

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, ALABAMA
BIRMINGHAM DIVISION**

TAMMY BROWN, VANESSA BROOKS,)
and EMILY SMITH SANDERS, individually)
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

ALABAMA CARDIOLOGY GROUP, P.C.,)
d/b/a ALABAMA CARDIOVASCULAR)
GROUP,)

Defendant.)

Case No. 01-CV-2024-903135

**DECLARATION OF JONATHAN MANN IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS’
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

I, Jonathan Mann, being competent to testify, make the following declaration based on my personal knowledge and, where stated, upon information and belief. I declare:

I. Counsel Qualifications

1. I am counsel for the Plaintiffs¹ in this Action and have personal knowledge of the facts and matters stated herein.

2. I am a shareholder with the law firm of Pittman, Dutton, Hellums, Bradley & Mann, P.C. (“PDHBM”). My practice includes complex litigation, including class actions, mass torts, and products liability matters. I have litigated complex actions since 2011, with an emphasis on consumer claims and defective products. PDHBM represents plaintiffs in complex litigation,

¹ Capitalized terms not herein defined shall have the meaning ascribed to them in Settlement Agreement, which is attached as *Exhibit A* to Plaintiff’s Unopposed Motion & Memorandum In Support of Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

including class actions, in federal and state courts. While our law firm is located in Birmingham, Alabama, we routinely litigate cases nationwide.

3. I am admitted to practice before all courts of the State of Alabama. I have also been admitted to practice before the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, the United States District Court for District of Massachusetts, the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the United States District Court for the District of Montana, and the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, California.

4. I and other PDHBM lawyers have been appointed to leadership positions in the following class actions and multidistrict litigations (MDLs) over the past ten years, including MDL 2406, *In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litigation* (Local Facilitating Counsel for Subscriber Plaintiffs); MDL 2441, *In re Stryker Rejuvenate and ABG II Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); MDL 2595, *In re Community Health Systems, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Local Liaison Counsel); MDL 2734, *In re Abilify (Aripiprazole) Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re: Arby's Restaurant Group, Inc. Data Security Litigation* (Financial Institution Plaintiffs' Steering

Committee); MDL 2846, *In re Davol, Inc./C.R. Bard, Inc. Polypropylene Hernia Mesh Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); MDL 2875, *In re Valsartan Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); MDL 2885, *In re 3M Combat Arms Earplug Products Liability Litigation* (Common Benefit Fund Committee), MDL 2974, *In re Paragard IUD Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee), *Pirani v. Medical Properties Trust, Inc.*, 2:23-cv-00486 (N.D. Ala.) (Liaison Counsel), and MDL 2885, *In re 3M Combat Arms Earplug Products Liability Litigation* (Settlement Implementation and Administration Committee).

5. I and other PDHBM attorneys have been appointed as settlement class counsel in other data breach cases such as *Sides v. Sheffield*, Circuit Court, Jefferson County, Alabama, Case No. 01-cv-2024-900745, *Williams v. Gulf Coast Pain Consultants, LLC d/b/a Clearway Pain Solutions Institute*, 3:19-cv-01659 (N.D. Fla.), *Limbaugh, et al. v. Norwood Clinic, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Jefferson County, Alabama, Case No. 01-cv-2022-900851, and *Kemp, et al. v. NorthStar Emergency Medical Services, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Case No. 63-cv-2023-900249.00.

6. I am other PDHBM lawyers have either been appointed as settlement class counsel or have been counsel of record in other class actions in the past few years, which have resolved favorably, including *Winsouth Credit Union v. MAPCO Express, Inc. and Delek US Holdings, Inc.*, 3:14-cv-1753 (M.D. Tn.), *Bach Enterprises, Inc. v. Advanced Disposal Services South, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Barbour County, Alabama, Case No. 69-cv-2013-9000090, *In re Arby's Restaurant Group, Inc. Data Security Litigation*, 1:17-cv-514 (N.D. Ga.), MDL 2406, *In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litigation* (Subscriber Plaintiffs), and *Sullen, et al. v. Vivint, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Jefferson County, Alabama, Case No. 01-cv-2023-903893. I am currently putative class counsel

in several pending actions involving data breaches, consumer protection, antitrust, and securities fraud claims.

7. The firms seeking to be named Class Counsel in this matter—PITTMAN, DUTTON, HELLUMS, BRADLEY, & MANN, P.C.; STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC; and SIRI & GLIMSTAD LLP—have extensive experience in class action litigation generally and data breach class action litigation in particular. Firm declarations and/or resumes documenting the experience of proposed Class Counsel are attached hereto as *Composite Exhibit 1*.

II. Initial Investigation and Communications

8. This is a putative class action brought by Plaintiffs Tammy Brown, Vanessa Brooks, and Emily Smith Sanders, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, i.e. Class Members, arising out of a Data Breach of Defendant's computer network on or about July 2, 2024. Defendant's investigation determined that the unauthorized third party that perpetrated the Data Breach had accessed potentially accessed documents containing Plaintiffs' and approximately 280,534 Class Members' PII and/or PHI in the Data Breach. In or around August 2024, Defendant began to notify the Settlement Class of the Data Breach.

9. After receiving notice that their PII/PHI may have been impacted by the Data Breach, Plaintiffs retained the law firms being proposed as Class Counsel.

10. My team and I, along with other Class Counsel firms, vigorously and aggressively gathered all information available regarding Defendant and the Data Breach, including publicly available documents concerning announcements of the Data Breach and notice that was sent to the Settlement Class.

11. Our initial investigation into the facts and circumstances of the Data Breach revealed that it likely involved highly sensitive PII/PHI of the Settlement Class, which was being stored on Defendant's computer network.

III. Procedural Posture

12. As a result of the Data Breach, eight consumer class action cases were filed against Defendant between August 12, 2024, and September 11, 2024.

13. On December 30, 2024, Plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Complaint consolidating the eight previously filed lawsuits arising from the Data Breach into this Action. The Consolidated Complaint asserts claims against Defendant for negligence, negligence *per se*, breach of contract, breach of implied contract, unjust enrichment, and breach of fiduciary duty. The claims of each Plaintiff all involve common questions of law or fact arising from the same Data Breach.

14. Following the Consolidated Complaint's filing, the Parties engaged in formal written discovery and produced documents, and after considerable meet and confer efforts, agreed to mediate the Action.

15. In preparation for the scheduled mediation, the Parties exchanged additional information related to the Action, including the composition of the putative Class. The Parties also laid out their respective positions, including with respect to the merits, class certification, and settlement, in written mediation statements provided to the other Party and the mediator. Additionally, the Parties maintained an open dialogue concerning the contours of a potential agreement in the weeks leading up to the scheduled mediation.

16. On July 10, 2025, the Parties engaged in the scheduled mediation session before respected class action mediator Jill R. Sperber, Esq. of Sperber Dispute Resolution. Ms. Sperber has been involved in the mediation and/or arbitration of more than fifteen hundred disputes,

including cases ranging from general business and personal disputes to complex, high-stakes, and multi-party matters, and had the requisite experience for the mediation of this Action.

17. The mediation session did not result in a settlement. However, the Parties continued to negotiate in good faith over the following days.

18. On July 14, 2025, Ms. Sperber made a mediator's proposal, which the Parties accepted. The Parties then worked at arms' length over the course of numerous additional phone calls and emails to negotiate and finalize all terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

19. The negotiations were hard fought on each side at mediation and beyond, but through the mediation process that assisted the Parties in resolving their outstanding differences, they were able to come to an agreement in principle to settle this Action. The exchange of information through formal discovery and in connection with the mediation and Settlement process allowed the Parties to sufficiently understand the relative strengths and weaknesses of their respective positions when fashioning the proposed Settlement.

20. While the negotiations between Class Counsel and ACG's Counsel were always collegial, cordial, and professional, and there is no doubt that they were adversarial in nature, with both sides forcefully advocating the position of their respective clients.

21. After the Parties reached an agreement in principle on all material terms of substantive relief for the Settlement Class, they began negotiating the amount of attorneys' fees and costs Defendant would agree to pay Class Counsel and the amount of Service Awards Defendant would pay agree to pay the Class Representatives (both subject to Court approval). At all times, the issues of attorneys' fees and costs and Class Representative Service Awards were negotiated separately from the Settlement relief to the Settlement Class. Like the other negotiations, these negotiations were conducted at arm's length.

22. The Parties then began drafting, exchanging, and editing the detailed Settlement Agreement, including its accompanying exhibits, forms of Notices, and Claim Form.

23. The Parties sought bids from multiple claims administrators, and after an extensive bidding process ultimately selected a qualified and cost-effective company, EisnerAmper, to serve as Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator is experienced in class notice and in administration of class action claims generally, and specifically those of the type provided for and made in data breach litigation.

24. The Settlement Agreement resulted from hard fought and adversarial negotiations over a months-long period. The time and effort spent by all Parties to this Action demonstrate the rigor, intensity, and thoroughness of the mediation efforts, as well as the Parties' commitment to working constructively toward a resolution. The proposed Settlement addresses the reasonable objectives of the litigation in this Action.

IV. The Proposed Settlement

Settlement Class

25. Under the terms of the Settlement, the Parties agreed to certification of the following proposed Settlement Class for settlement purposes only:

All individuals residing in the United States whose PHI and/or PII was compromised in the Data Breach discovered by Alabama Cardiology Group in July 2024, including all those individuals who received notice of the breach.

The Settlement Class specifically excludes the following individuals: (1) the Judges presiding over the Action and members of their immediate families and their staff; (2) ACG, its subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which ACG or its parents, have a controlling interest, and its current or former officers and directors; (3) natural persons who

properly execute and submit a Request for Exclusion prior to the expiration of the Opt-Out Period; and (4) the successors or assigns of any such excluded natural person.

26. The Settlement Class consists of approximately 280,534 individuals. All members of the proposed Settlement Class share common claims arising out of the same standardized conduct, i.e. exposure of PII/PHI due to Defendant's alleged data security deficiencies and the Data Breach.

Settlement Benefits

27. The Settlement negotiated on behalf of the Settlement Class will provide direct monetary relief to Class Members. Defendant will fund a \$2,225,000.00 non-reversionary common Settlement Fund to provide each Claimant with (a) either a Documented Loss Payment of up to \$5,000.00, or a flat, *pro rata* Cash Fund Payment calculated in accordance with § 2(i) of the Agreement; and (b) two years of Credit Monitoring and Insurance Services. Additionally, pursuant to the Agreement Defendant has agreed to adopt, continue, and/or implement reasonable data and information security measures, the costs of which will be paid by Defendant separate and apart from the Settlement Fund. The Settlement Fund will also be used to pay Settlement Administrative Expenses, Class Counsel's Fee Award and Costs, Service Awards, and taxes.

28. Pursuant to the Agreement, Class Members may submit claims for Settlement Payments from the Settlement Fund. Specifically, Class Members may submit claims for either (a) a Documented Loss Payment of up to \$5,000.00 for reimbursement in the form of monetary losses incurred by the Class Member and supported by Reasonable Documentation for attempting to remedy or remedying issues that are reasonable traceable to the Data Breach, or (b) a *pro rata* Cash Fund Payment, which shall be calculated by dividing the remaining amount of the Settlement Fund (after payment of Settlement Administrative Expenses and Notice Costs, the amount of

Attorneys' Fees and Costs awarded to Class Counsel and Service Awards to the Class Representatives, payment of taxes, payment of Credit Monitoring and Insurance Services, and payment of claims for Documented Loss Payments) by the number of Approved Claims submitted for Cash Fund Payments. Based on typical claims rates and historical data available from similar cases, we estimate each Claimant will receive approximately \$50.00 for Cash Fund Payments, which amount will be increased or decreased based on the number of claims made.

Release

29. The release in this case is tailored to the claims that have been pleaded or could have been pleaded in this case.

30. Released Claims shall not include the right of any Class Member or any of the Released Parties to enforce the terms of the Settlement contained in the Agreement and shall not include the claims of Class Members who have timely excluded themselves from the Settlement Class.

Notice

31. This settlement will be administered by EisnerAmper, should the Court approve.

32. All costs associated with the Notice Plan will be paid by Defendant from the Settlement Fund.

33. To reach as many potential Class Members as possible, individual Notice shall be provided by direct mail to all Class Members for whom Defendant has a valid address. While only the Summary Notice will be mailed to Class Members, a Long Form Notice will be made available on the Settlement Website. The Notice Date is the date upon which Notice is initially disseminated to the Settlement Class by the Settlement Administrator, which shall be no later than 30 days after entry of the Preliminary Approval Order. Defendant shall provide the Settlement Administrator

with the name, address, email, and other contact information that Defendant has in its possession for each Class Member in advance of the Notice Date.

34. The Notice Plan is designed and intended to reach as many potential Class Members as possible, is the best notice practicable, and is designed to meet all the criteria set forth in Alabama Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c) and the *Manual for Complex Litigation*.

35. As such, the Notice Plan set forth in the Settlement Agreement comports with Alabama Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c) and the United States Constitution and exceeds Due Process requirements.

Claims Process

36. The timing of the Claims Process is structured to ensure that all Class Members have adequate time to receive Notice, to review the terms of the Settlement Agreement and other relevant documents and decide whether they would like to make a claim, opt out or object.

37. Individuals in the Settlement Class who are seeking any Settlement Benefits under the Settlement must submit a Claim Form, submitted online or postmarked, on or before the 90th day after the Notice Date. The 90-day period to submit claims provides ample time for Class Members to decide whether to elect a pro-rata Cash Fund Payment or make a claim for Documented Losses.

Exclusions and Objections

38. Class Members who seek to be excluded from the Settlement Class must submit a request, in writing, postmarked or received, by the Settlement Administrator on or before the Opt-Out Deadline, which shall be 60 following the Notice Date, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Agreement. Requests for exclusion may only be done on an individual basis, and no person may request to be excluded from the Settlement Class through “mass” or “class” opt-outs.

39. The Notice shall describe the procedure for Class Members to object to the Settlement, by submitting written objections to the Settlement Administrator postmarked no later than 60 after the Notice Date. The written objection must include all the required information as provided in section 5 of the Agreement. The notice will set forth the time and place of the Final Approval Hearing and state that any Class Member who does not file a timely and adequate objection in accordance with the Agreement waives the right to object or to be heard at the Final Approval Hearing, and shall be forever barred from making any objection to the Settlement. Any Class Member who does not make their objection in the manner and by the date set forth in Settlement Agreement shall be deemed to have waived any objections and shall be forever barred from raising such objections in this or any other action or proceeding, absent further order of the Court.

Fee Award and Costs to Class Counsel; Service Awards to Class Representatives

40. The Settlement allows Class Counsel to make an application to the Court for an award of reasonable Attorneys' Fees and Costs, to be paid from the Settlement Fund.

41. Class Counsel intends to apply for an Attorneys' Fee Award not to exceed one-third of the total Settlement Fund (or \$741,666.67), subject to Court approval, plus reimbursement of reasonably incurred litigation costs and expenses for this Action, to be paid from the Settlement Fund.

42. Additionally, as provided in the Agreement, Plaintiffs intend to seek Service Awards to the Class Representatives of up to \$5,000.00 each (\$15,000.00 in total for the three Class Representatives), to be paid from the Settlement Fund. The Service Awards are meant to recognize Class Representatives for their efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, including providing information for pleadings, settlement discussions, and discovery responses; engaging

with Class Counsel regarding the litigation; participating in the settlement negotiations via telephone or email; and approving the proposed Settlement terms.

43. The Parties did not discuss payment of an Attorneys' Fee Award and Costs or Class Representative Service Awards until after the substantive terms of the Settlement had been agreed upon.

44. Plaintiffs' support for the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate is not conditioned upon the Court's award of the requested Service Award. The Parties did not discuss or agree upon the amount of the maximum amount of Service Award for which Plaintiffs as Class Representatives could apply until after the substantive terms of the Settlement had been agreed upon.

45. In the event the Court declines to approve, in whole or in part, the payment of the Service Award in the amount requested, the remaining provisions of the Settlement Agreement shall remain in full force and effect. No decision by the Court, or modification or reversal or appeal of any decision by the Court concerning the amount of the Service Award shall constitute grounds for cancellation or termination of the Settlement Agreement.

***Additional Facts Supporting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement
and Certification of the Settlement Class***

46. Plaintiffs' claims are typical to that of the other putative Class Members in that all Class Members entrusted Defendant with their PII/PHI, had that PII/PHI accessed by third parties in the Data Breach, and lost time and/or incurred out-of-pocket losses as a result. Proving liability for each Class Member's claim would require the resolution of the same central factual and legal issues, including whether Defendant's actions harmed its patients and exponentially increased their risk of future harm, and whether that conduct violated the law.

47. Plaintiffs have no conflicts of interest with the other members of the Settlement Class, Plaintiffs had their Private Information allegedly compromised in the same Data Breach as the other Class Members, and Plaintiffs share the Class's interests of maximizing their recovery and preventing future harm. Plaintiffs' pursuit of this Action has demonstrated that they have been, and will remain, zealous advocates for the Settlement Class.

48. In my opinion, I believe the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and provides significant benefits for Plaintiffs and the Class Members.

49. My years of experience representing individuals in complex class actions—including data breach and/or privacy actions—contributed to an awareness of Plaintiffs' settlement leverage, as well as the needs of Plaintiffs and the proposed Settlement Class. I believe that Plaintiffs would ultimately prevail in the litigation on a class-wide basis. However, I am also aware that a successful outcome is uncertain and would be achieved, if at all, only after prolonged, arduous litigation with the attendant risk of drawn-out appeals.

50. While Plaintiffs believe they have a very good likelihood of prevailing on their claims, they are also aware that Defendant has denied their material allegations and asserted several legal defenses, any of which, if successful, would result in the Plaintiffs and the proposed Settlement Class receiving no payment whatsoever. Specifically, Defendant is prepared to argue Plaintiffs have not suffered any actual injury, that no negligence or violation of other state law occurred, and that Plaintiffs would not be able to adversely certify any proposed class. Accordingly, there is significant risk that either Plaintiffs' individual claims will not survive, or else that Plaintiffs will ultimately be unsuccessful in certifying a class of individuals who would be entitled to any award following trial.

51. On the other hand, Defendant's ability to pay if Plaintiffs were to succeed at trial is not guaranteed. With more than 280,000 people in the Settlement Class, even a small award to each by a jury could result in a verdict against Defendant amounting to tens of millions of dollars.

52. Thus, in the absence of settlement, it is certain that the expense, duration, and complexity of the protracted litigation that would result would be substantial. The Parties would have to undergo significant motion practice and discovery before any trial on the merits could even be contemplated. Such motion practice would likely include a motion to dismiss, motions for summary judgment on Plaintiffs' individual claims, as well as briefing on any motion for class certification. Further, given the complexity of the issues and the amount in controversy, the defeated Party would likely appeal both any decision on the merits (at summary judgment and/or trial), as well as any decision on class certification. The Parties would each be required to retain experts. As such, the immediate and considerable relief provided to the Class under the Settlement Agreement weighs heavily in favor of its approval compared to the inherent risk and delay of continued litigation, trial, and appeal

53. Further, a class action is superior to class members bringing individual actions because otherwise, many members of the Settlement Class would remain unaware of their legal claims against Defendant, and most would find the cost of litigating their claims to be prohibitive. It is thus unlikely that individuals would invest the time and expense necessary to seek relief through individual litigation.

54. Given the strength of this Settlement and the significant amount of Settlement Benefits made available for Class Members to claim, Class Counsel and Plaintiffs expect little or no opposition to the Settlement by the Settlement Class. While it is difficult to ascertain the reaction of the Settlement Class to the Settlement prior to notice being disseminated, Plaintiffs

themselves have approved of the Settlement and believe that it is a fair and reasonable settlement in light of the defenses raised by Defendant and the potential risks involved with continued litigation.

55. It is thus my opinion, based on my substantial experience, that the Settlement provides significant relief to the Class Members and warrants the Court's preliminary approval.

56. I believe this Settlement is a positive resolution for the Settlement Class and falls comfortably within the range of reasonableness and represents a fair and reasonable discount from potential recovery. It is also my opinion that the Claim Form, Summary Notice, and Long Form Notice accurately and plainly explains the Settlement Benefits and how to obtain them, offers a clear opportunity for members of the Settlement Class to exclude themselves if they so choose, and provides a mechanism for the Settlement Class to share their opinions about the Settlement with the Court.

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

Executed this 7th day of October, 2025, in Birmingham, Alabama



Jonathan S. Mann (MAN057)
**PITTMAN, DUTTON, HELLUMS,
BRADLEY & MANN, P.C.**
2001 Park Place North, Suite 1100
Birmingham, AL 35203
Tel: (205) 322-8880
Fax: (205) 328-2711
Email: jonm@pittmandutton.com

COMPOSITE EXHIBIT 1



FIRM RÉSUMÉ

Pittman, Dutton, Hellums, Bradley & Mann P.C. (“PDHBM”) attorneys have been representing individuals, consumers, and small businesses in complex civil litigation for over 35 years. Founded in 1986 as a boutique civil litigation trial firm, PDHBM has been named one of the “Most Prolific Trial Law Firms in Alabama,” according to the Alabama Jury Verdict Reporter. PDHBM lawyers have achieved remarkable results and are constantly recognized by national and state organizations, publications, and their peers as among the most successful and experienced courtroom lawyers in the country.

Based in Birmingham, Alabama, PDHBM and its attorneys have litigated cases in every Alabama circuit court, all Alabama federal courts, and routinely represent clients across the country. PDHBM lawyers specialize in complex litigation and possess a wide range of expertise across many different practice areas and case types. PDHBM lawyers have experience successfully handling mass torts, class actions, commercial disputes, catastrophic injury, and wrongful death cases. Additionally, PDHBM lawyers litigate products liability, pharmaceutical drug, medical device, antitrust, data privacy, medical malpractice, insurance fraud, breach of contract, bad faith, securities fraud, and statutory violation-based claims.

PDHBM has recovered over \$1 billion for thousands of individual clients, hundreds of which resulted in verdicts and settlements exceeding \$1 million. PDHBM attorneys have also played critical roles in multidistrict litigations (MDLs) and class actions in which recoveries have exceeded over \$10 billion for consumers and small businesses.

Over the past decade, federal and state judges have trusted PDHBM lawyers and appointed them to various leadership positions in MDLs and class actions, including co-lead counsel, liaison counsel, and plaintiff steering and common benefit committees. PDHBM lawyers have also worked closely with judges, special masters, and third-party vendors in the settlement implementation and administration phase of MDLs and class actions.

PDHBM and its lawyers have consistently been recognized by numerous national organizations, publications and their peers as among the most successful and experienced courtroom lawyers in the country. These include U.S. News Best Law Firms in America, The Best Lawyers in America, SuperLawyers, Top Ranked Law Firms by Martindale-Hubbell, American College of Trial Lawyers, American Board of Trial Advocates, Martindale-Hubbell’s AV Preeminent Peer Review Rated, and Million Dollar Advocates Forum.



**PITTMAN DUTTON
HELLUMS BRADLEY
— & MANN, P.C. —**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

**REPRESENTATIVE LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE IN
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATIONS (MDLs) AND CLASS ACTIONS**

Class Actions

- MDL 2406 *In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litigation* (Local Facilitating Counsel and Plaintiffs' Steering Committee for over 100 million subscriber plaintiffs which resulted in a \$2.67 billion settlement)
- *Sullen, et al. v. Vivint, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Jefferson County, Alabama, Case No. 01-cv-2023-903893.00 (Settlement Class Counsel representing consumers of Fair Credit Reporting Act Violations resulting in a \$9.75 million settlement)
- *Fiyyaz Pirani, Trustee of Imperium Irrevocable Trust v. Medical Properties Trust, Inc.*, 2:23-cv-00486 (N.D. Ala.) (Liaison Counsel for shareholders in a securities fraud class action)
- *In re Municipal Parking Services, Inc. DPPA Litigation*, Case No. 3:24-cv-320-TKW-HTC (N.D. Fla.) (Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel in Drivers Privacy Protection Act case)

Product Liability MDLs

- MDL 2885 *In re 3M Combat Arms Earplug Products Liability Litigation* (Common Benefit Fund Committee)
- MDL 2885 *In re 3M Combat Arms Earplug Products Liability Litigation* (Settlement Implementation and Administration Committee)

Medical Device MDLs

- MDL 2441 *In re Stryker Rejuvenate and ABG II Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)
- MDL 2846 *In re Davol, Inc./C.R. Bard, Inc. Polypropylene Hernia Mesh Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)
- MDL 2974 *In re Paragard IUD Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)

Pharmaceutical Drug MDLs

- MDL 2374 *In re Abilify (Aripirazole) Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)
- MDL 2875 *In re Valsartan Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)
- MDL 3140 *In re Depo-Provera (Depot Medroxyprogesterone Acetate) Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee)
- MDL 3140 *In re Depo-Provera (Depot Medroxyprogesterone Acetate) Products Liability Litigation* (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)



**PITTMAN DUTTON
HELLUMS BRADLEY
— & MANN, P.C. —**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Data Privacy

- *Nadeau, et al. v. Onsite Mammography, LLC d/b/a Onsite Womens Health*, Case No. 3:25-cv-11123-MGM (D. Mass.) (Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel)
- *In re Christie's Data Breach Litigation*, Case No. 23-cv-221-JMF (S.D.N.Y.) (Co-Lead Class Counsel)
- MDL 3126 *In re Snowflake, Inc. Data Security Breach Litigation* (Co-Lead of Financial Institutions Spoke)
- *In re Municipal Parking Services, Inc. DPPA Litigation*, Case No. 3:24-cv-320-TKW-HTC (N.D. Fla.) (Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel in Drivers Privacy Protection Act case)
- MDL 2595 *In re Community Health Systems, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* (Local Liaison Counsel)
- *Lee, et al. v. Baptist Health Centers, LLC*, Circuit Court, Jefferson Cty., Ala., Case No. 01-cv-2023-9004352.00 (Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel)
- *Harrison, et al. v. Peco Foods, Inc.*, Case No. 7:24-cv-1028-LSC (N.D. Ala.) (Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel)
- *Brown, et al. v. Alabama Cardiology Group, P.C.*, Circuit Court, Jefferson Cnty., Ala., Case No. 01-cv-2024-903135 (Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel)
- *Kornegay, et al. v. Heart South Cardiovascular Group, P.C.*, Circuit Court, Bibb Cnty., Ala., Case No. 07-cv-2024-9000089 (Settlement Class Counsel)
- *In re Cardiology Associates Data Breach Litigation*, Circuit Court, Mobile Cty., Ala., Case No. 02-cv-2025-900139.00 (Liaison Counsel)
- *In re Heritage South Credit Union Data Breach Litigation*, Circuit Court, Talladega Cty., Ala., Case No. 61-cv-2025-900175 (Liaison Counsel)
- *Limbaugh, et al. v. Norwood Clinic, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Jefferson County, Alabama, Case No. 01-cv-2022-900851 (Co-Lead Class Counsel representing victims of a data breach which resulted in a \$2.3 million settlement)
- *Kemp, et al. v. NorthStar Emergency Medical Services, Inc.*, Circuit Court, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Case No. 63-cv-2023-900249 (Settlement Class Counsel representing victims of a data breach)
- *Sides, et al. v. Sheffield Group, Inc., et al.*, Circuit Court, Jefferson Cty., Ala., Case No. 01-cv-2024-900745 (Settlement Class Counsel representing victims of a data breach)
- *Hufstetler, et al. v. Upstream Rehabilitation, Inc., et al.*; Circuit Court, Jefferson Cty., Ala., Case No., 01-CV-2024-902563 (Settlement Class Counsel representing victims of a data breach)
- *Williams v. Gulf Coast Pain Consultants*, 3:19-cv-01659 (N.D. Fla.) (Class Counsel representing victims of a data breach)
- *In re Arby's Restaurant Group, Inc. Data Security Litigation*, 1:17-cv-514 (N.D. Ga.) (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)
- *WinSouth Credit Union, individually and on behalf of all similarly situated v. MAPCO Express, Inc. and Delek US Holdings, Inc.* (Class Counsel representing financial institution victims of a data breach)



**PITTMAN DUTTON
HELLUMS BRADLEY
— & MANN, P.C. —**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

- *Mandi Phillips, individually and on behalf of all similarly situated v. MAPCO Express, Inc. and Delek US Holdings, Inc.* (Class Counsel representing individual victims of a data breach)

PDHBM represented or currently represents clients in the following MDLs or class actions:

1. MDL 1985 *In re Total Body Formula Products Liability Litigation* (Co-Lead Counsel; member of Plaintiffs' Executive Committee and Plaintiffs' Steering Committee)
2. *In re NCAA Student-Athlete Name & Likeness Licensing Litigation*
3. MDL 1507 *In re Prempro Product Liability Litigation*
4. MDL 1657 *In re Vioxx Products Liability Litigation*
5. MDL 2000 *In re Yasmin and Yaz (Drospirenone) Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*
6. MDL 2047 *In re Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation*
7. MDL 2087 *In re Hydroxycut Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*
8. MDL 2179 *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010*
9. MDL 2187 *In re C.R. Bard, Inc., Pelvic Repair System Products Liability Litigation*
10. MDL 2197 *In re DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., ASR Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*
11. MDL 2240 *In re Cook Medical, Inc., Pelvic Repair System Products Liability Litigation*
12. MDL 2243 *In re Fosamax (Alendronate Sodium) Products Liability Litigation (No. II)*
13. MDL 2244 *In re DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc., Pinnacle Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*
14. MDL 2299 *In re Actos (Pioglitazone) Products Liability Litigation*
15. MDL 2385 *In re Pradaxa (Dabigatran Etxilate) Products Liability Litigation*
16. MDL 2387 *In re Coloplast Corp. Pelvic Support Systems Products Liability Litigation*
17. MDL 2391 *In re Biomet M2a Magnum Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*
18. MDL 2406 *In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litigation*
19. MDL 2592 *In re Xarelto (Rivaroxaban) Products Liability Litigation*
20. MDL 2641 *In re Bard IVC Filters Products Liability Litigation*
21. MDL 2666 *In re Bair Hugger Forced Air Warming Devices Products Liability Litigation*
22. MDL 2740 *In re Taxotere (Docetaxel) Products Liability Litigation*
23. MDL 2753 *In re Atrium Medical Corp. C-Qur Mesh Products Liability Litigation*
24. MDL 2768 *In re Stryker LFIT V40 Femoral Head Products Liability Litigation*
25. MDL 2775 *In re Smith & Nephew Birmingham Hip Resurfacing (BHR) Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*
26. MDL 2782 *In re Ethicon Physiomesh Flexible Composite Hernia Mesh Products Liability Litigation*
27. MDL 2862 *In re Diisocyanates Antitrust Litigation*
28. MDL 2867 *In re Local TV Advertising Antitrust Litigation*
29. MDL 2949 *In re Profemur Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*
30. MDL 3044 *In re Exactech Polyethylene Orthopedic Products Liability Litigation*
31. MDL 3108 *In re Change Healthcare, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*



PITTMAN DUTTON
HELLUMS BRADLEY
— & MANN, P.C. —

32. MDL 3125 *In re AngioDynamics, Inc., and Navilyst Medical, Inc. Port Catheter Products Liability Litigation*
33. MDL 3126 *In re Snowflake, Inc. Data Security Breach Litigation*
34. MDL 3140 *In re Depo-Provera (Depot Medroxyprogesterone Acetate) Products Liability Litigation*



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.

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.

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 settled on a class-wide basis in 2025, and preliminary approval was granted in The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota in May 2025.

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. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2023, and final approval was granted in June 2024.

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 settled on a class-wide basis in 2023, and final approval was granted in March 2024.

DATA PRIVACY

Doe, et al. v. HSCGP, LLC (Tn. Cir. Ct., Davidson Cty.)

Litigated on behalf of all patients of healthcare companies serviced by HSCGP, LLC whose sensitive personal information was exposed to third parties without their knowledge or consent. Plaintiff alleged that the healthcare companies serviced by HSCGP, LLC disclosed such sensitive personal information by using various tools on its website. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2024. Final approval was granted in March 2025.

Doe v. Lima Memorial Hospital, et al. (C.C.P. Allen)

Filed on behalf of all patients of Lima Memorial Hospital whose sensitive personal information was exposed to third parties without their knowledge or consent. Plaintiff alleged that Lima Memorial Hospital disclosed such sensitive personal information by using various tools on its website. The case was litigated in the Court of Common Pleas in Allen County, Ohio and settled on a class-wide basis in 2024. Final approval was granted in August 2024.

Rogers v. Rogers Behavioral Health System, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Dane Cty.)

Filed on behalf of all patients of Rogers Behavioral Health System whose sensitive personal information was exposed to third parties without their knowledge or consent. Plaintiff alleged that Rogers Behavioral Health System disclosed such sensitive personal information by using various tools on its website. The case was litigated in the Circuit Court for Dane County, Wisconsin, and settled on a class-wide basis in 2024. Final approval was granted in August 2024.

Doe, et al. v. The Wood County Hospital, et al. (C.C.P. Sandusky)

Filed on behalf of all patients of The Wood County Hospital whose sensitive personal information was exposed to third parties without their knowledge or consent. Plaintiffs alleged that The Wood County Hospital disclosed such sensitive personal information by using various tools on its website. The case was litigated in the Court of Common Pleas in Sandusky County, Ohio, and settled on a class-wide basis in 2024.

Moser, et al. v. Redeemer Health, et al. (C.C.P. Phila.)

Filed on behalf of all patients of Redeemer Health and Holy Redeemer Health System whose sensitive personal information was exposed to third parties without their knowledge or consent. Plaintiffs allege that Redeemer Health and Holy Redeemer Health System disclosed such sensitive personal information by using various tools on its website. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2025, and preliminary approval is pending in the Court of Common Pleas in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mrozinski, et al. v. Aspirus, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Marathon Cty.)

Filed on behalf of all patients of Aspirus whose sensitive personal information was exposed to third parties without their knowledge or consent. Plaintiffs allege that Aspirus disclosed such sensitive personal information by using various tools on its website. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2025, and preliminary approval was granted in the Circuit Court for Marathon County, Wisconsin in August 2025.

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 settled in 2023.

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.

RIGHT OF PUBLICITY

Nolen 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 currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

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.

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.

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. This case settled in 2024.

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](https://www.insideview.com), without their consent. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2024, and preliminary approval was granted in June 2025.

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.

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 settled on a class-wide basis in 2024 for \$21,875,000, and final approval was granted in September 2024.

Our Professionals

SAMUEL J. STRAUSS

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

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

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

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

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

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

RAINA C. BORRELLI

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CASSANDRA MILLER

Cassandra Miller is a partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including consumer protection, privacy, data breaches, and product liability. Ms. Miller is adept at navigating the intricate legal landscapes of both state and federal courts across the nation. Additionally, Ms. 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 Lattner & 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.)

Siri | Glimstad

FIRM RESUME

Class Action Practice Group

With attorneys across the country, Siri & Glimstad LLP represents clients from coast to coast in class actions and mass torts in state and federal courts. Utilizing decades of experience at major global law firms, we tackle each dispute with a sophisticated, strategic approach, and we fight hard for every one of our clients.

Offices Nationwide

NEW YORK

745 Fifth Ave • Suite 500
New York, NY 10151

PHOENIX

11201 N. Tatum Boulevard • Ste 300
Phoenix, AZ 85028

WASHINGTON D.C.

1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20007

AUSTIN

1005 Congress Avenue • Ste 925-C36
Austin, TX 78701

MIAMI

20200 West Dixie Highway • Ste 902
Aventura, FL 33180

DETROIT

220 West Congress Street • 2nd Floor
Detroit, MI 48226

LOS ANGELES

700 S Flower Street • Ste 1000
Los Angeles, CA 90017

CHARLOTTE

525 North Tryon Street • Ste 1600
Charlotte, NC 28202

1-888-SIRI-LAW (747-4529)

Admitted States

Alabama • Arizona • California • Colorado • Connecticut • District of Columbia • Florida
Idaho • Illinois • Kentucky • Maryland • Massachusetts • Michigan • Mississippi • New Jersey
New York • North Carolina • Oklahoma • Oregon • Pennsylvania • South Carolina • Tennessee
Texas • Virginia

Attorney Profiles

Aaron Siri

Managing Partner

Aaron Siri is the Managing Partner of Siri & Glimstad LLP and has extensive experience in a wide range of complex civil litigation matters, with a focus on civil rights, class actions, and commercial litigation.

Mr. Siri has successfully litigated numerous civil rights cases, prosecuted class actions against large corporations resulting in payments to hundreds of thousands of Americans, and has acted as counsel to clients in multiple commercial disputes exceeding one billion dollars, including regarding Oracle Team's challenge for the America's Cup and the collapse of the World Trade Center.



Prior to founding Siri & Glimstad, Mr. Siri was a litigation attorney at Latham & Watkins for over five years. Before Latham, Mr. Siri clerked for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Israel from 2004-2005 where he advised the Chief Justice of relevant American, English (including Commonwealth Countries), and International Law precedents for cases of first impression.

Mr. Siri has also been involved in various pro-bono matters, including representation of asylum applicants, housing discrimination victims, and non-profit organizations in tenant-landlord disputes, as well as being chosen as a Frank C. Newman delegate to present a paper he authored before the United Nations Human Rights Sub-Commission.

Mr. Siri earned his law degree at the University of California, Berkeley School of Law where he received four Prosser Prizes and ten High Honors. He was also the Editor-in-Chief and founder of the Berkeley Business Law Journal, which he developed into a nationally recognized publication, and was ranked as the leading commercial law journal in the country.

Prior to law school, Mr. Siri was an auditor at Arthur Andersen LLP, where he examined internal controls and audited corporate documents for private and public micro-cap technology companies. Mr. Siri is a Certified Public Accountant and an attorney admitted in federal and state courts across the country.

Mr. Siri is regularly interviewed on national television for his expertise regarding certain legal issues. He has also been published in the Washington Post, Stat News, and Bloomberg.

Mason A. Barney

Senior Partner

Mason A. Barney is an experienced trial attorney who for nineteen years has represented both individuals and corporations in complex litigations. Mr. Barney received his J.D., *summa cum laude* from Brooklyn Law School, in 2005, where he graduated second in his class of nearly 500 students, and received numerous academic honors, in addition to being an editor on the Brooklyn Law Review. He then served as a law clerk to the Honorable Judge David G. Trager in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. After clerking, he joined the litigation department at Latham & Watkins LLP, and later joined Olshan Frome Wolosky LLP a large established New York City law firm. Before law school, Mr. Barney earned his B.A. from Bowdoin College, where he double majored in Computer Science and Studio Art, and after college he served as a lead database developer for three years at a successful Internet start-up in Washington D.C.



Mr. Barney focuses his practice on class actions and representing individuals in complex litigations. In this practice he has won tens of millions of dollars for his clients. Among other matters, Mr. Barney has fought to stop companies from illegally spamming consumers with unwanted phone calls, has worked to stop companies from illegally obtaining their customers' biometric information (e.g., facial scans and fingerprints), and obtained recovery for numerous victims of data breaches. Mr. Barney has also served as counsel of record for numerous lawsuits involving alleged violations of the Illinois Genetic Information Privacy Act, successfully opposing dispositive motions and defeating improperly raised affirmative defenses.

Mr. Barney is recognized by the New York Legal Aid Society for his outstanding pro bono work representing indigent individuals in matters concerning prisoners' rights, immigration, and special education.

Mr. Barney has published a number of articles concerning a variety of legal issues. These include authoring or co-authoring: *The FBI vs. Apple: What Does the Law Actually Say?*, Inc. Magazine (February 2016); *Can Lawyers Be Compelled to Produce Data They Compile? An Emerging Front in the Trenches of e-Discovery Battles*, Bloomberg BNA (May 2015); *Legal Landscape for Cybersecurity Risk is Changing as Federal Government and SEC Take Action*, Inside Counsel Magazine (May 2015); *Tellabs v. Makor, One Year Later*, Securities Law 360 (July 2008); *Not as Bad as We Thought: The Legacy of Geier v. American Honda Motor Co. in Product Liability Actions*, 70 Brooklyn L. Rev. 949 (Spring 2005). Mr. Barney serves as an adjunct professor at Brooklyn College in New York, teaching Education Law in its graduate studies program, and separately has presented continuing legal education instruction regarding the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Elizabeth Brehm

Senior Partner

Elizabeth Brehm graduated from Boston University with a Bachelor of Science and earned her master's degree from Long Island University at C.W. Post. She attended Hofstra Law School and obtained a Juris Doctorate, graduating *magna cum laude*, in 2008.

After law school, Ms. Brehm spent a year at Winston & Strawn LLP where she focused on products liability litigation. For nine years prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Ms. Brehm worked for a New York law firm where she focused on antitrust class action lawsuits, health care fraud, and qui tam and whistleblower litigations.


Ms. Brehm has been an attorney at Siri & Glimstad for over two years and has handled numerous complex litigation matters, including class action matters.



Walker Moller

Partner

Before law school, Walker Moller worked and volunteered for three years in 15 countries throughout Southeast Asia, Oceania, and Africa. While at Mississippi College School of Law, Walker clerked at the Mississippi Supreme Court and was on the Law Review. He graduated *summa cum laude* in 2014 and earned the highest grade in eight courses. After graduation, Walker clerked for a federal judge at the United States District Court, Western District of Louisiana, where he gained exposure to a large volume of employment discrimination matters, products liability cases, and constitutional litigation.



Walker then worked for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from 2015 to 2021, where his practice focused on federal contracts and civil litigation in various administrative courts. Immediately before joining Siri & Glimstad, Walker achieved full dismissal of a lawsuit against the Corps of Engineers that implicated \$68M worth of federal contracts.

Tyler J. Bean

Partner

Tyler J. Bean graduated from the University of Oklahoma's Michael F. Price College of Business in 2015 and obtained a Juris Doctorate from the University of Oklahoma in 2019, where he served as editor for the Oil and Gas, Natural Resources, and Energy Law Review Journal. Mr. Bean also received numerous academic honors as a law student, including being named to the Faculty Honor Roll and Dean's List.



After graduating law school and serving as in-house counsel for a large, multi-billion-dollar retail organization, Mr. Bean turned his focus to complex civil litigation and consumer class actions, with a particular emphasis on data breach and privacy matters. He has years of experience as a data breach and privacy lawyer, having played a significant role as class counsel in successfully litigating numerous data breach and privacy class actions from inception through discovery and court approved settlements, recovering millions of dollars for hundreds of thousands of consumers, patients, students, and employees across the country who have been victims of negligent data security and privacy practices.

William M. Sweetnam

Partner

William M. Sweetnam practices in the areas of class action and complex litigation and appeals. He has prosecuted hundreds of class actions in federal and state courts across the country, including matters in which he was appointed lead counsel or co-lead counsel. His primary focus is on consumer protection and privacy matters, including class actions brought under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act (FACTA), the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA), the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (BIPA), the Illinois Genetic Information Privacy Act (GIPA) as well as cases brought under various state consumer fraud and deceptive business practices acts and federal securities and antitrust laws.



Mr. Sweetnam has been counsel of record in class action lawsuits resulting in recoveries totaling more than \$20 billion. Some notable examples include:

Stewart, et al. v. LexisNexis Risk Data Retrieval Services, LLC. Mr. Sweetnam was class counsel in this Fair Credit Reporting Act class action which resulted in a \$21.5 million settlement on behalf of 23,000 consumers about whom LexisNexis was alleged to have reported inaccurate civil judgment and lien information in violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

Kelly v. Old National Bank. Mr. Sweetnam obtained class certification and was appointed lead counsel for the class in this consumer fraud bank overdraft fee class action, ultimately resulting in an all-cash settlement of \$4.9 million, representing more than 90% of the class' damages.

Levey, et al. v. Concesionaria Vuela Compañía de Aviación, S.A.P.I. de C.V. Mr. Sweetnam was class counsel in this consumer fraud class action against Mexican airline Volaris alleging its failure to issue refunds to more than 23,000 passengers whose flights were canceled during the early phases of the Covid-19 pandemic. Although numerous other similar cases were filed against other airlines, Mr. Sweetnam obtained the only all-cash settlement, totaling \$3.5 million.

Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Mr. Sweetnam was the managing partner of a Chicago class action litigation boutique and a partner or counsel to other nationally recognized class action firms. He received his B.A. from the University of Michigan and his JD from De Paul University College of Law.

Kent. M. Williams

Attorney

Kent M. Williams has over 30 years of experience representing large classes of consumers, employees, and small businesses in antitrust, wage and hour, consumer fraud, data breach, privacy, employment discrimination, securities fraud, trespass, and product liability lawsuits.

Mr. Williams received his J.D. magna cum laude with legal writing honors from the University of Minnesota in 1991, where he was published in the University of Minnesota Law Review and competed against other law schools as a member of Minnesota's Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition Team.



After a summer internship with Jenner & Block in Chicago, Mr. Williams decided to remain in the Twin Cities, where he joined Dorsey & Whitney, one of the largest firms in the Midwest. After a few months, Mr. Williams yearned for more "hands on" experience, so he moved to Opperman Heins & Paquin (now known as Lockridge Grindal Nauen PLLP), a class action boutique where he was responsible for a variety of class and non-class matters. One of his most memorable experiences at OHP was coordinating the successful defense of the late Dr. John S. Najarian, a renowned surgeon who was accused by the Food and Drug Administration of illegally marketing and selling Minnesota antilymphocyte globulin ("MALG"), an anti-rejection drug that Dr. Najarian had developed into what became the immunosuppressive "gold standard" for transplant surgery.

In 1994, Mr. Williams and four other attorneys formed a new class action firm, Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C. His practice expanded to include class actions against major manufacturers of infant formula, industrial diamonds, hearing aids, polybutylene pipe, synthetic stucco, and other products. He advocated fiercely for consumers in antitrust cases, winning one of the first-ever contested indirect purchaser class certifications in the country, as well as an appellate court victory in North Carolina that established a private right of action for indirect purchasers in that state. Mr. Williams also represented landowners in class actions alleging trespass against railroads and telecommunications companies for burying fiber optic cable on private property without permission.

A firm believer that “variety is the spice of life,” in the mid-2000s, Mr. Williams decided to open a solo practice that allowed him to branch out into other areas of the law, while continuing to represent plaintiffs in class actions and other complex commercial matters. Over the next twenty years, Mr. Williams successfully handled a diversity of probate, family law, land-use, administrative law, criminal law, and employment law matters. During that same time period, he served as trial and/or lead counsel in a number of behemoth class actions brought against Big Pharma, Microsoft, and other large corporations. Mr. Williams is recognized as one of the first lawyers in the country to wage mass arbitration “guerilla warfare” (in the words of one legal commentator) by bringing hundreds of individual wage-and-hour arbitrations against a large, well-known restaurant chain.


More recently, Mr. Williams has expanded his practice to include consumer privacy litigation. He manages the Firm’s genetic and biogenetic information privacy litigation group, and he serves as class counsel in a number of privacy cases, including one brought against a well-known online healthcare company. At the same time, Mr. Williams continues to advocate for consumers victimized by price-fixing, monopolization, securities fraud, financial fraud, and other unlawful schemes.

Oren Faircloth

Attorney

Oren Faircloth graduated from McGill University in 2009 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science. Before attending law school, he served in the armed forces from 2010 to 2011. Mr. Faircloth graduated from Quinnipiac University School of Law, *magna cum laude*, in 2016.

Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Mr. Faircloth worked for a boutique law firm where he spearheaded ERISA class action lawsuits against Fortune 500 companies, including: Huntington Ingalls, Rockwell Automation,



Raytheon, UPS, U.S. Bancorp, Delta Air Lines, and Sprint. Mr. Faircloth was involved in the prosecution of numerous successful class actions in which over \$100 million dollars have been

recovered for tens of thousands of employees around the country. In 2022, Mr. Faircloth was recognized by Super Lawyers magazine as a Rising Star in the field of class action.

Mr. Faircloth focuses his practice on class actions and representing individuals in complex litigations. He presently represents individuals who have been denied reimbursement for work-related expenses from their employers, denied sufficient lactation accommodations in the workplace, and denied actuarially equivalent pension benefits. Mr. Faircloth has also represented several individuals on a pro bono basis, negotiating favorable settlements for violations of their constitutional rights.

Wendy Cox

Attorney

Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Ms. Cox served for 21 years in the United States Army as an Army Nurse Corps officer and as an Army Judge Advocate. As a nurse corps officer, Ms. Cox worked in several clinical settings to include a pediatric unit, a specialty surgical unit, and an orthopedic surgical unit. During her last year as an Army Nurse Corps officer, she taught Army medics in basic life-saving skills before being selected by the Army to attend law school. After graduating law school in 2005, Ms. Cox prosecuted soldiers, advised on operational law issues, taught Constitutional Law at West Point, and advised senior leaders on a variety of legal issues. Following her retirement from the United States Army in 2018, she went on to continue serving soldiers as an attorney for the Office of Soldiers' Counsel.



Wendy Cox graduated *cum laude* from the State University at Buffalo Law School in New York and *summa cum laude* from Norwich University with a Bachelor of Science in Nursing. She went on to get her Master of Laws (L.L.M.) degree in Military Law in 2008.

Catherine Cline

Attorney

Catherine Cline has extensive experience in a wide range of civil law, including constitutional, administrative, employment, and election law. Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Ms. Cline served as a judicial law clerk for judges in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania, and the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.



Ms. Cline attended law school on a full tuition scholarship, during which time she served as the Editor-in-Chief of the law review and as intern for a U.S. District Court Judge in the Middle District of Florida. Before attending law school, Ms. Cline received her Bachelor of Arts in Economics with a Minor in Business and the Liberal Arts

from Penn State University and worked in the Tax Credit Division of the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development.

Dana Smith

Attorney

Dana Smith is a seasoned litigator. Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Ms. Smith focused most of her legal career on personal injury litigation, including representing individuals harmed due to corporate negligence. Ms. Smith is also experienced in various domestic areas of practice, including divorce, high-conflict custody disputes, and child welfare law.

Ms. Smith graduated *cum laude* from the North Carolina Central University School of Law. Additionally, she received her Bachelor of Arts in Romance Languages from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.



Sonal Jain

Attorney

Sonal Jain has experience in complex commercial litigations as well as class actions. Ms. Jain graduated from the New York University School of Law with an LLM in International Business Regulation, Litigation and Arbitration in 2020 where she gained experience with international dispute resolution. She received her first degree in law (B.A. LL.B.) from ILS Law College, Pune, a prime legal education institution in India. Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Ms. Jain held various internships with top-tier law firms in India where she specialized in complex dispute resolution ranging from consumer and corporate litigation to domestic arbitrations.



Jack Spitz

Attorney

Jack R. Spitz is a graduate of Rutgers School of Law where he was a member of the Rutgers Law Record Journal and interned with the Essex County Public Defender's Office. Following law school, he served as Law Clerk for two judges at the Middlesex County Superior Court in New Brunswick, New Jersey. Subsequently, Mr. Spitz defended a wide variety of personal injury and property damage matters, as well as represented Plaintiffs in employment litigation matters. Prior to law school, Mr. Spitz graduated from Clemson University in South Carolina.



Gabrielle Williams

Attorney

Ms. Williams obtained her J.D. from the University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law. During her time in law school, she represented clients in state court through the Justice for Victims of Crime Clinical Law Program. She also served as an Associate Editor on the Journal of Healthcare Law and Policy, Executive Board Member of the Black Law Students Association, and Class Representative for the Student Bar Association. Prior to joining Siri and Glimstad, Ms. Williams served as a Judicial Law Clerk on the Appellate Court of Maryland.



Neil Williams

Attorney

With a robust background in data breach litigation, Mr. Williams is a seasoned legal professional dedicated to protecting the interests of clients in the digital age. Leveraging his extensive experience in cybersecurity law and privacy regulations, he has successfully represented numerous individuals in complex data breach cases. Mr. Williams meticulously navigates the intricate legal landscape surrounding data breaches, providing strategic counsel and vigorous advocacy to achieve favorable outcomes for his clients.



Mr. Williams received his J.D. from Charleston School of Law, where he was awarded CALI Awards on two occasions for the top grade in his class. He also worked alongside several South Carolina Pro Bono Services to ensure that competent legal representation was reaching the most at need populations in the area. Mr. Williams received his undergraduate degree from the University of South Carolina.

Sonjay Singh

Attorney

Sonjay Singh is a seasoned litigator with broad experience in data privacy matters.

Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Mr. Singh worked with prominent plaintiffs' firms in the District of Columbia and Pennsylvania, where he brought claims for individuals affected by data privacy violations, predatory lending, defective products, false advertising, institutional abuse, and other corporate misconduct. Mr. Singh has also practiced as a trial lawyer,



pursuing personal injury, medical malpractice, defective premises, and other tort cases on behalf of his clients.

Mr. Singh graduated from Temple University's Beasley School of Law with both his J.D. and a certificate in Trial Advocacy and Litigation. During his time in law school, he was active on campus, and served as Vice President of the Student Bar Association. Mr. Singh also competed on Temple's highly-ranked Trial Team, winning the Inter-American Invitational at the University of Puerto Rico among other honors. For his dedication to plaintiffs' representation, Mr. Singh was named the Eisenberg Scholar, a scholarship given yearly to the outstanding student in civil litigation, and received the Trial Program Award for excellence in trial advocacy. Upon graduating, Mr. Singh was inducted into the Rubin Public Interest Society for his commitment to public service.

Mr. Singh is active in the legal community, and served as the 2022-23 Communications Chair for the MSBA Young Lawyers Division. Before starting his legal career, Mr. Singh co-founded a DEI hiring and recruiting startup, and was elected to serve as Democratic Committeeperson for the Townships of Marple and Newtown, PA.

Jordan Underhill

Attorney

Prior to joining Siri & Glimstad, Jordan Underhill worked as an Assistant Attorney General for the Texas Office of Attorney General. While at the Texas OAG, he prosecuted multi-million-dollar civil fraud cases against pharmaceutical companies, hospital systems, and other entities accused of misappropriating taxpayer funds.

Mr. Underhill also worked for many years at a nonprofit organization where he provided free legal representation to low-income individuals. His work there covered a wide range of civil litigation, including housing/property law, family law, employment law, and criminal record sealing.

Mr. Underhill obtained his J.D. from the University of Colorado–Boulder, where he served as a student note editor for the Colorado Technology Law Journal and volunteered for the Colorado Innocence Project.

At Siri & Glimstad, he focuses on class actions involving data privacy issues.



Notable Class Actions Handled By Siri & Glimstad LLP

Buchanan v. Sirius XM Radio, Inc.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00728 (N.D. Tex.)

Appointed co-lead class counsel in a case alleging violations of the TCPA, which resulted in a settlement of \$25,000,000, plus free satellite radio service, to a class of 14.4 million members.

Thomas v. Dun & Bradstreet Credibility Corp.

Case No. 15-cv-3194 (S.D. Cal.)

Appointed co-lead class counsel in a case alleging violations of the TCPA which resulted in a settlement of \$10,500,000.

Gatto v. Sentry Services, Inc., et al.

Case No. 13 CIV 05721 (S.D. N.Y.)

Appointed co-lead class counsel in a case involving ERISA claims relating to an ESOP which resulted in a settlement of \$11,138,938.

Kindle v. Dejana

Case No. 14-cv-06784 (E.D. N.Y.)

Appointed co-lead trial counsel for plaintiffs in an ERISA matter filed as a class action involving breaches of fiduciary duty related to the management and termination of an ESOP, which settled after the beginning of trial for \$1,080,000 for the class.

MacNaughton v. Young Living Essential Oils, LC,

67 F.4th 89 (2d Cir. 2023)

Successfully reversed motion to dismiss, creating a significant precedent regarding the definition of “puffery” in N.Y. false advertising cases.

MacNaughton v. Young Living Essential Oils, LC,

Case No. 24LA0329 (Cir. Ct. Ill.)

Received final approval of settlement in false advertising class action valued at \$10,000,000.

Carter, et al. v. Vivendi Ticketing US LLC d/b/a See Tickets

Case No. 8:22-cv-01981 (C.D. Cal.)

Final approval granted, appointing firm as sole class counsel, in a data breach class action settlement involving 437,310 class members and a \$3,000,000 non-reversionary settlement fund.

Medina v. Albertsons Companies, Inc.

Case No. 1:23-cv-00480 (D. Del.)

Obtained final approval of a class settlement involving 33,000 class members and a \$750,000 non-reversionary settlement fund.

In re Sovos Compliance Data Security Incident Litigation

Case No. 1:23-cv-12100-AK (D. Mass.)

Obtained final approval of a class settlement that includes a non-reversionary settlement fund of \$3,534,128.50 involving 490,000 individuals, and separate from the settlement fund, requires the defendant to pay for data security improvements.

Owens v. US Radiology Specialists, Inc.,

Case No. 22 CVS 17797 (N.C. Super. Ct.)

Received final approval for settlement in data breach involving 1,309,429 customer's private health information, creating non-reversionary settlement fund of \$5,050,000 to compensate class members.

In re: Planet Home Lending, LLC Data Breach

Case No. 3:24-cv-127 (D. Conn.)

Final approval granted for data breach settlement affecting 285,000 individuals, which will create a non-reversionary settlement fund valued at \$ 2,425,000.

In re: Vivendi Ticketing US LLC, d/b/a See Tickets Data Security Incident

Case No. 2:23-cv-07498 (C.D. Cal.)

Final approval of settlement in second data breach affecting 323,498 individuals, where the settlement agreement calls for the creation of a non-reversionary settlement fund in the amount of \$3,250,000.

Fortra File Transfer Software Data Security Breach Litigation

Case No. 24-MD-03090-RAR (S.D. Fl.)

Appointed to leadership team in nationwide multi-district litigation concerning data breach affecting more than 4,000,000 individuals' personal and health information.

In re UNITE HERE Data Security Incident Litigation

Case No. 1:24-cv-01565-JSR (S.D.N.Y.)

Obtained final approval of data breach settlement affecting roughly 790,000 individuals, creating a non-reversionary settlement fund of \$6,000,000 to compensate class members.