

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

DOREEN CAHILL and JANET CHRISTMAN on
behalf of themselves and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KEURIG GREEN MOUNTAIN, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-7507-CS

**DECLARATION OF PHILIP L. FRAIETTA IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS’
UNOPOSED MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT**

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., Class Counsel in this action. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of New York, and I am a member of the bar of this Court. I make this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Settlement and am fully competent to do so. I have personal knowledge of all matters set forth herein unless otherwise indicated, and, if called upon to testify, I could and would competently do so.

2. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Parties’ Class Action Settlement Agreement, and the exhibits attached thereto.

3. On September 1, 2022, Doreen Cahill filed a putative class action complaint in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint alleges that Keurig’s K-Supreme, K-Supreme Plus, and K-Supreme SMART coffee makers (the “Coffee Maker(s)”) may experience performance or operational issues when descaled according to the directions supplied with the Coffee Makers or with the Keurig Descaling Solution. (ECF No.

1.). The complaint was originally brought against both Keurig and Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc. *Id.* Bed Bath & Beyond was dismissed from the action on June 7, 2023 and takes no part in this proposed Settlement. (ECF No. 47).

4. In response to the complaint, on November 21, 2022, Keurig filed a letter requesting a pre-motion conference regarding its intent to file a motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). (ECF No. 19).

5. On December 12, 2022, Ms. Cahill filed a letter in response to Defendant's November 21, 2022 letter. (ECF No. 21).

6. The pre-motion conference was conducted on December 19, 2022, and pursuant to which Ms. Cahill filed the operative First Amended Complaint on January 20, 2023, adding Janet Christman as a plaintiff along with claims under California law. (ECF No. 23).

7. In response to the Amended Complaint, on March 6, 2023, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). (ECF No. 37). On May 3, 2023, Plaintiffs filed an Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. (ECF No. 43). And on May 3, 2023, Defendant filed a Reply in Support of its Motion to Dismiss. (ECF No. 44).

8. The hearing on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss was held on December 20, 2023, during which the Court issued a bench ruling granting in part and denying in part Defendant's motion. (ECF No. 55). Plaintiffs were given leave to amend but declined to do so. (ECF No. 50).

9. An initial scheduling conference was also heard on December 20, 2023, and the Court issued a Civil Case Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order on December 22, 2023. (ECF No. 49).

10. On January 26, 2024, Defendant filed an Answer to the First Amended

Complaint, denying the allegations generally and asserting twenty-eight affirmative and other defenses. (ECF No. 53).

11. On December 20, 2023 the Court denied Defendant's motion to dismiss in part, after which Defendant filed an Answer to the First Amended Complaint, denying the allegations generally and asserting twenty-eight affirmative and other defenses. (ECF No. 53). Thereafter, the Parties engaged in discovery, including the exchange of thousands of pages of documents.

12. From the outset of the case, the Parties engaged in settlement discussions pursuant to their obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and, to that end, agreed to participate in a private mediation with the Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin (Ret.), formerly of that Southern District of New York.

13. Prior to the mediation, the Parties had been engaged in formal discovery, including the exchange of thousands of documents regarding sales of the subject products, consumer complaints, technical documents, and Defendant's internal communications. The parties also exchanged lengthy, detailed mediation statements, airing their respective legal arguments and theories on potential damages. Plaintiffs' counsel also spoke with potential merits and damages experts concerning the strengths and weakness of the case, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of Defendant's arguments and defenses. 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 before the Mediation.

14. On August 20, 2024, the Parties participated in a full-day mediation before Judge Scheindlin.

15. The Parties continued to engage in good-faith settlement negotiations after the

mediation's conclusion, working jointly on a Class Action Settlement Term Sheet, which was executed by the Parties on January 7, 2025.

16. After reaching an agreement in principle, I worked extensively with defense counsel to finalize and memorialize the agreement into a formal Class Action Settlement Agreement, including proposed class notice documents. That process included multiple rounds of redlines and phone calls to discuss proposed edits. Thus, the formal Settlement Agreement, which was fully executed as of March 10, 2025, was reached as a result of extensive arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and their counsel.

17. Finally, after finalizing and executing the Class Action Settlement Agreement, Class Counsel prepared Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, which was filed on March 10, 2025. ECF No. 61.

18. At the hearing, the Court raised concerns regarding certain people who may feasibly be left out of the settlement, so the Parties collaborated on revisions which addressed the Court's concerns.

19. Finding these changes sufficient, the Court preliminarily approved the Settlement on June 20, 2025. ECF No. 75.

20. The Settlement provides an exceptional result for the class by delivering cash to tens of thousands of individuals (the "Performance Issue Claims Class") who either (1) lodged complaints to Keurig claiming that a Coffee Maker experienced the Defect within the first 12 months of purchase between October 1, 2020 to the date of Preliminary Approval and were not provided with a remedy by Keurig pursuant to its Limited Warranty, or (2) who can demonstrate valid claims that a Coffee Maker manifested operational issues associated with the descaling process. The Settlement creates a \$950,000 non-reversionary cash Settlement Fund, from which

each Performance Issue Claim Class Member who submits a simple Claim Form will receive a *pro rata* cash payment. Settlement ¶ 2.2(b).¹

21. Non-monetary relief in the form of a 12-month extended warranty is also offered to all Persons in the United States (including its states, districts or territories) who purchased one of the Coffee Makers, or Descaling Solution for use with the Coffee Makers, from two years prior to the date of Preliminary Approval up to the date of Preliminary Approval. Settlement ¶ 2.1.

22. The Parties agreed to the terms of the Settlement through experienced counsel who possessed all the information necessary to evaluate the case, determined all the contours of the proposed class, and reached a fair and reasonable compromise after negotiating the terms of the Settlement at arms' length.

23. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize that despite our belief in the strength of Plaintiffs' claims, and Plaintiffs' and the Class's ability to secure an award of damages under California and New York consumer law, the expense, duration, and complexity of protracted litigation would be substantial and the outcome of trial uncertain. Thus, the Settlement secures a more proximate and more certain monetary benefit to the Class than continued litigation.

24. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel are also mindful that absent a settlement, the success of Defendant's various defenses in this case could deprive Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class

¹ Excluded from the Performance Issue Claim Class are (1) any Persons whose Coffee Makers are still within Defendant's original Limited Warranty period or the extended Limited Warranty period set forth below in paragraph 2.1(a); (2) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action and members of their families; (3) the Defendant, Defendant's 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, and attorneys; (4) Persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; and (5) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded Persons.

Members of any potential relief whatsoever.

25. Defendant is also represented by highly experienced attorneys who have made clear that absent a settlement, they were prepared to continue their vigorous defense of this case, including by moving for summary judgment. More specifically, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel are aware that Defendant would continue to assert a number of defenses on the merits, including (i) Plaintiffs' lack of standing; (ii) that the alleged problem with the Coffee Makers was not truly a problem; and (iii) that Plaintiffs lacked vertical privity with Keurig. Defendant would also oppose class certification vigorously, and Defendant would take the position that Plaintiffs is not entitled to bring his claims on a class wide basis. Defendant would also prepare a competent defense at trial. And looking beyond trial, Plaintiffs is also keenly aware that Defendant could appeal the merits of any adverse decision.

26. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel believe that the monetary 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.

27. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a current firm resume for Bursor & Fisher, P.A.

28. My firm, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., has 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 has also been recognized by courts across the country for its expertise and skilled and effective representation. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit 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.”); *In re Welspun Litigation*, Case No. 16-cv-06792-RJS (S.D.N.Y. January 26, 2017) (appointing Bursor & Fisher interim lead counsel to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of mislabeled Welspun Egyptian cotton bedding products). My firm has zealously represented the interests of the Class and committed substantial resources to the resolution of the class claims.

29. Moreover, my firm has served as trial counsel for class action Plaintiffs in six jury trials and has won all six, with recoveries ranging from \$21 million to \$299 million.

30. Plaintiffs and proposed 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.

31. The Settlement Agreement attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is the only agreement in connection with the proposed settlement.

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

Executed this 16th of September, 2025 at White Plains, New York.

/s Philip L. Fraietta

Philip L. Fraietta

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

DOREEN CAHILL and JANET
CHRISTMAN on behalf of themselves and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KEURIG GREEN MOUNTAIN, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 22-cv-7507-CS

CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Agreement (“Agreement” or “Settlement Agreement”) is entered into by and among (i) Plaintiffs Doreen Cahill and Janet Christman (“Plaintiffs”); (ii) the Settlement Classes (as defined herein); and (iii) Defendant Keurig Green Mountain, Inc. (“Defendant” or “Keurig”). The Settlement Classes and Plaintiffs are collectively referred to as the “Plaintiffs” unless otherwise noted. The Plaintiffs 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. On September 1, 2022, Doreen Cahill filed a putative class action complaint in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The complaint alleges that Keurig’s K-Supreme, K-Supreme Plus, and K-Supreme SMART coffee makers (the “Coffee Maker(s)”) contain a defect that causes a permanent loss of power to the Coffee Makers when descaled according to the directions supplied with the Coffee Makers or with the Keurig

Descaling Solution. (Dkt. 1.). The complaint was originally brought against both Keurig and Bed Bath & Beyond, Inc. *Id.* Bed Bath & Beyond was dismissed from the action on June 7, 2023 and takes no part in this Settlement. (Dkt. 47).

B. In response to the complaint, on November 21, 2022, Keurig filed a letter requesting a pre-motion conference regarding its intent to file a motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). (Dkt. 19).

C. On December 12, 2022, Ms. Cahill filed a letter in response to Defendant's November 21, 2022 letter. (Dkt. 21).

D. The pre-motion conference was conducted on December 19, 2022, and pursuant to which Ms. Cahill filed the operative First Amended Complaint on January 20, 2023, adding Janet Christman as a plaintiff along with claims under California law. (Dkt. 23).

E. In response to the Amended Complaint, on March 6, 2023, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). (Dkt. 37). On May 3, 2023, Plaintiffs filed an Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. (Dkt. 43). And on May 3, 2023, Defendant filed a Reply in Support of its Motion to Dismiss. (Dkt. 44).

F. The hearing on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss was held on December 20, 2023, during which Judge Cathy Seibel issued a bench ruling granting in part and denying in part Defendant's motion. (Dkt. 55). Plaintiffs were given leave to amend but declined to do so. (Dkt. 50).

G. An initial scheduling conference was also heard on December 20, 2023, and the Court issued a Civil Case Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order on December 22, 2023. (Dkt. 49).

H. On January 26, 2024, Defendant filed an Answer to the First Amended Complaint, denying the allegations generally and asserting twenty-eight affirmative and other defenses. (Dkt. 53).

I. Thereafter, the Parties engaged in discovery, including the exchange of thousands of pages of documents.

J. Throughout the litigation, the Parties discussed the prospect of settlement. To that end, the Parties agreed to participate in a private mediation with The Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin (Ret.) of Boies Schiller Flexner, LLP.

K. On August 20, 2024, the Parties participated in a full-day mediation with Judge Scheindlin. At the conclusion of the mediation session, the Parties had not reached an agreement.

L. The Parties continued to engage in good-faith settlement negotiations soon after the mediation's conclusion, working jointly on a Class Action Settlement Term Sheet, which expressly contemplates the creation of this fuller Agreement, and which was executed by the Parties on January 7, 2025.

M. At all times, Defendant has denied and continues to deny that the Coffee Makers contain any defect that causes the Coffee Makers to lose power when descaled according to instructions provided by Defendant and denies has denied and continues to deny that it breached any warranty or promise 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, and maintained its opposition to certification of a litigation class. Defendant believes that the claims asserted in the Action against Defendant have no merit and that Defendant would have prevailed at class certification, summary judgment, and/or trial. Nonetheless, taking into account

the expense, uncertainty and risks inherent in any litigation, Defendant believe 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 of contested claims, 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 or with respect to the certifiability of a litigation class.

N. Plaintiffs believe that the claims asserted in the Action against Defendant have merit and that they would have prevailed at class certification, summary judgment, and/or trial. Nonetheless, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize that Defendant has raised factual and legal defenses that present a risk that Plaintiffs may not prevail. Plaintiffs 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. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel also have 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, Plaintiffs believe it is desirable that the Released Claims, as further defined herein, be fully and finally compromised, settled, and resolved with prejudice. Based on its evaluation, Class Counsel has concluded that the terms and conditions of this Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Classes, and that it is in the best interests of the Settlement Classes 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 Plaintiffs, the Settlement Classes, 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 *Cahill v. Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.*, Case No. 22-cv-7507-CS, pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

1.2 “Alternate Judgment” means a form of final judgment that may be entered by the Court herein but in a form other than the form of Judgment provided for in this Agreement and where none of the Parties elects to terminate this Settlement by reason of such variance.

1.3 “Cash Award” means the cash compensation, payable by the Settlement Administrator from funds provided by Defendant, that each Performance Issue Claim Class Member who submits a valid and timely Claim Form shall be entitled to receive.

1.4 “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 each Performance Issue Claim Class Member who wishes to file a Claim for payment and each Coffee Maker

Purchaser Class Member who wishes to file a Claim under the extended warranty provided by the Settlement, shall be available in electronic and paper format in the manner described below.

1.5 “Claims Deadline” means the date by which all Claim Forms must be postmarked or submitted electronically in compliance with the instructions on the Claim Form to be considered timely and shall be set as follows: For Class Members who experienced a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process prior to the Effective Date, the Claims Deadline shall be 90 Days after the Effective Date; and for Class Members who experienced a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process after the Effective Date, the Claims Deadline shall be September 30, 2027.

1.6 “Class Counsel” means Philip L. Fraietta of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.

1.7 “Class Period” means October 1, 2020, to the date of Preliminary Approval.

1.8 “Class Members” means all Persons who falls within the definition of either Performance Issue Claim Class Member or Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Member.

1.9 “Class Representatives” means the named Plaintiffs in this Action, Doreen Cahill and Janet Christman.

1.10 “Coffee Maker(s)” means the Keurig K-Supreme, Keurig K-Supreme Plus, or Keurig K-Supreme SMART single serve coffee makers.

1.11 “Court” means the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the Honorable Cathy Seibel presiding, or any judge who shall succeed her as the Judge in this Action.

1.12 “Defect” means any operational issues in the Coffee Makers, including loss of power, which occurred in association with the descaling process.

1.13 “Defendant” means Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.

1.14 “Defendant’s Counsel” means Louis M. Solomon, Nancy Savitt and Robert A. Roth of Reed Smith LLP.

1.15 “Descaling Solution” means the descaling solution product sold by Keurig for use in descaling the Coffee Makers.

1.16 “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.

1.17 “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 Defendant 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.

1.18 “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.

1.19 “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*.

1.20 “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 Representatives.

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

1.22 “Limited Warranty” means the One-Year Limited Warranty Defendant provided for the Coffee Makers stating the terms, conditions, exclusions, limitations and instructions for obtaining warranty service.

1.23 “Notice” means the notice of this proposed Class Action Settlement Agreement and Final Approval Hearing, which is to be sent to the Settlement Classes substantially in the manner set forth in this Agreement, which is consistent with the requirements of Due Process, Rule 23, and is substantially in the form of Exhibits B, C, and D hereto.

1.24 “Notice Date” means the date by which the Notice set forth in Paragraph 4.1 is complete, which shall be no later than twenty-eight (28) days after Preliminary Approval.

1.25 “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 Classes must be made, which shall be designated as a date no later than sixty (60) 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.

1.26 “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, affiliates, parents, predecessors, successors, representatives, or assigns, subsidiaries, insurers, and their past, present and future directors, officers, shareholders, members, faculty, employees, agents, and attorneys both individually and in their capacities as directors, officers, shareholders, members, employees, agents, and attorneys. “Person” is not intended to include any governmental agencies or governmental actors, including, without limitation, any state Attorney General office.

1.27 “Plaintiffs” means Doreen Cahill, Janet Christman, and the Members of the Settlement Classes.

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

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

1.30 “Released Claims” means any and all causes of action, suits, claims, liens, demands, judgments, costs, damages, obligations, attorney fees (except as provided for in the Class Settlement), and all other legal responsibilities in any form or nature, including but not limited to, all claims relating to or arising out of state, local, or federal statute, ordinance, regulation, or claim at common law or in equity, whether past, present, or future, known or

unknown, asserted or unasserted, arising out of or in any way allegedly related to the Coffee Makers and the Keurig Descaling Solution, including all claims that were brought or could have been brought in the Action.

1.31 “Released Parties” means Defendant, Keurig Green Mountain, Inc., and all of its current, former, and future parents, predecessors, successors, affiliates, assigns, subsidiaries, divisions, or related corporate entities, and all of their respective current, future, and former employees, officers, directors, shareholders, assigns, agents, trustees, administrators, executors, insurers, attorneys, and customers, including retailers wholesalers and distributors.

1.32 “Releasing Parties” means Plaintiffs, those Members of the Settlement Classes who do not timely opt out of the Settlement Classes, and all of their respective present or past heirs, executors, family members, lenders, funders, payors, 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, limited liability companies, partnerships and corporations.

1.33 “Settlement Administration Expenses” means the expenses incurred by the Settlement Administrator in providing Notice (including CAFA notice), responding to inquiries from members of the Settlement Classes, receiving and administering Claim Forms and information, mailing checks, and related services, paying taxes and tax expenses related to the Settlement Fund (including all federal, state or local taxes of any kind and interest or penalties thereon, as well as expenses incurred in connection with determining the amount of and paying any taxes owed and expenses related to any tax attorneys and accountants).

1.34 “Settlement Administrator” means Epiq, or such other reputable administration company that has been selected jointly by the Parties and approved by the Court to perform the duties set forth in this Agreement, including but not limited to serving as Escrow Agent for the Settlement Fund, overseeing the distribution of Notice, handling all approved payments out of the Settlement Fund, and handling the determination, payment and filing of forms related to all federal, state and/or local taxes of any kind (including any interest or penalties thereon) that may be owed on any income earned by the Settlement Fund. Class Counsel’s assent to this Agreement shall constitute consent on behalf of each and every Member of the Settlement Classes as defined herein to disclose to Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator all information required by the Settlement Administrator to perform the duties and functions ascribed to it herein. .

1.35 “Settlement Classes” means both the Performance Issue Claim Class and the Coffee Maker Purchaser Class.

1.35.1 “Performance Issue Claim Class” means (1) all Persons in the United States (including its states, districts or territories) who are not excluded below in this paragraph and who lodged complaints to Keurig claiming that a Coffee Maker experienced the Defect within the first 12 months of purchase between October 1, 2020 to the date of Preliminary Approval and were not provided with a remedy by Keurig pursuant to its Limited Warranty and (2) all Persons in the United States (including its states, districts or territories) who are not excluded below in this paragraph and can demonstrate valid claims that a Coffee Maker manifested operational issues associated with the descaling process. Excluded from the

Performance Issue Claim Class are (1) any Persons whose Coffee Makers are still within Defendant's original Limited Warranty period or the extended Limited Warranty period set forth below in paragraph 2.1(a); (2) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action and members of their families; (3) the Defendant, Defendant's 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, and attorneys; (4) Persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; and (5) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded Persons.

1.35.2 "Performance Issue Claim Class Member" means a Person who falls within the definition of the Performance Issue Claim Class as set forth above and who has not submitted a valid request for exclusion.

1.35.3 "Coffee Maker Purchaser Class" means all Persons in the United States (including its states, districts or territories) who purchased one of the Coffee Makers, or Descaling Solution for use with the Coffee Makers, from two years prior to the date of Preliminary Approval up to the date of Preliminary Approval, excluding Performance Issue Claim Class Members and all Persons in the United States (including its states, districts or territories) who lodged complaints to Keurig claiming that a Coffee Maker experienced the Defect during the Class Period and who were provided with a remedy by Keurig pursuant to its Limited Warranty. Also excluded from the Coffee Maker Purchaser Class are (1) any Judge or Magistrate

presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, Defendant's 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, and attorneys; (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.

1.35.4 “Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Member” means a Person who falls within the definition of the Coffee Maker Purchaser Class as set forth above and who has not submitted a valid request for exclusion.

1.36 “Settlement Fund” means the non-reversionary fund that shall be established by or on behalf of Defendant in the total amount of nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$950,000.00 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 Cash Awards to Performance Issue Claim Class Members, Settlement Administration Expenses and taxes, any incentive award to the Class Representatives, any Fee Award to Class Counsel, and any other costs, fees or expenses approved by the Court. The **“Available Settlement Fund”** is the amount remaining in the Settlement Fund after payment of an approved Fee Award to Class Counsel, approved Settlement Administration Expenses, any approved incentive award to the Class Representatives, and any other costs, fees or expenses approved by the Court. 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 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. The payment of the sums into the Settlement Fund by Defendant fully discharges the Defendant and the other Released Parties' financial obligations (if any) in connection with the Settlement, meaning that no Released Party shall have any other obligation to make any payment into the Escrow Account or to any Performance Issue Claim Class Member, or any other Person, under this Agreement. In no event shall the total monetary obligation with respect to this Agreement on behalf of Defendant exceed nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$950,000.00 USD), and in no event shall the Settlement Fund or any portion thereof revert to Defendant.

2. SETTLEMENT RELIEF.

As consideration for the Settlement described herein, Defendant will provide to Members of the Settlement Classes certain warranty and monetary benefits as set forth below. Plaintiffs understand and agree that Plaintiffs and Members of the Settlement Classes would not receive the monies and/or benefits specified in this Agreement, except for Plaintiffs' execution of this Agreement and the fulfillment of the promises contained herein.

2.1 Warranty Extensions to Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Members

(a) Upon the Effective Date, Defendant shall extend by one (1) year the expiration date of its Limited Warranty for the Coffee Maker Purchaser Class as follows: Defendant shall provide to each Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Member who purchased their Coffee Makers within two years of the date of Preliminary Approval up to the date of Preliminary Approval an extended warranty period of 12 additional months from date of

purchase (24 months total from date of purchase) covering any Defect that caused or causes a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process.

(b) Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Members may make a warranty claim with the Settlement Administrator by the Claims Deadline, which:

(1) For Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Members who experienced a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process prior to the Effective Date shall be 90 Days after the Effective Date, and

(2) (2) For Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Members who experienced a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process after the Effective Date, shall be September 30, 2027.

By way of example, a Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Member who purchased a Coffee Maker on January 1, 2024 and who experienced a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process before the Effective Date may submit a warranty claim to the Settlement Administrator within 90 days after the Effective Date. A Coffee Maker Purchaser Class Member who purchased a Coffee Maker on January 1, 2025 and who experienced a permanent loss of power while performing the descaling process within the extended warranty period, but after the Effective Date, may submit a warranty claim to the Settlement Administrator by September 30, 2027.

2.2 Payments to Performance Issue Claim Class Members.

(a) Defendant shall within fifteen (15) days following Preliminary Approval pay or cause to be paid into the Escrow Account the amount of the Settlement Fund (\$950,000.00 USD), specified in Paragraph 1.31 of this Agreement.

(b) Each Performance Issue Claim Class Member who submits a valid and timely Claim Form by the Claims Deadline will receive a *pro rata* payment from the Settlement Fund. The *pro rata* payment for each Performance Issue Claim Class Member will be equal to the Available Settlement Fund divided by the total number of claims made by Performance Issue Claim Class Members. The *pro rata* payment for each Person, no matter the number of claims they may have made, shall not exceed a total \$250.00. The Notice will give Performance Issue Claim Class Members the ability to opt via the Claim Form to receive the Cash Award by Venmo, PayPal, Zelle, or check.

(c) Performance Issue Claim Class Members included in Bates Numbers CAHILL000317-000348 may file a claim using the Claim Form for one (1) Coffee Maker without proof of manifestation of the Defect. Performance Issue Claim Class Members may also submit a claim for other Coffee Makers of theirs that manifested a performance issue relating to the Defect during the Class Period.

(d) Performance Issue Claim Class Members not included in the Bates Numbers CAHILL000317-000348 , or those included in Bates Numbers CAHILL000317-000348 making claims for additional Coffee Makers must provide proof of manifestation of a loss of power during descaling caused by the Defect with their completed Claim Form. Proof of manifestation shall be substantially the same as required under Keurig's warranty replacement procedures.

(e) Payments to all Performance Issue Claim Class Members shall be made within ninety (90) days after the Effective Date.

(f) All Cash Awards issued to Performance Issue Claim 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 a check issued to a Performance Issue Claim Class Member is not cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) days after the date of issuance, such funds shall revert to the Settlement Fund and be distributed to a *cy pres* recipient to be selected jointly by Class Counsel and Defendant (who agree to work together in good faith to identify an acceptable *cy pres* recipient) ,and approved by the Court.

(g) Except as set forth below in the event of termination, in no event shall any funds revert to Defendant. In the event that the Settlement Fund is not exhausted by the filing of Claims, the payment of approved Settlement Administration Expenses, the payment of the Fee Award to Class Counsel, and the payment of any approved incentive award to the Class Representatives, any remaining funds will be distributed to a *cy pres* recipient to be selected selected jointly by Class Counsel and Defendant (who agree to work together in good faith to identify an acceptable *cy pres* recipient) ,and approved by the Court.

3. RELEASE AND COVENANT NOT TO SUE.

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.

3.3 Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, nothing in this Agreement will prevent any Released Party from pleading this Settlement Agreement as a full and complete defense to any action, suit, or other proceeding that has been or may be instituted, prosecuted, or attempted with respect to any of the Released Claims and may be filed, offered, and received into evidence, and otherwise used for such defense.

3.4 Plaintiffs also covenant not to sue any Released Party with respect to any Released Claim, and agree that Plaintiffs shall be permanently barred and enjoined from commencing, maintaining, prosecuting, causing, cooperating with, advising to be commenced or maintained, or encouraging any action, suit, proceeding, or claim in any court, tribunal, administrative agency, regulatory body, arbitrator, or other body in any jurisdiction against any Released Party based in whole or in part upon, arising out of, or in any way connected or related to any Released Claim. Released Parties shall be entitled to seek and recover their costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in the event a Plaintiff brings a Released Claim against any of them. Released Parties shall be entitled to recover any such costs and fees either from the Released-Claim Fund or directly from the Plaintiff bringing a Released Claim, at the option of Released Parties.

4. NOTICE TO THE CLASS.

4.1 The Notice Plan shall consist of the following:

(a) *Settlement Classes List.* No later than days from the thirty (30) days from execution of this Settlement Agreement, Defendant will produce, subject to a confidentiality agreement and court order that strictly restricts its use to providing Notice of the Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement, a list or electronic data from its records that includes, to the extent available from its records, the names and last known email and postal addresses,

belonging to persons within the Settlement Classes. This list shall include to the extent available, the names and last known email and postal addresses, for all Performance Issue Claim Class Members who lodged complaints with Keurig in Bates Numbers CAHILL000317-000348 and did not receive warranty relief. This list will be provided to the Settlement Administrator, who shall be subject to the the confidentiality agreement and court order, solely for the purpose of giving notice to the Members of the Settlement Classes, with a copy to Plaintiffs' Counsel. The list and / or electronic data shall be called the "Class List." and shall not be used for any purpose other than providing such notice.

(b) *Direct Notice via Email.* No later than twenty-one (21) days from entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator shall send Notice via email substantially in the form attached as Exhibit B to all Members of the Settlement Classes for whom an email address is in the Class List. In the event transmission of email notice results in any notification that the email was not delivered ("bounce-backs,") the Settlement Administrator shall, if possible, correct any issues that may have caused the "bounce-back" to occur and make a second attempt to re-send the email notice.

(c) *Direct Notice via U.S. Mail.* No later than twenty-eight (28) days from entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator shall send notice substantially in the form attached as Exhibit C via First Class U.S. Mail to all persons on the Settlement Classes List who did not receive an email pursuant to Paragraph 4.1(b), above.

(d) *Reminder Notices.* Both thirty (30) days prior to the Claims Deadline and seven (7) days prior to the Claims Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall 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 Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Settlement Classes List identified in 4.1(a) above.

(e) *Settlement Website.* Within ten (10) days from entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Notice shall be provided on a website at an available settlement URL (such as, for example, www.ksupremesettlement.com) which shall be obtained, administered and maintained by the Settlement Administrator and shall provide Members of the Settlement Classes with ability to submit Claim Forms and to update their mailing addresses. Copies of this Settlement Agreement, the long-form Notice, and other pertinent documents and Court filings pertaining to the Settlement (including the motion for attorneys' fees upon its filing), shall be provided on the Settlement Website. The Notice provided on the Settlement Website shall be substantially in the form of Exhibit D hereto.

(f) *Digital Publication Notice.* Within thirty-five (35) days from the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Class Notice will be provided by internet banner advertisements in locations to be agreed upon by the Parties, which will link to the Settlement Website, and/or social media to be agreed upon by the Parties which will link to the Settlement Website.

(g) *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 Members of the Settlement Classes reside, the Attorney General of the United States, and other required government officials, notice of the proposed settlement as required by law, subject to Paragraph 5.1 below.

4.2 The Notice shall advise the Settlement Classes 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 Member of the Settlement Classes 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 Member of one of the Settlement Classes; (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 Member of the Settlement Classes 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.

4.5 A Member of the Settlement Classes may request to be excluded from either of the Settlement Classes 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 either of the Settlement Classes must timely send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator 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 one of the Settlement Classes 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 appropriate Settlement Class and shall be bound as a Member of the Settlement Classes by this Agreement, if approved. Any Member of the Settlement Classes 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 each 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 Plan described in Paragraph 4.1 is provided.

4.7 Any Members of the Settlement Classes who do not, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, meet the requirements for exclusion from the Settlement

Classes will 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 Class notice will be provided by a well-established claims administrator, with a media plan designed to achieve no less than 75% reach, which shall include direct notice by email and/or postal mail to all Class Members for whom Defendant possesses such information.

5.2 The Settlement Administrator shall, under the supervision of the Court, administer the relief provided by this Settlement Agreement 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 Defendant's Counsel with regular reports at weekly intervals containing 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 Members of the Settlement Classes. 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 Objection/Exclusion Deadline;

(b) Provide Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel with drafts of all administration related documents, including but not limited to CAFA Notices, follow-up class notices or communications with Members of the Settlement Classes, telephone scripts, website postings or language or other communications with the Settlement Classes, at least five (5) days before the Settlement Administrator is required to or intends to publish or use such communications, unless Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel agree to waive this requirement in writing on a case by case basis; and

(c) Receive requests to be excluded from a 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.

5.3 In the exercise of its duties outlined in this Agreement, the Settlement Administrator shall have the right to reasonably request additional information from Class Counsel or any Members of the Settlement Classes. The Settlement Administrator shall employ reasonable procedures to screen claims for abuse or fraud and deny Claim Forms where there is evidence of abuse or fraud, including by cross-referencing Claim Forms with the list provided by Defendant. To the extent that any Person who does not appear in the list submits a Claim Form, the Settlement Administrator shall conduct a reasonable investigation to determine whether the Person is a Class Member before approving or rejecting that claim.

5.4 Defendant, the Released Parties, and Defendant’s Counsel shall have no responsibility for, interest in, or liability whatsoever with respect to: (i) any act, omission, or determination by Class Counsel, or the Settlement Administrator, or any of their respective designees or agents, in connection with the administration of the Settlement or otherwise; (ii) the management, investment, or distribution of the Settlement Fund; (iii) the allocation of Settlement Fund to Performance Issue Claim Class Members or the implementation, administration, or interpretation thereof; (iv) the determination, administration, calculation, or payment of any claims asserted against the Settlement Fund; (v) any losses suffered by, or fluctuations in value of, the Settlement Fund; or (vi) the payment or withholding of any Taxes, Tax Expenses, or costs incurred in connection with the taxation of the Settlement Fund or the filing of any federal, state, or local returns.

5.5 All taxes and tax expenses shall be paid out of the Settlement Fund and shall be timely paid by the Settlement Administrator pursuant to this Agreement and without further order of the Court. Any tax returns prepared for the Settlement Fund (as well as the election set forth therein) shall be consistent with this Agreement and in all events shall reflect that all taxes on the income earned by the Settlement Fund shall be paid out of the Settlement Fund as provided herein. The Released Parties shall have no responsibility or liability for the acts or omissions of the Settlement Administrator or its agents with respect to the payment of taxes or tax expenses.

6. TERMINATION OF SETTLEMENT.

6.1 Subject to Paragraphs 9.1-9.3 below, Defendant or the Class Representatives on behalf of the Settlement Classes, 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 Alternate 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 .

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 Classes for settlement purposes only; appointment of Class Counsel and the Class Representatives; and entry of a Preliminary Approval Order, which order shall set a Final Approval Hearing date and approve the Notice for dissemination substantially in the form of Exhibits 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 Classes or materially expand the obligations of Defendant.

7.2 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.

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

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

(c) approve the Settlement Agreement and the proposed settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to, and in the best interests of, the Members of the Settlement Classes; 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;

(d) 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 Classes 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;

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

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

(g) 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;

(h) permanently bar and enjoin all Members of the Settlement Classes who have not been properly excluded from the Settlement Classes 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;

(i) 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

(j) 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 Defendant agrees that Class Counsel is entitled to reasonable attorneys' fees and unreimbursed expenses incurred as the Fee Award from the Settlement Fund. The amount of the Fee Award shall be determined by the Court based on petition from Class Counsel. Class Counsel has agreed, with no consideration from Defendant, to limit their request for attorneys' fees and unreimbursed costs to a one-third of the Settlement Fund. Defendant may challenge the amount requested. 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 Section shall

remain in the Settlement Fund and be distributed to Performance Issue Claim Class Members as settlement payments.

8.2 The Fee Award shall be payable by the Settlement Administrator within ten (10) days after entry of the trial 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 from the Settlement Fund by wire transfer to Bursor & Fisher, P.A., in accordance with wire instructions to be provided 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 trial court's Final Judgment is reversed or rendered void as a result of an appeal(s) then Class Counsel shall return such funds to the Defendant. Additionally, should any parties to the Undertaking dissolve, merge, declare bankruptcy, become insolvent, or cease to exist prior to the final payment to Class Members, those parties shall execute a new undertaking guaranteeing repayment of funds within 14 days of such an occurrence.

8.3 Defendant agrees that, subject to Court approval, the Settlement Administrator may pay incentive awards to the Class Representatives from the Settlement Fund, in addition to any settlement payment as a result of an Approved Claim pursuant to this Agreement, and in recognition of their efforts on behalf of the Settlement Classes, in the amount of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) each. Defendant shall not object to or otherwise challenge, directly or indirectly, Class Counsel's application for the incentive award to the Class Representatives if limited to this amount. Class Counsel, in turn, agrees to seek no more than this amount from the Court as the incentive award for the Class Representatives. 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. Such award shall be paid from the Settlement Fund (in the form of a check to the Class Representatives that is sent care of Class Counsel), within five (5) business 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, subject to appeal, following Notice to the Settlement Classes and a Final Approval Hearing, as provided in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and has entered the Final Judgment, subject to appeal, or a judgment consistent with this Agreement in all material respects;

(d) The time for appeal has passed and Final Judgment has become Final which, if there is an appeal or appeals (other than an appeal or appeals solely with respect to the Fee Award), shall be the date of completion, in a manner that finally affirms and leaves in place the trial court's 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 the date of final dismissal of any appeal or the final dismissal of any proceeding on certiorari, and

(e) As defined above, or, in the event that the Court enters an Alternate Judgment, such Alternate 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, 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. Notwithstanding anything herein, 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 above shall not prevent the Agreement from becoming effective, nor shall it be grounds for termination.

9.3 If this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 6.1-6.2 or 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. Within five (5) business days after written notification of termination as provided in this Agreement is sent to the other Parties, the Settlement Fund (including accrued interest thereon), less any Settlement Administration costs actually incurred, paid or payable and less any taxes and tax expenses paid, due or owing, shall be refunded by the Settlement Administrator to Defendant, based upon

written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel. In the event Defendant terminates this Agreement because of Plaintiffs' or Class Counsel's breach of this Agreement, Class Counsel shall refund to Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, any Settlement Administration costs actually incurred prior to termination. 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, Class Counsel shall, within thirty (30) days repay to Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the full amount of the attorneys' fees and costs paid to Class Counsel from the Settlement Fund, including any accrued interest. In the event the attorney fees and costs awarded by the Court or any part of them are vacated, modified, reversed, or rendered void as a result of an appeal, Class Counsel shall within thirty (30) days repay to Defendant, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the attorneys' fees and costs paid to Class Counsel and/or Class Representatives from the Settlement Fund, in the amount vacated or modified, including any accrued interest.

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 Plaintiffs, the Settlement Classes 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 Plaintiffs or defended by Defendant, or each or any of them, in bad faith or without a reasonable 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 or any term, provision or definition therein, nor any act performed or communication made or document executed in the course of negotiating, implementing or seeking approval pursuant to or in furtherance of this Agreement or the settlement:

(a) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency, arbitral proceeding or other tribunal 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 Plaintiffs, the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in the Action, the violation of any law or statute, the definition or scope of any term or provision, 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. Defendant, while continuing to deny all allegations of wrongdoing and disclaiming all liability with respect to all claims, considers it desirable to resolve the action on the terms stated herein to avoid further expense, inconvenience, and burden, and therefore has determined that this settlement is in Defendant's best interests. Any public statements made by Plaintiff or Class Counsel will be consistent with this paragraph;

(b) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against any Released Party, 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, or supporting the certification of a litigation class, 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 Plaintiffs, the Settlement Classes, 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 Plaintiffs, the Settlement Classes, the Releasing Parties, or each and any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, that any of Plaintiffs' 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 Parties acknowledge that (a) any certification of the Settlement Classes as set forth in this Agreement, including certification of the Settlement Classes for settlement purposes in the context of Preliminary Approval, shall not be deemed a concession that certification of a litigation class is appropriate, or that the Settlement Class definitions would be appropriate for a litigation class, nor would Defendant be precluded from challenging class certification in further proceedings in the Action or in any other action if the Settlement Agreement is not finalized or finally approved; (b) if the Settlement Agreement is not finally approved by the Court for any reason whatsoever, then any certification of the Settlement Classes will be void, the Parties and the Action shall be restored to the *status quo ante*, and no doctrine of waiver, estoppel or preclusion will be asserted in any litigated certification proceedings in the Action or in any other action; and (c) no agreements made by or entered into by Defendant in connection with the

Settlement may be used by Plaintiffs, any Person in the Settlement Classes, or any other Person to establish any of the elements of class certification in any litigated certification proceedings, whether in the Action or any other judicial proceeding.

10.6 No Person or entity shall have any claim against the Class Representatives, Class Counsel, the Settlement Administrator or any other agent designated by Class Counsel, or the Released Parties and/or their counsel, arising from distributions made substantially in accordance with this Agreement. The Parties and their respective counsel, and all other Released Parties shall have no liability whatsoever for the investment or distribution of the Settlement Fund or the determination, administration, calculation, or payment of any claim or nonperformance of the Settlement Administrator, the payment or withholding of taxes (including interest and penalties) owed by the Settlement Fund, or any losses incurred in connection therewith.

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

10.8 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.

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

10.10 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, including, without limitation, the Term Sheet executed on January 8, 2025. 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.

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

10.12 Plaintiffs represent and warrant that they have not assigned any claim or right or interest therein as against the Released Parties to any other Person or Party and that they are fully entitled to release the same. Plaintiffs further represent and warrant that they have not filed, caused to be filed, or presently are a party to any claim against Defendant, except the Action, which will be dismissed with Prejudice pursuant to the terms of this Agreement. Plaintiffs agree to seek approval of this Agreement and dismissal of this Action with prejudice in its entirety as outlined in this Agreement.

10.13 Unless otherwise agreed in writing, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall not issue any press releases, website advertisements, or statements to the media or otherwise in which Defendant is identified or which might directly or indirectly suggest that Defendant has engaged in wrongful conduct. This Paragraph does not preclude Class Counsel from advising any Members of the Settlement Classes. If Plaintiffs or Class Counsel is contacted by anyone other than a member of the Settlement Classes regarding this Agreement, they shall respond by stating only that “the matter has been resolved.”

10.14 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.

10.15 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.

10.16 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.

10.17 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.

10.18 This Settlement Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the substantive laws of the State of New York without giving effect to its conflict of laws provisions.

10.19 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall continue to treat as confidential all financial and class-related materials provided to Class Counsel as part of the Parties' mediation and Settlement. Upon dismissal of this action, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall permanently delete from their files and/or return to Defendant's counsel any confidential files produced by Defendant in this Action. Provided, however, that nothing herein shall preclude Class Counsel from describing those materials in public Court filings to the extent that such description of confidential information is necessary to obtain Court approval of the Settlement and to the extent that there is no reasonable alternative to including such description of confidential information in the public filings, such as filing such description with redactions or under seal .

10.20 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.

10.21 Once the Parties and their counsel execute this Agreement, the Court will resolve any and all disputes that arise as to the interpretation or enforcement of this Agreement.

10.22 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 10016; Louis M. Solomon, Reed Smith, LLP, 599 Lexington Avenue New York, NY 10022.

**REMAINDER OF THE PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK. SIGNATURE
PAGES TO FOLLOW**

IT IS SO AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES:

Dated: 16/06/25

DOREEN CAHILL

By: 
Doreen Cahill (Jun 16, 2025 11:14 EDT)

Doreen Cahill, individually and as representative of the Class

Dated: 16/06/25

JANET CHRISTMAN

By: 
Janet Christman (Jun 16, 2025 08:36 PDT)

Janet Christman, individually and as representative of the Class

Dated: 6/16/2025

KEURIG GREEN MOUNTAIN, INC.

By: 

Name: Amanda Praestholm

Title: Corporate Counsel

IT IS SO STIPULATED BY COUNSEL:

Dated: 16/06/25

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.

By: 

Philip L. Fraietta
1330 Avenue Of The Americas
32nd Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (646) 837-7150
Facsimile: (212) 989-9163
Email: pfraietta@bursor.com

Attorneys for Class Representatives and the Settlement Class

Dated: June 16, 2025

REED SMITH LLP

By: 

Louis M. Solomon
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 549-0400
lsolomon@reedsmith.com

Attorneys for Defendant Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.



50 MAIN STREET
WHITE PLAINS, NY 10606

www.bursor.com

1990 N. CALIFORNIA BLVD.
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

1330 AVE. OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019

701 BRICKELL AVENUE
MIAMI, FL 33131

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 nationwide 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,
78. *Young v. Military Advantage, Inc. d/b/a Military.com* (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. July 26, 2023) to represent a nationwide class of website subscribers who were also Facebook users under the Video Privacy Protection Act,
79. *Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd.* (Cir. Ct. Henderson Cnty. Aug. 15, 2023) to represent a certified class of Kentucky residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Kentucky law,
80. *Kotila v. Charter Financial Publishing Network, Inc.* (W.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2024) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
81. *Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research* (W.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2024) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,

82. *Norcross v. Tishman Speyer Properties, et al.* (S.D.N.Y. May 17, 2024) to represent a class of online ticket purchasers under New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4).

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 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, unlawful and junk fees, data breach claims, and violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and 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 Courts of Appeals for the First, Second and Sixth Circuits.

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:

Farwell v. Google, LLC, 595 F. Supp. 3d 702 (C.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), denying defendant's motion to dismiss BIPA claims brought on behalf of Illinois students using Google's Workspace for Education platform.

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:

Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation, Case No. 22-cv-0188-HYJ-RSK (W.D. Mich. 2024) – final approval granted for \$52.5 million class settlement to resolve claims of periodical subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Edwards v. Mid-Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, Case No. 22-cv-00562-TJM-CFH (N.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$2.2 million class settlement to resolve claims alleging unlawfully charged overdraft fees on accounts with sufficient funds.

Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, LLC, Case No. 2020-CH-07269 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$11.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged TCPA violations.

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 on the Google Photos platform.

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.

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., 482 F.Supp.3d 80, 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 repellents.

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 repellents.

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 repellents.

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 repellents.

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.

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[®] 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, Michigan, and California, 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:

Garner v. Me-TV National Limited Partnership, 132 F.4th 1022 (7th Cir. Mar. 28, 2025), reversing grant of motion to dismiss under federal Video Privacy Protection Act and specifying standard for being a “consumer” under the Act.

Jancik v. WebMD LLC, 2025 WL 560705 (N.D. Ga. Feb 20, 2025), certifying the first ever contested class under the federal Video Privacy Protection Act.

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.

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:

Ramos v. ZoomInfo Technologies, LLC, Case No. 21-cv-02032-CPK (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for \$29.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged statutory right of publicity violations.

Awad v. AMC Entertainment Holdings, Inc., Index No. 607322/2024 (Sup. Ct. Nassau Cnty. 2024) – final approval granted for \$12.3 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged New York ticket fee claims.

Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Case No. 22-cv-00188-HYJ (W.D. Mich. 2024) – final approval granted for \$52.5 million class settlement to resolve claims of newsletter subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC, Case No. 19-cv-04892-MSS (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for \$10.1 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged statutory right of publicity violations.

Young v. Military Advantage, Inc., Case No. 2023LA000535 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2023) – final approval granted for \$7.35 million class settlement to resolve claims of newsletter subscribers for alleged federal Video Privacy Protection Act claims.

Rivera 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.

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.

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.

D’Amario et al. v. Univ. of Tampa, Case No. 7:20-cv-07344 (S.D.N.Y. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

Olin et al. v. Meta Platforms, Inc., Case No. 3:18-cv-01881-RS (N.D. Cal. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement involving invasion of privacy claims.

Croft v. SpinX Games et al., Case No. 2:20-cv-01310-RSM (W.D. Wash. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al., Case No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cnty. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Barbieri v. Tailored Brands, Inc., Index No. 616696/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Metzner et al. v. Quinnipiac Univ., Case No. 3:20-cv-00784 (D. Conn.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

In re GE/Canon Data Breach, Case No. 1:20-cv-02903 (S.D.N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve data breach claims.

Davis v. Urban Outfitters, Inc., Index No. 612162/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Armstead v. VGW Malta LTD et al., Civil Action No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Casler et al. v. Mclane Company, Inc. et al., Index No. 616432/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Wyland v. Woopla, Inc., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00356 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Graziano et al. v. Lego Systems, Inc., Index No. 611615/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Lipsky et al. v. American Behavioral Research Institute, LLC, Case No. 50-2023-CA-011526-XXXX-MB (Palm Beach Cnty. Fl.) – final approval granted to resolve allegedly deceptive automatic renewal and product efficacy claims.

Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00358 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

DANIEL GUERRA

Daniel Guerra is a Senior Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Dan focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions.

Prior to working at Bursor & Fisher, Dan practiced at a national law firm in San Francisco. He helped represent various companies during internal investigations and in complex civil litigation, including product liability litigation and commercial disputes. He also advised clients on a range of matters including regulatory compliance, litigation risk assessment, and product counseling.

Dan is admitted to the State Bar of California, all California Federal District Courts, and the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

Dan received his Juris Doctor from the University of California Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings College of the Law) in 2009.

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, the Eastern District of Missouri, and the Northern District of Illinois.

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.

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.

Since 2023, Max has been named "Rising Star" in the New York Metro Area by Super Lawyers®.

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:

Huertas v. Bayer US LLC, 120 F.4th 1169 (3d Cir. 2024), reversing district court and holding plaintiffs had alleged an injury-in-fact sufficient for Article III standing. Max personally argued the appeal before the Third Circuit, which can be listened to [here](#).

Jackson v. Amazon.com, Inc., 65 F.4th 1093 (9th Cir. 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., 213 N.E.3d 942 (Ill. App. Ct. 2d Dist. 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](#).

Newman v. Bayer Corp., --- F.R.D. ---, 2025 WL 856225 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 19, 2025), certifying class of New York purchases of "One A Day" gummy multivitamins.

Shah v. Fandom, Inc., 754 F. Supp. 3d 924 (N.D. Cal. 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of California pen register statute.

Yockey v. Salesforce, Inc., 745 F. Supp. 3d 945 (N.D. Cal. 2024), denying motion dismiss alleged violations of California and Pennsylvania wiretapping statutes.

Gladstone v. Amazon Web Services, Inc., 739 F. Supp. 3d 846 (W.D. Wash. 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of California wiretapping statute.

Rancourt v. Meredith Corp., 2024 WL 381344 (D. Mass. Jan. 11, 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of federal Video Privacy Protection Act, and finding personal jurisdiction over operator of mobile application.

Saunders v. Hearst Television, Inc., 711 F. Supp. 3d 24 (D. Mass. 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of federal Video Privacy Protection Act.

Cristostomo v. New Balance Athletics, Inc., 647 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D. Mass. 2022), denying motion to dismiss and motion to strike class allegations in case involving sneakers marketed as "Made in

the USA.”

Selected Class Settlements:

Sholopa v. Turk Hava Yollari A.O. (d/b/a Turkish Airlines), Case No. 1:20-cv-3294-ALC (S.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$14.1 million class settlement to resolve claims of passengers whose flights with Turkish Airlines were cancelled due to COVID-19 and who did not receive refunds.

Payero v. Mattress Firm, Inc., Case No. 7:21-cv-3061-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$4.9 million class settlement to resolve claims of consumers who purchased allegedly defective bed frames.

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
- First Circuit Court of Appeals
- Second Circuit Court of Appeals
- Third Circuit Court of Appeals
- Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals
- Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

JULIA K. VENDITTI

Julia K. 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 privacy violations, illegal gambling, financial misconduct, and false advertising. 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, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the First Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

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. 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 prior to law school.

Selected Class Settlements:

Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al., Case No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cnty. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$11.75 million class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Edwards v. Mid-Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, Case No. 22-cv-00562-TJM-CFH (N.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$2.2 million class settlement to resolve claims that an upstate New York credit union was unlawfully charging overdraft fees on accounts with sufficient funds.

Fischer, et al. v. Instant Checkmate LLC, et al., No. 19-cv-04892 (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for state-by-state non-reversionary cash settlements involving alleged violations of right of publicity statutes totaling in excess of \$10.1 million.

Wyland v. Woopla, Inc., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00356 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$835,000 class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00358 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$1.32 million class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

XAVIER JOHNSON

Xavier Johnson is a Staff Attorney at Bursor & Fisher, where they focus their practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. They are admitted to the State Bar of California. Xavier is a former Director of Policy Justice at the Just Cities Institute where their work focused on Fair Chance Housing policies, re-entry policy, as well as tenants' rights. Previously, Xavier worked as a Tenants' Rights Attorney at Centro Legal de la Raza. Their work at Centro Legal de la Raza centered on representing tenants in hearings with the Oakland Rent Adjustment Program. Xavier provided assistance to tenants through all stages of the petition process including providing representation on the day of the hearings. Xavier successfully advocated for more than one million dollars in rent reductions. Xavier engaged with the community through outreach and documented how tenants are being impacted by the housing crisis and what steps we can take to ensure that our tenant communities are protected. Xavier Johnson is also an elected official serving as a Commissioner on the Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board.

Over their career, Xavier has worked with law firms, non-profits, and governmental entities in the realms of policy advocacy, research and community organizing. Xavier spent two

years as a Congressional Aide in Congresswoman Barbara Lee's District Office with a focus on housing and housing justice.

Xavier holds a Juris Doctorate from University of California Berkeley School of Law and a Bachelor of Arts in Sociology from University of Texas at San Antonio.

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.

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 and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts 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.

MUJGHAN AHMAD

Mujghan Ahmad is a Staff Attorney at Bursor & Fisher, where she focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. She is admitted to the State Bar of California.

Mujghan earned her Juris Doctor from Golden Gate University, School of Law in 2022, with specializations in Intellectual Property and Public Interest. During law school, she received a CALI Award in Intellectual Property Law Survey, wrote for the Environmental Law Journal, and was a member of the Moot Court Board and the Pro Bono Honor Society. She also served as a teaching assistant for Criminal Law Professor Thomas Schaaf. In 2017, Mujghan received a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from the University of California, Irvine.

Her prior legal experience includes internships with the Los Angeles County Counsel's Property Division, Homeless Advocacy Project, Bay Area Legal Aid's Economic Justice Unit, and California Lawyers for the Arts. Before joining Bursor & Fisher, Mujghan served as a Foreclosure Prevention Attorney at Legal Assistance to the Elderly, where she litigated cases involving wrongful foreclosure and financial elder abuse, and provided pro bono estate planning services to low-income seniors in San Francisco.

INES DIAZ

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

Ines 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.

Ines received her Juris Doctor in 2023 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Ines served as an Executive Editor of the California Law Review. She also served as an intern with the East Bay Community Law Center's Immigration Clinic and as a Fellow of the Berkeley Law Academic Skills Program. Additionally, Ines served as an instructor with the University of California, Berkeley Extension, Legal Studies Global Access Program where she taught legal writing to international law students. In 2021, Ines was selected

for a summer externship at the California Supreme Court where she served as a judicial extern for the Honorable Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar.

CAROLINE C. DONOVAN

Caroline C. Donovan is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Caroline focuses her practice on complex civil litigation, data protection, mass arbitration, and class actions. Caroline interned with Bursor & Fisher during her third year of law school before joining full time in Fall 2023.

Caroline is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Caroline received her Juris Doctor in 2023 from Brooklyn Law School. During law school, Caroline was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society Trial Division, where she was chosen to serve as a National Team Member. Caroline competed and coached in numerous competitions across the country, and placed second at regionals in AAJ's national competition in both her second and third year of law school. Caroline was also the President of the Art Law Association, and the Treasurer of the Labor and Employment Law Association.

During law school, Caroline was a judicial intern for Judge Kenneth W. Chu of the National Labor Relations Board. She also interned at the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of New York, as well as a securities class action firm.

JOSHUA B. GLATT

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

Joshua 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.

Joshua earned his Juris Doctor from the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings). While there, he received a CALI Award for earning the highest grade in Constitutional Law II and served on the executive boards of the Jewish Law Students Association and the American Constitution Society. Prior to law school, Joshua graduated *summa cum laude* from the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Arizona State University in 2016 and earned a master's degree from the University of Southern California in 2018.

JOSHUA R. WILNER

Joshua Wilner is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joshua focuses his practice on complex civil litigation, data privacy, consumer protection, and class actions. Joshua was a Summer Associate at Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm full time in Fall 2023.

Joshua 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.

Joshua received his Juris Doctor in 2023 from Berkeley Law. During law school, he received the American Jurisprudence Award for Constitutional Law.

During law school, Joshua served on the board of the Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law. Joshua also interned at Disability Rights California, Legal Aid at Work, and a private firm that worked closely with the ACLU of Northern California to enforce the California Racial Justice Act. In 2022 and 2023, Joshua worked as a research assistant for Professor Abbye Atkinson.

VICTORIA ZHOU

Victoria Zhou is an Associate in Bursor & Fisher's New York office. Victoria focuses her practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection.

Victoria is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Victoria received her Juris Doctor from Fordham Law School in 2023. During law school, Victoria served as an Associate Editor of the Moot Court Board and competed in multiple mock trial competitions as a member of the Brendan Moore Trial Advocates. In addition, Victoria served as a judicial extern to Chief Judge Mark A. Barnett of the United States Court of International Trade. In 2019, Victoria graduated *magna cum laude* from Fei Tian College with a B.F.A. in Classical Dance.

KYLE D. GORDON

Kyle Gordon is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Kyle focuses his practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection. Kyle was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Kyle is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Kyle received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School in 2023, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Kyle was a Staff Editor for the Columbia Science and Technology Law Review. In 2020, Kyle graduated *summa cum laude* from New York University with a B.A. in Politics and became a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Prior to law school, Kyle interned in the Clerk's Office of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

ELEANOR R. GRASSO

Eleanor Grasso is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Eleanor focuses her practice on complex civil litigation, including data privacy and consumer protection class actions.

Eleanor is admitted to the State Bars of New York and Florida, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York and Eastern District of New York.

Eleanor earned her Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law. During law school, Eleanor was a member of the Fordham Journal of Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law, serving as Symposium Editor for Volume XXXIV. Eleanor was also a member of the Brendan Moore Trial Advocacy Team, served as a Research Assistant, and was a member of the Board of Student Advisors.

Throughout her time in law school, Eleanor interned for the Office of the Public Defender for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida in the Misdemeanor Unit, the Office of the Federal Public Defender for the Middle District of Tennessee in the Capital Habeas Unit, the ACLU of Florida, and for the Honorable Kiyoo A. Matsumoto in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Eleanor was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher and also interned part-time during her third year of law school.

Eleanor earned her Bachelors from the University of Florida, with a double-major in Criminology & Law and Political Science and a minor in French & Francophone studies.

RYAN B. MARTIN

Ryan Martin is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ryan focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. He was a Summer Associate and part-time law clerk with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full time Associate in August 2024.

Ryan 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.

He earned his Juris Doctor from the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings), graduating *Cum Laude* with a Concentration in Environmental Law and as a member of the Honors Society. While there, he was a Senior Production Editor of the *U.C. Law Journal*, was President of the Hastings Environmental Law Association, and was a Torts Teaching Fellow.

Prior to law school, Ryan graduated from the W.A. Franke College of Business at Northern Arizona University with a Bachelors of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management and a minor in Business. Ryan also studied Sustainable Business and Hotel Management at the Internationale Hochschule of Applied Sciences in Bad Honnef Germany and is a certified yoga instructor.

LOGAN HAGERTY

Logan Hagerty is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Logan is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Logan received his Juris Doctor from Boston College Law School in 2024, where he received a certificate in Land & Environmental Law.

During law school, Logan was President of the Environmental Law Society. In addition, Logan worked for a class action firm, a general practice firm, and interned at a Massachusetts state agency.

Logan earned his Bachelors from St. Lawrence University, where he graduated magna cum laude with a double major in History and Environmental Studies and a minor in African Studies. He is also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

KAREN VALENZUELA

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

Karen 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.

Karen received her Juris Doctor in 2024 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Karen was part of the Consumer Protection Public Policy Order, and interned for the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office. Karen also participated in the International Human Rights Law Clinic, La Alianza Workers' and Tenants' Rights Clinic, and the Death Penalty Clinic.

Prior to law school, Karen graduated from the University of California, Berkeley with a B.A. in Gender and Women's Studies and a minor in Global Poverty and Practice.