a class of cable television subscribers who alleged that the defendant had improperly failed to share certain tax refunds with its subscribers.

### **JOSEPH I. MARCHESE**

Joseph I. Marchese is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joe focuses his practice on consumer class actions, employment law disputes, and commercial litigation. He has represented corporate and individual clients in a wide array of civil litigation, and has substantial trial and appellate experience.

Joe has diverse experience in litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of mislabeling, false or misleading advertising, privacy violations, data breach claims, and violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Joe also has significant experience in multidistrict litigation proceedings. Recently, he served on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In Re: Blue Buffalo Company, Ltd. Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2562, which resulted in a \$32 million consumer class settlement. Currently, he serves on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee for Economic Reimbursement in *In Re: Valsartan Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2875.

Joe is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, and the Eastern District of Michigan, as well as the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Joe graduated from Boston University School of Law in 2002 where he was a member of The Public Interest Law Journal. In 1998, Joe graduated with honors from Bucknell University.

### **Selected Published Decisions:**

*Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 269 F. Supp. 3d 172 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 7, 2017), granting plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment on state privacy law violations in putative class action.

*Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 192 F. Supp. 3d 427 (S.D.N.Y. June 17, 2016), denying publisher's motion to dismiss its subscriber's allegations of state privacy law violations in putative class action.

*In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation*, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

*In re Michaels Stores Pin Pad Litigation*, 830 F. Supp. 2d 518 (N.D. Ill. 2011), denying retailer’s motion to dismiss its customers’ state law consumer protection and privacy claims in data breach putative class action.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-09279-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$50 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast*, Case No. 15-cv-05671-NRB (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$13.75 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation*, Case No. 12-cv-4727-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$47 million class settlement to resolve false advertising claims of purchasers of combination grass seed product.

*In Re: Blue Buffalo Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation*, Case No. 14-MD-2562-RWS (E.D. Mo. 2016) – final approval granted for \$32 million class settlement to resolve claims of pet owners for alleged false advertising of pet foods.

*Rodriguez v. Citimortgage, Inc.*, Case No. 11-cv-4718-PGG (S.D.N.Y. 2015) – final approval granted for \$38 million class settlement to resolve claims of military servicemembers for alleged foreclosure violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, where each class member was entitled to \$116,785 plus lost equity in the foreclosed property and interest thereon.

*O’Brien v. LG Electronics USA, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-cv-3733-DMC (D.N.J. 2011) – final approval granted for \$23 million class settlement to resolve claims of Energy Star refrigerator purchasers for alleged false advertising of the appliances’ Energy Star qualification.

**SARAH N. WESTCOT**

Sarah N. Westcot is the Managing Partner of Bursor & Fisher’s Miami office. She focuses her practice on consumer class actions, complex business litigation, and mass torts.

She has represented clients in a wide array of civil litigation, and has substantial trial and appellate experience. Sarah served as trial counsel in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, where Bursor & Fisher won a jury verdict defeating Sprint’s \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class’s recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

Sarah also has significant experience in high-profile, multi-district litigations. She currently serves on the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee in *In re Zantac (Ranitidine) Products*

*Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2924 (S.D. Florida). She also serves on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In re Apple Inc. App Store Simulated Casino-Style Games Litigation*, MDL No. 2985 (N.D. Cal.) and *In Re: Google Play Store Simulated Casino-Style Games Litigation*, MDL No. 3001 (N.D. Cal.).

Sarah is admitted to the State Bars of California and Florida, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern Districts of California, the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, and the bars of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Eighth, and Ninth Circuits.

Sarah received her Juris Doctor from the University of Notre Dame Law School in 2009. During law school, she was a law clerk with the Cook County State's Attorney's Office in Chicago and the Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office in San Jose, CA, gaining early trial experience in both roles. She graduated with honors from the University of Florida in 2005.

Sarah is a member of The National Trial Lawyers Top 100 Civil Plaintiff Lawyers, and was selected to The National Trial Lawyers Top 40 Under 40 Civil Plaintiff Lawyers for 2022.

#### **JOSHUA D. ARISOHN**

Joshua D. Arisohn is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Josh has litigated precedent-setting cases in the areas of consumer class actions and terrorism. He participated in the first ever trial to take place under the Anti-Terrorism Act, a statute that affords U.S. citizens the right to assert federal claims for injuries arising out of acts of international terrorism. Josh's practice continues to focus on terrorism-related matters as well as class actions.

Josh is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the District Court for the District of Columbia, and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Josh previously practiced at Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP and DLA Piper LLP. He graduated from Columbia University School of Law in 2006, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, and received his B.A. from Cornell University in 2002. Josh has been honored as a 2015, 2016 and 2017 Super Lawyer Rising Star.

#### **Selected Published Decisions:**

*Fields v. Syrian Arab Republic*, Civil Case No. 18-1437 (RJL), entering a judgment of approximately \$850 million in favor of the family members of victims of terrorist attacks carried out by ISIS with the material support of Syria.

*Farwell v. Google LLC*, 2022 WL 1568361 (C.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), denying social media defendant's motion to dismiss BIPA claims brought on behalf of Illinois school students using Google's Workspace for Education platform on laptop computers.



*Weiman v. Miami University*, Case No. 2020-00614JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

*Smith v. The Ohio State University*, Case No. 2020-00321JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

*Waitt v. Kent State University*, Case No. 2020-00392JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

*Duke v. Ohio University*, Case No. 2021-00036JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

*Keba v. Bowling Green State University*, Case No. 2020-00639JD (Oh. Ct. Claims), certifying a class of students alleging a breach of contract based on their school's failure to provide a full semester of in-person classes.

*Kirkbride v. The Kroger Co.*, Case No. 2:21-cv-00022-ALM-EPD, denying motion to dismiss claims based on the allegation that defendant overstated its usual and customary prices and thereby overcharged customers for generic drugs.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Morris v. SolarCity Corp.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-05107-RS (N.D. Cal.) - final approval granted for \$15 million class settlement to resolve claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.*

*Marquez v. Google LLC*, Case No. 2021-CH-1460 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$100 million class settlement to resolve alleged BIPA violations of Illinois residents appearing in photos on the Google Photos platform.

**JOEL D. SMITH**

Joel D. Smith is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joel is a trial attorney who has practiced in lower court and appeals courts across the country, as well as the U.S. Supreme Court.

Prior to joining Bursor & Fisher, Joel was a litigator at Crowell & Moring, where he represented Fortune 500 companies, privately held businesses, and public entities in a wide variety of commercial, environmental, and class action matters. Among other matters, Joel served as defense counsel for AT&T, Enterprise-Rent-A-Car, Flowers Foods, and other major U.S. businesses in consumer class actions, including a class action seeking to hold U.S. energy companies accountable for global warming. Joel represented four major U.S. retailers in a case arising from a devastating arson fire and ensuing state of emergency in Roseville, California,

which settled on the eve of a trial that was expected to last several months and involve several dozen witnesses. Joel also was part of the trial team in a widely publicized trial over the death of a contestant who died after participating in a Sacramento radio station's water drinking contest.

More recently, Joel's practice focuses on consumer class actions involving automotive and other product defects, financial misconduct, false advertising, and privacy violations.

Joel received both his undergraduate and law degrees from the University of California at Berkeley. While at Berkeley School of Law, he was a member of the California Law Review, received several academic honors, externed for the California Attorney General's office and published an article on climate change policy and litigation.

Joel is admitted to the State Bar of California, as well as the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third and Ninth Circuits; all California district courts; the Eastern District of Michigan; and the Northern District of Illinois.

**Selected Published Decisions:**

*Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC*, --- Fed App'x --- 2022 WL 1744107 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022), reversing dismissal in a class action alleging surreptitious monitoring of internet communications.

*Revitch v. DIRECTV, LLC*, 977 F.3d 713 (9th Cir. 2020), affirming denial of motion to compel arbitration in putative class action alleging unlawful calls under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

*Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.*, 2020 WL 5901116 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), granting class certification of consumer protection claims brought by purchasers of defective chainsaws.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Recinos et al. v. The Regents of the University of California*, Superior Court for the State of California, County of Alameda, Case No. RG19038659 – final approval granted for a settlement providing debt relief and refunds to University of California students who were charged late fees.

*Crandell et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America*, Case No. 2:18-cv-13377-JSA (D.N.J.) – final approval granted for a settlement providing relief for Volkswagen Touareg owners to resolve allegations that defects in Touareg vehicles caused the engines to ingest water when driving in the rain.

*Isley et al. v. BMW of N. America, LLC*, Case No. 2:19-cv-12680-ESK (D.N.J.) – final approval granted for settlement providing BMW owners with reimbursements and credit vouchers to resolve allegations that defects in the BMW N63TU engine caused excessive oil consumption.

*Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.*, 8:19-cv-01203-JVS-DFM (C.D. Cal.) – final approval granted for a settlement valued up to \$40 million to resolve allegations that Harbor



Freight sold chainsaws with a defective power switch that could prevent the chainsaws from turning off.

*Morris v. SolarCity Corp.*, Case No. 3:15-cv-05107-RS (N.D. Cal.) - final approval granted for \$15 million class settlement to resolve claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.*

### **NEAL J. DECKANT**

Neal J. Deckant is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A., where he serves as the firm's Head of Information & e-Discovery. Neal focuses his practice on complex business litigation and consumer class actions. Prior to joining Bursor & Fisher, Neal counseled low-income homeowners facing foreclosure in East Boston.

Neal is admitted to the State Bars of California and New York, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and the bars of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Neal received his Juris Doctor from Boston University School of Law in 2011, graduating cum laude with two Dean’s Awards. During law school, Neal served as a Senior Articles Editor for the Review of Banking and Financial Law, where he authored two published articles about securitization reforms, both of which were cited by the New York Court of Appeals, the highest court in the state. Neal was also awarded Best Oral Argument in his moot court section, and he served as a Research Assistant for his Securities Regulation professor. Neal has also been honored as a 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 Super Lawyers Rising Star. In 2007, Neal graduated with Honors from Brown University with a dual major in East Asian Studies and Philosophy.

### **Selected Published Decisions:**

*Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson*, 2019 WL 1429653 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2019), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of Benecol spreads labeled with the representation “No Trans Fats.”

*Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 2017 WL 6513347 (D.N.J. Dec. 20, 2017), granting class certification of consumer protection claims brought by purchasers of Maytag Centennial washing machines marked with the “Energy Star” logo.

*Duran v. Obesity Research Institute, LLC*, 204 Cal. Rptr. 3d 896 (Cal. Ct. App. 2016), reversing and remanding final approval of a class action settlement on appeal, regarding allegedly mislabeled dietary supplements, in connection with a meritorious objection.

*Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al.*, 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting individual and law firm defendants' motion for judgment as a matter of law on plaintiff's claims for retaliation and defamation, as well as for all claims against law firm partners, Nadeem and Lubna Faruqi.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor's motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

#### **Selected Class Settlements:**

*In Re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation*, Case No. 15-cv-00760-PJH (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2016) – final approval granted for \$4.5 million class action settlement to resolve claims that a computer graphics card was allegedly sold with false and misleading representations concerning its specifications and performance.

*Hendricks v. StarKist Co.*, 2016 WL 5462423 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016) – final approval granted for \$12 million class action settlement to resolve claims that 5-ounce cans of tuna were allegedly underfilled.

*In re: Kangadis Food Inc.*, Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014) – class action claims resolved for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy, following claims that its olive oil was allegedly sold with false and misleading representations.

#### **Selected Publications:**

Neal Deckant, *X. Reforms of Collateralized Debt Obligations: Enforcement, Accounting and Regulatory Proposals*, 29 Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 79 (2009) (cited in *Quadrant Structured Products Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, 16 N.E.3d 1165, 1169 n.8 (N.Y. 2014)).

Neal Deckant, *Criticisms of Collateralized Debt Obligations in the Wake of the Goldman Sachs Scandal*, 30 Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 407 (2010) (cited in *Quadrant Structured Products Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, 16 N.E.3d 1165, 1169 n.8 (N.Y. 2014)); *Lyon Village Venetia, LLC v. CSE Mortgage LLC*, 2016 WL 476694, at \*1 n.1 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. Feb. 4, 2016); Ivan Ascher, *Portfolio Society: On the Capitalist Mode of Prediction*, at 141, 153, 175 (Zone Books / The MIT Press 2016); Devon J. Steinmeyer, *Does State National Bank of Big Spring v. Geithner Stand a Fighting Chance?*, 89 Chi.-Kent. L. Rev. 471, 473 n.13 (2014)).

#### **YITZCHAK KOPEL**

Yitzchak Kopel is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Yitz focuses his practice on consumer class actions and complex business litigation. He has represented corporate and

individual clients before federal and state courts, as well as in arbitration proceedings.

Yitz has substantial experience in successfully litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of consumer fraud, data breaches, and violations of the telephone consumer protection act. Since 2014, Yitz has obtained class certification on behalf of his clients five times, three of which were certified as nationwide class actions. Bursor & Fisher was appointed as class counsel to represent the certified classes in each of the cases.

Yitz is admitted to the State Bars of New York and New Jersey, the bar of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Eleventh, and Ninth Circuits, and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, Eastern District of New York, Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern District of Wisconsin, Northern District of Illinois, and District of New Jersey.

Yitz received his Juris Doctorate from Brooklyn Law School in 2012, graduating *cum laude* with two Dean's Awards. During law school, Yitz served as an Articles Editor for the Brooklyn Law Review and worked as a Law Clerk at Shearman & Sterling. In 2009, Yitz graduated *cum laude* from Queens College with a B.A. in Accounting.

**Selected Published Decisions:**

*Bassaw v. United Industries Corp.*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2020 WL 5117916 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2020), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning insect foggers.

*Poppiti v. United Industries Corp.*, 2020 WL 1433642 (E.D. Mo. Mar. 24, 2020), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning citronella candles.

*Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc.*, 2019 WL 6699188 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 9, 2019), granting summary judgment on behalf of certified class in robocall class action.

*Krumm v. Kittrich Corp.*, 2019 WL 6876059 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 17, 2019), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning mosquito repellent.

*Crespo v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, 394 F. Supp. 3d 260 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), denying defendant's motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action regarding Raid insect fogger.

*Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc.*, 2019 WL 1294659 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 21, 2019), certifying a class of persons who received robocalls in the state of Illinois.

*Bourbia v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, 375 F. Supp. 3d 454 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), denying defendant's motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action regarding mosquito repellent.

*Hart v. BHH, LLC*, 323 F. Supp. 3d 560 (S.D.N.Y. 2018), denying defendants' motion for summary judgment in certified class action involving the sale of ultrasonic pest repellents.

*Hart v. BHH, LLC*, 2018 WL 3471813 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2018), denying defendants' motion to exclude plaintiffs' expert in certified class action involving the sale of ultrasonic pest repellers.

*Penrose v. Buffalo Trace Distillery, Inc.*, 2018 WL 2334983 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 5, 2018), denying bourbon producers' motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action.

*West v. California Service Bureau, Inc.*, 323 F.R.D. 295 (N.D. Cal. 2017), certifying a nationwide class of "wrong-number" robocall recipients.

*Hart v. BHH, LLC*, 2017 WL 2912519 (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2017), certifying nationwide class of purchasers of ultrasonic pest repellers.

*Browning v. Unilever United States, Inc.*, 2017 WL 7660643 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2017), denying motion to dismiss fraud and warranty claims in putative class action concerning facial scrub product.

*Brenner v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 2016 WL 8192946 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2016), denying motion to dismiss warranty and consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning baby wipes.

*Hewlett v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc.*, 2016 WL 4466536 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2016), denying telemarketer's motion to dismiss TCPA claims in putative class action.

*Bailey v. KIND, LLC*, 2016 WL 3456981 (C.D. Cal. June 16, 2016), denying motion to dismiss fraud and warranty claims in putative class action concerning snack bars.

*Hart v. BHH, LLC*, 2016 WL 2642228 (S.D.N.Y. May 5, 2016) denying motion to dismiss warranty and consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning ultrasonic pest repellers.

*Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al.*, 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting clients' motion for judgment as a matter of law on claims for retaliation and defamation in employment action.

*In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation*, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

*Brady v. Basic Research, L.L.C.*, 101 F. Supp. 3d 217 (E.D.N.Y. 2015), denying diet pill manufacturers' motion to dismiss its purchasers' allegations for breach of express warranty in putative class action.

*Ward v. TheLadders.com, Inc.*, 3 F. Supp. 3d 151 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), denying online job board's motion to dismiss its subscribers' allegations of consumer protection law violations in putative class action.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor’s motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Hart v. BHH, LLC*, Case No. 1:15-cv-04804 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 22, 2020), resolving class action claims regarding ultrasonic pest repellers.

*In re: Kangadis Food Inc.*, Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014), resolving class action claims for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy following the certification of nationwide claims alleging that its olive oil was sold with false and misleading representations.

*West v. California Service Bureau*, Case No. 4:16-cv-03124-YGR (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2019), resolving class action claims against debt-collector for wrong-number robocalls for \$4.1 million.

**FREDERICK J. KLORCZYK III**

Frederick J. Klorczyk III is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Fred focuses his practice on complex business litigation and consumer class actions.

Fred has substantial experience in successfully litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of mislabeling, false or misleading advertising, and privacy violations. In 2019, Fred certified both a California and a 10-state express warranty class on behalf of purchasers of a butter substitute. In 2014, Fred served on the litigation team in *Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.* At class certification, Judge Rakoff adopted Fred’s choice of law fraud analysis and research directly into his published decision certifying a nationwide fraud class.

Fred is admitted to the State Bars of California, New York, and New Jersey, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Eastern, and Southern Districts of California, the Southern, Eastern, and Northern Districts of New York, the District of New Jersey, the Northern District of Illinois, the Eastern District of Missouri, the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and the Eastern District of Michigan, as well as the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Fred received his Juris Doctor from Brooklyn Law School in 2013, graduating *magna cum laude* with two CALI Awards for the highest grade in his classes on conflict of laws and criminal law. During law school, Fred served as an Associate Managing Editor for the Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial and Commercial Law and as an intern to the Honorable Alison J. Nathan of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York and the Honorable Janet Bond Arterton of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut. In 2010, Fred graduated from the University of Connecticut with a B.S. in Finance.

**Selected Published Decisions:**

*Revitch v. New Moosejaw, LLC*, 2019 WL 5485330 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2019), denying defendants' motions to dismiss consumer's allegations of state privacy law violations in putative class action.

*In re Welspun Litigation*, 2019 WL 2174089 (S.D.N.Y. May 20, 2019), denying retailers' and textile manufacturer's motion to dismiss consumers' allegations of false advertising relating to purported "100% Egyptian Cotton" linen products.

*Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson*, 2019 WL 1429653 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2019), granting class certification of California false advertising claims and multi-state express warranty claims brought by purchasers of a butter substitute.

*Porter v. NBTY, Inc.*, 2016 WL 6948379 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 28, 2016), denying supplement manufacturer's motion to dismiss consumers' allegations of false advertising relating to whey protein content.

*Weisblum v. Prophase Labs, Inc.*, 88 F. Supp. 3d 282 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), denying supplement manufacturer's motion to dismiss consumers' allegations of false advertising relating to a homeopathic cold product.

*In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation*, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

*Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al.*, 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting individual and law firm defendants' motion for judgment as a matter of law on plaintiff's claims for retaliation and defamation, as well as for all claims against law firm partners, Nadeem and Lubna Faruqi.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, Case No. 13-4775 (2d Cir. Apr. 15, 2015), denying olive oil manufacturer's Rule 23(f) appeal following grant of nationwide class certification.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

*Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor's motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$9 million class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.



*Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-02444-KMK (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$16.375 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*In Re: Blue Buffalo Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation*, Case No. 14-MD-2562-RWS (E.D. Mo. 2016) –final approval granted for \$32 million class settlement to resolve claims of pet owners for alleged false advertising of pet foods.

*In re: Kangadis Food Inc.*, Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014) – resolved class action claims for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy following the certification of nationwide claims alleging that its olive oil was sold with false and misleading representations.

### **YEREMEY O. KRIVOSHEY**

Yeremey O. Krivoshey is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Mr. Krivoshey has particular expertise in COVID-19 related consumer litigation, unlawful fees and liquidated damages in consumer contracts, TCPA cases, product recall cases, and fraud and false advertising litigation. He has represented clients in a wide array of civil litigation, including appeals before the Ninth Circuit.

Mr. Krivoshey served as trial counsel with Mr. Bursor in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, where, in May 2019, the jury returned a verdict for \$267 million in statutory damages under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Since 2017, Mr. Krivoshey has secured over \$200 million for class members in consumer class settlements. Mr. Krivoshey has been honored multiple times as a Super Lawyers Rising Star.

Mr. Krivoshey is admitted to the State Bar of California. He is also a member of the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern Districts of California, as well as the District of Colorado.

Mr. Krivoshey graduated from New York University School of Law in 2013, where he was a Samuel A. Herzog Scholar. Prior to Bursor & Fisher, P.A., Mr. Krivoshey worked as a Law Clerk at Vladeck, Waldman, Elias & Engelhard, P.C, focusing on employment discrimination and wage and hour disputes. In law school, he has also interned at the American Civil Liberties Union and the United States Department of Justice. In 2010, Mr. Krivoshey graduated *cum laude* from Vanderbilt University.

### **Representative Cases:**

*Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, Case No. 16-cv-03396-YGR (N.D. Cal. May 13, 2019). Mr. Krivoshey litigated claims against a national health-care debt collection agency on behalf of people that received autodialed calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent. Mr. Krivoshey successfully obtained nationwide class certification, defeated the defendant's motion for summary judgment, won summary judgment as to the issue of prior express consent and the use of automatic telephone dialing systems, and navigated the case

towards trial. With his partner, Scott Bursor, Mr. Krivoshey obtained a jury verdict finding that the defendant violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) 534,712 times. Under the TCPA, class members are entitled to \$500 per each call made in violation of the TCPA – in this case, \$267 million for 534,712 unlawful calls.

**Selected Published Decisions:**

*Goodrich, et al. v. Alterra Mountain Co., et al.*, 2021 WL 2633326 (D. Col. June 25, 2021), denying ski pass company’s motion to dismiss its customers’ allegations concerning refunds owed due to cancellation of ski season due to COVID-19.

*Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc.*, 2014 WL 4793935 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2014), denying enforcement of forum selection clause based on public policy grounds.

*Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc.*, 78 F. Supp. 3d 1252 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2015), denying car-rental company’s motion to dismiss its subscriber’s allegations of unlawful late fees.

*Brown v. Comcast Corp.*, 2016 WL 9109112 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2016), denying internet service provider’s motion to compel arbitration of claims alleged under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

*Chaisson, et al. v. University of Southern California* (Cal. Sup. Ct. Mar. 25, 2021), denying university’s demurrer as to its students’ allegations of unfair and unlawful late fees.

*Choi v. Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc.*, 2019 WL 4894120 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2019), denying tampon manufacturer’s motion to dismiss its customer’s design defect claims.

*Horanzy v. Vemma Nutrition Co.*, Case No. 15-cv-298-PHX-JJT (D. Ariz. Apr. 16, 2016), denying multi-level marketer’s and its chief scientific officer’s motion to dismiss their customer’s fraud claims.

*McMillion, et al. v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, 2017 WL 3895764 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2017), granting nationwide class certification of Telephone Consumer Protection Act claims by persons receiving autodialed and prerecorded calls without consent.

*McMillion, et al. v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, 2018 WL 692105 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 2, 2018), granting plaintiffs’ motion for partial summary judgment on Telephone Consumer Protection Act violations in certified class action.

*Perez v. Indian Harbor Ins. Co.*, 2020 WL 2322996 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2020), denying insurance company’s motion to dismiss or stay assigned claims of bad faith and fair dealing arising out of \$267 million trial judgment.

*Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, 2020 WL 1904533 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2020), upholding constitutionality of \$267 million class trial judgment award.

*Salazar v. Honest Tea, Inc.*, 2015 WL 7017050 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2015), denying manufacturer’s motion for summary judgment as to customer’s false advertising claims.



*Sholopa v. Turk Hava Yollari A.O., Inc. (d/b/a Turkish Airlines)*, 2022 WL 976825 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2022), denying airline's motion to dismiss its customers claims for failure to refund flights cancelled due to COVID-19.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, Case No. 16-cv-03396-YGR (N.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2021) granting final approval to a \$75.6 million non-reversionary cash common fund settlement, the largest ever consumer class action settlement stemming from a violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

*Strassburger v. Six Flags Theme Parks Inc., et al.* (Ill. Cir. Ct. 2022) granting final approval to \$83.6 million settlement to resolve claims of theme park members for alleged wrongful charging of fees during the COVID-19 pandemic.

*Juarez-Segura, et al. v. Western Dental Services, Inc.* (Cal. Sup. Ct. Aug. 9, 2021) granting final approval to \$35 million settlement to resolve claims of dental customers for alleged unlawful late fees.

*Moore v. Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc.* (Ill. Cir. Ct. July 22, 2020) granting final approval to \$11.2 million settlement to resolve claims of tampon purchasers for alleged defective products.

*Retta v. Millennium Prods., Inc.*, 2017 WL 5479637 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2017) granting final approval to \$8.25 million settlement to resolve claims of kombucha purchasers for alleged false advertising.

*Cortes v. National Credit Adjusters, L.L.C.* (E.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2020) granting final approval to \$6.8 million settlement to resolve claims of persons who received alleged autodialed calls without prior consent in violation of the TCPA.

*Bayol et al. v. Health-Ade LLC, et al.* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2019) – granting final approval to \$3,997,500 settlement to resolve claims of kombucha purchasers for alleged false advertising.

**PHILIP L. FRAIETTA**

Philip L. Fraietta is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Phil focuses his practice on data privacy, complex business litigation, consumer class actions, and employment law disputes. Phil has been named a “Rising Star” in the New York Metro Area by Super Lawyers<sup>®</sup> every year since 2019.

Phil has significant experience in litigating consumer class actions, particularly those involving privacy claims under statutes such as the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act, the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, and Right of Publicity statutes. Since 2016, Phil has recovered over \$100 million for class members in privacy class action settlements. In addition to privacy claims, Phil has significant experience in litigating and settling class action claims involving false or misleading advertising.

Phil is admitted to the State Bars of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, and Michigan, the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the Western District of New York, the Northern District of New York, the District of New Jersey, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the Northern District of Illinois, the Central District of Illinois, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, and Ninth Circuits. Phil was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Phil received his Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law in 2014, graduating cum laude. During law school, Phil served as an Articles & Notes Editor for the Fordham Law Review, and published two articles. In 2011, Phil graduated cum laude from Fordham University with a B.A. in Economics.

**Selected Published Decisions:**

*Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC*, 2022 WL 971479 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), certifying class of Illinois residents for alleged violations of Illinois' Right of Publicity Act by background reporting website.

*Kolebuck-Utz v. Whitepages Inc.*, 2021 WL 157219 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 22, 2021), denying defendant's motion to dismiss for alleged violations of Ohio's Right to Publicity Law.

*Bergeron v. Rochester Institute of Technology*, 2020 WL 7486682 (W.D.N.Y. Dec. 18, 2020), denying university's motion to dismiss for failure to refund tuition and fees for the Spring 2020 semester in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

*Porter v. NBTY, Inc.*, 2019 WL 5694312 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 4, 2019), denying supplement manufacturer's motion for summary judgment on consumers' allegations of false advertising relating to whey protein content.

*Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 269 F. Supp. 3d 172 (S.D.N.Y. 2017), granting plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment on state privacy law violations in putative class action.

**Selected Class Settlements:**

*Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-09279-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$50 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-02444-KMK (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$16.375 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast*, Case No. 15-cv-05671-NRB (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$13.75 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, LLC*, Case No. 2020-CH-07269 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2021) – final approval granted for \$11.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged TCPA violations.

*Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$9 million class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.

*Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-01812-KMK (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$8.225 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*Moeller v. American Media, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-11367-JEL (E.D. Mich. 2017) – final approval granted for \$7.6 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

*Rocchio v. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey*, Case No. MID-L-003039-20 (Sup. Ct. Middlesex Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$5 million class settlement to resolve claims for failure to refund mandatory fees for the Spring 2020 semester in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

*Heigl v. Waste Management of New York, LLC*, Case No. 19-cv-05487-WFK-ST (E.D.N.Y. 2021) – final approval granted for \$2.7 million class settlement to resolve claims for charging allegedly unlawful fees pertaining to paper billing.

*Frederick v. Examsoft Worldwide, Inc.*, Case No. 2021L001116 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$2.25 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged BIPA violations.

### **ALEC M. LESLIE**

Alec Leslie is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. He focuses his practice on consumer class actions, employment law disputes, and complex business litigation.

Alec is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bar of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York. Alec was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Alec received his Juris Doctor from Brooklyn Law School in 2016, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Alec served as an Articles Editor for Brooklyn Law Review. In addition, Alec served as an intern to the Honorable James C. Francis for the Southern District of New York and the Honorable Vincent Del Giudice, Supreme Court, Kings County. Alec graduated from the University of Colorado with a B.A. in Philosophy in 2012.

### **Selected Class Settlements:**

*Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*, Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final

approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.

*Wright v. Southern New Hampshire Univ.*, Case No. 1:20-cv-00609-LM (D.N.H. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 tuition and fee refunds to students.

*Mendoza et al. v. United Industries Corp.*, Case No. 21PH-CV00670 (Phelps Cnty. Mo. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve false advertising claims on insect repellent products.

*Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.*, Case No. 8:19-cv-01203-JVS-DFM (C.D. Cal. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly defective and dangerous chainsaws.

*Rocchio v. Rutgers Univ.*, Case No. MID-L-003039-20 (Middlesex Cnty. N.J. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

*Malone v. Western Digital Corporation*, Case No. 5:20-cv-03584-NC (N.D. Cal.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve false advertising claims on hard drive products.

*Frederick et al. v. ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc.*, Case No. 2021L001116 (DuPage Cnty. Ill. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over alleged BIPA violations with respect to exam proctoring software.

### **STEPHEN BECK**

Stephen is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Stephen focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Stephen is admitted to the State Bar of Florida and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida.

Stephen received his Juris Doctor from the University of Miami School of Law in 2018. During law school, Stephen received an Honors distinction in the Litigation Skills Program and was awarded the Honorable Theodore Klein Memorial Scholarship for excellence in written and oral advocacy. Stephen also received the CALI Award in Legislation for earning the highest grade on the final examination. Stephen graduated from the University of North Florida with a B.A. in Philosophy in 2015.

### **STEFAN BOGDANOVICH**

Stefan Bogdanovich is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Stefan litigates complex civil and class actions typically involving privacy, intellectual property, entertainment, and false advertising law.

Prior to working at Bursor & Fisher, Stefan practiced at two national law firms in Los Angeles. He helped represent various companies in false advertising and IP infringement cases, media companies in defamation cases, and motion picture producers in royalty disputes. He also advised corporations and public figures on complying with various privacy and advertising laws and regulations.

Stefan is admitted to the State Bar of California and all of the California Federal District Courts. He is also a Certified Information Privacy Professional.

Stefan received his Juris Doctor from the University of Southern California Gould School of Law in 2018, where he was a member of the Hale Moot Court Honors Program and the Trial Team. He received the highest grade in his class in three subjects, including First Amendment Law.

### **BRITTANY SCOTT**

Brittany Scott is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Brittany focuses her practice on data privacy, complex civil litigation, and consumer class actions. Brittany was an intern with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Brittany has substantial experience litigating consumer class actions, including those involving data privacy claims under statutes such as the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, the Fair Credit Reporting Act, and the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act. In addition to data privacy claims, Brittany has significant experience in litigating class action claims involving false and misleading advertising.

Brittany is admitted the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern Districts of California, the Eastern District of Wisconsin, and the Northern District of Illinois.

Brittany received her Juris Doctor from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2019, graduating cum laude. During law school, Brittany was a member of the Constitutional Law Quarterly, for which she was the Executive Notes Editor. Brittany published a note in the Constitutional Law Quarterly entitled “Waiving Goodbye to First Amendment Protections: First Amendment Waiver by Contract.” Brittany also served as a judicial extern to the Honorable Andrew Y.S. Cheng for the San Francisco Superior Court. In 2016, Brittany graduated from the University of California Berkeley with a B.A. in Political Science.

### **Selected Class Settlements:**

*Morrissey v. Tula Life, Inc.*, Case No. 2021L0000646 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2021) – final approval granted for \$4 million class settlement to resolve claims of cosmetics purchasers for alleged false advertising.

*Clarke et al. v. Lemonade Inc.*, Case No. 2022LA000308 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$4 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged BIPA violations.

*Whitlock v. Jabil Inc.*, Case No. 2021CH00626 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$995,000 class settlement to resolve claims for alleged BIPA violations.

### **MAX S. ROBERTS**

Max Roberts is an Associate in Bursor & Fisher’s New York office. Max focuses his practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection. Max was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm and is now Co-Chair of the firm’s Appellate Practice Group.

Max received his Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law in 2019, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Max was a member of Fordham’s Moot Court Board, the Brennan Moore Trial Advocates, and the Fordham Urban Law Journal, for which he published a note entitled [\*Weaning Drug Manufacturers Off Their Painkiller: Creating an Exception to the Learned Intermediary Doctrine in Light of the Opioid Crisis\*](#). In addition, Max served as an intern to the Honorable Vincent L. Briccetti of the Southern District of New York and the Fordham Criminal Defense Clinic. Max graduated from Johns Hopkins University in 2015 with a B.A. in Political Science.

Outside of the law, Max is an avid triathlete.

### **Selected Published Decisions:**

*Jackson v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, --- F.4th ---, 2023 WL 2997031 (9th Cir. Apr. 19, 2023), affirming district court’s denial of motion to compel arbitration. Max personally argued the appeal before the Ninth Circuit, which can be viewed [here](#).

*Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC*, 2022 WL 1744107 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022), reversing district court and holding that Section 631 of the California Invasion of Privacy Act requires prior consent to wiretapping. Max personally argued the appeal before the Ninth Circuit, which can be viewed [here](#).

*Mora v. J&M Plating, Inc.*, --- N.E.3d ---, 2022 WL 17335861 (Ill. App. Ct. 2d Dist. Nov. 30, 2022), reversing circuit court and holding that Section 15(a) of Illinois’ Biometric Information Privacy Act requires an entity to establish a retention and deletion schedule for biometric data at the first moment of possession. Max personally argued the appeal before the Second District, which can be listened to [here](#).

*Cristostomo v. New Balance Athletics, Inc.*, 2022 WL 17904394 (D. Mass. Dec. 23, 2022), denying motion to dismiss and motion to strike class allegations in case involving sneakers marketed as “Made in the USA.”

*Carroll v. Myriad Genetics, Inc.*, 2022 WL 16860013 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2022), denying in part motion to dismiss in case involving non-invasive prenatal testing product.

*Louth v. NFL Enterprises LLC*, 2022 WL 4130866 (D.R.I. Sept. 12, 2022), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of the Video Privacy Protection Act.



*Sholopa v. Turk Hava Yollari A.O., Inc. d/b/a Turkish Airlines*, 2022 WL 976825 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2022), denying motion to dismiss passenger's allegations that airline committed a breach of contract by failing to refund passengers for cancelled flights during the COVID-19 pandemic.

*Saleh v. Nike, Inc.*, 562 F. Supp. 3d 503 (C.D. Cal. 2021), denying in part motion to dismiss alleged violations of California Invasion of Privacy Act.

*Soo v. Lorex Corp.*, 2020 WL 5408117 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2020), denying defendants' motion to compel arbitration and denying in part motion dismiss consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning security cameras.

#### **Selected Class Settlements:**

*Miranda v. Golden Entertainment (NV), Inc.*, Case No. 2:20-cv-534-AT (D. Nev. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement valued at over \$4.5 million to resolve claims of customers and employees of casino company stemming from data breach.

*Malone v. Western Digital Corp.*, Case No. 5:20-cv-3584-NC (N.D. Cal. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement valued at \$5.7 million to resolve claims of hard drive purchasers for alleged false advertised.

*Frederick v. ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc.*, Case No. 2021-L-001116 (18th Judicial Circuit Court DuPage County, Illinois 2021) – final approval granted for \$2.25 million class settlement to resolve claims of Illinois students for alleged violations of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.

#### **Bar Admissions**

- New York State
- Southern District of New York
- Eastern District of New York
- Northern District of New York
- Northern District of Illinois
- Central District of Illinois
- Eastern District of Michigan
- District of Colorado
- Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
- Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals

#### **CHRISTOPHER R. REILLY**

Chris Reilly is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Chris focuses his practice on consumer class actions and complex business litigation.

Chris is admitted to the State Bar of Florida and is a member of the bar of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida.

Chris received his Juris Doctor from Georgetown University Law Center in 2020. During law school, Chris clerked for the Senate Judiciary Committee, where he worked on antitrust and food and drug law matters under Senator Richard Blumenthal. He has also clerked for the Mecklenburg County District Attorney's Office, the ACLU Prison Project, and the Pennsylvania General Counsel's Office. Chris served as Senior Editor of Georgetown's Journal of Law and Public Policy. In 2017, Chris graduated from the University of Florida with a B.A. in Political Science.

### **JULIA K. VENDITTI**

Julia Venditti is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Julia focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions. Julia was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Julia is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Julia received her Juris Doctor in 2020 from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law, where she graduated *cum laude* with two CALI Awards for the highest grade in her Evidence and California Community Property classes. During law school, Julia was a member of the UC Hastings Moot Court team and competed at the Evans Constitutional Law Moot Court Competition, where she finished as a national quarterfinalist and received a best brief award. Julia was also inducted into the UC Hastings Honors Society and was awarded Best Brief and an Honorable Mention for Best Oral Argument in her First-Year Moot Court section. In addition, Julia served as a Research Assistant for her Constitutional Law professor, as a Teaching Assistant for Legal Writing & Research, and as a Law Clerk at the San Francisco Public Defender's Office. In 2017, Julia graduated *magna cum laude* from Baruch College/CUNY, Weissman School of Arts and Sciences, with a B.A. in Political Science.

### **JULIAN DIAMOND**

Julian Diamond is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Julian focuses his practice on privacy law and class actions. Julian was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Julian received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Julian was Articles Editor for the Columbia Journal of Environmental Law. Prior to law school, Julian worked in education. Julian graduated from California State University, Fullerton with a B.A. in History and a single subject social science teaching credential.



**MATTHEW GIRARDI**

Matt Girardi is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Matt focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions, and has focused specifically on consumer class actions involving product defects, financial misconduct, false advertising, and privacy violations. Matt was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Matt is admitted to the State Bar of New York, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, and the Eastern District of Michigan

Matt received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School in 2020, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Matt was the Commentary Editor for the Columbia Journal of Tax Law, and represented fledgling businesses for Columbia's Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic. In addition, Matt worked as an Honors Intern in the Division of Enforcement at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Prior to law school, Matt graduated from Brown University in 2016 with a B.A. in Economics, and worked as a Paralegal Specialist at the U.S. Department of Justice in the Antitrust Division.

**JENNA GAVENMAN**

Jenna Gavenman is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Jenna focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Jenna was a Summer Associate and a part-time intern with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full-time Associate in September 2022.

Jenna is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Jenna received her Juris Doctor in 2022 from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law (now named UC Law SF). During law school, she was awarded an Honorable Mention for Best Oral Argument in her First-Year Moot Court section. Jenna also participated in both the Medical Legal Partnership for Seniors (MLPS) and the Lawyering for Children Practicum at Legal Services for Children—two of UC Hastings's nationally renowned clinical programs. Jenna was awarded the Clinic Award for Outstanding Performance in MLPS for her contributions to the clinic. In addition, Jenna volunteered with her law school's Legal Advice and Referral Clinic and as a LevelBar Mentor.

In 2018, Jenna graduated *cum laude* from Villanova University with a B.A. in Sociology and Spanish (double major). Jenna was a Division I athlete, competing on the Villanova Women's Water Polo varsity team for four consecutive years.

**EMILY HORNE**

Emily Horne is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Emily focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Emily was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Emily is admitted to the State Bar of California.

Emily received her Juris Doctor from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 2022 (now UC, Law SF). During law school, Emily served as Editor-in-Chief for the UC Hastings Communications and Entertainment Law Journal, and she competed on the Moot Court team. Emily also served as a judicial extern in the Northern District of California and as a Teaching Assistant for Legal Writing & Research. In 2015, Emily graduated from Scripps College with a B.A. in Sociology.

**IRA ROSENBERG**

Ira Rosenberg is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ira focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Ira received his Juris Doctor in 2022 from Columbia Law School. During law school, Ira served as a Student Honors Legal Intern with Division of Enforcement at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Ira also interned during law school in the Criminal Division at the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York and with the Investor Protection Bureau at the Office of the New York State Attorney General. Ira graduated in 2018 from Beth Medrash Govoha with a B.A. in Talmudic Studies.

**LUKE SIRONSKI-WHITE**

Luke Sironski-White is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A., focusing on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Luke joined the firm as a full-time Associate in August 2022.

Luke is admitted to the State Bar of California.

Luke received his Juris Doctor in 2022 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Luke was on the board of the Consumer Advocacy and Protection Society (CAPS), edited for the Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, and volunteered with the Prisoner Advocacy Network.

In 2017, Luke graduated from the University of Chicago with a B.A. in Anthropology. Before entering the field of law Luke was a professional photographer and filmmaker.

**JONATHAN L. WOLLOCH**

Jonathan L. Wolloch is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Jonathan focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions. Jonathan was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Jonathan is admitted to the State Bar of Florida and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida.

Jonathan received his Juris Doctor from the University of Miami School of Law in 2022, graduating magna cum laude. During law school, Jonathan served as a judicial intern to the Honorable Beth Bloom for the Southern District of Florida. He received two CALI Awards for earning the highest grade in his Trusts & Estates and Substantive Criminal Law courses, and he was elected to the Order of the Coif. Jonathan was also selected for participation in a semester long externship at the Florida Supreme Court, where he served as a judicial extern to the Honorable John D. Couriel. In 2018, Jonathan graduated from the University of Michigan with a B.A. in Political Science.