

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

CARLA PLOWMAN, on behalf of herself and all
others similarly situated

Plaintiff,

v.

TY INC.

Defendant,

2024 CH 000205

Case Number

File Stamp Here

EXHIBIT COVER SHEET

Local Court Rules 5.06 and 5.09

EXHIBIT NAME: Ex. A - Declaration of Cassandra P. Miller in Support of Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion
for Attorney Fees and Service Award

TITLE OF DOCUMENT THIS EXHIBIT BELONGS WITH:

Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Attorney Fees and Service Award

Document File Date: 5/2/2025

(The file date of the document this exhibit belongs with)

EXHIBIT FILED ON BEHALF OF: Plaintiff CARLA PLOWMAN

(Case Party Name)

Submitted by: Cassandra Miller

Name: Cassandra Miller ☐ Pro Se

DuPage Attorney Number: 382570

Attorney for: Plaintiff CARLA PLOWMAN

Address: 980 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1610

City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60611

Telephone Number: (872) 263-1100

Email: cmiller@straussborrelli.com

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

CARLA PLOWMAN, on behalf of herself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

TY INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2024 CH 000205

**DECLARATION OF CASSANDRA P. MILLER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES AND SERVICE AWARD**

I, Cassandra P. Miller, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am a partner at Strauss Borrelli PLLC, counsel of record for Plaintiff Carla Plowman. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration. I am submitting this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

2. Prior to filing suit, Proposed Settlement Class Counsel conducted extensive investigations into the Security Incident. Proposed Settlement Class Counsel had to understand Defendant Ty Inc.'s ("Defendant") business and its relationship with its current and former employees. Plaintiff's counsel next had to investigate Defendant's response to the Security Incident and whether it was sufficiently thorough. Plaintiff's counsel examined sample data breach notices and related information that Defendant submitted to the various governmental entities. Plaintiff's counsel analyzed these notices to determine the extent to which they complied with state mandated notice requirements.

3. Recognizing the benefits of early resolution, the parties began settlement discussions in early May 2024. Thereafter, the Parties exchanged numerous settlement proposals, and, in the coming months, the Parties were able to reach an agreement on all the principal terms of settlement for this matter.

4. After reaching an accord on the principal terms of their settlement, the Parties continued negotiating the finer points of the Settlement Agreement, diligently drafting and finalizing the Settlement, Notice, and Claim Forms, and drafting the motion for preliminary approval for presentment to the Court. All negotiations were always collegial, cordial, and professional—but there is no doubt that they were adversarial in nature, with both parties forcefully advocating the position of their respective clients.

5. The Parties did not discuss the payment of attorneys' fees, costs, expenses and/or service award with Plaintiff until after the substantive terms of the Settlement had been agreed upon, other than that Defendant would pay reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and a service award to Class Representative as may be agreed to by Defendant and Class Counsel and as ordered by the Court, or, in the event of no agreement, as ordered by the Court. The Service Award is meant to compensate Plaintiff for her efforts in this Litigation, including maintaining contact with counsel, assisting in the investigation of the case, reviewing pleadings, remaining available for consultation throughout the mediations, answering counsel's many questions, and reviewing the Settlement Agreement.

6. The Settlement Agreement was executed by all Parties between November 25, 2024 and November 27, 2024.

7. Settlement Class Counsel have extensive experience in consumer class actions generally, data privacy, and cybersecurity incident cases in particular, and are leaders in the field.

They have been appointed sole lead in dozens of data breach cases and have successfully litigated and settled similar cases across the country against law firms of national prominence. The Resume of Settlement Class Counsel is attached hereto as **Exhibit 1**. Similarly, Ty Inc. was defended by highly skilled and experienced counsel, which further evidences the effectiveness of Settlement Class Counsel.

8. Settlement Class Counsel advises that the Plaintiff/Class Representative approves of Settlement Class Counsel's fee request.

9. The Settlement Class includes approximately 2,797 individuals. The Settlement provides for several different types of monetary relief that Settlement Class members can elect to participate in.

10. This Settlement proposes significant, effective Class member relief, including; (a) up to \$5,000 for Documented Out-of-Pocket Losses relating to fraud or identity theft; professional fees including attorneys' fees, accountants' fees, and fees for credit repair services; costs associated with freezing or unfreezing credit with any credit reporting agency; credit monitoring costs that were incurred after April 26, 2023 through the Claims Deadline; and miscellaneous expenses such as notary, fax, postage, copying, mileage, and long-distance telephone charges, (2) reimbursement for up to four (4) hours of lost time spent dealing with the Security Incident, at \$20 per hour (for a total of \$80, subject to the \$5,000 Out-of-Pocket Loss cap), and (3) two (2) years of credit monitoring services to include credit monitoring through one national reporting bureau provided through CyEx with \$1,000,000 in identity theft protection insurance. Defendant also implemented security enhancements since the Security Incident and the cost of such enhancements are paid by Defendant separate and apart from all other settlement benefits. These enhancements benefit all future employees of Defendant.

11. Defendant will pay for the Notice and Administrative Expenses, which will be paid separately from costs associated with providing the Settlement.

12. Settlement Class Counsel's billing records have been reviewed for duplicative work, and to ensure appropriate tasks were delegated to paralegals or support staff.

13. To date, Settlement Class Counsel have expended 89.60 hours litigating this case, incurring a lodestar of \$55,344.00 at their customary rates, and reasonably expect to incur additional hours throughout the final approval process and in administering the settlement. Settlement Class Counsel's billing records have been reviewed for duplicative work, and to ensure appropriate tasks were delegated to paralegals or support staff.

<u>Biller</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Hourly Rate</u>	<u>Time Spent</u>	<u>Lodestar</u>
Strauss Borrelli PLLC				
Raina C. Borrelli	Managing Partner	\$700.00	23.70	16,590.00
Sam J. Strauss	Managing Partner	\$700.00	18.10	12,670.00
Cassandra P. Miller	Partner	\$700.00	16.30	11,410.00
Stephen Pigozzi	Associate	\$515.00	8.40	4,326.00
Zog Begolli	Associate	\$425.00	5.50	2,337.50
Carolyn Chen	Associate	\$400.00	7.90	3,160.00
Carly Roman	Associate	\$515.00	9.20	4,738.00
Rachel Pollack	Legal Assistant	\$225.00	0.50	112.50
		Total:	86.20	55,344.00

14. Settlement Class Counsel's hourly rates, pictured above, are their customary rates and are reasonable in the complex class action context.

15. The current lodestar multiplier of 2.86 (which will decrease as Class Counsel expend additional hours on this litigation) is within the range of lodestar multipliers regularly approved in Illinois. This multiplier is calculated by first subtracting the incurred costs of \$1,303.10 from the requested fee award of \$159,000 which equates to a net fee request of \$158,273.30. Then, the fee multiplier is calculated by dividing \$158,273.30 by the total lodestar of \$55,344.00. This equals a multiplier of 2.8598095 which rounds up to 2.86.

16. Settlement Class Counsel incurred reasonable and necessary costs of \$1,303.10 for filing fees, research and postage.

17. This case required a significant investment of time and labor, as the case involved novel, complex, and difficult legal questions. Settlement Class Counsel invested time and labor by investigating the Security Incident, interviewing potential clients; researching viable claims under Illinois law; drafting the complaint; reviewing the complaint with the client; drafting and serving informal discovery; reviewing informal discovery from Ty Inc.; negotiating and preparing the Settlement Agreement, notice forms, and the claims form; drafting the motion for preliminary approval and exhibits; overseeing the settlement process, including assisting and supervising the Settlement Administrator's initial implementation of the Class Notice; and preparing this motion for attorney fees, costs, expenses, and a service award. Additionally, Settlement Class Counsel dedicated significant time keeping the Class Representative informed throughout the litigation. This included obtaining information from and securing approval for the filing of the complaint, keeping the Class Representative apprised of and involved in key decisions, litigation strategies, and ultimately, the Settlement reached in this case. Settlement Class Counsel was precluded from

representing other clients during the 89.60 hours that Settlement Class Counsel invested in this case.

18. Settlement Class Counsel assumed considerable risk to pursue this matter on a pure contingency basis, and have not been compensated for any time spent in the litigation. Indeed, Settlement Class Counsel assumed a significant risk of underpayment (or even nonpayment). Absent taking this case on a contingency basis, it is very likely that the Settlement Class Members would not be able to take advantage of the significant relief being made available. Moreover, given the immediacy of the injuries and risks created by data breaches (such as the risk of future identity theft and fraud), Settlement Class Members benefited from the efficient prosecution of this case because Settlement Class Members can obtain timely and tailored relief now.

19. The value of this Settlement is underscored by the complexity of the litigation and the significant risks and barriers that loomed in the absence of Settlement. Data breach cases are especially risky, expensive, and complex. Moreover, Settlement Class Counsel anticipates Ty Inc. would likely raise substantial and potentially meritorious defenses. This is significant because in the data breach context, few cases have gone through the certification stage, and none have been tried. Any of these risks could easily have impeded, if not prevented, Plaintiff and Settlement Class Members from receiving any relief from their alleged injuries. As such, the recovery provided by this Settlement must be judged in reference to the reality that recovery through continued litigation could only have been achieved if Plaintiff succeeded in certifying a class, defeating a motion for summary judgment, establishing liability and damages at trial, and defending against any appeal. Thus, the Settlement here is a fair and reasonable recovery for the Settlement Class in light of Ty Inc.'s defenses, and the challenging and unpredictable path of protracted litigation.

20. Settlement Class Counsel have maintained a professional relationship with Plaintiff since this case was filed. Without the efforts of Plaintiff, the thousands of other Settlement Class Members would not have received the benefits of the Settlement. Plaintiff committed to participate actively in what she knew could be a long and hard-fought lawsuit, and to do so on behalf of a Class of thousands of other Settlement Class Members, with no guarantee of ever being compensated. Even though no award of any sort was promised to Plaintiff, she contributed her time and effort by assisting in the litigation, aiding in the preparation of the Complaint, and approving of the Settlement.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 1st day of May 2025, at Oak Park, Illinois.

/s/ Cassandra P. Miller
Cassandra P. Miller

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 2, 2025, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically via Odyssey eFileIL. Notice of this filing will be sent by email to counsel of record by operation of the court's electronic filing system.

DATED this 2nd day of May, 2025.

STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC

By: /s/ Cassandra Miller
Cassandra Miller
cmiller@straussborrelli.com
STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC
One Magnificent Mile
980 N Michigan Avenue, Suite 1610
Chicago IL, 60611
Telephone: (872) 263-1100
Facsimile: (872) 263-1109

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

CARLA PLOWMAN, on behalf of herself and all
others similarly situated

Plaintiff,

v.

TY INC.

Defendant,

2024 CH 000205

Case Number

File Stamp Here

EXHIBIT COVER SHEET

Local Court Rules 5.06 and 5.09

EXHIBIT NAME: Ex. 1 - Strauss Borrelli Firm Resume

TITLE OF DOCUMENT THIS EXHIBIT BELONGS WITH:

Declaration of Cassandra P. Miller in Support of Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Attorney Fees and Service Award

Document File Date: 5/2/2025

(The file date of the document this exhibit belongs with)

EXHIBIT FILED ON BEHALF OF: Plaintiff CARLA PLOWMAN

(Case Party Name)

Submitted by: Cassandra Miller

Name: Cassandra Miller ☐ Pro Se

DuPage Attorney Number: 382570

Attorney for: Plaintiff CARLA PLOWMAN

Address: 980 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1610

City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60611

Telephone Number: (872) 263-1100

Email: cmiller@straussborrelli.com



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

Our Firm

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

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

We make the courtroom accessible to all.

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

We innovate and adapt.

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

We know that people are our greatest resource.

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

We understand the strength in numbers.

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

We commit to personal connections.

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

Our Cases

CONSUMER PROTECTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATA BREACH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATA PRIVACY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RIGHT OF PUBLICITY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Professionals

SAMUEL J. STRAUSS

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

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

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

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

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

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

RAINA C. BORRELLI

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CASSANDRA MILLER

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

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

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

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

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

2012)

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

BRITTANY RESCH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALEX S. PHILLIPS

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

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

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

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