

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

KEVIN MERRELL, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

1ST LAKE PROPERTIES, INC.,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 23-1450-SSV-DPC

**DECLARATION OF RAINA C. BORRELLI IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO APPROVE ATTORNEY'S FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARD**

I, Raina Borrelli, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this Declaration and, if called to testify, I could and would testify to the matters stated herein.

2. I am a partner of Strauss Borrelli PLLC and was appointed Settlement Class Counsel for Plaintiff Kevin Merrell in this litigation against 1st Lake Properties, Inc. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees, Costs, and Service Award (the "Fee Motion") incurred in connection with the prosecution of the above-captioned action.

3. I, along with my co-counsel Layne C. Hilton of Meyer Wilson, Co., LPA, spent significant time and effort pursuing this case. Counsel investigated the data incident, detailed Plaintiff's claims in their complaint, prepared the case for litigation, engaged in confidential informal discovery in advance of arm's-length negotiations to ensure Class Counsel had sufficient facts and information to make an informed decision about resolution, mediated the dispute, reviewed confidential confirmatory discovery, drafted the settlement agreement and exhibits,

prepared and submitted the Motion for Preliminary approval (which was ultimately granted), and implemented the parties' settlement by working with Defendant and the claims administrator to effectuate notice.

LITIGATION BACKGROUND AND COUNSEL'S WORK

4. Plaintiff is a former tenant of one of 1st Lake's properties and his information was impacted in the data incident discovered in December 2021.

5. On March 22, 2023, Plaintiff sued 1st Lake Properties, Inc. ("1st Lake") to remediate the harms he alleges were caused by the December 2021 data incident, asserting five counts and demanding 1st Lake reimburse his losses. 1st Lake denied any and all liability and allegations of wrongdoing, and moved to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint.

6. The Court granted the motion in part, dismissing the claims of negligence *per se*, breach of fiduciary duty, and invasion of privacy. On October 17, 2023, Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint reasserting claims for negligence and violation of the Louisiana Database Security Breach Notification Law. The court denied Defendant's renewed motion to dismiss and strike Plaintiffs Amended Complaint.

7. Plaintiff alleges he has been impacted the same as all Settlement Class Members and has the same interests as them. Plaintiff has assisted in the investigation of this case, reviewed and approved pleadings, stayed in contact with Settlement Class Counsel, and answered Settlement Class Counsel's many questions. Plaintiff is informed of the risks of continued litigation and the benefits of early resolution.

8. The parties agreed to mediate this case with Bruce A. Friedman, a mediator experienced in settling data breach cases. In advance of mediation, Plaintiff's counsel requested, and 1st Lake produced, confidential confirmatory discovery.

9. On June 6, 2024, the parties mediated with Bruce Friedman where the Parties engaged in an extensive evaluation and discussion of the relevant facts and law, and carefully considered the risk and uncertainties of continued litigation and all other factors bearing on the merits of settlement. Despite a lengthy mediation, conducted at arms-length with Mr. Friedman's assistance, the parties were unable to reach a settlement.

10. The parties re-opened the case, prepared case management orders, sought guidance from the Court on scheduling expert and fact discovery, class certification briefing, and summary judgment briefing, and exchanged formal discovery requests and responses, all the while continuing their negotiations. In the following months, the Parties succeeded in reaching agreement on the principal terms of a settlement.

11. From the start, the parties agreed they would not negotiate the proposed class's attorney fees or plaintiff's service award until they agreed on the settlement agreement's core terms, thus avoiding conflict between Plaintiff, class counsel, and the class.

12. While the negotiations were always collegial, cordial, and professional, there is no doubt that they were adversarial in nature, with both parties forcefully advocating the position of their respective clients. Throughout all negotiations, Settlement Class Counsel and counsel for 1st Lake fought hard for the interests of their respective clients.

13. The Parties diligently negotiated and edited drafts of the Settlement, the Notices, a Claim Form, and other exhibits.

14. On February 4, 2025, Plaintiff moved the Court to preliminarily approve the Agreement and implement its terms. After considering the merits underlying the proposal, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion, ordering the parties to hire an administrator and notify the class.

15. Since this Court granted the Preliminary Approval motion, the Parties, in conjunction with the Settlement Administrator, RG/2, have effectuated Notice consistent with the Settlement and Preliminary Approval Order.

16. Over the next several weeks and continuing to today, Class Counsel have continued to diligently work with Defendant and the Settlement Administrator regarding claims administration and processing. While the claims process is ongoing, and while RG/2 will submit a detailed declaration about the notice program and claims process in connection with the motion for final approval, preliminary data about the notice and claims process is positive.

17. Through July 25, 2025, 28,505 notices were successfully mailed, only one Settlement Class Member has requested exclusion, and no Settlement Class Member has objected to the Settlement.

THE SETTLEMENT

18. The Settlement Agreement provides a \$525,000 non-reversionary Settlement Fund, a significant monetary and remedial relief to the Settlement Class. The Agreement compensates class members for their losses. Class members can claim “Unreimbursed Economic Losses”, Class Members may claim up to \$10,000 for losses resulting from the incident, including identity theft, fraud, and costs spent mitigating those risks. Doc. 50-1 (“Agreement”), ¶ 61(i). In other words, these terms address the “tangible” losses stemming from the breach. 1st Lake also agreed to provide class members who submit valid claims “credit monitoring services.” *Id.* ¶ 61(iii). The monitoring will last for two years under three bureaus. *Id.* Further, class members may claim a *pro rata* cash payment, in an amount estimated to exceed \$50. *Id.* 61(ii). Defendant has also confirmed it has implemented information security enhancements. *Id.* ¶ 75. And the value this term delivers will not affect any other term under the Agreement, as 1st Lake agreed to provide it “separate and apart”

from other benefits. *Id.* Finally, 1st Lake agreed to pay the reasonable settlement administration costs, and agreed not to object to an award of Plaintiff's approved fees not to exceed \$174,983.50 (or 33.33% of the settlement amount), \$10,410.64 in expenses-which is largely attributable to the Plaintiff's portion of the mediation fee, and a service award for Plaintiff not to exceed \$5,000. *Id.* ¶¶ 94, 96.

19. Based on my experience litigating class and other complex actions, I endorse the Settlement and believe it benefits and provides relief to the Settlement Class Members. Of the various forms of relief available in national consumer protection class actions (injunctive, declaratory, coupons, gift cards, cash compensation, etc.), the relief obtained by Class Counsel in this case is of the most preferable form: remedial relief, plus cash compensation.

20. The result achieved in this Settlement is notable because the Parties were able, through capable and experienced counsel, to reach a negotiated Settlement without involvement of the Court.

21. Class Counsel worked on behalf of the Settlement Class to obtain information from Defendant regarding the Data Incident and used that information (along with their experience and the knowledge gained from other data breach class actions) to negotiate the Settlement.

22. Although I believe that Plaintiff and the Class would ultimately prevail in the litigation on a class-wide basis, data breach class actions are still new and can present novel and complex issues, making a successful outcome difficult to predict. Also, a successful outcome would ensue, if at all, only after prolonged and arduous litigation with an attendant risk of drawn-out appeals.

23. This case presented substantial risks and uncertainties that could have prevented any recovery whatsoever. Despite the most vigorous and competent of efforts, success in this contingent-fee litigation was never assured.

24. Among national consumer protection class action litigation, data breach cases are some of the most complex and involve a rapidly evolving area of law. As such, these cases are particularly risky for plaintiff attorneys. Indeed, class counsel here took this case on “contingency,” risking that they may recover no fees at all. Even so, they committed to litigating this case through discovery, which would have included hiring experts, moving to certify the class, and trying the case—all without knowing whether they would even recover those costs. Plaintiff would not have settled this case without Class Counsel’s skill and aptitude, qualities. Accordingly, the value of the services received by the Plaintiff and the Settlement Class in this case is commensurate with the attorneys’ fees, costs and expenses, and service awards sought here.

25. Finally, Notice of the Settlement has been given in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. As of this date, no Settlement Class Members have objected to the Settlement, including the requested attorney fees, reimbursement of expenses or the service award/incentive payment to Plaintiff, or opted out of the Settlement.

26. Class Counsel’s work is not over and will continue throughout the claims period. Based on experience, Class Counsel will spend substantial additional hours seeking final approval, defending the Settlement from potential objections (of which there are none to date), and supervising claims administration and the distribution of proceeds.

COUNSEL’S LODESTAR AND EXPENSES

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

28. The billable rates for our firms are consistent with rates billed for similar legal services, especially when considering the particularized skill necessary for effective litigation of claims like these.

29. Through July 30, 2025, our firms worked a total of 398 hours on this case, incurring fees of \$225,111.50.

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

31. Through July 30, 2024, we have incurred \$10,410.64 in reasonable expenses necessary to the litigation, which include filing fees, research expenses, and mediation costs. Each firm's expenses are identified below.

Strauss Borrelli PLLC

32. Through July 30, 2025, Strauss Borrelli has worked a total of 113.1 hours on this case, incurring fees of \$56,042.50. A summary of the Strauss Borrelli's time records are attached as **Exhibit A**.

33. Through July 30, 2025, Strauss Borrelli has incurred \$9,516.65 in reasonable expenses necessary to the litigation, including mediation fees, and *pro hac* fees.

Meyer Wilson, Co., LPA

34. Through July 30, 2025, Meyer Wilson, Co., LPA, has worked a total of 285.6 hours on this case, incurring fees of \$169,069.00. A summary of Meyer Wilson's time records are attached as **Exhibit C**.

35. Meyer Wilson has incurred \$893.99 in reasonable expenses necessary to the litigation, including filing fees, and mailing expenses.

COUNSEL’S QUALIFICATIONS

A. Strauss Borrelli PLLC

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

37. Raina Borrelli, the principal attorney from Strauss Borrelli assigned to this case, is a founding partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data breach, Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Borrelli received her J.D. magna cum laude from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2011. Prior to forming Strauss Borrelli, Ms. Borrelli was a partner at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Borrelli is an active member of the Minnesota Women’s Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of pro se litigants through the Pro Se Project. Ms. Borrelli has repeatedly been named to the annual Minnesota “Rising Star” Super Lawyers list (2014-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine. She has also been repeatedly certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association (2012-2015; 2018-2020) for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services. In recent years, Ms. Borrelli has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including: *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.); *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, 20-cv-01502 (JRT/HB) (D. Minn.); *In re FCA Monostable Gearshifts Litig.*, 16-md-02744 (E.D. Mich.); *Zeiger v. WellPet LLC*, 17-cv-04056 (N.D. Cal.); *Wyoming v. Procter & Gamble*, 15-cv-2101 (D. Minn.); *In re Big Heart Pet Brands Litig.*, 18-cv-00861 (N.D. Cal.); *Sullivan v. Fluidmaster*, 14-cv-05696 (N.D. Ill.); *Rice v.*

Electrolux Home Prod., Inc., 15-cv-00371 (M.D. Pa.); *Gorczynski v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.*, 18-cv-10661 (D.N.J.); *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods*, 18-cv-1736 (C.D. Cal.); *Reynolds, et al., v. FCA US, LLC*, 19-cv-11745 (E.D. Mich.).

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

39. The Strauss Borrelli Firm Resume is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

B. Meyer Wilson, Co., LPA

40. Meyer Wilson is a plaintiffs' law firm with offices in Columbus, Los Angeles, Cleveland, New Orleans, Atlanta, and Bloomfield Hills, Michigan. With co-counsel, Meyer

Wilson handles cases across the county. Meyer Wilson has a robust complex litigation and class action practice involving consumer, employment, financial, securities, and especially privacy matters.

41. Meyer Wilson attorney Layne Hilton has primarily worked on this matter. Ms. Hilton is an experienced class action attorney, who attended Mount Holyoke College before graduating from Emory University School of Law in 2011. She was selected by New Orleans City Business Magazine as “One to Watch” and is a frequent speaker on topics related to class action litigation strategies.

42. Ms. Hilton has been appointed by numerous courts to serve on Plaintiffs’ Executive and Steering Committees in a variety of multi-district litigations. This includes *In re Uber Technologies, Inc., Passenger Sexual Assault Litigation*, Case No. 3:23-md-03084 (N.D. Cal) (Hon. Charles Breyer) (serving on the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee and Discovery sub-committee); *In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine/Naloxone) Film Products Liability Litigation*, Case No. 1:24-md-03092 (N.D. Ohio) (Hon. J. Philip Calabrese) (serving on the Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee and court-appointed ESI Coordinator); *In re Glucagon-like Peptide-1 Receptor Agonists (GLP-1 RAS) Products Liability Litigation*, Case No. 2:24-md-03094 (E.D. Pa) (Hon. Karen Marston) (serving on the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee); and *In re Valsartan, Losartan and Irbesartan Products Liability*, Case No. 1:19-md-02875 (D. N.J) (Hon. Marie Bumb) (serving on the class action committee).

43. Prior to working at Meyer Wilson, Ms. Hilton worked at a boutique consumer protection law firm in New Orleans where she represented consumers and third-party payor health insurance companies in the following cases: *Barba v. Shire U.S., Inc, et al*, Case No. 13-21158 (S.D. Fl) (antitrust pay-for-delay class action which resulted in a \$14.75 million cash settlement

on behalf of purchasers of Adderall XR); *In re Intuniv Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 1:16-cv-12396 (D. Mass) (consumer antitrust suit against the manufacturers of Intuniv who resulted in a \$3 million settlement for consumer purchasers of the drug); and *Medical Mutual of Ohio v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-00716 (N.D. Ohio) (suit brought against more than 30 pharmaceutical manufacturers, distributors, and retailers for claims related to the marketing of opioid drugs).

44. Matthew R. Wilson, a principal with Meyer Wilson, has also worked on this case. Mr. Wilson has significant experience in litigating consumer class actions, and particularly privacy class actions like this one. Mr. Wilson has recovered over \$350 million in cash for consumers in TCPA and data breach class actions, including the following recent cases: *Head v. Citibank, N.A.*, No. 3:18-cv-08189-ROS (D. Ariz.) (TCPA case where class settled for \$29.5 million); *Avetisyan v. United Health Centers of the San Joaquin Valley*, Case No. 22ECG00285 (Fresno County Superior Court) (Class counsel in a data breach suit alleging failure to protect sensitive medical information of patients from release which resulted in a \$1.65 million settlement approved in March 2023); *Brown v. DirectTV, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-08382 (C.D. Cal.) (Class Counsel in nationwide class action alleging privacy violations from calls with prerecorded messages sent to cell phones which resulted in a \$17 million settlement granted February 2023); *Burns et al. v. Deloitte Consulting, LLP*, Case No. 1:20-cv-4077 (S.D.N.Y.) (Class counsel in a nationwide settlement of claims stemming from improper maintenance of consumer data in connection with customers seeking government benefits where the final approval of settlement was granted February 2022); *Grogan et al. v. Aaron's, Inc.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-2821 (N.D. Ga.) (Class Counsel in case alleging privacy violations from autodialer debt collection calls to noncustomers which resulted in a \$2.175 million cash settlement approved on October 2020); *John Doe One et al. v. Caremark, LLC et al.*, Case No. 2:18-cv-238, 2:18-cv-448 (S.D. Ohio) (Class Counsel in class

action involving disclosure of the personal information of HIV-positive patients in Ohio which resulted in a \$4.4 million settlement approved in January 2020); *Woodrow v. Sagent Auto, LLC*, Case No. 2:18-cv-1054 (E.D.Wisc.) (Class Counsel in nationwide class settlement alleging privacy violations from autodialer calls to cell phones which resulted in \$1.75 million common fund cash settlement approved in September 2019); *Rice-Redding et al. v. Nationwide Mutual Automobile Ins. Co.*, Case No. 1:16-cv-03634-TCB (N.D.Ga.) Counsel in nationwide class settlement alleging privacy violations from autodialer telemarketing calls to millions of cell phones which resulted in \$5 million cash settlement approved in August 2019); and *Luster v. Wells Fargo Dealer Services*, No. 1:15-cv-1058, (N.D. Ga.) (Class Counsel in case alleging privacy violations from autodialer debt collection calls to customers and non-customers in connection with auto loans which resulted in a \$14.8 million cash settlement approved in December 2017).

45. The Meyer Wilson, Co., LPA Firm Resume is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 30th Day of July, 2025, at Eagan, Minnesota.

/s/ Raina C. Borrelli
 Raina C. Borrelli (*pro hac vice*)
 STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC
 One Magnificent Mile
 980 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1610
 Chicago, IL, 60611
 Telephone: (872) 263-1100
 Facsimile: (872) 263-1109
 raina@straussborrelli.com

EXHIBIT A

Time & Expenses
Merrell v. 1st Lake Properties

Timekeeper	Position	Hourly Rate	Hours	Lodestar
Brittany Resch	Partner	575.00	2.7	1,552.50
Carolyn Chen	Associate	400.00	11	4,400.00
Cassandra Miller	Partner	700.00	0.8	560.00
Jack Rader	Legal Assistant	150.00	1	150.00
Rachel Pollack	Paralegal	225.00	0.2	45.00
Raina Borrelli	Partner	700.00	38.6	26,700.00
Rudis Requeno	Partner	150.00	0.8	120.00
Samuel Strauss	Partner	700.00	16.7	11,690.00
Sarah Soleiman	Associate	400.00	61.6	24,640.00
Zog Begolli	Associate	425.00	0.2	85.00
			133.60	69,942.50

Time & Expenses
Merrell v. 1st Lake Properties

Category	Total
E-Discovery	16.65
Mediation Fees	9,500.00
TOTAL	9,516.65

EXHIBIT B



One Magnificent Mile
980 N Michigan Avenue
Suite 1610
Chicago, Illinois 60611
P: 872.263.1100
F: 872.263.1109
straussborrelli.com

Our Firm

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

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

We make the courtroom accessible to all.

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

We innovate and adapt.

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

We know that people are our greatest resource.

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

We understand the strength in numbers.

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

We commit to personal connections.

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

Our Cases

CONSUMER PROTECTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATA BREACH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATA PRIVACY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RIGHT OF PUBLICITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT***Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC, et al. (S.D. Ohio)***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Professionals

SAMUEL J. STRAUSS

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

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

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

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

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

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

RAINA C. BORRELLI

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CASSANDRA MILLER

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

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

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

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

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

2012)

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

BRITTANY RESCH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALEX S. PHILLIPS

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

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

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

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

CARLY ROMAN

Carly Roman is an attorney at Strauss Borrelli PLLC. Ms. Roman's practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including consumer protection, data breach, privacy, and Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA") cases in state and federal courts. Additionally, Ms. Roman has substantial experience advocating for consumers under California's Unfair Competition Law, the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, and the Song-Beverly Warranty Act.

Ms. Roman received her J.D. from the University of New Hampshire School of Law with High Honors. Prior to joining Strauss Borrelli, Ms. Roman honed her skills at a prominent consumer protection firm in California as well as in Chicago at one of the leading firms specializing in class actions and consumer rights. There, Ms. Roman litigated a variety of state and federal claims, including claims brought under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act, Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), and Truth in Lending Act (TILA), as well as the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Practices Act (ICFA).

Ms. Roman is a member of the Illinois State Bar Association and The State Bar of California. In recent years, Ms. Roman has been involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Doe v. SSK Plastic Surgery*, 30-2025-01467755 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Orange Cty.)
- *Doe v. Jaime S. Schwartz MD PC*, 25STCV07155 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.), removed, No. 2:25-cv-03393 (C.D. Cal.)
- *Cole v. Solairus Aviation LLC*, No. 3:25-cv-03035 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Dean, et al., v. New York Blood Center, Inc., et al.* No. 25-cv-01051 (S.D.N.Y.)
- *In re: DISA Global Data Breach Litigation*, No. 4:25-cv-00821 (S.D. Tex.)
- *Kelly v. Insomniac Games*, No. 24-CIV-05793 (Cal. Sup. Ct., San Mateo Cty.)
- *Palanti v. Lawble Inc., et al.*, No. 2023CH02120 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.), removed, No. 1:23-cv-02365 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Tamburo v. Hyundai Motor America (Corporation), et al.*, No. 1:23-cv-282 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Mirabile v. Bank of America, N.A.*, No. 1:23-cv-01719 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Fleury v. General Motors, LLC*, No. 1:22-cv-03862 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Rocio v. Mod Super Fast Pizza, LLC*, No. 1:21-cv-00507 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Abruscato, et al. v. Wells Fargo, et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-00012 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Avery v. Cvi Sgp-Co Acquisition Trust, et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-06965 (N.D. Ill.)

EXHIBIT

*In re: 1st Lake Properties Breach Litigation***Meyer Wilson Co., L.P.A.****Time**

PARTNERS (P) and ATTORNEYS (A)	ALL HOURS	HOURLY RATE	TOTAL LODESTAR
Matthew Wilson (P)	50.80	\$985.00	\$50,038.00
Layne Hilton (A)	215.30	\$525.00	\$113,032.50
ATTORNEY TOTAL	266.10		\$163,070.50
PARALEGALS			
Aaron Porterfield	4.70	\$325.00	\$1,527.50
Kemmily Kwok	3.50	\$325.00	\$1,137.50
Danielle Aldach	11.30	\$295.00	\$3,333.50
PARALEGAL TOTAL	19.50		\$5,998.50
TOTAL	285.60		\$169,069.00

In re: 1st Lake Properties Breach Litigation**Meyer Wilson Co., L.P.A.****Expenses**

Date	1st Lake Properties Data Breach	Amount
3/23/2023	Filing Fees	\$600.00
3/29/2023	Mailings	\$30.71
5/31/2023	Pro Hac Vice Costs	\$25.63
5/31/2023	Pro Hac Vice Costs	\$15.00
5/31/2023	Mailings	\$9.65
12/31/2023	Filing Fees	\$213.00
TOTAL		\$893.99

EXHIBIT

MeyerWilson

T M r d H A r d r M r A d d
r r d r r r d
d r dr d d d dr r r
r d r T r r d d d
d d r r d r M r
d r rd r r rd d
dr d d r

M r r d r d r r d d
d d d r d r r r d
r d d r r r rd
r d r r d r r r
r rd r I r d r d M r
d d r d r T r
r r d r r r M r T r r d r
d r r r d rd T
Burns, et al. v. Prudential Securities, Inc. r
M r T d r r r
M r r d r r r
r r d

A r r r M r d r r
r r r d d r r r
d d r d r r

M r d r r M r
r d r d d r M r

Grogan v. Aaron's, Inc. B
d T A r
r r d r

Brown & Szaller Co., LPA v. Waste Mgmt. of Ohio
r

M r r
r d A

John Doe v. CVS Health Corp. et al.
r r d r HI
r r d M r r

M
r r r d

DeCapua v. MetLife Inc.
d T A E A I
r r d r

Woodrow v. Sagent Auto, LLC
d T A E
r d r
r r d

Rice-Redding et al. v. Nationwide Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.
d T A T B
r d r
r d A

Luster v. Wells Fargo Dealer Servs.
T A r d r d
r d r r
r d r

Prather v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
T A r d r d
r d r d
r d A

Cross v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
d T A r d r
r d r d
r r d r r

Markos v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.
d T A r d r d
r d r
r r d

Smith v. State Farm, et al.
d T A I
r r d r
r r r
r r d r

Ossola, et al. v. American Express Co., et al. I
d T A r
d r r
r d r

Franklin v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. MMA
d T A r d r
r r d M r r M
r d r

Bayat v. Bank of the West EM
d T A r d r
r d A r

Connor v. JPMorgan Chase Bank M B M r
d T A r
d r d
r r d r

In re Capital One Telephone Consumer Litig. I
M r d d d d r r rd d
d r d r
T r r A T d
d r r r T A
r r r r d
M r r M r d r r

Mills v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A., et al
d T A r d r
r r d M r
r M
r d r r

Wannemacher v. Carrington Morg. Servs. LLC M A
d d T A
r d r r r

Lazebnik v. Apple, Inc. E d
d r d r
Breaking Bad A T r I
r A r d d r d r r d
r r d r

Yarger, et al. v. ING Bank FSB
d
d r r r d
r r d A r d
r r r d M r
r M r d

Steinfeld v. Discover Fin. Servs.
r T A r d r
M r r r d

Rose v. Bank of America Corp., et al.
d T A r
d r T r
T A r d

Arthur v. Sallie Mae, Inc
d T A r d r
d rr r d d r
d r T d r d r
r I r T A
d

Smith v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.
A d
d d r r d r
d d r I r
d r r d M d I r
r d d d

Mack v. hh gregg, Inc., et al.
I d d
d rr dr r
d r d r r M r

Kaiser-Flores v. Lowe’s Home Centers, Inc.
d d rr
dr r d d r r
r d r r r

Frankle v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.
M d
d rr dr r
d r d r r r

Sanbrook v. Office Depot, Inc.
r d r d d
d

r r d r r d T d r r r
r d r d r r r

Stout v. Jeld Wen, Inc. d
d d r r d
M r r M r d d
A

Fulford v. Logitech, Inc. d
d d r r r d T
d r d r r M r

Schweinfurth, et al. v. Motorola, Inc. d
d d r r r d
r d r r r

Steele v. Pergo, Inc. r d
d r T d d
r d r r r d M r r
M

Jenkins v. Hyundai Motor Fin. Co.
A d d r d d
T d r r d r d r

Guisseppone v. Wendy's Int'l, Inc., et al.
r d r d Ar T d
d r d r

In Re Apple iPod Nano Prod. Liab. Litig. M M
d M r r d
d r I d r
r d r r d r d A
d r d r d r d r r
r r d r r A r

Health Science Prods. LLC. v. Sage Software SB, Inc.
d d
d d r d d r r
M r I r d r A r

Wiatrowski, et al. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., et al.

d d r d d
r r M r r T r
r d r r

Bowen, et al. v. Whirlpool Corp., et al.

d d r r
r r d d r

Opperman, et al. v. Cellco P'ship, et al.

B
A d r d r d d *inter alia*,
r r r r r d r r r d
r r r d M r r r
r

Heitbrink, et al. v. eMachines

I
d r d d r r d M r
r r r d r T r r d r
r

Martino, et al. v. Motorola, Inc.

I M d
d d r d d r d
d r d d d r r M r r
T r r d r M r

Beckman v. Robinhood Fin., LLC et al.

d r d r d
d r d

Brown v. DirecTV, LLC

d r r r r rd d
A r r M r
d d d r d r r r
d d r M
r

Myers v. Marietta Memorial Hosp.

A r d d
r r T r d r r

Head v. Citibank, N.A.

Ar
d T A r r r rd d
T d r

Bowen v. Porsche Cars, N.A.
d

r d d

r d

d r M r

Mr M r r d r T T
r d T r d T
H d B r A r r
d A r Tr r A d T Tr
A r

Mr M r r r rd r
rd r d r d d

Mr M r r d r r r r
r r d H r r d r dr d d d
r r r r I A A r r r d
r r r r d rd d d
dr d d r r

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{H} & & & \text{d} & \text{d} & \text{r} & \text{d} & & \text{d} & \text{d} & \text{r} & & \text{r} & \text{r} \\ & & \text{r} & & & \text{r} & & & & & & & & \end{array}$$

Mr M r r d r r r r r d r d r
r r r d d r r r r r r
d r d r Mr M r
r d d r r d r r
r r r

Mr M r d d r d r r r d d r
 d r d r r r H d
 r d M

MATTHEW R. WILSON

Mr. [redacted] Mr. [redacted]
[redacted]

Mr. [redacted]
[redacted]
T. [redacted] Mr. [redacted]
[redacted]

[redacted] Mr. [redacted]
[redacted] *In re: Capital One Telephone Consumer Protection Act Litigation*
[redacted] *Wilkins v. HSBC Bank*
Nevada, N.A. et al. [redacted]
Rose v. Bank of America Corp. [redacted]
d Arthur, et al. v. Sallie Mae, Inc.

I. [redacted] Mr. [redacted] *Yarger v. ING Bank, fsb*
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

I. [redacted] Mr. [redacted]
[redacted] A. [redacted]
[redacted] Mr. [redacted] *United States v. Boards*
[redacted] A. [redacted]
[redacted] Ad. [redacted]
[redacted] M. [redacted]

Mr. [redacted] *d magna cum laude* B. [redacted]
[redacted] H. [redacted]
[redacted] H. [redacted]

COURTNEY WERNING r r r

A r r M r r r d r r
r r r r r d r d
r r r r r

M r d M r r r d d *magna cum*
laude r r
r d M r d rd d r r
r r r rd r r rd r
B rr r r r d r d

r r M r M r r d r M
r d r H r A T r d r d r r
r r r r r A r d
r d

M r r r r d I r r r
r r r A d I r r r
d d d r r r r

M r d d r rr r
I r Ar r B r A IABA r
A r A A r A d
B r A BA M r r
r r r r M r r r

JARED W. CONNORS

Mr. [redacted] [redacted] M. [redacted] [redacted] H. [redacted] M. [redacted]
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

Mr. [redacted] [redacted] d. B.A. *magna cum laude* [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] I.
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] rd. d. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] E. [redacted] d.
M. [redacted] H. [redacted] [redacted] M. [redacted] A. [redacted] H. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] T.
[redacted] [redacted] M. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] d. [redacted]
[redacted] *Ohio State Law Journal* [redacted] d. B. Br. [redacted] H. [redacted] M. [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] A. I. A. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

A. M. [redacted] Mr. [redacted] [redacted] d. [redacted] [redacted] d. [redacted]
[redacted] d. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

Bowen v. Porsche Cars, N.A. [redacted] d. [redacted] d.
[redacted] d. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] d. d. d.

Brown v. DirecTV, LLC [redacted] d. [redacted] d.
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
T. A.

Head v. Citibank, N.A. [redacted] Ar. [redacted] [redacted] d.
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

Nichols v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. [redacted] d.
[redacted] d. [redacted] [redacted] d. [redacted]
[redacted] d. d. [redacted] [redacted]

Ghanaat v. Numerade Labs, Inc. [redacted] d. [redacted] d.
[redacted] d. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] A. [redacted]

M. [redacted] [redacted]
Allen v. Wenco Mgmt., LLC [redacted] d. [redacted] d.
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] d. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

I. dd. Mr. [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] A. [redacted] [redacted] d.
B. r. A.

r