

SOPHIA M. RIOS (SBN 305801)  
**BERGER MONTAGUE PC**  
401 B Street, Suite 2000  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 489-0300  
Fax: (215) 875-4604  
Email: srios@bm.net

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed  
Settlement Class*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

ALABAMA DOE 1, ALABAMA DOE 2,  
INDIANA DOE, MISSOURI DOE, AND  
FLORIDA DOE, Individually and on Behalf of  
All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.: 20-CIV-03699

**DECLARATION OF SHANON J.  
CARSON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'  
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS  
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Dept: 22  
Judge: Hon. Danny Chou  
Date: December 1, 2022  
Time: 11:00 a.m.

**CLASS ACTION**

Action Filed: September 1, 2020  
Trial Date: None Set

1 I, Shanon J. Carson, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am a Managing Shareholder of Berger Montague PC (“Berger Montague” or the  
3 “Firm”) and one of Plaintiffs’ attorneys in the above-referenced matter. I am admitted in this Court pro  
4 hac vice with respect to this Litigation.

5 2. I submit this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Preliminary  
6 Approval of Class Action Settlement.

7 3. On April 13 and 14, 2021, counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendant Gilead Sciences, Inc.  
8 (together, the “Parties”) participated in two full-day mediation sessions via Zoom with an experienced  
9 mediator, Jill Sperber, Esq. Prior to the mediation process, Defendant produced documents and  
10 information requested by Plaintiffs’ counsel to ensure that any potential settlement would be informed  
11 and based on an adequate factual record. The April 2021 mediation was unsuccessful and the Parties  
12 returned to litigation and formal discovery efforts.

13 4. The Parties have engaged in extensive formal discovery efforts during this matter. Both  
14 sides served and responded to written discovery. Defendant produced thousands of documents between  
15 September 16, 2021, and February 14, 2022, and responded to interrogatories. Plaintiffs also produced  
16 documents and responded to interrogatories, and three Plaintiffs were deposed. During this time, the  
17 Parties engaged in numerous meet-and-confer conferences to negotiate various discovery issues and  
18 litigated a motion to compel filed by Defendant and granted by the Court in an Order on October 29,  
19 2021.

20 5. Before reaching the proposed settlement, the Parties were continuing to address several  
21 discovery disputes, including Defendant’s privilege assertions, the sufficiency of Plaintiffs’ discovery  
22 responses, and a protocol for third party depositions. Depositions of two Plaintiffs and three Gilead  
23 employees were calendared for late March and early April, 2022.

24 6. In March 2022, the Parties resumed their arm’s-length settlement negotiations, picking  
25 up largely where the Parties ended the April 2021 mediation. The Parties exchanged several counter-  
26 proposals before reaching an agreement on the core terms of the Settlement. Thereafter, the Parties  
27 engaged in subsequent substantial negotiations to reach and execute the full Settlement Agreement.  
28

1           7.       The information Plaintiffs' counsel gathered through extensive hard-fought litigation,  
2 an unsuccessful mediation in 2021 with an experienced mediator, formal discovery conducted by both  
3 sides, and substantial settlement discussions allowed them to act intelligently and exercise professional  
4 judgment in negotiating the Settlement in light of the maximum damages available to the Settlement  
5 Class and the significant risks presented by the litigation. For example, as shown by discovery, the  
6 evidence supporting each Plaintiff's allegations that third parties viewed the Mailers varied.

7           8.       The Settlement Fund provided by the settlement will be distributed to the Settlement  
8 Class through automatic \$100 base payments and Claimant Awards—up to \$2,000 for economic harms  
9 and up to \$500 for non-economic harms for each Settlement Class Member. A claims process is  
10 appropriate for these harms because not all Settlement Class Members may have experienced these  
11 harms and because there is great variation in the possible harms each Settlement Class Member may  
12 have suffered depending on the circumstances in which they received the Mailer.

13          9.       The Parties and their counsel have no interest in the proposed *cy pres* recipient, Positive  
14 Women's Network-USA.

15          10.      To accomplish the Notice Plan and administer the Settlement, the Parties conducted a  
16 request for proposal and bidding process, and agreed based upon the proposals that were received, to  
17 use an experienced settlement administrator, Kroll Settlement Administration LLC. Kroll Settlement  
18 Administration LLC has agreed that its costs will not exceed \$160,865.66.00.

19          11.      Both Plaintiffs and Defendant in this action are represented by counsel who have  
20 significant experience in class action litigation and settlements, including cases concerning the alleged  
21 breach of confidential medical information.

22          12.      In addition to being represented by law firms with extensive experience in class action  
23 litigation, Plaintiffs are here represented by the non-profit AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania which  
24 has provided legal services to people living with HIV for 34 years (Exhibit B).

25          13.      Berger Montague specializes in class action litigation in federal and state courts and is  
26 one of the preeminent class action law firms in the United States. A copy of our Firm's resume is  
27 attached hereto as Exhibit C.

14. Berger Montague currently consists of approximately 75 lawyers, 16 paralegals, and an experienced support staff who primarily represent plaintiffs in complex civil litigation and class action litigation. Berger Montague has played lead roles in major class action cases for over 50 years (since 1970) and has recovered billions of dollars for its clients.

15. I have been appointed as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous other class actions and collective actions on behalf of consumers and employees throughout the country that have collectively achieved hundreds of millions of dollars in settlements on behalf of my clients and the classes they have represented.

16. Attached as Exhibits are true and correct copies of the following:

**EXHIBIT A:** Settlement Agreement;

**EXHIBIT B:** AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania Resume;

**EXHIBIT C: Berger Montague PC Firm Resume.**

The foregoing statement is made under penalty of perjury and is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Date: October 21, 2022

/s/ Shanon J. Carson  
Shanon J Carson

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

1. I am over eighteen years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. My business address is 401 B Street, Suite 2000, San Diego, California 92101.

2. On October 21, 2022, I served the following document(s):

**DECLARATION OF SHANON J. CARSON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'  
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION  
SETTLEMENT**

**EXHIBIT A**

**EXHIBIT B**

**EXHIBIT C**

3. I served the document(s) on the following person(s):

**See attached Service List.**

4. The documents were served by the following means:

☐ **By U.S. Mail.** I enclosed the document(s) in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the person(s) at the address(es) in Item 3 and **(check one)**:

☐ deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.

☐ placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business' practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day the correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

I am employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at San Diego, California

☐ **By Overnight Delivery/Express Mail.** I enclosed the documents and an unsigned copy of this declaration in a sealed envelope or package designated by **[name of delivery company or U.S. Postal Service for Express Mail]** addressed to the persons at the address(es) listed in Item 3, with **[Express Mail postage or, if not Express Mail, delivery fees]** prepaid or provided for. I placed the sealed envelope or package for collection and delivery, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business' practice for collecting and processing correspondence for express delivery. On the same day the correspondence is

collected for delivery, it is placed for collection in the ordinary course of business in a box regularly maintained by [name of delivery company or U.S. Postal Service for Express Mail] or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by [name of delivery company] to receive documents.

- ☐ **By Messenger Service.** I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the address(es) listed in Item 3 and providing them to a professional messenger service for service. (See attached Declaration(s) of Messenger.)
- ☐ **By Facsimile Transmission.** Based on an agreement between the parties to accept service by facsimile transmission, which was confirmed in writing, I faxed the document(s) and an unsigned copy of this declaration to the person(s) at the facsimile numbers listed in Item 3 on [date], at [type time]. The transmission was reported as complete without error by a transmission report issued by the facsimile machine that I used immediately following the transmission. A true and correct copy of the facsimile transmission report, which I printed out, is attached hereto.
- ☐ **By Electronic Service (E-mail).** Based on California Rule of Court 2.251(c)(3), or on a court order, or on an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I transmitted the document(s) to the person(s) at the electronic notification address(es) listed in Item 3 on [date].
- ☐ **Via Court Notice of Electronic Filing.** The document(s) will be served by the court via NEF and hyperlink to the document(s). On [date], I checked the CM/ECF docket for this case or adversary proceeding and determined that the person(s) listed in Item 3 are on the Electronic Mail Notice List to receive NEF transmission at the email addresses indicated in Item 3 [or on the attached service list, if applicable].
- ☒ **Via Electronic Notification.** The document(s) will be served via electronic notification on **October 21, 2022** on the person(s) listed in Item 3 at the email addresses indicated in Item 3 [or on the attached service list, if applicable].
- ☒ **STATE:** I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
- ☐ **FEDERAL:** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Dated: October 21, 2022

/s/ Julie Gionnette

Julie Gionnette

jgionnette@bm.net

**SERVICE LIST**

***Attorneys for Defendant Gilead, Inc.***

Kenneth L. Chernof (SBN 156187)  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001-3743  
Tel: (202) 942-5940  
Email: ken.chernof@arnoldporter.com

Angel Tang Nakamura (SBN 205396)  
Stephanie N. Kang (SBN 306162)  
Hannah Coleman (SBN 327875)  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
777 S. Figueroa Street, 44<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Tel: (213) 243-4000  
Email: angel.nakamura@arnoldporter.com  
stephanie.kang@arnoldporter.com  
hannah.coleman@arnoldporter.com

Alexander S. Altman (SBN 340795)  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
250 West 55<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel: (212) 836-8000  
Email: alexander.altman@arnoldporter.com

***Attorneys for Plaintiffs***

Sophia M. Rios (SBN 305801)  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
401 B Street, Suite 2000  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 489-0300  
Email: srios@bm.net

John Albanese  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1229 Tyler Street NE, Suite 205  
Minneapolis, MN 55413  
Tel: (612) 594-5999  
Email: jalbanese@bm.net

Shanon Carson  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1818 Market Street, Suite 3600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel: (215) 875-3000  
Email: scarson@bm.net

Ronda Goldfein  
Yolanda Lollis  
Adrian Lowe  
AIDS LAW PROJECT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA  
1211 Chestnut Street, Suite 600  
Philadelphia, PA 19107  
Tel: (215) 587-9377  
Email: goldfein@aidslawpa.org  
lollis@aidslawpa.org  
alowe@aidawpa.org

John Grogan  
LANGER GROGAN & DIVER PC  
1717 Arch Street, Suite 4020  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel: (215) 320-5660  
Email: jgrogan@langergrogan.com

***JUDGE***

Hon. Danny Y. Chou  
Dept. 22, Courtroom K  
1050 Mission Road  
S. San Francisco, CA 94080  
Email: dept22@sanmateocourt.org

*Courtesy Copy*



# EXHIBIT A

## **SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

This Settlement Agreement (the “Settlement Agreement” or “Agreement”) is made and entered into by Plaintiffs Alabama Doe 1, Alabama Doe 2, Indiana Doe, Missouri Doe, and Florida Doe (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of the Settlement Class defined below, and Defendant Gilead Sciences, Inc. (“Gilead”). Plaintiffs and Gilead are collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.”

### **RECITALS**

A. On September 1, 2020, Plaintiffs Alabama Doe 1, Indiana Doe, and Missouri Doe filed a Class Action Complaint captioned *Alabama Doe, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*, No. 20-CIV-03699, in the Superior Court of the State of California, for the County of San Mateo (the “Litigation”). Plaintiffs are represented by Berger Montague PC (“Berger Montague”), Langer, Grogan & Diver PC (“LGD”), and the AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania (“AIDS Law Project”), a nonprofit legal organization whose mission is to represent and advocate for clients who are living with HIV and AIDS. Berger Montague, LGD, and AIDS Law Project are collectively referred to herein as “Co-Lead Class Counsel.”

B. Plaintiffs alleged in their Class Action Complaint that confidential medical information belonging to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members was disclosed by Gilead to third parties through a mailing of an envelope with the words “HIV Prevention Team” on the face of the envelope in the return address (the “Mailer”). The Class Action Complaint further alleged that Gilead was responsible for all harm caused by the Mailer under various theories of liability.

C. On April 13 and 14, 2021, the Parties participated in two full-day mediation sessions conducted via Zoom by an experienced California mediator, Jill Sperber, Esq., to determine whether Plaintiffs’ claims could be resolved. Prior to and during the mediation process, Gilead produced documents and information requested by Co-Lead Class Counsel to ensure that any potential settlement would be informed by relevant discovery and based on an adequate factual record. In addition, Co-Lead Class Counsel continued to conduct their own independent factual and legal investigation of the case.

D. Gilead’s production of documents and information to Co-Lead Class Counsel for purposes of the mediation included, for example: (1) documents regarding the Mailer; (2) documents and data identifying the size and geographic location of all Settlement Class Members; (3) documents evidencing Gilead’s policies and procedures regarding printing/mailing confidential medical information; (4) complaints received about the Mailer from recipients; and (5) iterations of the Advancing Access enrollment form.

E. The April 2021 mediation did not result in a settlement and the Parties resumed litigation and formal discovery efforts. On August 25, 2021, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint (the “Complaint”) that added Plaintiffs Alabama Doe 2 and Florida Doe, and added Lahlouh, Inc. as an additional defendant. On September 17, 2021, Gilead filed its General Denial and Affirmative Defenses to the Complaint. Plaintiffs subsequently agreed to

dismiss the claims against Lahlouh, Inc. without prejudice following Lahlouh's production of documents. The Court granted Plaintiffs' request to dismiss Lahlouh on February 23, 2022.

F. As part of the Parties' formal discovery efforts in the Litigation, Gilead and Plaintiffs each responded to written discovery requests and produced documents, including the production of thousands of documents by Gilead. Certain Plaintiffs were also deposed. The Parties also engaged in numerous meet-and-confer conferences to negotiate various discovery issues, and Gilead filed a motion to compel, which the Court granted.

G. In March 2022, following the above extensive discovery efforts, the Parties resumed their settlement discussions, and Plaintiffs, through their counsel, and Gilead, through its counsel, engaged in arm's-length settlement negotiations.

H. Gilead represents that it no longer uses the term "HIV Prevention Team" in the return addresses or otherwise on the face of the envelopes sent to individuals enrolled in Gilead's Advancing Access Program.

I. Gilead does not admit that it is liable to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class for the claims, damages, harm, causes of action, costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees asserted in the Litigation and/or related to the sending of the Mailer; denies all allegations by Plaintiffs; and further has asserted numerous legal and factual defenses against Plaintiffs' claims. Nonetheless, Gilead has concluded, in light of the costs, risks, and burden of litigation, that this Settlement Agreement is in the interest of all parties.

J. Plaintiffs, through their undersigned counsel, represent that they have made a thorough and independent investigation of the facts and law relating to the allegations in the Complaint, including, without limitation: (1) interviews by Co-Lead Class Counsel of the Plaintiffs; (2) the review and analysis by Co-Lead Class Counsel of the documents, data, and information produced by Gilead as part of the Parties' mediation process and as part of formal discovery in the Litigation; (3) documents produced by Lahlouh, Inc.; (4) the depositions that were taken by Gilead of several Plaintiffs; and (5) extensive factual investigation and legal research by Co-Lead Class Counsel with respect to the claims and defenses in the Litigation. After careful consideration, Plaintiffs and their undersigned counsel represent that they have concluded that it is in the best interests of the Settlement Class to settle the Released Claims against the Released Parties for the consideration set forth in this Settlement Agreement, and this Settlement Agreement is the result of arm's-length negotiations including the mediation process described above. Plaintiffs and Co-Lead Class Counsel have also considered, among other things: (1) the complexity, expense and likely duration of the litigation if it was litigated through trial and appeals; (2) the stage of the litigation and amount of fact gathering completed; (3) Gilead's factual and legal arguments and defenses and the potential for Gilead to prevail on the merits with respect to class certification, liability, and/or damages; and (4) the range of possible recovery, and have determined that the proposed resolution of Plaintiffs' individual and class action claims as set forth in this Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class. Plaintiffs and Co-Lead Counsel represent that they are not aware of any member of the Settlement Class that has expressed an interest in opting out of the settlement.

K. The Parties desire to settle, compromise, and resolve fully all Released Claims, and to seek the Court's review and approval of the Settlement Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, the foregoing recitals are expressly incorporated into this Settlement Agreement, and in consideration of the agreements set forth in this Settlement Agreement, this Litigation shall be settled and compromised under the following terms and conditions.

## **SECTION 1** **DEFINITIONS**

1.1 The following terms used in this Settlement Agreement shall have the meanings ascribed to them below for purposes of this Settlement Agreement:

A. "Claimant" means a Settlement Class Member who submits a Claim Form.

B. "Claimant Award" means the amount of money that is paid by the Settlement Administrator out of the available Net Settlement Fund to each Claimant who submits a valid and timely Claim Form.

C. "Claim Form" means the Claim Form attached as Exhibit A hereto that Settlement Class Members may complete to make a claim for harm they experienced as a result the Mailer in addition to the Base Payment defined in Paragraph 4.2(a) below.

D. "Claim Period" shall mean the time period of sixty (60) days after the date that notice of this Settlement is issued by the Settlement Administrator to submit a Claim Form.

E. "Class Representatives" or "Plaintiffs" mean Alabama Doe 1, Alabama Doe 2, Indiana Doe, Florida Doe, and Missouri Doe.

F. "Co-Lead Class Counsel" means Shanon J. Carson, John Albanese, and Sophia Rios of Berger Montague; John Grogan and Kevin Trainer of LGD, and Ronda B. Goldfein, Yolanda French Lollis, and Adrian Lowe of AIDS Law Project.

G. "Complaint" means the First Amended Complaint filed in the Litigation on August 25, 2021.

H. "Counsel for Gilead" means Kenneth L. Chernof, Angel Tang Nakamura, Stephanie N. Kang, Alexander S. Altman, David B. Schwartz, and Hannah R. Coleman of Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP.

I. "Court" means the Superior Court of the State of California, San Mateo County.

J. "Effective Date" means the day following the date of the Court's Final Approval Order and Judgment approving the Settlement Agreement if there are no objectors, and

if there are any objectors, means (i) the day following the expiration of the deadline for appealing the entry by the Court of the Final Approval Order and Judgment approving the Settlement Agreement, if no appeal is filed; or (ii) if an appeal of the Final Approval Order and Judgment is filed, the date upon which all appellate courts with jurisdiction affirm such Final Approval Order and Judgment, or deny any such appeal or petition for certiorari, such that no future appeal is possible.

K. “Final Approval Hearing” means the hearing scheduled by the Court to consider the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of this Settlement Agreement, and to determine whether a Final Approval Order and Judgment should be entered.

L. “Final Approval Date” means the date on which the Court enters the Final Approval Order and Judgment.

M. “Final Approval Order” means the Final Approval Order and Judgment entered by the Court.

N. “Net Settlement Fund” means the amount of money remaining in the Settlement Fund after the following amounts are subtracted as approved by the Court in its Final Approval Order: (1) any service awards to the Class Representatives; (2) attorneys’ fees and costs to Co-Lead Class Counsel; and (3) reasonable fees and costs invoiced by the Settlement Administrator.

O. “Notice of Deficiency” means any written notice that the Settlement Administrator sends to any Claimant who submits a Claim Form that contains a deficiency that needs to be cured as determined by the Settlement Administrator. A form of Notice of Deficiency to be used by the Settlement Administrator is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

P. “Notice of Settlement” means the Notice of Class Action Settlement in the form of Exhibit C attached hereto, to be approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order, which is to be provided by the Settlement Administrator to the Settlement Class Members to provide notice of this Settlement.

Q. “Preliminary Approval Order” means the Court’s Order preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement and preliminarily certifying the Settlement Class.

R. “Released Claims” means the claims released as set forth in Section 6 below.

S. “Released Parties” means Gilead and each of its respective past, present or future successors, assigns, predecessors, parents, subsidiaries, sister companies, joint venturers, partnerships, related companies, affiliates, unincorporated entities, divisions and groups, and each of their directors, officers, shareholders, employees, managers, agents, representatives, insurers, reinsurers, partners, accountants, consultants, legal representatives, administrators, contractors and subcontractors, and agents of and all persons acting under, by, through, or in concert with any of them, and each of them.

T. “Settlement Administrator” means Kroll Settlement Administration LLC, who will be presented to the Court for approval in the Preliminary Approval Order to perform all responsibilities assigned to the Settlement Administrator in this Settlement Agreement.

U. “Settlement Agreement” or “Settlement” mean this Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits which are incorporated herein, including any subsequent amendments and subsequent exhibits that are agreed to by the Parties in writing and approved by the Court.

V. “Settlement Payment” means the total payment that each Settlement Class Member is entitled to receive pursuant to the terms of this Agreement as determined by the Settlement Administrator.

W. “Settlement Class” or “Settlement Class Members” mean all persons to whom a Mailer was sent by Gilead and that was not returned as undeliverable. Gilead has represented and produced data evidencing that there are 18,192 Settlement Class Members.

X. “Settlement Fund” means the non-reversionary cash amount of Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) which shall be the total amount from which the following will be paid, all subject to the approval of the Court: (1) all Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members; (2) all reasonable settlement administration fees and costs; (3) Co-Lead Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and costs; and (4) all service awards to the Class Representatives.

Y. “Settlement Website” means the website regarding this Settlement that will be established by the Settlement Administrator following issuance by the Court of its Preliminary Approval Order.

## **SECTION 2**

### **BENEFITS FOR SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBERS**

2.1 Consideration. In consideration of the Releases set forth in Section 6 below, Gilead shall pay, as further described in Section 4.1 below, the non-reversionary cash amount of Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000.00) into the Settlement Fund, to be distributed as set forth herein and approved by the Court in its Final Approval Order. This payment is the total consideration provided by Gilead in connection with this Settlement Agreement, and under no circumstances will Gilead provide any additional payment.

## **SECTION 3**

### **SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR AND NOTICE TO SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBERS**

#### **3.1 Appointment of Settlement Administrator and Protection of Class List**

3.1.1 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval will request the Court to appoint Kroll Settlement Administration LLC to act as the Court-appointed independent Settlement Administrator and to implement all settlement administration tasks and duties set forth in this Settlement Agreement. The Parties each represent that they do not have any financial interest in the Settlement Administrator or otherwise have a relationship with the

Settlement Administrator that could create a conflict of interest and the Parties jointly conducted a request for proposal/bidding process to four (4) potential companies to find and select the proposed Settlement Administrator.

3.1.2 The Settlement Administrator shall perform all tasks and duties ascribed to it in this Settlement Agreement and as the Court may direct. The Settlement Administrator shall prepare and submit written status reports and declarations to Co-Lead Class Counsel and/or Counsel for Gilead at any time upon written request.

3.1.3 The term “Class List” means the list of names and last known contact information, including last known mailing addresses (where available) and email addresses (where available), of the Settlement Class Members. After the Settlement Administrator is appointed by the Court and agrees to be bound by a Qualified Protective Order entered by the Court (which may be contained in the Preliminary Approval Order), and within five (5) business days following the issuance of the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order, Gilead will cause the Class List to be delivered to the Settlement Administrator as directed by the Preliminary Approval Order.

3.1.4 At no time shall the Settlement Administrator share the Class List or any information contained on the Class List, or any confidential medical information, with the Court, Co-Lead Class Counsel, Counsel for Gilead, or any other person or entity, without a Court Order or an authorization form that is signed by the Settlement Class Member whose information is to be disclosed (or by someone with legal authorization to sign on their behalf), except that the Settlement Administrator shall comply with any federal and state tax laws and required reporting and withholding with respect to this Settlement, and Gilead shall have no obligations relating to such matters.

3.2 Settlement Administrator Fees and Costs. The reasonable fees and costs of the Settlement Administrator incurred in administering this Settlement that are approved by the Court in its Final Approval Order will be paid out of the Settlement Fund.

3.3 Settlement Website. Within ten (10) days after the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator will cause to be established and maintained a Settlement Website containing relevant information about the Settlement, including, without limitation, downloadable .pdf copies of the Complaint, this Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits, the Notice of Settlement, the Claim Form, the Preliminary Approval Order, the Final Approval Order, and other case documents relevant to the Settlement, as well as a “Frequently Asked Questions” webpage. A draft of the Settlement Website shall be reviewed and approved by Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead before it is made available to the public. The Settlement Website shall be owned and operated by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will post relevant information about the Settlement on the Settlement Website, including, as it becomes available, information about deadlines and methods to participate, and Claim Form requirements. Claim Forms may be submitted to the Settlement Administrator via the Settlement Website in a secure and private fashion and using Share File, a secure file transfer tool, or a suitable alternative. In addition, the Settlement Administrator shall implement reasonable measures designed to protect individual privacy rights and encourage

check-cashing including by allowing Settlement Class Members as part of the notice process to inform the Settlement Administrator of a direct method to issue payment other than checks, such as through Paypal, through their Claim Form.

3.4 Automated Telephone System. Within ten (10) days after the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator will cause to be established and maintained an automated telephone system using a toll-free number to provide information about the Settlement to the Settlement Class Members, utilizing an interactive voice response script approved by Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead. The automated telephone system shall be operated by the Settlement Administrator. The automated telephone system shall permit Settlement Class Members to request and obtain copies of the Settlement Agreement, Notice of Settlement and Claim Form, and shall also provide the opportunity for Settlement Class Members to speak with a live operator during business hours for further information.

3.5 De-identified Information. The Settlement Administrator shall utilize a unique number identifier system so it can communicate with and about Settlement Class Members without including or identifying any confidential medical information or identifying their names, addresses, or other identifying information belonging to any Settlement Class Member. All Parties and all Counsel shall cooperate in good faith to respect the privacy and confidentiality of all Settlement Class Members' confidential medical information.

3.6 Notice of Settlement to Settlement Class Members. The notice shall include sending the Notice of Class Action Settlement attached hereto as Exhibit C to all Settlement Class Members (1) by U.S. first class mail where Gilead has the Settlement Class Members' physical mailing addresses; and (2) by email where Gilead does not have Settlement Class Members' physical mailing addresses but does have the Settlement Class Members' email addresses, using practices for the physical mailing and emailing, as applicable, intended to maintain the confidentiality of Settlement Class Members' confidential medical information, including, without limitation:

(a) by using an opaque envelope of appropriate and sufficient stock and with no transparent window in order to obscure the contents of the envelope;

(b) by using a return address on the outside of the envelope with no identifying information other than the name of the Settlement Administrator, a P.O. Box, City, State and Zip Code;

(c) by including a statement on the front of the envelope stating that it contains "Confidential Legal Information – To Be Opened Only By The Addressee";

(d) by using a protective cover page that folds around the Notice of Class Action Settlement and that identifies that the information being provided therein is confidential and solely for reading by the Settlement Class Member;

(e) by using paper stock for the cover page that will protect the confidentiality of the contents of the envelope from being read through the envelope; and



(f) for emailed notice, by using the subject line “Confidential Legal Information – To Be Read Only By The Named Email Recipient.”

3.7 Other Notice Requirements. Prior to mailing the Notice of Class Action Settlement, the Settlement Administrator shall process the information in the Class List through the U.S. Postal Service’s National Change of Address database. The notice shall include: (a) direct notice by U.S. first-class mail as set forth above; (b) email notice to those Settlement Class Members for whom email addresses are available but for whom physical mailing addresses are not available; (c) notice through the Settlement Website (and utilizing the automated telephone system set forth above); (d) the issuance of press releases by both Gilead and Co-Lead Class Counsel, which each party will have the opportunity to review before they are finalized, following the issuance of the Preliminary Approval Order; and (e) an announcement to be included on the webpages dedicated to this litigation that are already maintained by Co-Lead Class Counsel. To the extent any Notice of Settlement sent as described in (a) is returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable, Settlement Administrator shall then utilize postal service processes to identify any updated address information for any such individual and resend the notice accordingly. If no such updated address information is available or mail sent to the updated address is returned, Settlement Administrator shall send the Notice of Settlement as described in (b).

3.8 Compliance with all Regulatory and Other Requirements. The Class List delivered by Gilead to the Settlement Administrator and as ordered by the Court and any completed Claim Forms or other information submitted by Claimants to the Settlement Administrator, will be recorded by the Settlement Administrator in a computerized database that will be securely and confidentially maintained by the Settlement Administrator in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and guidelines, including, without limitation, any laws concerning heightened privacy for confidential medical information. The Settlement Administrator must: (a) designate specifically-assigned employees to handle its administration of this Settlement; (b) train them concerning their legal duties and obligations arising out of this Settlement with respect to the information that they are provided; (c) ensure that all of the information it receives is used properly in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and solely for the purpose of administering this Settlement; and (d) ensure that an orderly system of data management and maintenance is adopted and implemented, and that the information is retained under responsible custody until the conclusion of this litigation and the check-cashing period discussed below applicable to Settlement Class Members, at which time all of the information and data shall be destroyed by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator will keep the database in a form that grants access for settlement administration use only and shall restrict access rights only to the least possible number of employees of the Settlement Administrator who are working directly on the administration of this Settlement. The Settlement Administrator shall immediately notify the Court, Co-Lead Class Counsel, and Counsel for Gilead in writing if there is any breach of applicable privacy laws in any respect.

3.9 Access to the Class List and Related Information. Only the Settlement Administrator shall have access to the Class List, Claim Forms, and any supporting information

submitted by Settlement Class Members. All information submitted by Settlement Class Members to the Settlement Administrator will be treated as highly confidential pursuant to the Court's Preliminary Approval Order and applicable protective orders, and the Settlement Administrator shall not share any such information with Co-Lead Class Counsel, Counsel for any Plaintiff, Gilead, Gilead's counsel, or any other person, except upon an Order of the Court or an authorization form that is signed by the Settlement Class Member whose information is to be disclosed (or by someone with legal authorization to sign on their behalf).

#### **SECTION 4**

#### **MONETARY PAYMENTS FOR SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBERS AND DISTRIBUTION OF NET SETTLEMENT FUND**

4.1 Consideration. As set forth above, Gilead shall pay the non-reversionary cash amount of \$4,000,000 into the Settlement Fund to be distributed in accordance with the Court's Final Approval Order. This payment is the total consideration provided by Gilead in connection with this Settlement Agreement, and under no circumstances will Gilead provide any additional payment. Gilead will provide the Settlement Administrator with an IRS Form 1099 for the lump sum payment made pursuant to this Settlement Agreement. Gilead shall wire the payment to an escrow account within fourteen (14) business days after the Effective Date and receipt by Gilead of wiring instructions to an escrow account at a bank selected by Co-Lead Class Counsel (which shall be established and maintained by the Settlement Administrator as a Qualified Settlement Fund for federal tax purposes pursuant to Treas. Reg. § 1.468B-1) and a W-9 from the Settlement Administrator, whichever is later. The Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for all administrative, accounting, and tax compliance activities in connection with the Qualified Settlement Fund, including any filings necessary to obtain Qualified Settlement Fund status pursuant to Treas. Reg. § 1.468B-1. Gilead shall provide to the Settlement Administrator any documentation necessary to facilitate obtaining Qualified Settlement Fund status.

4.2 Allocation and Distribution of Net Settlement Fund. The Net Settlement Fund will be distributed as follows.

a. First, every Settlement Class Member is automatically entitled to receive a base payment of One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) without having to submit a Claim Form ("Base Payment").

b. Second, Settlement Class Members may include information on their Claim Form credibly alleging under oath that they incurred reasonable non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses that were directly caused by the Mailer, including, for example, any moving costs, medical or counseling costs, loss of income, or other non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses upon a showing of reasonable proof. The term "reasonable proof" means the submission to the Settlement Administrator by the Claimant of actual receipts, invoices, credit card statements, medical records, insurance records, copies of returned checks, and/or any other reasonable form of supporting written proof of non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses incurred as a direct result of the Mailer, which must be submitted with the Claim Form in support of any claimed economic damages. Reasonable non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses may be reimbursed up to \$2,000.

c. Third, Settlement Class Members may set forth information on their Claim Form credibly alleging under oath with details about (i) how the Settlement Class Member became aware of the Mailer, (ii) that they experienced non-economic harm constituting emotional distress, anxiety, or fear, as a direct result of the Mailer, and (iii) a description of that emotional distress, anxiety, or fear. If they make such a showing, the Settlement Administrator will determine if they will be eligible for an award of up to \$500.

d. If the Net Settlement Fund does not cover the total collective amount of all base payments and all Claimant Awards as set forth above and calculated by the Settlement Administrator, then each totaled Claimant Award (not including the base payment) shall be reduced *pro rata* to be paid out of the remaining amount in the Net Settlement Fund.

4.3 Mailing of Settlement Payments. The Settlement Administrator will distribute Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members by U.S. first class mail or a direct method, such as through Paypal (if that method is selected by a Settlement Class Member on their Claim Form), no later than thirty (30) days after the Effective Date or as soon as reasonably practicable.

4.4 Review and Processing of Claim Forms. Within two weeks after receiving a Claim Form from a Claimant, the Settlement Administrator shall determine the sufficiency and completeness of the Claim Form and any required contents. The Settlement Administrator shall reject a Claim Form if it does not include all required content and supporting documentation, as applicable, subject to the cure provisions set forth below.

4.5 Deficiencies and Cure. For any rejected Claim Form, the Settlement Administrator shall send via U.S. mail, email, or secure message as indicated in the Claim Form, a Notice of Deficiency to the Settlement Class Member that contains a brief explanation of the deficiency(ies) at issue, and will, where necessary, request the additional information and/or documentation. The Notice of Deficiency will be sent no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of the Claim Form by the Settlement Administrator. The Notice of Deficiency will provide that the deficiency must be cured within twenty-one (21) days from the date of mailing of the Notice of Deficiency. Any Claim Form that is not timely cured will be denied by the Settlement Administrator in writing. If the deficiency is later cured before such time as the Settlement Administrator determines and calculates all Claimant Awards, then the Settlement Administrator shall accept the cure.

4.6 Challenge to Approved Claims to Prevent Fraud. For every Claim approved, the Settlement Administrator shall provide the Claim Form and any supporting documentation to the Parties within seven (7) days of approving the Claim Form. Prior to providing the Claim Form and supporting information to the Parties, the Settlement Administrator shall remove any personally identifying information from the Claim Form and supporting documentation. Should any Party believe in good faith that the Claim should not have been approved, in whole or in part, the Party may challenge the Claim within seven (7) days of receiving the Claim Form and any supporting information by serving the Settlement Administrator and all Parties with a notice, not to exceed one page, as to why the Claim should not have been approved in whole or in part. Any party may respond to that notice within seven (7) days. The Settlement Administrator shall then consider the challenge and make a determination as to the merits of the challenge. The Settlement Administrator's decision shall be final and non-reviewable. The Parties agree that

challenges to approved Claims shall be limited to instances where one Party believes that a fraudulent claim has been approved.

4.7 Use of Settlement Fund Prior to the Effective Date. If the Settlement does not become final and effective for any reason, then Gilead will not owe the payment of the Settlement Fund except for any amounts reasonably incurred and billed by the Settlement Administrator, which shall be Gilead's responsibility.

4.8 Check Cashing. All settlement checks to Settlement Class Members will remain negotiable for 180 days from the date they are issued and shall be accompanied by the cover letter attached hereto as Exhibit D when they are sent by the Settlement Administrator. If payment is made through electronic means, an email message shall be sent to the Settlement Class Member. Any mailed checks shall be mailed using the same protections and mailing procedures as set forth in Paragraph 3.6 above. At any point in the check-cashing period, the Settlement Administrator shall have the authority to stop payment on a lost check and issue a new check or other form of payment to an eligible Settlement Class Member upon reasonable request, and after the Settlement Class Member has executed and sent to the Settlement Administrator an affidavit or declaration of lost check. Sixty (60) days prior to the expiration of the check-cashing period, the Settlement Administrator will send a reminder letter or email, the content of which shall be subject to the Parties' approval, to any Settlement Class Members who have not yet cashed their settlement check.

4.9 Remaining Funds from Net Settlement Fund and Uncashed Checks. Ninety (90) days following the 180-day check negotiation period, the Settlement Administrator shall distribute any remaining amounts in the Net Settlement Fund, subject to the approval of the Court pursuant to Cal. Code. Civ. P. § 384, to Positive Women's Network-USA, a non-profit *cypres* recipient chosen by the Parties, subject to approval by the Court in its Final Approval Order.

## **SECTION 5**

### **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL, FINAL APPROVAL, OPT-OUTS, AND OBJECTIONS**

5.1 Motion for Preliminary Approval. Promptly after this Settlement Agreement is executed, Co-Lead Class Counsel shall file a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, which shall include a copy of this Settlement Agreement and its Exhibits. The Motion shall request that the Court schedule a Final Approval Hearing approximately two weeks after the conclusion of the Claim Period.

5.2 Stay of Proceedings. The Parties shall request that the Preliminary Approval Order stay the Litigation during the pendency of the Court's approval process regarding this Settlement Agreement.

5.3 Stipulation to Certification of Settlement Class. The Parties stipulate and agree to certification of the Settlement Class pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. P. § 382 and Cal. Rule of Court 3.769. The Parties agree that this stipulation is for settlement purposes only. The Parties do not waive or concede any position or arguments they have for or against certification of any class for any other purpose in any action or proceeding. The Parties agree that the Court's certification of the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement does not constitute an admission by Gilead

that the claims of the Settlement Class would be appropriate for class treatment if the claims were contested in this or any other forum.

5.4 Opt Outs. The Notice of Settlement attached hereto as Exhibit C provides detailed instructions to Settlement Class Members regarding the procedures that must be followed to opt out of the Settlement Class. To validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class, a Settlement Class Member must submit a written request to opt out to the Settlement Administrator stating “I wish to exclude myself from the Settlement Class in *Alabama Doe I, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*, No. 20-CIV-03699 (Cal. Sup. Ct., San Mateo Cty.) (or substantially similar clear and unambiguous language), no later than sixty (60) days after the Notice of Settlement is sent to Settlement Class Members by the Settlement Administrator (the “Opt-Out Date”). That written request shall contain the Settlement Class Member’s printed name, address, telephone number, email address, and date of birth. A written request for exclusion must contain the actual written signature of the Settlement Class Member seeking to exclude himself or herself from the Settlement Class and requests for exclusion cannot be made on a group or class basis. The Settlement Administrator will provide redacted and de-identified copies of all requests for exclusion to Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead as they are received, and only redacted and de-identified copies shall be filed with the Court. All Settlement Class Members who do not timely and properly request exclusion from the Settlement Class will in all respects be bound by all terms of this Settlement Agreement and the Court’s Final Approval Order, and upon the Effective Date, will be entitled to all benefits described in this Settlement Agreement. Settlement Class Members who opt out can withdraw their request for exclusion before the Final Approval Hearing by submitting a written request stating their desire to revoke their request for exclusion along with their written signature. In the event that more than one percent (1%) of the Settlement Class Members timely and validly opt out, Gilead may, by notifying Co-Lead Class Counsel and the Court in writing within ten (10) days of the Opt-Out deadline, void this Settlement Agreement, in which case the Parties shall return to their respective positions before this Agreement was executed.

5.5 Objections. Any Settlement Class Member who does not submit a written request for exclusion may present a written objection to the Settlement explaining why he or she believes that the Settlement Agreement should not be approved by the Court as fair, reasonable, and adequate. A Settlement Class Member who wishes to object to any aspect of the Settlement must submit to the Settlement Administrator a written statement of the objection no later than sixty (60) days after the Notice of Settlement is sent to Settlement Class Members. The written statement must include a detailed statement of the Settlement Class Member’s objection(s), as well as the specific reasons, if any, for each such objection, including any evidence and legal authority that the Settlement Class Member wishes to bring to the Court’s attention. That written statement shall contain the Settlement Class Member’s printed name, address, telephone number, and date of birth, and any other supporting papers, materials, or briefs that the Settlement Class Member wishes the Court to consider when reviewing the objection. A written objection must contain the actual written signature of the Settlement Class Member making the objection. The Settlement Administrator shall provide Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead with copies of any objections as they are received. The names of any objectors who affirmatively state in writing that they wish to use a pseudonym shall be held in strict confidence by Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead and shall not be disclosed on the public record without the objector’s written permission. The parties may file responses to any Settlement Class Member’s

written objection to the Settlement.

5.6 Representation. A Settlement Class Member may object on his or her own behalf or through an attorney, however, even if represented, the Settlement Class Member must sign the objection and all attorneys who are involved in any way asserting objections on behalf of a Settlement Class Member must file a notice of appearance with the Court at the time when the objection is submitted, or as the Court may otherwise direct.

5.7 Final Approval Hearing. A Settlement Class Member (or counsel representing him or her, if any) seeking to make an appearance at the Final Approval Hearing must file with the Court, by twenty-one (21) days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, a written notice of his or her intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, including a statement of any evidence or exhibits that will be presented.

5.8 Motion for Final Approval and Final Approval Order. No later than fourteen (14) days prior to the Final Approval Hearing or at such other time as ordered by the Court, Plaintiffs shall file a Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement to request a Final Approval Order and Judgment from the Court, the approval and entry of which shall be a condition of this Settlement Agreement, that: (1) approves the Settlement Agreement as fair, reasonable, and adequate; (2) confirms the final certification of the Settlement Class; (3) confirms the appointments of the Class Representatives and of Co-Lead Class Counsel; (4) finds that the Notice Plan is acceptable to the Court; (5) states that all notices and communications described herein are approved of by the Court as compliant with applicable laws, including but not limited to privacy laws; (6) permanently bars, enjoins and restrains the Releasors (and each of them) from commencing, filing, initiating, prosecuting, asserting, and/or maintaining any and all Released Claims against the Released Parties; (7) dismisses with prejudice the operative Complaint pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement; (8) confirms the appointment of the Settlement Administrator; and (9) provides that the Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Parties, the Settlement Class and this Settlement Agreement, to interpret, implement, administer and enforce the Settlement Agreement in accordance with its terms and conditions.

## **SECTION 6**

### **RELEASES**

6.1 In consideration of the benefits provided to Settlement Class Members by Gilead as described in this Settlement Agreement, upon the Effective Date, each Settlement Class Member, on his or her own behalf and on behalf of his or her respective predecessors, successors, assigns, assignors, representatives, attorneys, agents, trustees, insurers, heirs, estates, beneficiaries, executors, administrators, and any natural, legal, or juridical person or entity to the extent he, she, or it is or will be entitled to assert any claim on behalf of any Settlement Class Member (the “Releasors”), hereby waive and release, forever discharge and hold harmless the Released Parties, and each of them, of and from any and all past, present and future claims, counterclaims, actions, rights, causes of action, liabilities, suits, demands, damages, losses, payments, judgments, debts, dues, sums of money, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorneys’ fees and costs), accounts, bills, covenants, contracts, controversies, agreements, obligations, or promises, in law or in equity, contingent or non-contingent, known or

unknown, suspected or unsuspected, foreseen or unforeseen, matured or unmatured, accrued or unaccrued, liquidated or unliquidated, whether patent or latent, concealed or overt, direct, representative, class or individual in nature, in any forum (“Claims”) that the Releasors, and each of them, had, has, or may have in the future arising out of, in any way relating to, or in connection with, the Mailer or the allegations, transactions, facts, matters, occurrences, representations or omissions involved, that are or could have been alleged or set forth in, referred to, or relate to the Complaint and/or the Mailer (collectively the “Released Claims,” or the “Releases”).

6.2 California Civil Code Section 1542. Plaintiffs and each Settlement Class Member may hereafter discover claims or facts in addition to, or different from, those which he now knows or believes to exist. As of the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each Settlement Class Member shall further be deemed to have waived and released any and all provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by § 1542 of the California Civil Code to the extent applicable or similar laws of any other state or jurisdiction.

Section 1542 of the California Civil Code reads:

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

6.3 Nothing in the Releases will preclude any action to enforce the terms of this Settlement Agreement in the Court.

6.4 The Parties represent and warrant that no promise or inducement has been offered or made for the Releases contained in this Article except as set forth in this Settlement Agreement and that the Releases are executed without reliance on any statements or any representations not contained in this Settlement Agreement.

## **SECTION 7** **ATTORNEYS’ FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

7.1 Attorneys’ Fees and Costs. Co-Lead Class Counsel will file a Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards with the Court fourteen (14) days before the deadline for objections for a payment of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of Co-Lead Class Counsel’s out-of-pocket costs from the Settlement Fund, and which will be posted on the Settlement Website. The Parties agree that the amount for attorneys’ fees shall not exceed one-third of the \$4 million Settlement Fund (*i.e.*, \$1,333,333.33). In addition, Co-Lead Class Counsel’s out-of-pocket costs shall not exceed \$60,000. Should the Court decline to approve any requested payment, the Settlement shall remain effective. The Settlement Administrator shall wire the Court-approved attorneys’ fees and costs to Berger Montague after the Effective Date. Gilead shall bear its own costs of litigation and attorneys’ fees incurred in connection with the Action and this Settlement Agreement.

7.2 Class Representative Service Awards. In recognition of their service to the Settlement Class, the Motion for Fees, Costs, and Service Awards may request the Court to approve service awards of \$5,000 each to the Class Representatives subject to the approval of the Court. Gilead will take no position on the Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards as long as the requested amounts are consistent with this and the preceding paragraph. The service awards shall be paid from the Settlement Fund at the same time as Settlement Payments are made to Settlement Class Members. Should the Court reduce or decline to approve any requested service awards, the Settlement shall remain effective.

## **SECTION 8**

### **MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

8.1 Continuing Jurisdiction. The Court will retain continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the interpretation, implementation, administration, and enforcement of this Settlement Agreement. The Parties and the Settlement Class are hereby deemed to have submitted to the exclusive jurisdiction of this Court for any suit, action, proceeding, or dispute arising out of, or relating to, this Settlement Agreement.

8.2 Authority. Each of the undersigned signatories represent and warrant that they have authority to enter and sign this Settlement Agreement and fulfill its terms as set forth herein.

8.3 No Admission of Liability. It is understood and agreed that this Settlement Agreement is a compromise of disputed claims and that any consideration given is not to be construed as an admission of liability by the Parties. Gilead denies any liability and nothing in this Settlement Agreement is, or may be construed as, an admission or concession on any point of fact or law by or against any Party.

8.4 No Liability for Actions in Accordance with Agreement. Plaintiffs and Gilead, as well as Co-Lead Class Counsel, Counsel for any Plaintiff, and Counsel for Gilead, shall not be liable for any acts undertaken in conformance with this Settlement Agreement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order and Final Approval Order. Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class shall hold harmless the Released Parties from any acts undertaken in conformance with this Settlement Agreement, including acts that result in disclosure of any information, including, but not limited to, confidential medical information.

8.5 Non-Disparagement. The Parties and their counsel agree not to make any public statements, written or verbal, or cause or encourage others to make any public statements, written or verbal, that defame, disparage, or in any way criticize the personal or business reputation, practices, or conduct of the Parties, their affiliates, employees, directors, officers, or attorneys based upon the facts alleged in the Litigation.

8.6 Choice of Law. This Settlement Agreement will be interpreted and enforced in accordance with the laws of the State of California, without regard to conflict of law principles.



8.7 Cooperation. The Parties will cooperate, assist and undertake all reasonable actions to accomplish all steps contemplated by this Settlement Agreement and to implement the Settlement Agreement on the terms and conditions provided herein. The Parties and all of their counsel agree to support the final approval and implementation of this Settlement Agreement. Neither the Parties nor their counsel, directly or indirectly, will encourage any person to object to the Settlement or assist them in doing so.

8.8 Integration. This Settlement Agreement and its exhibits shall constitute the entire agreement and understanding among the Parties and supersedes all prior proposals, negotiations, letters, conversations, agreements, term sheets, and understandings, whether written or oral, relating to the subject matter of this Settlement Agreement. The Parties acknowledge, stipulate, and agree that no covenant, obligation, condition, representation, warranty, inducement, negotiation, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, whether written or oral, concerning any part or all of the subject matter of this Settlement Agreement has been made or relied on except as expressly set forth in this Settlement Agreement.

8.9 Severability. If any provision or any part of any provision of this Settlement Agreement is for any reason held to be invalid, unenforceable, or contrary to any public policy, law, statute, and/or ordinance, that provision may be severed from the Settlement Agreement and the remainder of the Settlement Agreement shall remain valid and enforceable as if the invalid, unenforceable, or illegal provision or part of any provision had not been contained herein.

8.10 Headings. The headings used in this Settlement Agreement are intended for the convenience of the reader only and shall not affect the meaning or interpretation of this Settlement Agreement in any manner. Any inconsistency between the headings used in this Settlement Agreement and the text of the Settlement Agreement shall be resolved in favor of the text.

8.11 Incorporation of Exhibits. All of the exhibits to this Settlement Agreement are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. Notwithstanding the foregoing, any inconsistency between this Settlement Agreement and any exhibits hereto will be resolved in favor of this Settlement Agreement.

8.12 Amendment. Subject to the approval of the Court, the Parties may agree in a writing executed by Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead to amend this Settlement Agreement or to modify the exhibits to this Agreement to effectuate the purpose of this Agreement or to conform to guidance from the Court about the contents of such exhibits without the need to further amend this Agreement. Any amendment modifying the Settlement must be filed with the Court and is subject to the Court's approval.

8.13 Mutual Preparation. The Parties negotiated this Settlement Agreement at arm's-length and following a mediation process overseen by an experienced mediator, Jill Sperber, Esq. Neither the Settlement Class Members nor Gilead, nor any one of them, nor any of their counsel, will be considered to be the sole drafter of this Settlement Agreement or any of its provisions for the purpose of any statute, case law, or rule of interpretation or construction that would or might cause any provision to be construed against the drafter of this Settlement Agreement. This

Settlement Agreement will be deemed to have been mutually prepared by the Parties and will not be construed against any of them by reason of authorship.

8.14 Independent Advice of Counsel. The Parties represent and declare that in executing this Settlement Agreement, each relied upon the advice and recommendations of their own independently selected counsel. Further, the Parties represent that each has had sufficient opportunity to consult with their respective attorneys about the terms and conditions of this Settlement Agreement prior to its execution. Each Party has read and fully understands the full contents and effect of this Settlement Agreement, and consciously and voluntarily contracts and agrees as provided herein.

8.15 Extensions of Time. Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead may agree in writing, subject to approval of the Court where required, to reasonable extensions of time to implement the provisions of this Settlement Agreement.

8.16 Execution in Counterparts. This Settlement Agreement may be executed in counterparts, and an emailed, or electronic signature, for example, via DocuSign, shall be deemed an original signature for purposes of this Settlement Agreement.

8.17 Issuance of Notices. In any instance in which this Settlement Agreement requires the issuance of any notice to the Parties and/or to Co-Lead Class Counsel and Counsel for Gilead, such notice must be issued by issuing written notice to Co-Lead Class Counsel and to Counsel for Gilead as defined above.

**AGREED TO AS OF THIS 7th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2022**

DocuSigned by:



5A9289ABD8B54D8...

Shanon J. Carson

BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1818 Market Street, Ste. 3600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
scarson@bm.net  
Telephone: (215) 875-4656

John Albanese  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1229 Tyler Street NE  
Suite 205  
Minneapolis, MN 55413  
jalbanese@bm.net  
Telephone: (612) 594-5997


Sophia Rios  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
401 B Street, Suite 2000  
San Diego, CA 92101


srios@bm.net  
Telephone: (858) 252-6649

Ronda B. Goldfein (PA 61452)  
goldfein@aidslawpa.org  
Yolanda French Lollis (PA 65148)  
lollis@aidslawpa.org  
Adrian M. Lowe (PA 313614)  
lowe@aidslawpa.org  
AIDS LAW PROJECT OF PENNSYLVANIA  
1211 Chestnut Street, Suite 600

John J. Grogan  
jgrogan@langergrogan.com  
Kevin Trainer  
ktrainer@langergrogan.com  
LANGER, GROGAN & DIVER PC  
1717 Arch Street, Suite 4020  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 320-5660

*Co-Lead Class Counsel for Plaintiffs and the  
Settlement Class*

DocuSigned by:  
  
7268E0E2FDE948B  
Deborah H. Telman  
Executive Vice President, Corporate Affairs  
and General Counsel  
GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.  
333 Lakeside Drive  
Foster City, CA 94401

  
Kenneth L. Chernof  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
601 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Kenneth.Chernof@arnoldporter.com  
Telephone: 202.942.5000

Angel Tang Nakamura  
Stephanie N. Kang  
Hannah R. Coleman  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP

777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Angel.Nakamura@arnoldporter.com  
Stephanie.Kang@arnoldporter.com  
Hannah.Coleman@arnoldporter.com  
Telephone: 213.243.4000

David B. Schwartz  
Alexander S. Altman  
ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: 212.836.8000  
David.Schwartz@arnoldporter.com  
Alexander.Altman@arnoldporter.com  
Telephone: 212.836.8000

*Attorneys for Gilead Sciences, Inc.*

# **EXHIBIT A**

## **CLAIM FORM**

**IMPORTANT -- All Settlement Class Members will automatically receive a minimum Base Payment of \$100.**

This Claim Form is solely for Class Members who want to make a claim for harm they experienced as a direct result the Mailer.

**Please answer all questions honestly and accurately. You are swearing under penalty of perjury that your statements below are true and correct as if you were testifying in court.**

To complete this Claim Form, you must:

- (a) completely fill out Part I -- Claimant Information;
- (b) fill out Part II -- Explanation of Harm;
- (c) personally sign the Certification and Declaration;
- (d) attach all documentation of your alleged harm as requested below; and
- (e) return your completed Claim Form and any requested documentation to the Settlement Administrator.

**YOU MUST SUBMIT YOUR COMPLETED CLAIM FORM BY DATE FOR IT TO BE CONSIDERED TIMELY.**

You may fill out this Claim Form in hard copy or you may download and fill out the electronic Claim Form located at WEBSITE. The electronic Claim Form can be uploaded using the secure portal also located on the website. If you fill out the Claim Form in hard copy, you may return it by uploading it using the secure portal at WEBSITE or by mail to INSERT MAIL ADDRESS.

If you have any questions about this Claim Form, please call the Settlement Administrator toll-free at xxx-xxx-xxxx or contact the Settlement Administrator using the Contact Us form located at WEBSITE. For additional information about the Settlement, please visit WEBSITE.

### **PART I -- CLAIMANT INFORMATION**

**Note -- All information you provide on this Claim Form will be kept strictly confidential by the Settlement Administrator and will be destroyed by the Settlement Administrator after the distribution of the settlement proceeds.**

Name of Claimant: \_\_\_\_\_

Personal Identification Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Note -- It is your responsibility to let the Settlement Administrator know if your mailing address changes at any time before you receive a Settlement Payment or if you want future mail related to this Settlement sent to a different mailing address.**

Current Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Social Security Number \_\_\_\_\_

If you prefer to be contacted by email only, please check the box:

☐ I prefer to be contacted by email only at email address above.

If you would like to receive your settlement payment via Paypal rather than by check, please check the box below and make sure that your email address listed above corresponds with your Paypal or Venmo account.

☐ I would like to receive my settlement payment by Paypal at the email address above.

## **PART II -- EXPLANATION OF HARM**

### **A. Out-of-Pocket Expenses**

If you incurred any non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses as a direct result of the Mailer, such as moving costs, medical or counseling costs, loss of income, or other non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses, for which you are seeking reimbursement pursuant to this Settlement, please list and itemize those expenses below. For each expense listed, **you must attach and return to the Settlement Administrator the corresponding receipt, invoice, credit card statement, medical record, insurance record, copy of returned check, or other reasonable form of evidence documenting that you made each payment listed below.** If you need more room, please continue the list on a separate sheet of paper and return it to the Settlement Administrator along with this Claim Form and the required documentation.


Total Amount Claimed:		

## **B. Emotional Distress**

**If you experienced, emotional distress, anxiety, or fear, as a direct result of the Mailer, please describe in detail the circumstances under which you became aware of the Mailer, and the emotional distress, anxiety, or fear you experienced. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.**



I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
PRINT NAME

**REMINDER CHECKLIST BEFORE YOU SUBMIT THIS CLAIM FORM**

1. Make sure that you fully completed Part I -- Claimant Information.
2. Make sure that you fully completed Part II -- Explanation of Harm.
3. Make sure that you have signed and dated the Claim Form.
4. Make sure that you retain a copy of this Claim Form and your supporting documentation for your records.

# **EXHIBIT B**

**INSERT SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR INFO**

Mail Date

**INSERT PERSONAL CLAIMANT NUMBER**

«ClaimantName»

«Addr1»«Addr2»

«City» «State» «Zip»

**RE:   *Alabama Doe 1, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*, No. 20-CIV-03699 (Cal. Sup. Ct., San Mateo Cty.)  
Notice of Deficiency with Claim Form**

Dear **INSERT NAME**:

Thank you for submitting your Claim Form pursuant to the Settlement Agreement in the above-referenced matter. We are the Court-appointed Settlement Administrator. We have reviewed your Claim Form and it is deficient or lacks necessary information for the following reason(s):

- **INSERT detailed explanation for the deficiency and how it can be fixed.**
- **INSERT more bullet points if needed.**

Please note that the deficiency(ies) noted above must be cured by you by **INSERT CURE DEADLINE DATE**, which is thirty (30) days from the date this notice was mailed. You may respond to this notice through the secure portal located at **WEBSITE**, by email to **EMAIL ADDRESS**, or by mail to **INSERT MAIL ADDRESS**.

If you do not fix the problems identified above, your claim may be denied by the Settlement Administrator.

Please make sure to include your Personal Claimant Number above to assist us in verifying your identity. Your Personal Claimant Number was also printed on the earlier Notice of Settlement that was mailed to you.

If you have any questions about the settlement, please call us toll-free at **xxx-xxx-xxxx**, email us at **EMAIL ADDRESS**, or by using the Contact Us form located at **WEBSITE**. For additional information about the Settlement, please visit **WEBSITE**.

Sincerely,  
Settlement Administrator

# **EXHIBIT C**

Name: **INSERT**  
Personal Identification No.: **123456789**

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

ALABAMA DOE 1, et al., individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 20-CIV-03699

**NOTICE OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT (“NOTICE”)**

You are receiving this Notice because you have been identified as being part of a group of people whose confidential medical information (“CMI”) is alleged to have been disclosed by Defendant Gilead Sciences, Inc. (“Gilead”) when Gilead mailed you an envelope (the “Mailer”) in April 2020.

A class action lawsuit was filed concerning the Mailer and a settlement has now been preliminarily approved by the Court. This Notice provides information about the lawsuit, the settlement, and your options as a Settlement Class Member. Please read this Notice carefully because it affects your legal rights. A California state court ordered the sending of this Notice to you. This is not a solicitation or any other form of marketing.

**1. Why Should You Read This Notice?**

You are receiving this Notice because Gilead’s records show that you are a Settlement Class Member. The term “Settlement Class” means all persons who were sent the Mailer that allegedly disclosed purported CMI and that Mailer was not returned as undeliverable. Gilead has confirmed that approximately 18,192 Settlement Class Members were sent the Mailer and did not have the Mailer returned as undeliverable, and therefore are Settlement Class Members.

This lawsuit was filed on September 1, 2020, in the Superior Court of California, San Mateo County by plaintiffs using pseudonyms to address the alleged harm caused by the Mailer.

Following a mediation process overseen by experienced mediator, Jill Sperber, Esq., in April 2021, and continued settlement negotiations, Plaintiffs and Gilead have now reached a settlement that has been preliminarily approved by the Superior Court, and as a Settlement Class Member, you are entitled to a settlement payment.

**All Settlement Class Members shall automatically receive a “Base Payment” of \$100.**

Settlement Class Members who fill out a Claim Form may receive a payment of up to \$2,000 for reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses that were directly caused by the Mailer, and up to \$500 for non-economic harms constituting emotional distress, anxiety, or fear as a direct result of the Mailer.

The Superior Court of California, San Mateo County has preliminarily approved this Settlement as fair and reasonable and authorized this Notice to be sent to you. The Court will hold a Final Approval Hearing on \_\_\_\_\_, 2022 at \_\_\_\_\_, in Department 22, Courtroom K, Northern Court, 1050 Mission Road, South San Francisco, California 94080. Additional information about this case and the Settlement can be found at **WEBSITE**. The Court may hold the Final Approval Hearing through remote means, such as by Zoom videoconference. If the Final Approval Hearing is held by videoconference, the relevant information necessary to participate will be posted to the Settlement Website, **INSERT**, no later than one week prior to the Final Approval Hearing.

## **2. What Are the Terms of the Settlement?**

Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, a copy of which is available at **WEBSITE**, Gilead has agreed to pay the non-reversionary cash amount of \$4,000,000 (the “Settlement Fund”) to settle all claims relating to the alleged disclosure described above and/or asserted in this lawsuit unless the Settlement Agreement is voided, disapproved, or otherwise terminated for any reason. The Settlement Fund is non-reversionary, meaning none of the funds will be returned to Gilead.

The Settlement Fund will be used to pay: (a) all Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members; (b) all reasonable settlement administration fees and costs as approved by the Court, not to exceed \$160,865.66; (c) Co-Lead Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees, not to exceed \$1,333,333.33, plus costs not to exceed \$60,000, subject to the approval of the Court; and (d) service awards to the five Class Representatives of \$25,000 in the aggregate, subject to the approval of the Court. The “Net Settlement Fund” is the amount left in the Settlement Fund after the Court-approved deductions for settlement administration fees and costs, attorneys’ fees and costs, and service awards.

### **A. The Settlement Payments to Settlement Class Members will be calculated as follows:**

**Base Payment:** All Settlement Class Members will automatically receive a “Base Payment” of \$100.

**Claimant Award:** Settlement Class Members who fill out a Claim Form demonstrating harm may receive additional payment. Settlement Class Members that include information on their Claim Form credibly alleging under oath that they incurred reasonable non-reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses that were directly caused by the Mailer may be reimbursed up to \$2,000 upon a showing of reasonable proof. Settlement Class Members may also set forth information on their Claim Form credibly alleging under oath that they experienced non-economic harm constituting emotional

distress, anxiety, or fear, as a direct result of the Mailer, for a payment of up to \$500. The Settlement Administrator will consider the evidence submitted by each Claimant to determine if a Claimant is eligible for a Claimant Award.

The final amounts will depend on the number of Claims filed. In order to be considered timely and valid, all Claim Forms must be submitted or postmarked by **DATE**.

B. **Remaining Amounts in the Net Settlement Fund.** If there is money remaining in the Net Settlement Fund after subtracting all Base Payments and Claimant Awards, any service awards to the Class Representatives; attorneys' fees and costs to Co-Lead Class Counsel; and reasonable fees and costs invoiced by the Settlement Administrator, the remaining money shall be donated to the Parties' proposed *cy pres* recipient, Positive Women's Network-USA, subject to the Court's approval.

C. **Timing of Payments.** Settlement Checks will be mailed by U.S. first class mail by the Settlement Administrator to Settlement Class Members or sent by an alternative direct method, such as through Paypal, as selected by the Settlement Class Members, no later than 30 days after final approval by the Court and the time for any appeals have expired, or any appeals have been resolved.

D. **Uncashed Checks.** If possible, the Settlement Administrator will make two attempts to distribute settlement payments to each Settlement Class Member. The total amount of any uncashed settlement checks after the second attempt will be distributed to the Parties' proposed *cy pres* recipient, Positive Women's Network-USA, subject to the Court's approval.

F. **Release.** In consideration of the benefits provided to Settlement Class Members by Gilead as described in this Settlement Agreement, upon the Effective Date, each Settlement Class Member, on his or her own behalf and on behalf of his or her respective predecessors, successors, assigns, assignors, representatives, attorneys, agents, trustees, insurers, heirs, estates, beneficiaries, executors, administrators, and any natural, legal, or juridical person or entity to the extent he, she, or it is or will be entitled to assert any claim on behalf of any Settlement Class Member (the "Releasors"), hereby waive and release, forever discharge and hold harmless the Released Parties, and each of them, of and from any and all past, present and future claims, counterclaims, actions, rights or causes of action, liabilities, suits, demands, damages, losses, payments, judgments, debts, dues, sums of money, costs and expenses (including, without limitation, attorneys' fees and costs), accounts, bills, covenants, contracts, controversies, agreements, obligations, or promises, in law or in equity, contingent or non-contingent, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, foreseen or unforeseen, matured or unmatured, accrued or unaccrued, liquidated or unliquidated, whether patent or latent, concealed or overt, direct, representative, class or individual in nature, in any forum ("Claims") that the Releasors, and each of them, had, has, or may have in the future arising out of, in any way relating to or in connection with the Mailer or the allegations, transactions, facts, matters, occurrences, representations or omissions involved, that are or could have been alleged or set forth in, referred to, or relate to the Complaint and/or the Mailer (collectively, the "Released Claims," or the "Releases"). The term Released Parties means Gilead and each of its respective past, present or future successors, assigns, predecessors, parents, subsidiaries, sister companies, joint venturers, partnerships, related companies, affiliates, unincorporated entities, divisions and groups, and each of their directors, officers, shareholders, employees, managers, agents, representatives, insurers, reinsurers, partners, accountants, consultants, legal representatives, administrators, contractors and subcontractors, and

agents of and all persons acting under, by, through, or in concert with any of them, and each of them.

### **3. How Do I Submit A Claim Form?**

**To be considered valid and timely, Claim Forms must be submitted to the Settlement Administrator by DATE.**

You may fill out this Claim Form in hard copy or you may download and fill out the electronic Claim Form located at WEBSITE. The electronic Claim Form can be uploaded using the secure portal also located on the website. If you fill out the Claim Form in hard copy, you may return it by uploading it using the secure portal at WEBSITE or by mail to INSERT ADDRESS. To be considered valid and timely, Claim Forms returned by mail must be postmarked by DATE.

If you have any questions about this Claim Form, please call the Settlement Administrator toll-free at xxx-xxx-xxxx or contact the Settlement Administrator by using the Contact Us form located at WEBSITE. For additional information about the Settlement, please visit WEBSITE. If you decide to fill out and return the Claim Form, all information you provide will be kept strictly confidential by the Settlement Administrator and will be destroyed by the Settlement Administrator after the distribution of the settlement proceeds.

**Important -- It is your responsibility to let the Settlement Administrator know if your mailing address changes at any time before you receive a Settlement Payment or if you want future mail related to this Settlement sent to a different mailing address or to receive further correspondence by email only. If you fail to keep your address current, you may not receive your Settlement Award.**

### **4. What Are My Rights?**

If you wish to participate in the Settlement, you will automatically receive the Base Payment of \$100 via check as described above. You may also submit a Claim Form explaining the harm caused by the sending of the Mailer, for compensation in addition to the Base Payment. All Claim Forms must be submitted or postmarked by DATE. You may also use the Settlement Website to elect to receive any payment by a method other than check. All elections must be made by DATE.

If you wish to exclude yourself from the Settlement so that you do not receive any Settlement Award and are not bound by any release of claims, then you must submit a written request to opt out to the Settlement Administrator stating “I wish to exclude myself from the Settlement Class in *Alabama Doe I, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*, No. 20-CIV-03699 (Cal. Sup. Ct., San Mateo Cty.) (or in substantially similar clear and unambiguous language), postmarked by DATE. Your request for exclusion must include your printed name, address, telephone number, email address, date of birth, and actual written signature. Requests for exclusion cannot be made on a group or class basis. All Settlement Class Members who do not timely and properly request exclusion from the Settlement Class will in all respects be bound by all terms of this Settlement Agreement and the Court’s Final Approval Order, and upon the Effective Date, will be entitled to all benefits described in this Settlement Agreement. The request for exclusion must be sent to the Settlement Administrator at INSERT ADDRESS. Any person who requests exclusion from the Settlement will not be entitled to



any Settlement Award and will not be bound by the Settlement Agreement or have any right to object, appeal, or comment thereon.

You can also ask the Court to deny approval by filing an objection. If you choose to object, you remain part of the Settlement Class and will in all respects be bound by all terms of this Settlement Agreement. You can't ask the Court to order a different settlement; the Court can only approve or reject the settlement. If the Court denies approval, no settlement payments will be sent out and the lawsuit will continue. If that is what you want to happen, you must object.

Any objection to the proposed settlement must be in writing. If you file a timely written objection, you may, but are not required to, appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through your own attorney. If you appear through your own attorney, you are responsible for hiring and paying that attorney. All written objections and supporting papers must (a) clearly identify the case name and number *Alabama Doe I, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*, No. 20-CIV-03699 (Cal. Sup. Ct., San Mateo Cty.), (b) be submitted to the Court, and (c) be filed or postmarked on or **before DATE.**

If you wish to send the Settlement Administrator a letter in support of the Settlement, you are free to do so, and may send your letter to **INSERT ADDRESS.**

## **5. Who Are The Attorneys Representing The Class?**

The attorneys who represent the Settlement Class are listed below:

Ronda B. Goldfein  
Yolanda French Lollis  
Adrian M. Lowe  
AIDS LAW PROJECT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA  
1211 Chestnut Street, #600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 587-9377  
Gileadclass@aidslawpa.org

Shanon J. Carson  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1818 Market Street, Ste. 3600  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
scarson@bm.net  
Telephone: (215) 875-4656

John J. Grogan  
Kevin Trainer  
LANGER, GROGAN & DIVER PC  
1717 Arch Street, Suite 4020  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
jgrogan@langergrogan.com  
Telephone: (215) 320-5660

John Albanese  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
1229 Tyler Street NE  
Suite 205  
Minneapolis, MN 55413  
jalbanese@bm.net  
Telephone: (612) 594-5997

Sophia Rios  
BERGER MONTAGUE PC  
401 B Street, Suite 2000  
San Diego, CA 92101  
srios@bm.net  
Telephone: (858) 252-6649

The AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania is a nonprofit public-interest legal organization for almost thirty-four years.

**6. How Will The Attorneys For The Settlement Class Be Paid?**

You do not have to pay the attorneys who represent the Settlement Class. The Settlement Agreement provides that attorneys' fees and costs will be paid from the Settlement Fund subject to the approval of the Court. The attorneys' request for fees will not exceed \$1,333,333.33 plus reimbursement of reasonable out-of-pocket costs not to exceed \$60,000.

**7. Who May I Contact If I Have Further Questions?**

If you need more information or have any questions, you may contact the AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania at (215) 587-9377 or by email at [Gileadclass@aidslawpa.org](mailto:Gileadclass@aidslawpa.org), or you may contact the Settlement Administrator below. Please refer to the Gilead Mailer Settlement.

*Gilead Mailer Settlement*  
[ADDRESS]  
[TELEPHONE NUMBER]  
[TOLL FREE NUMBER]  
[EMAIL]  
INSERT SETTLEMENT WEBSITE

This notice summarizes the proposed settlement. For the precise terms and conditions of the settlement, please see the Settlement Agreement available at [www.\\_\\_\\_\\_\\_.com](http://www._____.com), by contacting the AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania, or by accessing the Court docket in this case or by visiting the Clerk's office, 1050 Mission Road, South San Francisco, CA, 94080, between 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding Court holidays.

**PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE COURT CLERK'S OFFICE TO INQUIRE ABOUT THIS SETTLEMENT OR THE CLAIM PROCESS.**

# **EXHIBIT D**

**SETTLEMENT ADMIN INFO**

Mail Date

«ClaimantName»  
«Addr1»«Addr2»  
«City» «State» «Zip»

**RE:     *Alabama Doe 1, et al. v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.*, No. 20-CIV-03699 (Cal. Sup. Ct., San Mateo Cty.)  
SETTLEMENT CHECK ENCLOSED**

Dear **INSERT NAME**:

Thank you for participating in the class action settlement in the above-referenced matter. Your settlement payment, which is attached to this letter, was calculated in accordance with the terms of the Court-approved Settlement Agreement.

Please note that your attached check must be cashed on or before **MAILDATE+180 days**. If you fail to cash your check by **MAILDATE+180**, your check will be voided and the funds will be distributed to **INSERT CY PRES APPROVED BY THE COURT**, pursuant to the Court's Final Approval Order and Judgment.

Please also note that the Settlement Administrator and Class Counsel cannot provide tax advice. We suggest that you contact your tax advisor regarding your settlement payment and the tax consequences related to these proceeds.

If you have any questions about your settlement payment, please call us toll-free at **xxx-xxx-xxxx** or contact us using the Contact Us form located at **WEBSITE**. For additional information about the Settlement, please visit **WEBSITE**.

Sincerely,  
Settlement Administrator

**SAVE THIS INFORMATION**

I.Settlement Payment	II.«Bene»
III.Total Payment	IV.«CKAMT»

**DETACH CHECK BEFORE CASHING -- VOID AFTER **MAILDATE+180 days****

# EXHIBIT B

# AIDS Law Project *of Pennsylvania*

*a nonprofit, public-interest law firm*

The AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania is a nonprofit public-interest law firm providing free legal services to people living with HIV or at high risk of acquiring it. Founded in 1988, the AIDS Law Project was established when the fear of AIDS was at its height. Routine and widespread discrimination flourished in every major aspect of life, including healthcare, housing and education.

We serve all of Pennsylvania and Southern New Jersey from our offices in Philadelphia and Camden County, NJ. We make home and hospital visits to clients who are too ill to travel to our offices and utilize bilingual staff and translation services to assist our clients in their preferred language.

Complementing our direct legal representation are our public education services and legislative advocacy. The AIDS Law Project educates the public on HIV-related legal issues through three monthly seminars, trains case management professionals in a biannual two-day public benefits training. We work at local, state, and national levels to achieve fair HIV laws and policies.

We have a holistic approach to providing legal services. We provide representation in those areas that are HIV-specific, such as discrimination and privacy. We help people obtain health care through private or public health insurance. We assist people who are unable to work obtain private or public disability benefits. We represent people facing eviction, utility terminations or mortgage foreclosures. We provide immigration assistance. We also draft Wills, Living Wills and Medical and Financial Powers of Attorney for our clients.

In our 34-year history, the AIDS Law Project has risen to the defense of approximately 46,000 Pennsylvanians and New Jerseyans living with HIV and educated more than 45,000 others on HIV-related legal issues so that they could advocate for themselves and their communities.

The AIDS Law Project has been honored with several awards as a testament to our dedication and commitment to people living with HIV. In 2014, the AIDS Law Project received the Alexander D. Forger Award for Excellence in HIV Legal Services and Advocacy for our “record of commitment and effectiveness in the fight against HIV and AIDS.” In 2012, we were awarded the Kiyoshi Kuromiya Award for Justice “for more than 20 years of fighting fearlessly for the legal rights of those living with HIV, educating thousands about AIDS-related issues, and working on multiple levels of government to achieve fair laws and policies for those living with and affected by the virus.” In 2007, Philadelphia Black Gay Pride recognized us for our “unapologetic commitment to Philadelphia’s Black LGBT communities.” In 2006, we received the Bridge Award for our “unconditional work and dedication to unite and strengthen Philadelphia’s diverse LGBT community.” In 2005, we received the Barristers’ Association of Philadelphia annual Cecil B. Moore award for “continued and selfless service to the Philadelphia community.” That same year, we received the Philadelphia AIDS Consortium Annual Providers’ Choice Award. In 1994, we were awarded Dignity Philadelphia’s annual Community Service Award for our “outstanding service to the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual community.”

The AIDS Law Project works to ensure that people living with HIV understand that their medical information is private and may not be shared without permission, except in certain limited circumstances. We have represented numerous individuals living with or affected by HIV in confidentiality cases. *See, e.g., Beckett v. Aetna* (2018) (reached \$17 million settlement in class action lawsuit against Aetna for exposing their insureds' confidential HIV-related information); *EEOC and MB v. Shoe Store* (Aug. 2016) (reached settlement for employer's disclosure of HIV status to a co-worker without consent, in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act); *DD v. Home Healthcare Provider* (Apr. 2015) (reached settlement on behalf of client whose HIV status was disclosed to a family member by a home health worker); *JS v. Hospital* (Sept. 2014) (reached settlement where treating physician disclosed HIV status to visitor in hospital room); *TH v. Doctor & Hospital* (July 2014) (reached settlement where treating physician disclosed client's HIV status to visitor in hospital room); *MM, et al. v. Residential Treatment Center* (Dec. 2011) (reached settlement on behalf of residents of a drug treatment center where dietician was careless with a list of patients with HIV); *Doe v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transp. Auth.*, (1994) (alleging that employer's administrative officer reviewed and disclosed information on utilization of employer's prescription benefit plan that indicated that employee was being treated for HIV-related illness, violating client's rights to privacy).

The AIDS Law Project has represented numerous clients in HIV discrimination cases. *See, e.g. Jones v. OSS Orthopaedic Hospital LLC*, (2016) (representing women alleging discriminatory denial of access to aquatic therapy pool because of her HIV status); *Jones v. Diamantoni & Associates Family Practice*, (2015) (settlement reached on behalf of client and his family after they were allegedly dismissed from a medical practice based on the client's HIV status); *Smith v. Milton Hershey School*, (2012) (alleging that the Milton Hershey School refused to enroll a 13-year-old student because he is living with HIV; case brought with Department of Justice settled for \$715,000); *Canal Side Care Manor, LLC v. Pa. Human Relations Commission*, (2011) (affirming a finding of discrimination against a personal care home that evicted a client because she had HIV); *EEOC v. Capital Healthcare Solutions, No.* (2011) (representing a Certified Nursing Assistant refused employment by a staffing service because of his HIV status); *Smith v. City of Philadelphia*, 345 F. Supp. 2d 482 (E.D. Pa. 2004) (alleging that city emergency medical technicians failed to provide appropriate care to man with HIV); *Silverman v. 12<sup>th</sup> Street Gym* (1994)(settled case on behalf of man ejected from gym, once his HIV status became known).

Moreover, the AIDS Law Project serves as an expert in HIV confidentiality laws and HIV privacy issues generally. We train approximately 500 people a year on HIV confidentiality at lectures convened by the Philadelphia Department of Health, the federal AIDS Education and Training Center Program, and the Drexel University College of Medicine. We have also lectured at national and local CLEs, the international AIDS conference, and webinars for private industry.

1211 Chestnut Street, Suite 600/Philadelphia, PA 19107/215-587-9377

[www.aidslawpa.org](http://www.aidslawpa.org)

[\(215\) 587-9377](tel:2155879377)

[\(215\) 587-9902](tel:2155879902)

# EXHIBIT C





1818 Market Street | Suite 3600 | Philadelphia, PA 19103

[info@bm.net](mailto:info@bm.net)

[bergermontague.com](http://bergermontague.com)

800-424-6690

## About Berger Montague

Berger Montague is a full-spectrum class action and complex civil litigation firm, with nationally known attorneys highly sought after for their legal skills. The firm has been recognized by courts throughout the country for its ability and experience in handling major complex litigation, particularly in the fields of antitrust, securities, mass torts, civil and human rights, whistleblower cases, employment, and consumer litigation. In numerous precedent-setting cases, the firm has played a principal or lead role.

The *National Law Journal* selected Berger Montague in 12 out of 14 years (2003-2005, 2007-2013, 2015-2016) for its "Hot List" of top plaintiffs-oriented litigation firms in the United States. The select group of law firms recognized each year had done "exemplary, cutting-edge work on the plaintiffs' side." The *National Law Journal* ended its "Hot List" award in 2017 and replaced it with "Elite Trial Lawyers," which Berger Montague has won from 2018-2021. The firm has also achieved the highest possible rating by its peers and opponents as reported in *Martindale-Hubbell* and was ranked as a 2021 "Best Law Firm" by *U.S. News - Best Lawyers*.

Currently, the firm consists of 75 lawyers; 16 paralegals; and an experienced support staff. Few firms in the United States have our breadth of practice and match our successful track record in such a broad array of complex litigation.

## History of the Firm

Berger Montague was founded in 1970 by the late David Berger to concentrate on the representation of plaintiffs in a series of antitrust class actions. David Berger helped pioneer the use of class actions in antitrust litigation and was instrumental in extending the use of the class action procedure to other litigation areas, including securities, employment discrimination, civil and human rights, and mass torts. The firm's complement of nationally recognized lawyers has represented both plaintiffs and defendants in these and other areas and has recovered billions of dollars for its clients. In complex litigation, particularly in areas of class action litigation, Berger Montague has established new law and forged the path for recovery.

The firm has been involved in a series of notable cases, some of them among the most important in the last 50 years of civil litigation. For example, the firm was one of the principal counsel for

plaintiffs in the *Drexel Burnham Lambert/Michael Milken* securities and bankruptcy litigation. Claimants in these cases recovered approximately \$2 billion in the aftermath of the collapse of the junk bond market and the bankruptcy of *Drexel* in the late 1980's. The firm was also among the principal trial counsel in the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill* litigation in Anchorage, Alaska, a trial resulting in a record jury award of \$5 billion against Exxon, later reduced by the U.S. Supreme Court to \$507.5 million. Berger Montague was lead counsel in the *School Asbestos Litigation*, in which a national class of secondary and elementary schools recovered in excess of \$200 million to defray the costs of asbestos abatement. The case was the first mass tort property damage class action certified on a national basis. Berger Montague was also lead class counsel and lead trial counsel in the *Cook v. Rockwell International Corporation* litigation arising out of a serious incident at the Rocky Flats nuclear weapons facility in Colorado.

Additionally, in the human rights area, the firm, through its membership on the executive committee in the *Holocaust Victim Assets Litigation*, helped to achieve a \$1.25 billion settlement with the largest Swiss banks on behalf of victims of Nazi aggression whose deposits were not returned after the Second World War. The firm also played an instrumental role in bringing about a \$4.37 billion settlement with German industry and government for the use of slave and forced labor during the Holocaust.

### **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Initiatives**

Berger Montague not only supports the idea of its Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (“DEI”) initiatives, it is a part of the DNA and fabric of the firm—internally amongst the Berger Montague family and in the way we practice law with co-counsel, opposing counsel, the courts, and with our clients. Through our DEI initiatives, Berger Montague actively works to increase diversity at all levels of our firm and to ensure that professionals of all races, religions, national origins, gender identities, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical abilities feel supported and respected in the workplace.

Berger Montague has a DEI Task Force with the leadership of the DEI Coordinator, Camille Fundora Rodriguez, and including, Candice J. Enders, Caitlin G. Coslett, Sophia Rios, and Reginald L. Streater. Berger Montague has enacted a broad range of diversity and inclusion projects, including successful efforts to hire and retain attorneys and non-attorneys from diverse backgrounds and to foster an inclusive work environment, including through firmwide trainings on implicit bias issues that may impact the workplace.

Additionally, at Berger Montague women lead. Women comprise over 30% of Berger Montague's shareholders, well above the national average as reported by the National Association of Women Lawyers. Moreover, women at the firm are encouraged and have taken advantage of professional development support to bolster their trajectories into key participation and leadership roles, both within and outside the firm, including mentoring, networking, and educational opportunities for women across all career levels. As a result of these intentional policies and initiatives, women attorneys at Berger Montague are managing departments, running offices, overseeing major

administrative programs, generating new business, serving as first chair in trials, handling large matters, and holding numerous other leadership positions firmwide.

Berger Montague's commitment to DEI activities extends beyond our firm. For example, DEI Task Force members are involved in numerous community and professional activities outside of the firm. Representative activities include membership in and/or board or leadership positions with the Hispanic Bar Association, the Barristers' Association of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Public School Board of Education, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Bar Association's Business Law Section's Antitrust Committee, Community Legal Services of Philadelphia, the Greater Philadelphia Chapter of the Pennsylvania ACLU, AccessMatters, After School Activities Partnerships, and Leadership Council on Legal Diversity. As such, Berger Montague's commitment to DEI has created an atmosphere in which the attorneys can share their gifts with the legal and greater communities from which they come.

### **Commitment to *Pro Bono***

Berger Montague attorneys commit their most valuable resource, their time, to charities, nonprofit organizations, and *pro bono* legal work. For over 50 years, Berger Montague has encouraged its attorneys to support charitable causes and volunteer in the community. Our lawyers understand that participating in *pro bono* representation is an essential component of their professional and ethical responsibilities.

Berger Montague is strongly committed to numerous charitable causes. Over his lengthy career, David Berger, the firm's founding partner, was prominent in a great many philanthropic and charitable enterprises, including serving as Honorary Chairman of the American Heart Association; a Trustee of the American Cancer Society; and a member of the Board of Directors of the American Red Cross. This tradition continues to the present.

Community Legal Services of Philadelphia, an organization that provides free legal advice and representation to low-income residents of Philadelphia, honored Berger Montague with its 2021 Champion of Justice Award for the firm's work leading a case against the IRS that succeeded in getting unemployed people their rightful benefits during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In prior years, Berger Montague received the Chancellor's Award presented by the Philadelphia Volunteers for the Indigent Program ("VIP"), which provides crucial legal services to more than 1,000 low-income Philadelphia residents each year. VIP relies on volunteer attorneys to provide *pro bono* representation for families and individuals. In 2009 and 2010, Berger Montague also received an award for our volunteer work with the VIP Mortgage Foreclosure Program.

Today, Berger Montague attorneys engage in *pro bono* work for many organizations, including:

- Public Interest Law Center of Philadelphia ("PILCOP")
- Community Legal Services of Philadelphia ("CLS")
- Philadelphia Legal Assistance
- Education Law Center

- Legal Clinic for the Disabled
- Support Center for Child Advocates
- Veterans Pro Bono Consortium
- AIDS Law Project of Philadelphia
- Center for Literacy
- National Liberty Museum
- Philadelphia Volunteers for the Indigent Program
- Philadelphia Mortgage Foreclosure Program

We are proud of our written *pro bono* policy that encourages and strongly supports our attorneys to get involved in this important and rewarding work. Many attorneys at Berger Montague have been named to the First District of Pennsylvania's Pro Bono Honor Roll.

Berger Montague also makes annual contributions to the Philadelphia Bar Foundation, an umbrella charitable organization dedicated to promoting access to justice for all people in the community, particularly those struggling with poverty, abuse, and discrimination.

The firm also has held numerous clothing drives, toy drives, food drives, and blood drives. Through these efforts, Berger Montague professional and support staff have donated thousands of items of clothing, toys, and food to local charities including the Salvation Army, Toys for Tots, and Philabundance, a local food bank. Blood donations are made to the American Red Cross. Berger Montague attorneys also volunteer on an annual basis at MANNA, which prepares and delivers nourishing meals to those suffering with serious illnesses.

## Practice Areas and Case Profiles

### Antitrust

In antitrust litigation, the firm has served as lead, co-lead or co-trial counsel on many of the most significant civil antitrust cases over the last 50 years, including *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation* (settlement of approximately \$5.6 billion), *In re Namenda Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* (recovery of \$750 million), *In re Loestrin 24 Fe Antitrust Litigation* (recovery of \$120 million), and *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation* (settlements totaling \$190.7 million).

Once again, Berger Montague has been selected by *Chambers and Partners* for its 2021 *Chambers USA* Guide as one of Pennsylvania's top antitrust firms. *Chambers USA 2021* states that Berger Montague's antitrust practice group is "a preeminent force in the Pennsylvania antitrust market, offering expert counsel to clients from a broad range of industries."

*The Legal 500*, a guide to worldwide legal services providers, ranked Berger Montague as a Top Tier Law Firm for Antitrust: Civil Litigation/Class Actions: Plaintiff in the United States in its 2021 guide and states that Berger Montague's antitrust department "has a flair for handling high-stakes plaintiff-side cases, regularly winning high-value settlements for clients following antitrust law violations."

- ***In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel for a national class including millions of merchants in the *Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation* against Visa, MasterCard, and several of the largest banks in the U.S. (e.g., Chase, Bank of America, and Citi). The lawsuit alleged that merchants paid excessive fees to accept Visa and MasterCard cards because the payment cards, individually and together with their respective member banks, violated the antitrust laws. The challenged conduct included, *inter alia*, the collective fixing of interchange fees and adoption of rules that hindered any competitive pressure by merchants to reduce those fees. The lawsuit further alleged that defendants maintained their conspiracy even after both Visa and MasterCard changed their corporate forms from joint ventures owned by member banks to publicly-owned corporations following commencement of this litigation. On September 18, 2018, after thirteen years of hard-fought litigation, Visa and MasterCard agreed to pay as much as approximately \$6.26 billion, but no less than approximately \$5.56 billion, to settle the case. This result is the largest-ever class action settlement of an antitrust case. The settlement received preliminary approval on January 24, 2019. The settlement received final approval on December 16, 2019, for approximately \$5.6 billion.
- ***Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.:*** Berger Montague served as lead class counsel in the multistate indirect purchaser antitrust class action *Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.*, against 16 of the world's largest dealer banks. Plaintiffs alleged that the defendants colluded to manipulate prices on foreign currency ("FX") instruments, using a number of methods to carry out their conspiracies, including sharing confidential price and order information through electronic chat rooms, thereby enabling the defendants to coordinate pricing and eliminate price competition. As with prior bank rigging scandals involving conspiracies to manipulate prices on other financial instruments, the defendants' alleged conspiracy to manipulate FX prices was the subject of numerous governmental investigations as well as direct purchaser class actions brought under antitrust federal law. However, the *Contant* action was the first of such cases to bring claims under state indirect purchaser antitrust laws on behalf of state-wide classes of retail investors of those financial instruments and whose claims have never been redressed. On July 29, 2019, U.S. District Judge Lorna G. Schofield granted preliminary approval of a \$10 million settlement with Citigroup and a \$985,000 settlement with MUFG Bank Ltd. On July 17, 2020, the Court granted preliminary approval of three settlements with all remaining defendants for a combined \$12.695 million. Each of the five settlements, totaling \$23.63 million, received final approval on November 19, 2020.
- ***In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel for a class of dental practices and dental laboratories in *In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation*, a suit brought against Henry Schein, Inc., Patterson Companies, Inc., and Benco Dental Supply Company, the three largest distributors of dental supplies in the United States. On September 7, 2018, co-lead counsel announced that they agreed with defendants to settle on a classwide basis for \$80 million. The settlement received final

approval on June 24, 2019. The suit alleged that the defendants, who collectively control close to 90 percent of the dental supplies and equipment distribution market, conspired to restrain trade and fix prices at anticompetitive levels, in violation of the Sherman Act. In furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, plaintiffs claimed that the defendants colluded to boycott and pressure dental manufacturers, dental distributors, and state dental associations that did business with or considered doing business with the defendants' lower-priced rivals. The suit claimed that, because of the defendants' anticompetitive conduct, members of the class were overcharged on dental supplies and equipment. In the 2019 Fairness Hearing, Judge Brian M. Cogan of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York said: "This is a substantial recovery that has the deterrent effect that class actions are supposed to have, and I think it was done because we had really good Plaintiffs' lawyers in this case who were running it."

- ***In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel on behalf of a class of direct purchasers of drywall, in a case alleging that the dominant manufacturers of drywall engaged in a conspiracy to fix drywall prices in the U.S. and to abolish the industry's long-standing practice of limiting price increases for the duration of a construction project through "job quotes." Berger Montague represented a class of direct purchasers of drywall from defendants for the period from January 1, 2012 to January 31, 2013. USG Corporation and United States Gypsum Company (collectively, "USG"), New NGC, Inc., Lafarge North America Inc., Eagle Materials, Inc., American Gypsum Company LLC, TIN Inc. d/b/a Temple-Inland Inc., and PABCO Building Products, LLC were named as defendants in this action. On August 20, 2015, the district court granted final approval of two settlements—one with USG and the other with TIN Inc.—totaling \$44.5 million. On December 8, 2016, the district court granted final approval of a \$21.2 million settlement with Lafarge North America, Inc. On February 18, 2016, the district court denied the motions for summary judgment filed by American Gypsum Company, New NGC, Inc., Lafarge North America, Inc., and PABCO Building Products. On August 23, 2017, the district court granted direct purchaser plaintiffs' motion for class certification. On January 29, 2018, the district court granted preliminary approval of a joint settlement with the remaining defendants, New NGC, Inc., Eagle Materials, Inc., American Gypsum Company LLC, and PABCO Building Products, LLC, for \$125 million. The settlement received final approval on July 17, 2018, bringing the total amount of settlements for the class to \$190.7 million.
- ***In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague, as one of two co-lead counsel, spearheaded a class action lawsuit alleging that the major credit cards had conspired to fix prices for foreign currency conversion fees imposed on credit card transactions. After eight years of litigation, a settlement of \$336 million was approved in October 2009, with a Final Judgment entered in November 2009. Following the resolution of eleven appeals, the District Court, on October 5, 2011, directed distribution of the settlement funds to more than 10 million timely filed claimants, among the largest class of claimants in an antitrust consumer class action. A subsequent settlement with American Express increased the settlement amount to \$386 million. (MDL No. 1409 (S.D.N.Y)).

- ***In re Marchbanks Truck Service Inc., et al. v. Comdata Network, Inc.***: Berger Montague was co-lead counsel in this antitrust class action brought on behalf of a class of thousands of Independent Truck Stops. The lawsuit alleged that defendant Comdata Network, Inc. had monopolized the market for specialized Fleet Cards used by long-haul truckers. Comdata imposed anticompetitive provisions in its agreements with Independent Truck Stops that artificially inflated the fees Independents paid when accepting the Comdata's Fleet Card for payment. These contractual provisions, commonly referred to as anti-steering provisions or merchant restraints, barred Independents from taking various competitive steps that could have been used to steer fleets to rival payment cards. The settlement for \$130 million and valuable prospective relief was preliminary approved on March 17, 2014, and finally approved on July 14, 2014. In its July 14, 2014 order approving Class Counsel's fee request, entered contemporaneously with its order finally approving the settlement, the Court described this outcome as "substantial, both in absolute terms, and when assessed in light of the risks of establishing liability and damages in this case."
  
- ***Ross, et al. v. Bank of America (USA) N.A., et al.***: Berger Montague, as lead counsel for the cardholder classes, obtained final approval of settlements reached with Chase, Bank of America, Capital One and HSBC, on claims that the defendant banks unlawfully acted in concert to require cardholders to arbitrate disputes, including debt collections, and to preclude cardholders from participating in any class actions. The case was brought for injunctive relief only. The settlements remove arbitration clauses nationwide for 3.5 years from the so-called "cardholder agreements" for over 100 million credit card holders. This victory for consumers and small businesses came after nearly five years of hard-fought litigation, including obtaining a decision by the Court of Appeals reversing the order dismissing the case, and will aid consumers and small businesses in their ability to resist unfair and abusive credit card practices. In June 2009, the National Arbitration Forum (or "NAF") was added as a defendant. Berger Montague also reached a settlement with NAF. Under that agreement, NAF ceased administering arbitration proceedings involving business cards for a period of three and one-half (3.5) years, which relief is in addition to the requirements of a Consent Judgment with the State of Minnesota, entered into by the NAF on July 24, 2009.
  
- ***Johnson, et al. v AzHHA, et al.***: Berger Montague was co-lead counsel in this litigation on behalf of a class of temporary nursing personnel, against the Arizona Hospital and Healthcare Association, and its member hospitals, for agreeing and conspiring to fix the rates and wages for temporary nursing personnel, causing class members to be underpaid. The court approved \$24 million in settlements on behalf of this class of nurses. (Case No. 07-1292 (D. Ariz.)).

The firm has also played a leading role in cases in the pharmaceutical arena, especially in cases involving the delayed entry of generic competition, having achieved over \$2 billion in settlements in such cases over the past decade, including:

- ***In re: Namenda Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague is co-lead counsel for the class in this antitrust action brought on behalf of a class of direct purchasers of branded and/or generic Namenda IR and/or branded Namenda XR. It settled for \$750 million on the very eve of trial. The \$750 million settlement received final approval on May 27, 2020, and is the largest single-defendant settlement ever for a case alleging delayed generic competition. (Case No. 15-cv-7488 (S.D.N.Y.)).
- ***King Drug Co. v. Cephalon, Inc.:*** Berger Montague played a major role (serving on the executive committee) in this antitrust class action on behalf of direct purchasers of the prescription drug Provigil (modafinil). After nine years of hard-fought litigation, the court approved a \$512 million partial settlement, then the largest settlement ever for a case alleging delayed generic competition. (Case No. 2:06-cv-01797 (E.D. Pa.)). Subsequent non-class settlements pushed the total settlement figure even higher.
- ***In re Aggrenox Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague represented a class of direct purchasers of Aggrenox in an action alleging that defendants delayed the availability of less expensive generic Aggrenox through, *inter alia*, unlawful reverse payment agreements. The case settled for \$146 million. (Case No. 14-02516 (D. Conn.)).
- ***In re Asacol Antitrust Litigation:*** The firm served as class counsel for direct purchasers of Asacol HS and Delzicol in a case alleging that defendants participated in a scheme to block generic competition for the ulcerative colitis drug Asacol. The case settled for \$15 million. (Case No. 15-cv-12730-DJC (D. Mass.)).
- ***In re Celebrex (Celecoxib) Antitrust Litigation:*** The firm represented a class of direct purchasers of brand and generic Celebrex (celecoxib) in an action alleging that Pfizer, in violation of the Sherman Act, improperly obtained a patent for Celebrex from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in a scheme to unlawfully extend patent protection and delay market entry of generic versions of Celebrex. The case settled for \$94 million. (Case No. 14-cv-00361 (E.D. VA.)).
- ***In re DDAVP Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel in a case that charged defendants with using sham litigation and a fraudulently obtained patent to delay the entry of generic versions of the prescription drug DDAVP. Berger Montague achieved a \$20.25 million settlement only after winning a precedent-setting victory before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that ruled that direct purchasers had standing to recover overcharges arising from a patent-holder's misuse of an allegedly fraudulently obtained patent. (Case No. 05-2237 (S.D.N.Y.)).
- ***In re K-Dur Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel for the class in this long-running antitrust litigation. Berger Montague litigated the case before the Court of Appeals and won a precedent-setting victory and continued the fight before the Supreme Court. On remand, the case settled for \$60.2 million. (Case No. 01-1652 (D.N.J.)).



- ***In re Loestrin 24 Fe Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel for the class of direct purchasers of brand Loestrin, generic Loestrin, and/or brand Minastrin. The direct purchaser class alleged that defendants violated federal antitrust laws by unlawfully impairing the introduction of generic versions of the prescription drug Loestrin 24 Fe. The case settled shortly before trial for \$120 million (Case No. 13-md-2472) (D.R.I.).
- ***Meijer, Inc., et al. v. Abbott Laboratories:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel in a class action on behalf of pharmaceutical wholesalers and pharmacies charging Abbott Laboratories with illegally maintaining monopoly power and overcharging purchasers in violation of the federal antitrust laws. Plaintiffs alleged that Abbott had used its monopoly with respect to its anti-HIV medicine Norvir (ritonavir) to protect its monopoly power for another highly profitable Abbott HIV drug, Kaletra. This antitrust class action settled for \$52 million after four days of a jury trial in federal court in Oakland, California. (Case No. 07-5985 (N.D. Cal.)).
- ***Mylan Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Warner Chilcott Public Ltd. Co.:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel in a case challenging Warner Chilcott's alleged anticompetitive practices with respect to the branded drug Doryx. The case settled for \$15 million. (Case No. 2:12-cv-03824 (E.D. Pa.)).
- ***In re Oxycontin Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel on behalf of direct purchasers of the prescription drug Oxycontin. The case settled in 2011 for \$16 million. (Case No. 1:04-md-01603 (S.D.N.Y.)).
- ***In re Prandin Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel and recovered \$19 million on behalf of direct purchasers of the diabetes medication Prandin. (Case No. 2:10-cv-12141 (E.D. Mich.)).
- ***Rochester Drug Co-Operative, Inc. v. Braintree Labs., Inc.:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel on behalf of direct purchasers alleging sham litigation led to the delay of generic forms of the brand drug Miralax. The case settled for \$17.25 million. (Case No. 07-142 (D. Del.)).
- ***In re Skelaxin Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague was among a small group of firms litigating on behalf of direct purchasers of the drug Skelaxin. The case settled for \$73 million. (Case No. 2:12-cv-83 / 1:12-md-02343) (E.D. Tenn.)).
- ***In re Solodyn Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel representing a class of direct purchasers of brand and generic Solodyn (extended-release minocycline hydrochloride tablets) alleging that defendants entered into agreements not to compete in the market for extended-release minocycline hydrochloride tablets in violation of the Sherman Act. With a final settlement on the eve of trial, the case settled for a total of more than \$76 million. (Case No. 14-MD-2503-DJC (D. Mass.)).

- ***In re Tricor Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague was one of a small group of counsel in a case alleging that the manufacturer of this drug was paying its competitors to refrain from introducing less expensive generic versions of Tricor. The case settled for \$250 million. (No. 05-340 (D. Del.)).
- ***In re Wellbutrin XL Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel for a class of direct purchasers of the antidepressant Wellbutrin XL. A settlement of \$37.5 million was reached with Valeant Pharmaceuticals (formerly Biovail), one of two defendants in the case. (Case No. 08-cv-2431 (E.D. Pa.)).

### Commercial Litigation

Berger Montague helps business clients achieve extraordinary successes in a wide variety of complex commercial litigation matters. Our attorneys appear regularly on behalf of clients in high stakes federal and state court commercial litigation across the United States. We work with our clients to develop a comprehensive and detailed litigation plan, and then organize, allocate and deploy whatever resources are necessary to successfully prosecute or defend the case.

- ***Robert S. Spencer, et al. v. The Arden Group, Inc., et al.:*** Berger Montague represented an owner of limited partnership interests in several commercial real estate partnerships in a lawsuit against the partnerships' general partner. The terms of the settlement are subject to a confidentiality agreement. (Aug. Term, 2007, No. 02066 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty. - Commerce Program)).
- ***Forbes v. GMH:*** Berger Montague represented a private real estate developer/investor who sold a valuable apartment complex to GMH for cash and publicly-held securities. The case which claimed securities fraud in connection with the transaction settled for a confidential sum which represented a significant portion of the losses experienced. (No. 07-cv-00979 (E.D. Pa.)).

### Commodities & Financial Instruments

Berger Montague ranks among the country's preeminent firms for managing and trying complex Commodities & Financial Instruments related cases on behalf of individuals and as class actions. The firm's commodities clients include individual hedge and speculation traders, hedge funds, energy firms, investment funds, and precious metals clients.

- ***In re Peregrine Financial Group Customer Litigation:*** Berger Montague served as co-lead counsel in a class action which helped deliver settlements worth more than \$75 million on behalf of former customers of Peregrine Financial Group, Inc., in litigation against U.S. Bank, N.A., and JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., arising from Peregrine's collapse in July 2012. The lawsuit alleges that both banks breached legal duties by allowing Peregrine's owner to withdraw and put millions of dollars in customer funds to non-customer use. (No. 1:12-cv-5546)

- ***In re MF Global Holdings Ltd. Investment Litigation:*** Berger Montague is one of two co-lead counsel that represented thousands of commodities account holders who fell victim to the alleged massive theft and misappropriation of client funds at the former major global commodities brokerage firm MF Global. Berger Montague reached a variety of settlements, including with JPMorgan Chase Bank, the MF Global SIPA Trustee, and the CME Group, that collectively helped to return approximately \$1.6 billion to the class. Ultimately, class members received more than 100% of the funds allegedly misappropriated by MF Global even after all fees and expenses. (No. 11-cv-07866 (S.D.N.Y.)).
  
- ***In re Commodity Exchange, Inc., Gold Futures and Options Trading Litigation:*** Berger Montague is one of two co-lead counsel representing traders of gold-based derivative contracts, physical gold, and gold-based securities against The Bank of Nova Scotia, Barclays Bank plc, Deutsche Bank AG, HSBC Bank plc, Société Générale and the London Gold Market Fixing Limited. Plaintiffs allege that the defendants, members of the London Gold Market Fixing Limited, which sets an important benchmark price for gold, conspired to manipulate this benchmark for their collective benefit. (1:14-md-02548 (S.D.N.Y.)).
  
- ***In re Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation:*** Berger Montague represents exchange-based investors in this sprawling litigation alleging a conspiracy among many of the world's largest banks to manipulate the key LIBOR benchmark rate. LIBOR plays an important role in valuing trillions of dollars of financial instruments worldwide. The case, filed in 2011, alleges that the banks colluded to misreport and manipulate LIBOR rates for their own benefit. The banks' conduct damaged, among others, exchange-based investors who transacted in Eurodollar futures and options on the CME between 2005 and 2010. Eurodollar futures and options are keyed to LIBOR and are the world's most heavily traded short-term interest rate contracts. Following years of hotly contested litigation on behalf of these exchange-based investors, Berger Montague and its co-counsel achieved settlements with seven banks totaling more than \$180 million. In September 2019, the Court granted preliminary approval of a plan of distribution for these settlement funds. A final approval hearing on the settlement is scheduled in September 2020. (No. 1:11-md-02262-NRB (S.D.N.Y.)).

### **Consumer Protection**

Berger Montague's Consumer Protection Group protects consumers when they are injured by false or misleading advertising, defective products, data privacy breaches, and various other unfair trade practices. Consumers too often suffer the brunt of corporate wrongdoing, particularly in the area of false or misleading advertising, defective products, and data or privacy breaches.

- ***In re Public Records Fair Credit Reporting Act Litigation:*** Berger Montague is class counsel in three class action settlements involving how the big three credit bureaus, Experian, TransUnion, and Equifax, report public records, including tax liens and civil judgments. The settlements provide groundbreaking injunctive relief valued at over \$100 billion and provide a streamlined process for consumers to receive uncapped monetary payments for claims related to inaccurate reporting of public records.
- ***In re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation:*** The firm, as one of two Co-Lead Counsel firms obtained a settlement of more than \$103 million in this multidistrict products liability litigation concerning CertainTeed Corporation's fiber cement siding, on behalf of a nationwide class. (MDL No. 2270 (E.D. Pa.)).
- ***Countrywide Predatory Lending Enforcement Action:*** Berger Montague advised the Ohio Attorney General (and several other state attorneys general) regarding predatory lending in a landmark law enforcement proceeding against *Countrywide* (and its parent, Bank of America) culminating in 2008 in mortgage-related modifications and other relief for borrowers across the country valued at some \$8.6 billion.
- ***In re Experian Data Breach Litigation:*** Berger Montague served on the Executive Committee of this class action lawsuit that arose from a 2015 data breach at Experian in which computer hackers stole personal information including Social Security numbers and other sensitive personal information for approximately 15 million consumers. The settlement is valued at over \$170 million. It consisted of \$22 million for a non-reversionary cash Settlement Fund; \$11.7 million for Experian's remedial measures implemented in connection with the lawsuit; and two years of free credit monitoring and identity theft insurance. The aggregate value of credit monitoring claimed by class members during the claims submission process exceeded \$138 million, based on a \$19.99 per month retail value of the service.
- ***In re Pet Foods Product Liability Litigation:*** The firm served as one of plaintiffs' co-lead counsel in this multidistrict class action suit seeking to redress the harm resulting from the manufacture and sale of contaminated dog and cat food. The case settled for \$24 million. Many terms of the settlement are unique and highly beneficial to the class, including allowing class members to recover up to 100% of their economic damages without any limitation on the types of economic damages they may recover. (1:07-cv-02867 (D.N.J.), MDL Docket No. 1850 (D.N.J.)).
- ***In re TJX Companies Retail Security Breach Litigation:*** The firm served as co-lead counsel in this multidistrict litigation brought on behalf of individuals whose personal and financial data was compromised in the then-largest theft of personal data in history. The breach involved more than 45 million credit and debit card numbers and 450,000 customers' driver's license numbers. The case was settled for benefits valued at over \$200 million. Class members whose driver's license numbers were at risk were entitled to 3 years of credit monitoring and identity theft insurance (a value of \$390 per person based

on the retail cost for this service), reimbursement of actual identity theft losses, and reimbursement of driver's license replacement costs. Class members whose credit and debit card numbers were at risk were entitled to cash of \$15-\$30 or store vouchers of \$30-\$60. (No. 1:07-cv-10162-WGY, (D. Mass.)).

- ***In re: Heartland Payment Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation:*** The firm served on the Executive Committee of this multidistrict litigation and obtained a settlement of cash and injunctive relief for a class of 130 million credit card holders whose credit card information was stolen by computer hackers. The breach was the largest known theft of credit card information in history. (No. 4:09-MD-2046 (S.D. Tex. 2009)).
- ***In re: Countrywide Financial Corp. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation:*** The firm served on the Executive Committee of this multidistrict litigation and obtained a settlement for a class of 17 million individuals whose personal information was at risk when a rogue employee sold their information to unauthorized third parties. Settlement benefits included: (i) reimbursement of several categories of out-of-pocket costs; (ii) credit monitoring and identity theft insurance for 2 years for consumers who did not accept Countrywide's prior offer of credit monitoring; and (iii) injunctive relief. The settlement was approved by the court in 2010. (3:08-md-01998-TBR (W.D. Ky. 2008)).
- ***In re Educational Testing Service Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grades 7-12 Litigation:*** The firm served on the plaintiffs' steering committee and obtained an \$11.1 million settlement in 2006 on behalf of persons who were incorrectly scored on a teacher's licensing exam. (MDL No. 1643 (E.D. La.)).
- ***Salvucci v. Volkswagen of America, Inc. d/b/a Audi of America, Inc.:*** The firm served as co-lead counsel in litigation brought on behalf of a nationwide class alleging that defendants failed to disclose that its vehicles contained defectively designed timing belt tensioners and associated parts and that defendants misrepresented the appropriate service interval for replacement of the timing belt tensioner system. After extensive discovery, a settlement was reached. (Docket No. ATL-1461-03 (N.J. Sup. Ct. 2007)).

### **Corporate Governance and Shareholder Rights**

Berger Montague protects the interests of individual and institutional investors in shareholder derivative actions in state and federal courts across the United States. Our attorneys help individual and institutional investors reform poor corporate governance, as well as represent them in litigation against directors of a company for violating their fiduciary duty or provide guidance on shareholder rights.

- ***Emil Rossdeutscher and Dennis Kelly v. Viacom:*** The firm, as lead counsel, obtained a settlement resulting in a fund of \$14.25 million for the class. (C.A. No. 98C-03-091 (JEB) (Del. Super. Ct.)).

- ***Fox v. Riverview Realty Partners, f/k/a Prime Group Realty Trust, et al.***: The firm, as lead counsel, obtained a settlement resulting in a fund of \$8.25 million for the class.

### **Employee Benefits & ERISA**

Berger Montague represents employees who have claims under the federal Employee Retirement Income Security Act. We litigate cases on behalf of employees whose 401(k) and pension investments have suffered losses as a result of the breach of fiduciary duties by plan administrators and the companies they represent. Berger Montague has recovered hundreds of millions of dollars in lost retirement benefits for American workers and retirees, and also gained favorable changes to their retirement plans.

- ***Diebold v. Northern Trust Investments, N.A.***: As co-lead counsel in this ERISA breach of fiduciary duty case, the firm secured a \$36 million settlement on behalf of participants in retirement plans who participated in Northern Trust's securities lending program. Plaintiffs alleged that defendants breached their ERISA fiduciary duties by failing to manage properly two collateral pools that held cash collateral received from the securities lending program. The settlement represented a recovery of more than 25% of alleged class member losses. (No. 1:09-cv-01934 (N.D. Ill.)).
- ***Glass Dimensions, Inc. v. State Street Bank & Trust Co.***: The firm served as co-lead counsel in this ERISA case that alleged that defendants breached their fiduciary duties to the retirement plans it managed by taking unreasonable compensation for managing the securities lending program in which the plans participated. After the court certified a class of the plans that participated in the securities lending program at issue, the case settled for \$10 million on behalf of 1,500 retirement plans that invested in defendants' collective investment funds. (No. 1:10-cv-10588-DPW (D. Mass)).
- ***In re Eastman Kodak ERISA Litigation***: The firm served as class counsel in this ERISA breach of fiduciary duty class action which alleged that defendants breached their fiduciary duties to Kodak retirement plan participants by allowing plan investments in Kodak common stock. The case settled for \$9.7 million. (Master File No. 6:12-cv-06051-DGL (W.D.N.Y.)).
- ***Lequita Dennard v. Transamerica Corp. et al.***: The firm served as counsel to plan participants who alleged that they suffered losses when plan fiduciaries failed to act solely in participants' interests, as ERISA requires, when they selected, removed and monitored plan investment options. The case settled for structural changes to the plan and \$3.8 million monetary payment to the class. (Civil Action No. 1:15-cv-00030-EJM (N.D. Iowa)).

### **Employment & Unpaid Wages**

The Berger Montague Employment & Unpaid Wages Department works tirelessly to safeguard the rights of employees and devotes all of their energies to helping the firm's clients achieve their goals. Our attorneys' understanding of federal and state wage and hour laws, federal and state civil rights and discrimination laws, ERISA, the WARN Act, laws protecting whistleblowers, such

as federal and state False Claims Acts, and other employment laws, allows us to develop creative strategies to vindicate our clients' rights and help them secure the compensation to which they are entitled.

Berger Montague is at the forefront of class action litigation, seeking remedies for employees under the Fair Labor Standards Act, state wage and hour law, breach of contract, unjust enrichment, and other state common law causes of action.

Berger Montague's Employment & Unpaid Wages Group, which is chaired by Executive Shareholder Shanon Carson, is repeatedly recognized for outstanding success in effectively representing its clients. In 2015, *The National Law Journal* selected Berger Montague as the top plaintiffs' law firm in the Employment Law category at the Elite Trial Lawyers awards ceremony. Portfolio Media, which publishes *Law360*, also recognized Berger Montague as one of the eight Top Employment Plaintiffs' Firms in 2009.

Representative cases include the following:

- ***Fenley v. Wood Group Mustang, Inc.***: The firm served as lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$6.25 million on behalf of a class of oil and gas inspectors who allegedly did not receive overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. (Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-326 (S.D. Ohio)).
- ***Sanders v. The CJS Solutions Group, LLC***: The firm served as co-lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$3.24 million on behalf of a class of IT healthcare consultants who allegedly did not receive overtime premiums for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. (Civil Action No. 17-3809 (S.D.N.Y.)).
- ***Gundrum v. Cleveland Integrity Services, Inc.***: The firm served as lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$4.5 million on behalf of a class of oil and gas inspectors who allegedly did not receive overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. (Civil Action No. 4:17-cv-55 (N.D. Okl.)).
- ***Fenley v. Applied Consultants, Inc.***: The firm served as lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$9.25 million on behalf of a class of oil and gas inspectors who allegedly did not receive overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. (Civil Action No. 2:15-cv-259 (W.D. Pa.)).
- ***Acevedo v. Brightview Landscapes, LLC***: The firm served as co-lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$6.95 million on behalf of a class of landscaping crew members who allegedly did not receive proper overtime premiums for hours worked in excess of 40 per week. (Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-02529 (M.D. Pa.)).
- ***Jantz v. Social Security Administration***: The firm served as co-lead counsel and obtained a settlement on behalf of employees with targeted disabilities ("TDEs") alleged

that SSA discriminated against TDEs by denying them promotional and other career advancement opportunities. The settlement was reached after more than ten years of litigation, and the Class withstood challenges to class certification on four separate occasions. The settlement includes a monetary fund of \$9.98 million and an unprecedented package of extensive programmatic changes valued at approximately \$20 million. (EEOC No. 531-2006-00276X (2015)).

- ***Ciamillo v. Baker Hughes, Incorporated:*** The firm served as lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$5 million on behalf of a class of oil and gas workers who allegedly did not receive any overtime compensation for working hours in excess of 40 per week. (Civil Action No. 14-cv-81 (D. Alaska)).
- ***Salcido v. Cargill Meat Solutions Corp.:*** The firm served as co-lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$7.5 million on behalf of a class of thousands of employees of Cargill Meat Solutions Corp. alleging that they were forced to work off-the-clock and during their breaks. This is one of the largest settlements of this type of case involving a single plant in U.S. history. (Civil Action Nos. 1:07-cv-01347-LJO-GSA and 1:08-cv-00605-LJO-GSA (E.D. Cal.)).
- ***Chabrier v. Wilmington Finance, Inc.:*** The firm served as co-lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$2,925,000 on behalf of loan officers who worked in four offices to resolve claims for unpaid overtime wages. A significant opinion issued in the case is *Chabrier v. Wilmington Finance, Inc.*, 2008 WL 938872 (E.D. Pa. April 04, 2008) (denying the defendant's motion to decertify the class). (No. 06-4176 (E.D. Pa.)).
- ***Bonnette v. Rochester Gas & Electric Co.:*** The firm served as co-lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$2 million on behalf of a class of African American employees of Rochester Gas & Electric Co. to resolve charges of racial discrimination in hiring, job assignments, compensation, promotions, discipline, terminations, retaliation, and a hostile work environment. (No. 07-6635 (W.D.N.Y.)).

## Environment & Public Health

Berger Montague lawyers are trailblazers in the fields of environmental class action litigation and mass torts. Our attorneys have earned their reputation in the fields of environmental litigation and mass torts by successfully prosecuting some of the largest, most well-known cases of our time. Our Environment & Public Health Group also prosecutes significant claims for personal injury, commercial losses, property damage, and environmental response costs. In 2016, Berger Montague was named an Elite Trial Lawyer Finalist in special litigation (environmental) by *The National Law Journal*.

- ***Cook v. Rockwell International Corporation:*** In February 2006, the firm won a \$554 million jury verdict on behalf of thousands of property owners whose homes were exposed to plutonium from the former Rocky Flats nuclear weapons site northwest of Denver, Colorado. Judgment in the case was entered by the court in June 2008 which, with



interest, totaled \$926 million. Recognizing this tremendous achievement, the Public Justice Foundation bestowed its prestigious Trial Lawyer of the Year Award for 2009 on Merrill G. Davidoff, David F. Sorensen, and the entire trial team for their “long and hard-fought” victory against “formidable corporate and government defendants.” (No. 90-cv-00181-JLK (D. Colo.)). The jury verdict in that case was vacated on appeal in 2010, but on a second trip to the Tenth Circuit, Plaintiffs secured a victory in 2015, with the case then being sent back to the district court. A \$375 million settlement was reached in May 2016, and final approval by the district court was obtained in April 2017.

- ***In re Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litigation:*** On September 16, 1994, a jury trial of several months duration resulted in a record punitive damages award of \$5 billion against the Exxon defendants as a consequence of one of the largest oil spills in U.S. history. The award was reduced to \$507.5 million pursuant to a Supreme Court decision. David Berger was co-chair of the plaintiffs’ discovery committee (appointed by both the federal and state courts). Harold Berger served as a member of the organizing case management committee. H. Laddie Montague was specifically appointed by the federal court as one of the four designated trial counsel. Both Mr. Montague and Peter Kahana shared (with the entire trial team) the 1995 “Trial Lawyer of the Year Award” given by the Trial Lawyers for Public Justice. (No. A89-0095-CVCHRH (D. Alaska)).
- ***Drayton v. Pilgrim’s Pride Corp.:*** The firm served as counsel in a consolidation of wrongful death and other catastrophic injury cases brought against two manufacturers of turkey products, arising out of a 2002 outbreak of *Listeria Monocytogenes* in the Northeastern United States, which resulted in the recall of over 32 million pounds of turkey – the second largest meat recall in U.S. history at that time. A significant opinion issued in the case is *Drayton v. Pilgrim’s Pride Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 2d 638 (E.D. Pa. 2006) (denying the defendants’ motions for summary judgment and applying the alternative liability doctrine). All of the cases settled on confidential terms in 2006. (No. 03-2334 (E.D. Pa.)).
- ***In re Three Mile Island Litigation:*** As lead/liaison counsel, the firm successfully litigated the case and reached a settlement in 1981 of \$25 million in favor of individuals, corporations and other entities suffering property damage as a result of the nuclear incident involved. (C.A. No. 79-0432 (M.D. Pa.)).

## Insurance Fraud

When insurance companies and affiliated financial services entities engage in fraudulent, deceptive or unfair practices, Berger Montague helps injured parties recover their losses. We focus on fraudulent, deceptive and unfair business practices across all lines of insurance and financial products and services sold by insurers and their affiliates, which include annuities, securities and other investment vehicles.

- ***Spencer v. Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc.:*** The firm, together with co-counsel, prosecuted this national class action against The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. and its affiliates in the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (*Spencer*

*v. Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc.*, Case No. 05-cv-1681) on behalf of approximately 22,000 claimants, each of whom entered into structured settlements with Hartford property and casualty insurers to settle personal injury and workers' compensation claims. To fund these structured settlements, the Hartford property and casualty insurers purchased annuities from their affiliate, Hartford Life. By purchasing the annuity from Hartford Life, The Hartford companies allegedly were able to retain up to 15% of the structured amount of the settlement in the form of undisclosed costs, commissions and profit - all of which was concealed from the settling claimants. On March 10, 2009, the U.S. District Court certified for trial claims on behalf of two national subclasses for civil RICO and fraud (256 F.R.D. 284 (D. Conn. 2009)). On October 14, 2009, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals denied The Hartford's petition for interlocutory appeal under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(f). On September 21, 2010, the U.S. District Court entered judgment granting final approval of a \$72.5 million cash settlement.

- ***Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company v. O'Dell***: The firm, together with co-counsel, prosecuted this class action against Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company in West Virginia Circuit Court, Roane County (*Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company v. O'Dell*, Case No. 00-C-37), on behalf of current and former West Virginia automobile insurance policyholders, which arose out of Nationwide's failure, dating back to 1993, to offer policyholders the ability to purchase statutorily-required optional levels of underinsured ("UIM") and uninsured ("UM") motorist coverage in accordance with West Virginia Code 33-6-31. The court certified a trial class seeking monetary damages, alleging that the failure to offer these optional levels of coverage, and the failure to provide increased first party benefits to personal injury claimants, breached Nationwide's insurance policies and its duty of good faith and fair dealing, and violated the West Virginia Unfair Trade Practices Act. On June 25, 2009, the court issued final approval of a settlement that provided a minimum estimated value of \$75 million to Nationwide auto policyholders and their passengers who were injured in an accident or who suffered property damage.

### **Predatory Lending and Borrowers' Rights**

Berger Montague's attorneys fight vigorously to protect the rights of borrowers when they are injured by the practices of banks and other financial institutions that lend money or service borrowers' loans. Berger Montague has successfully obtained multi-million-dollar class action settlements for nationwide classes of borrowers against banks and financial institutions and works tirelessly to protect the rights of borrowers suffering from these and other deceptive and unfair lending practices.

- ***Coonan v. Citibank, N.A.***: The firm, as Co-Lead Counsel, prosecuted this national class action against Citibank and its affiliates in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York concerning alleged kickbacks Citibank received in connection with its force-placed insurance programs. The firm obtained a settlement of \$122 million on behalf of a class of hundreds of thousands of borrowers.

- ***Arnett v. Bank of America, N.A.***: The firm, as Co-Lead Counsel, prosecuted this national class action against Bank of America and its affiliates in the United States District Court for the District of Oregon concerning alleged kickbacks received in connection with its force-placed flood insurance program. The firm obtained a settlement of \$31 million on behalf of a class of hundreds of thousands of borrowers.
- ***Clements v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.***: The firm, as Co-Lead Counsel, prosecuted this national class action against JPMorgan Chase and its affiliates in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California concerning alleged kickbacks received in connection with its force-placed flood insurance program. The firm obtained a settlement of \$22,125,000 on behalf of a class of thousands of borrowers.
- ***Holmes v. Bank of America, N.A.***: The firm, as Co-Lead Counsel, prosecuted this national class action against Bank of America and its affiliates in the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina concerning alleged kickbacks received in connection with its force-placed wind insurance program. The firm obtained a settlement of \$5.05 million on behalf of a class of thousands of borrowers.

### **Securities & Investor Protection**

In the area of securities litigation, the firm has represented public institutional investors – such as the retirement funds for the States of Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Louisiana and Ohio, as well as the City of Philadelphia and numerous individual investors and private institutional investors. The firm was co-lead counsel in the *Melridge Securities Litigation* in the Federal District Court in Oregon, in which jury verdicts of \$88.2 million and a RICO judgment of \$239 million were obtained. Berger Montague has served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous other major securities class action cases where substantial settlements were achieved on behalf of investors.

- ***In re Merrill Lynch Securities Litigation***: Berger Montague, as co-lead counsel, obtained a recovery of \$475 million for the benefit of the class in one of the largest recoveries among the recent financial crisis cases. (No. 07-cv-09633 (S.D.N.Y.)).
- ***In re: Oppenheimer Rochester Funds Group Securities Litigation***: The firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained a \$89.5 million settlement on behalf of investors in six tax-exempt bond mutual funds managed by OppenheimerFunds, Inc. (No. 09-md-02063-JLK (D. Col.)).
- ***In re KLA Tencor Securities Litigation***: The firm, as a member of Plaintiffs' Counsel's Executive Committee, obtained a cash settlement of \$65 million in an action on behalf of investors against KLA-Tencor and certain of its officers and directors. (No. 06-cv-04065 (N.D. Cal.)).
- ***In re NetBank, Inc. Securities Litigation***: The firm served as lead counsel in this certified class action on behalf of the former common shareholders of NetBank, Inc. The \$12.5

million settlement, which occurred after class certification proceedings and substantial discovery, is particularly noteworthy because it is one of the few successful securities fraud class actions litigated against a subprime lender and bank in the wake of the financial crisis. (No. 07-cv-2298-TCB (N.D. Ga.)).

- ***The City Of Hialeah Employees' Retirement System v. Toll Brothers, Inc.***: The firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained a class settlement of \$25 million against Home Builder Toll Brothers, Inc. (No. 07-cv-1513 (E.D. Pa.)).
- ***In re Alcatel Alsthom Securities Litigation***: The firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained a class settlement for investors of \$75 million cash. (MDL Docket No. 1263 (PNB) (E.D. Tex.)).
- ***Qwest Securities Action***: The firm represented New Jersey in an opt-out case against Qwest and certain officers, which was settled for \$45 million. (C.A. No. L-3838-02 (Superior Court New Jersey, Law Division)).

### **Whistleblower, *Qui Tam*, and False Claims Act**

Berger Montague has represented whistleblowers in matters involving healthcare fraud, defense contracting fraud, IRS fraud, securities fraud, and commodities fraud, helping to return more than \$3 billion to federal and state governments. In return, whistleblower clients retaining Berger Montague to represent them in state and federal courts have received more than \$500 million in rewards. Berger Montague's time-tested approach in whistleblower/*qui tam* representation involves cultivating close, productive attorney-client relationships with the maximum degree of confidentiality for our clients.

### **Judicial Praise for Berger Montague Attorneys**

Berger Montague's record of successful prosecution of class actions and other complex litigation has been recognized and commended by judges and arbitrators across the country. Some remarks on the skill, efficiency, and expertise of the firm's attorneys are excerpted below.

### **Antitrust Cases**

From **Judge Lorna G. Schofield**, of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York:

"I'm not sure I've ever seen a case without a single objection or opt-out, so congratulations on that."

Transcript of the November 19, 2020 Hearing in ***Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.***, No. 1:17-cv-03139 (S.D.N.Y.).

From **Judge William E. Smith**, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Rhode Island:

“The degree to which you all litigated the case is – you know, I can’t imagine attorneys litigating a case more rigorously than you all did in this case. It seems like every conceivable, legitimate, substantive dispute that could have been fought over was fought over to the max. So you, both sides, I think litigated the case as vigorously as any group of attorneys could. The level of representation of all parties in terms of the sophistication of counsel was, in my view, of the highest levels. I can’t imagine a case in which there was really a higher quality of representation across the board than this one.”

Transcript of the August 27, 2020 Hearing in ***In re Loestrin 24 Fe Antitrust Litigation***, No. 13-md-02472 (D.R.I.).

From **Judge Margo K. Brodie**, of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York:

“Class counsel has without question done a tremendous job in litigating this case. They represent some of the best plaintiff-side antitrust groups in the country, and the size and skill of the defense they litigated against cannot be overstated. They have also demonstrated the utmost professionalism despite the demands of the extreme perseverance that this case has required...”

***In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation***, No. 1:05-md-01720 (E.D.N.Y. 2019) (Mem. & Order).

From **Judge Brian M. Cogan**, of the U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of New York:

“This is a substantial recovery that has the deterrent effect that class actions are supposed to have, and I think it was done because we had really good Plaintiffs’ lawyers in this case who were running it.”

Transcript of the June 24, 2019 Fairness Hearing in ***In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation***, No. 16-cv-696 (E.D.N.Y.).

From **Judge Michael M. Baylson**, of the U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“[C]ounsel...for direct action plaintiffs have done an outstanding job here with representing the class, and I thought your briefing was always very on point. I thought the presentation of the very contentious issues on the class action motion was very well done, it was very well briefed, it was well argued.”

Transcript of the June 28, 2018 Hearing in *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation*, No. MD-13-2437 at 11:6-11.

From **Judge Madeline Cox Arleo**, of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey praising the efforts of all counsel:

“I just want to thank you for an outstanding presentation. I don’t say that lightly . . . it’s not lost on me at all when lawyers come very, very prepared. And really, your clients should be very proud to have such fine lawyering. I don’t see lawyering like this every day in the federal courts, and I am very grateful. And I appreciate the time and the effort you put in, not only to the merits, but the respect you’ve shown for each other, the respect you’ve shown for the Court, the staff, and the time constraints. And as I tell my law clerks all the time, good lawyers don’t fight, good lawyers advocate. And I really appreciate that more than I can express.”

Transcript of the September 9 to 11, 2015 Daubert Hearing in *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur*, No. 11-cv-07178 (D.N.J.) at 658:14-659:4.

From **Judge William H. Pauley, III**, of the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of New York:

“Class Counsel did their work on their own with enormous attention to detail and unflagging devotion to the cause. Many of the issues in this litigation . . . were unique and issues of first impression.”

\* \* \*

“Class Counsel provided extraordinarily high-quality representation. This case raised a number of unique and complex legal issues .... The law firms of Berger Montague and Coughlin Stoia were indefatigable. They represented the Class with a high degree of professionalism, and vigorously litigated every issue against some of the ablest lawyers in the antitrust defense bar.”

*In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litigation*, 263 F.R.D. 110, 129 (2009).

From **Judge Faith S. Hochberg**, of the United States District court for the District of New Jersey:

“[W]e sitting here don’t always get to see such fine lawyering, and it’s really wonderful for me both to have tough issues and smart lawyers ... I want to congratulate all of you for the really hard work you put into this, the way you presented the issues, ... On behalf of the entire federal judiciary I want to thank you for the kind of lawyering we wish everybody would do.”

***In re Remeron Antitrust Litig.***, Civ. No. 02-2007 (Nov. 2, 2005).

From U.S. District **Judge Jan DuBois**, of the U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“[T]he size of the settlements in absolute terms and expressed as a percentage of total damages evidence a high level of skill by petitioners ... The Court has repeatedly stated that the lawyering in the case at every stage was superb, and does so again.”

***In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.***, 2004 WL 1221350, at \*5-\*6 (E.D. Pa. 2004).

From **Judge Nancy G. Edmunds**, of the U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Michigan:

“[T]his represents an excellent settlement for the Class and reflects the outstanding effort on the part of highly experienced, skilled, and hard working Class Counsel....[T]heir efforts were not only successful, but were highly organized and efficient in addressing numerous complex issues raised in this litigation[.]”

***In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.***, MDL No. 1278 (E.D. Mich., Nov. 26, 2002).

From **Judge Charles P. Kocoras**, of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

“The stakes were high here, with the result that most matters of consequence were contested. There were numerous trips to the courthouse, and the path to the trial court and the Court of Appeals frequently traveled. The efforts of counsel for the class has [sic] produced a substantial recovery, and it is represented that the cash settlement alone is the second largest in the history of class action litigation. . . . There is no question that the results achieved by class counsel were extraordinary [.]”

Regarding the work of Berger Montague in achieving more than \$700 million in settlements with some of the defendants in ***In Re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation***, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1734, at \*3-\*6 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 9, 2000).

From **Judge Peter J. Messitte**, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland:

“The experience and ability of the attorneys I have mentioned earlier, in my view in reviewing the documents, which I have no reason to doubt, the plaintiffs’ counsel are at the top of the profession in this regard and certainly have used their expertise to craft an extremely favorable settlement for their clients, and to that extent they deserve to be rewarded.”

Settlement Approval Hearing, Oct. 28, 1994, in ***Spawd, Inc. and General Generics v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Inc.***, CA No. PJM-92-3624 (D. Md.).

From **Judge Donald W. Van Artsdalen**, of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“As to the quality of the work performed, although that would normally be reflected in the not immodest hourly rates of all attorneys, for which one would expect to obtain excellent quality work at all times, the results of the settlements speak for themselves. Despite the extreme uncertainties of trial, plaintiffs’ counsel were able to negotiate a cash settlement of a not insubstantial sum, and in addition, by way of equitable relief, substantial concessions by the defendants which, subject to various condition, will afford the right, at least, to lessee-dealers to obtain gasoline supply product from major oil companies and suppliers other than from their respective lessors. The additional benefits obtained for the classes by way of equitable relief would, in and of itself, justify some upward adjustment of the lodestar figure.”

***Bogosian v. Gulf Oil Corp.***, 621 F. Supp. 27, 31 (E.D. Pa. 1985).

From **Judge Krupansky**, who had been elevated to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals:

“Finally, the court unhesitatingly concludes that the quality of the representation rendered by counsel was uniformly high. The attorneys involved in this litigation are extremely experienced and skilled in their prosecution of antitrust litigation and other complex actions. Their services have been rendered in an efficient and expeditious manner, but have nevertheless been productive of highly favorable result.”

***In re Art Materials Antitrust Litigation***, 1984 CCH Trade Cases ¶65,815 (N.D. Ohio 1983).

From **Judge Joseph Blumenfeld**, of the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut:

“The work of the Berger firm showed a high degree of efficiency and imagination, particularly in the maintenance and management of the national class actions.”

***In re Master Key Antitrust Litigation***, 1977 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12948, at \*35 (Nov. 4, 1977).

## **Securities & Investor Protection Cases**



From **Judge Brantley Starr** of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division:

“I think y’all have been a model on how to handle a case like this. So I appreciate the diligence y’all have put in separating the fee negotiations until after the main event is resolved...Everything I see here is in great shape, and really a testament to y’all’s diligence and professionalism. So hats off to y’all...So thanks again for your professionalism in handling this case and handling the stipulated settlement. Y’all are model citizens, and so I wish I could send everyone to y’all’s school of litigation management.”

***Howell Family Trust DTD 1/27/2004 v. Hollis Greenlaw, et al.***, No. 3:18-cv-02864-X (N.D. Tex., March 25, 2021).

From **Judge Jed Rakoff** of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York:

Court stated that lead counsel had made “very full and well-crafted” and “excellent submissions”; that there was a “very fine job done by plaintiffs’ counsel in this case”; and that this was “surely a very good result under all the facts and circumstances.”

***In re Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. Securities, Derivative & ERISA Litigation***, Master File No. 07-cv-9633(JSR)(DFE) (S.D.N.Y., July 27, 2009).

From **Judge Michael M. Baylson** of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“The Court is aware of and attests to the skill and efficiency of class counsel: they have been diligent in every respect, and their briefs and arguments before the Court were of the highest quality. The firm of Berger Montague took the lead in the Court proceedings; its attorneys were well prepared, articulate and persuasive.”

***In re CIGNA Corp. Sec. Litig.***, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51089, at \*17-\*18 (E.D. Pa. July 13, 2007).

From **Judge Stewart Dalzell** of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“The quality of lawyering on both sides, but I am going to stress now on the plaintiffs’ side, simply has not been exceeded in any case, and we have had some marvelous counsel appear before us and make superb arguments, but they really don’t come any better than Mrs. Savett... [A]nd the arguments we had on the motion to dismiss [Mrs. Savett argued the motion], both sides were fabulous, but plaintiffs’ counsel were as good as they come.”

***In re U.S. Bioscience Secs. Litig.***, No. 92-0678 (E.D. Pa. April 4, 1994).

From **Judge Wayne Andersen** of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois:

“[Y]ou have acted the way lawyers at their best ought to act. And I have had a lot of cases...in 15 years now as a judge and I cannot recall a significant case where I felt people were better represented than they are here...I would say this has been the best representation that I have seen.”

***In re: Waste Management, Inc. Secs. Litig.***, No. 97-C 7709 (N.D. Ill. 1999).

From **Chancellor William Chandler, III** of the Delaware Chancery Court:

“All I can tell you, from someone who has only been doing this for roughly 22 years, is that I have yet to see a more fiercely and intensely litigated case than this case. Never in 22 years have I seen counsel going at it, hammer and tong, like they have gone at it in this case. And I think that’s a testimony – Mr. Valihura correctly says that’s what they are supposed to do. I recognize that; that is their job, and they were doing it professionally.”

***Ginsburg v. Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc.***, No. 2202 (Del. Ch., Oct. 22, 2007).

From **Judge Stewart Dalzell** of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“Thanks to the nimble class counsel, this sum, which once included securities worth \$149.5 million is now all cash. Seizing on an opportunity Rite Aid presented, class counsel first renegotiated what had been stock consideration into Rite Aid Notes and then this year monetized those Notes. Thus, on February 11, 2003, Rite Aid redeemed those Notes from the class, which then received \$145,754,922.00. The class also received \$14,435,104 in interest on the Notes.”

“Co-lead counsel ... here were extraordinarily deft and efficient in handling this most complex matter... they were at least eighteen months ahead of the United States Department of Justice in ferreting out the conduct that ultimately resulted in the write down of over \$1.6 billion in previously reported Rite Aid earnings. In short, it would be hard to equal the skill class counsel demonstrated here.”

***In re Rite Aid Corp. Securities Litigation***, 269 F. Supp. 2d 603, 605, n.1, 611 (E.D. Pa. 2003).

From **Judge Helen J. Frye**, United States District Judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon:

“In order to bring about this result [partial settlements then totaling \$54.25 million], Class Counsel were required to devote an unusual amount of time and effort over more than eight years of intense legal litigation which included a four-month long jury trial and full briefing and argument of an appeal before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and which produced one of the most voluminous case files in the history of this District.”

\* \* \*

“Throughout the course of their representation, the attorneys at Berger Montague and Stoll, Stoll, Berne, Lokting & Shlachter who have worked on this case have exhibited an unusual degree of skill and diligence, and have had to contend with opposing counsel who also displayed unusual skill and diligence.”

***In Re Melridge, Inc. Securities Litigation***, No. CV 87-1426-FR (D. Ore. April 15, 1996).

From **Judge Marvin Katz** of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

“[T]he co-lead attorneys have extensive experience in large class actions, experience that has enabled this case to proceed efficiently and professionally even under short deadlines and the pressure of handling thousands of documents in a large multi-district action... These counsel have also acted vigorously in their clients’ interests...”

\* \* \*

“The management of the case was also of extremely high quality.... [C]lass counsel is of high caliber and has extensive experience in similar class action litigation.... The submissions were of consistently high quality, and class counsel has been notably diligent in preparing filings in a timely manner even when under tight deadlines.”

Commenting on class counsel, where the firm served as both co-lead and liaison counsel in ***In re Ikon Office Solutions, Inc. Securities Litigation***, 194 F.R.D. 166, 177, 195 (E.D. Pa. 2000).

From **Judge William K. Thomas**, Senior District Judge for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio:

“In the proceedings it has presided over, this court has become directly familiar with the specialized, highly competent, and effective quality of the legal services performed by Merrill G. Davidoff, Esq. and Martin I. Twersky, Esq. of Berger Montague....”

\* \* \*

“Examination of the experience-studded biographies of the attorneys primarily involved in this litigation and review of their pioneering prosecution of many class actions in antitrust, securities, toxic tort matters and some defense representation in antitrust and other litigation, this court has no difficulty in approving and adopting the hourly rates fixed by Judge Aldrich.”

Commenting in *In re Revco Securities Litigation*, Case No. 1:89CV0593, Order (N.D. Oh. September 14, 1993).

### **Consumer Protection Cases**

From **Judge Paul A. Engelmayer** of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York:

“I know the diligence of counsel and dedication of counsel to the class...Thank you, Ms. Drake. As always I appreciate the – your extraordinary dedication to your – to the class and the very obvious backwards and forwards familiarity you have with the case and level of preparation and articulateness today. It’s a pleasure always to have you before me...Class Counsel [] generated this case on their own initiative and at their own risk. Counsel’s enterprise and ingenuity merits significant compensation...Counsel here are justifiably proud of the important result that they achieved.”

Sept. 22, 2020, Final Approval Hearing, *Gambles v. Sterling Info., Inc.*, No. 15-cv-9746.

From **Judge Joel Schneider** of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey:

“I do want to compliment all counsel for how they litigated this case in a thoroughly professional manner. All parties were zealously represented in the highest ideals of the profession, legitimately and professionally, and not the usual acrimony we see in these cases...I commend the parties and their counsel for a very workmanlike professional effort.”

Transcript of the September 10, 2020 Final Fairness Hearing in *Somogyi, et al. v. Freedom Mortgage Corp.*

From **Judge Harold E. Kahn** of the Superior Court of California County of San Francisco:

“You are extraordinarily impressive. And I thank you for being here, and for your candid, non-evasive response to every question I have. I was extremely skeptical at the outset of this morning. You have allayed all of my concerns and have persuaded me that this is an important issue, and that you have done a great service to the class. And for that reason, I am going to approve your settlement in all respects, including the motion for attorneys’ fees. And I congratulate you on your excellent work.”

## Civil/Human Rights Cases

From **Deputy Treasury Secretary Stuart E. Eizenstat**:

“We must be frank. It was the American lawyers, through the lawsuits they brought in U.S. courts, who placed the long-forgotten wrongs by German companies during the Nazi era on the international agenda. It was their research and their work which highlighted these old injustices and forced us to confront them. Without question, we would not be here without them.... For this dedication and commitment to the victims, we should always be grateful to these lawyers.”

In his remarks at the July 17, 2000, signing ceremony for the international agreements which established the German Foundation to act as a funding vehicle for the payment of claims to Holocaust survivors.

## Insurance Litigation

From **Judge Janet C. Hall**, of the U.S. District Court of the District of Connecticut:

Noting the “very significant risk in pursuing this action” given its uniqueness in that “there was no prior investigation to rely on in establishing the facts or a legal basis for the case....[and] no other prior or even now similar case involving parties like these plaintiffs and a party like these defendants.” Further, “the quality of the representation provided to the plaintiffs ... in this case has been consistently excellent.... [T]he defendant[s] ... mounted throughout the course of the five years the case pended, an extremely vigorous defense.... [B]ut for counsel’s outstanding work in this case and substantial effort over five years, no member of the class would have recovered a penny.... [I]t was an extremely complex and substantial class ... case ... [with an] outstanding result.”

Regarding the work of Berger Montague attorneys Peter R. Kahana and Steven L. Bloch, among other co-class counsel, in **Spencer, et al. v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc., et al.**, in the Order approving the \$72.5 million final settlement of this action, dated September 21, 2010 (No. 3:05-cv-1681, D. Conn.).

## Customer/Broker Arbitrations

From **Robert E. Conner**, Public Arbitrator with the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.:

“[H]aving participated over the last 17 years in 400 arbitrations and trials in various settings, ... the professionalism and the detail and generally the civility of everyone involved has been not just a cause for commentary at the end of these proceedings but between ourselves [the arbitration panel] during the course of them, and ... the detail and the intellectual rigor that went into the documents was fully reflective of the effort that was made in general. I wanted to make that known to everyone and to express my particular respect and admiration.”

About the efforts of Berger Montague shareholders Merrill G. Davidoff and Eric L. Cramer, who achieved a \$1.1 million award for their client, in ***Steinman v. LMP Hedge Fund, et al.***, NASD Case No. 98-04152, at Closing Argument, June 13, 2000.

### **Employment & Unpaid Wages Cases**

From **Judge Timothy R. Rice**, United States Magistrate Judge for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania:

Describing Berger Montague as “some of the finest legal representation in the nation,” who are “ethical, talented, and motivated to help hard working men and women.”

Regarding the work of Berger Montague attorney Camille F. Rodriguez in ***Gonzalez v. Veritas Consultant Group, LLC, d/b/a Moravia Health Network***, No. 2:17-cv-1319-TR (E.D. Pa. March 13, 2019).

From **Judge Malachy E. Mannion**, United States District Judge for the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania:

“At the final approval hearing, class counsel reiterated in detail the arguments set forth in the named plaintiffs’ briefing. ... The court lauded the parties for their extensive work in reaching a settlement the court deemed fair and reasonable.

\* \* \*

“The court is confident that [class counsel] are highly skilled in FLSA collective and hybrid actions, as seen by their dealings with the court and the results achieved in both negotiating and handling the settlement to date.”

***Acevedo v. Brightview Landscapes, LLC***, No. 3:13-cv-2529, 2017 WL 4354809 (M.D. Pa. Oct. 2, 2017).

From **Judge Joseph F. Bataillon**, United States District Judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska:

[P]laintiffs' counsel succeeded in vindicating important rights. ... The court is familiar with "donning and doffing" cases and based on the court's experience, defendant meat packing companies' litigation conduct generally reflects "what can only be described as a deeply-entrenched resistance to changing their compensation practices to comply with the requirements of FLSA." (citation omitted). Plaintiffs' counsel perform a recognized public service in prosecuting these actions as a 'private Attorney General' to protect the rights of underrepresented workers.

The plaintiffs have demonstrated that counsel's services have benefitted the class. ... The fundamental policies of the FLSA were vindicated and the rights of the workers were protected.

Regarding the work of Berger Montague among other co-counsel in ***Morales v. Farmland Foods, Inc.***, No. 8:08-cv-504, 2013 WL 1704722 (D. Neb. Apr. 18, 2013).

From **Judge Jonathan W. Feldman**, United States Magistrate Judge for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York:

"The nature of the instant application obliges the Court to make this point clear: In my fifteen years on the bench, no case has been litigated with more skill, tenacity and legal professionalism than this case. The clients, corporate and individual, should be proud of the manner in which their legal interests were brought before and presented to the Court by their lawyers and law firms."

and

"...the Court would be remiss if it did not commend class counsel and all those who worked for firms representing the thousands of current and former employees of Kodak for the outstanding job they did in representing the interests of their clients. For the last several years, lead counsel responsibilities were shared by Shanon Carson .... Their legal work in an extraordinarily complex case was exemplary, their tireless commitment to seeking justice for their clients was unparalleled and their conduct as officers of the court was beyond reproach."

**Employees Committed For Justice v. Eastman Kodak**, (W.D.N.Y. 2010) (\$21.4 million settlement).

#### **Other Cases**

From **Stephen M. Feiler, Ph.D.**, Director of Judicial Education, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, Mechanicsburg, PA *on behalf of the Common Pleas Court Judges (trial judges) of Pennsylvania*:

“On behalf of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and AOPC’s Judicial Education Department, thank you for your extraordinary commitment to the *Dealing with Complexities in Civil Litigation* symposia. We appreciate the considerable time you spent preparing and delivering this important course across the state. It is no surprise to me that the judges rated this among the best programs they have attended in recent years.”

About the efforts of Berger Montague attorneys Merrill G. Davidoff, Peter Nordberg and David F. Sorensen in planning and presenting a CLE Program to trial judges in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

## **Our Founding Partner and Attorneys**

### **Founding Partner**

#### **David Berger – 1912-2007**

David Berger was the founder and the Chairman of Berger Montague. He received his A.B. *cum laude* in 1932 and his LL.B. *cum laude* in 1936, both from the University of Pennsylvania. He was a member of The Order of the Coif and was an editor of the *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. He had a distinguished scholastic career including being Assistant to Professor Francis H. Bohlen and Dr. William Draper Lewis, Director of the American Law Institute, participating in the drafting of the first Restatement of Torts. He also served as a Special Assistant Dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He was a member of the Board of Overseers of the Law School and Associate Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania. In honor of his many contributions, the Law School established the David Berger Chair of Law for the Improvement of the Administration of Justice.

David Berger was a law clerk for the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. He served as a deputy assistant to Director of Enemy Alien Identification Program of the United States Justice Department during World War II.

Thereafter he was appointed Lt.j.g. in the U.S. Naval Reserve and he served in the South Pacific aboard three aircraft carriers during World War II. He was a survivor of the sinking of the U.S.S. Hornet in the Battle of Santa Cruz, October 26, 1942. After the sinking of the Hornet, Admiral Halsey appointed him a member of his personal staff when the Admiral became Commander of the South Pacific. Mr. Berger was ultimately promoted to Commander. He was awarded the Silver Star and Presidential Unit Citation.

After World War II, he was a law clerk in the United States Court of Appeals. The United States Supreme Court appointed David Berger a member of the committee to draft the Federal Rules of Evidence, the basic evidentiary rules employed in federal courts throughout the United States.



David Berger was a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers, the International Society of Barristers, and the International Academy of Trial Lawyers, of which he was a former Dean. He was a Life Member of the Judicial Conference of the Third Circuit and the American Law Institute.

A former Chancellor (President) of the Philadelphia Bar Association, he served on numerous committees of the American Bar Association and was a lecturer and author on various legal subjects, particularly in the areas of antitrust, securities litigation, and evidence.

David Berger served as a member of President John F. Kennedy's committee which designed high speed rail lines between Washington and Boston. He drafted and activated legislation in the Congress of the United States which resulted in the use of federal funds to assure the continuance of freight and passenger lines throughout the United States. When the merger of the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, which created the Penn Central Transportation Company, crashed into Chapter 11, David Berger was counsel for Penn Central and a proponent of its reorganization. Through this work, Mr. Berger ensured the survival of the major railroads in the Northeastern section of the United States including Penn Central, New Jersey Central, and others.

Mr. Berger's private practice included clients in London, Paris, Dusseldorf, as well as in Philadelphia, Washington, New York City, Florida, and other parts of the United States. David Berger instituted the first class action in the antitrust field, and for over 30 years he and the Berger firm were lead counsel and/or co-lead counsel in countless class actions brought to successful conclusions, including antitrust, securities, toxic tort and other cases. He served as one of the chief counsel in the litigation surrounding the demise of Drexel Burnham Lambert, in which over \$2.6 billion was recovered for various violations of the securities laws during the 1980s. The recoveries benefitted such federal entities as the FDIC and RTC, as well as thousands of victimized investors.

In addition, Mr. Berger was principal counsel in a case regarding the Three Mile Island accident near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, achieving the first legal recovery of millions of dollars for economic harm caused by the nation's most serious nuclear accident. As part of the award in the case, David Berger established a committee of internationally renowned scientists to determine the effects on human beings of emissions of low-level radiation.

In addition, as lead counsel in *In re Asbestos School Litigation*, he brought about settlement of this long and vigorously fought action spanning over 13 years for an amount in excess of \$200 million.

David Berger was active in Democratic politics. President Clinton appointed David Berger a member of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, in which capacity he served from 1994-2004. In addition to his having served for seven years as the chief legal officer of Philadelphia, he was a candidate for District Attorney of Philadelphia, and was a Carter delegate in the Convention which nominated President Carter.

Over his lengthy career David Berger was prominent in a great many philanthropic and charitable enterprises some of which are as follows: He was the Chairman of the David Berger Foundation and a long time honorary member of the National Commission of the Anti-Defamation League. He was on the Board of the Jewish Federation of Philadelphia and, at his last place of residence, Palm Beach, as Honorary Chairman of the American Heart Association, Trustee of the American Cancer Society, a member of the Board of Directors of the American Red Cross, and active in the Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County.

David Berger's principal hobby was tennis, a sport in which he competed for over 60 years. He was a member of the Board of Directors of the International Tennis Hall of Fame and other related organizations for assisting young people in tennis on a world-wide basis.

## **Firm Chair**

### **Eric L. Cramer – Chairman**

Mr. Cramer is Chairman of the Firm and Co-Chair of the Firm's antitrust department. He has a national practice in the field of complex litigation, primarily in the area of antitrust class actions. He is currently co-lead counsel in multiple significant antitrust class actions across the country in a variety of industries and is responsible for winning numerous significant settlements for his clients totaling well over \$3 billion. Most recently, he has focused on representing workers claiming that anticompetitive practices have suppressed their pay, including cases on behalf of mixed-martial-arts fighters, luxury retail workers, and chicken growers.

In 2020, *Law360* named Mr. Cramer a Titan of the Plaintiffs Bar, and *Who's Who Legal* identified him as a Global Elite Thought Leader, stating that he "comes recommended by peers as a top name for antitrust class action proceedings." In 2019, *The National Law Journal* awarded Mr. Cramer the 2019 Keith Givens Visionary Award, which was developed to honor an outstanding trial lawyer who has moved the industry forward through his or her work within the legal industry ecosystem, demonstrating excellence in all aspects of work from client advocacy to peer education and mentoring. In 2018, he was named Philadelphia antitrust "Lawyer of the Year" by *Best Lawyers*, and in 2017, he won the American Antitrust Institute's Antitrust Enforcement Award for Outstanding Antitrust Litigation Achievement in Private Law Practice for his work in *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.*, No. 11-cv-07178 (D.N.J.). In that case, Mr. Cramer represented a national class of physicians challenging Sanofi Pasteur with anticompetitive conduct in the market for meningitis vaccines, resulting in a settlement of more than \$60 million for the class. He has also been identified as a top tier antitrust lawyer by *Chambers & Partners* in Pennsylvania and nationally. In 2020, *Chambers & Partners* observed that Mr. Cramer is "a fantastic lawyer...He has real trial experience and is very capable and super smart." He has been highlighted annually since 2011 by *The Legal 500* as one of the country's top lawyers in the field of complex antitrust litigation and repeatedly deemed one of the "Best Lawyers in America," including for 2021. In 2014 and 2018, Mr. Cramer was selected by *Philadelphia Magazine* as one of the top 100 lawyers in Philadelphia.

Mr. Cramer is also a frequent speaker at antitrust and litigation related conferences and a leader of multiple non-profit advocacy groups. He is President of the Board of Directors of Public Justice, a national public interest advocacy group and law firm; a Senior Fellow and Vice President of the Board of Directors of the American Antitrust Institute; a past President of COSAL (Committee to Support the Antitrust Laws), a leading industry group; and a member of the Advisory Board of the Institute of Consumer Antitrust Studies of the Loyola University Chicago School of Law. He was the only Plaintiffs' lawyer selected to serve on the American Bar Association's Antitrust Section Transition Report Task Force delivered to the incoming Obama Administration in 2012.

He has written widely in the fields of class certification and antitrust law. Among other writings, Mr. Cramer has co-authored *Antitrust, Class Certification, and the Politics of Procedure*, 17 George Mason Law Review 4 (2010), which was cited by both the First Circuit in *In re Nexium Antitrust Litig.*, 777 F.3d 9, 27 (1st Cir. 2015), *quoting* Davis & Cramer, 17 Geo. Mason L. Rev. 969, 984-85 (2010), and the Third Circuit in *Behrend v. Comcast Corp.*, 655 F.3d 182, 200, n.10 (3d Cir. 2011), *rev'd on other grounds*, 133 S. Ct. 1426 (2013). He has also co-written a number of other pieces, including: *Of Vulnerable Monopolists?: Questionable Innovation in the Standard for Class Certification in Antitrust Cases*, 41 Rutgers Law Journal 355 (2009-2010); *A Questionable New Standard for Class Certification in Antitrust Cases*, published in the ABA's Antitrust Magazine, Vol. 26, No. 1 (Fall 2011); a Chapter of American Antitrust Institute's Private International Enforcement Handbook (2010), entitled "*Who May Pursue a Private Claim?*"; and a chapter of the American Bar Association's Pharmaceutical Industry Handbook (July 2009), entitled "Assessing Market Power in the Prescription Pharmaceutical Industry."

Mr. Cramer is a *summa cum laude* graduate of Princeton University (1989), where he earned membership in *Phi Beta Kappa*. He graduated *cum laude* from Harvard Law School with a J.D. in 1993.

## Executive Shareholders

### **Sherrie R. Savett – Executive Shareholder, Chair *Emeritus***

Sherrie R. Savett, Chair *Emeritus* of the Firm, Co-Chair of the Securities Litigation Department and *Qui Tam*/False Claims Act Department, and member of the Firm's Management Committee, has practiced in the areas of securities litigation, class actions, and commercial litigation since 1975.

Ms. Savett serves or has served as lead or co-lead counsel or as a member of the executive committee in a large number of important securities and consumer class actions in federal and state courts across the country, including:

- ***In re Alcatel Alsthom Securities Litigation:*** The firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained a class settlement for investors of \$75 million cash. (MDL Docket No. 1263 (PNB) (E.D. Tex.));
- ***In re CIGNA Corp. Securities Litigation:*** The firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained a settlement of \$93 million for the benefit of the class. (Master File No. 2:02-cv-8088 (E.D. Pa.));

- ***In re Fleming Companies, Inc. Securities Litigation:*** The firm, as lead counsel, obtained a class settlement of \$94 million for the benefit of the class. (No. 5-03-MD-1530 (TJW) (E.D. Tex.));
- ***In re KLA Tencor Securities Litigation:*** The firm, as a member of Plaintiffs' Counsel's Executive Committee, obtained a cash settlement of \$65 million in an action on behalf of investors against KLA-Tencor and certain of its officers and directors. (No. 06-cv-04065 (N.D. Cal.));
- ***Medaphis/Deloitte & Touche*** (class settlement of \$96.5 million) (No. 1:96-CV-2088-FMH (N.D. GA));
- ***In re Rite Aid Corp. Securities Litigation:*** The firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained settlements totaling \$334 million against Rite Aid's outside accounting firm and certain of the company's former officers. (No. 99-cv-1349) (E.D. Pa.);
- ***In re Sotheby's Holding, Inc. Securities Litigation:*** The firm, as lead counsel, obtained a \$70 million settlement, of which \$30 million was contributed, personally, by an individual defendant (No. 00-cv-1041 (DLC) (S.D.N.Y.));
- ***In re Waste Management, Inc. Securities Litigation:*** In 1999, the firm, as co-lead counsel, obtained a class settlement for investors of \$220 million cash, which included a settlement against Waste Management's outside accountants. (No. 97-cv-7709 (N.D. Ill.)); and
- ***In re Xcel Inc. Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation:*** The firm, as co-lead counsel in the securities actions, obtained a cash settlement of \$80 million on behalf of investors against Xcel Energy and certain of its officers and directors. (No. 02-cv-2677 (DSD/FLN) (D. Minn.)).

Ms. Savett has helped establish several significant precedents. Among them is the holding (the first ever in a federal appellate court) that municipalities are subject to the anti-fraud provisions of SEC Rule 10b-5 under § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and that municipalities that issue bonds are not acting as an arm of the state and therefore are not entitled to immunity from suit in the federal courts under the Eleventh Amendment. *Sonnenfeld v. City and County of Denver*, 100 F.3d 744 (10th Cir. 1996).

In the *U.S. Bioscience* securities class action, a biotechnology case where critical discovery was needed from the federal Food and Drug Administration, the court ruled that the FDA may not automatically assert its administrative privilege to block a subpoena and may be subject to discovery depending on the facts of the case. *In re U.S. Bioscience Secur. Litig.*, 150 F.R.D. 80 (E.D. Pa. 1993).

In the *CIGNA Corp. Securities Litigation*, the Court denied defendants' motion for summary judgment, holding that a plaintiff has a right to recover for losses on shares held at the time of a corrective disclosure and his gains on a stock should not offset his losses in determining legally recoverable damages. *In re CIGNA Corp. Securities Litigation*, 459 F. Supp. 2d 338 (E.D. Pa. 2006).

Additionally, Ms. Savett has become increasingly well-known in the area of consumer litigation, achieving a groundbreaking \$24 million settlement in 2008 in the *Menu Foods* case brought by pet owners against manufacturers of allegedly contaminated pet food. (*In re Pet Food Products Liability Litigation*, MDL Docket No. 1850 (D.N.J. 2007).

In the data breach area, she was co-lead counsel in *In re TJX Retail Securities Breach Litigation*, MDL Docket No. 1838 (D. Mass.), the first very large data breach case where hackers stole personal information from 45 million consumers. The settlement, which became the template for future data breach cases, consisted of providing identity theft insurance to those whose social security or driver's license numbers were stolen, a cash fund for actual damages and time spent mitigating the situation, and injunctive relief.

Ms. Savett also litigated a case on behalf of the City of Philadelphia titled *City of Philadelphia v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, No. 17-cv-02203 (E.D. Pa.), involving alleged violations of the Fair Housing Act. The case was resolved in 2019 with a settlement providing \$10 million to go to citizens of Philadelphia for down payment assistance, to local agencies to assist homeowners in foreclosure, and for greening and cleaning foreclosed properties in Philadelphia which blight neighborhoods.

In the past decade, she has also actively worked in the False Claims Act arena. She was part of the team that litigated over more than a decade and settled the Average Wholesale Price *qui tam* cases, which collectively settled for more than \$1 billion.

Ms. Savett speaks and writes frequently on securities litigation, consumer class actions and False Claims Act litigation. She is a lecturer and panelist at the University of Pennsylvania Law School on the subjects of Securities Law and the False Claims Act/*Qui Tam* practice from the whistleblower's perspective. She has also lectured at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and at the Stanford Law School on prosecuting shareholder class actions and on False Claims Act Litigation. She is frequently invited to present and serve as a panelist in American Bar Association, American Law Institute/American Bar Association and Practising Law Institute (PLI) conferences on securities class action litigation and the use of class actions in consumer litigation. She has been a presenter and panelist at PLI's Securities Litigation and Enforcement Institute annually from 1995 to 2010. She has also spoken at major institutional investor and insurance industry conferences, and DRI – the Voice of the Defense Bar. In February 2009, she was a member of a six-person panel who presented an analysis of the current state of securities litigation before more than 1,000 underwriters and insurance executives at the PLUS (Professional Liability Underwriting Society) Conference in New York City. She has presented at the Cyber-Risk Conference in 2009, as well as the PLUS Conference in Chicago on November 16, 2009 on the subject of litigation involving security breaches and theft of personal information.

Most recently, in April 2019, she spoke as a panelist at PLI's Securities Litigation 2019: From Investigation to Trial program. Her panel was titled "Commencement of a Civil Action: Filing the Complaint, Preparing the Motion to Dismiss, Coordinating Multiple Securities Litigation Actions." Ms. Savett also co-authored an article for the program that was published in PLI's *Corporate Law and Practice Court Handbook Series*. The article is titled "After the Fall—A Plaintiff's Perspective."

In 2015 and 2016, she served as a panelist in American Law Institute programs held in New York City called "Securities and Shareholder Litigation: Cutting-Edge Developments, Planning and Strategy." Ms. Savett also spoke at the 2013 ABA Litigation Section Annual Conference in Chicago on two panels. One program on securities litigation was entitled "The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly: Ethical Issues in Class Action Settlements and Opt Outs." The other program focused on consumer class actions in the real estate area and was entitled "The Foreclosure Crisis Puzzle: Navigating the Changing Landscape of Foreclosure."

In May 2007, Ms. Savett spoke in Rome, Italy at the conference presented by the Litigation Committee of the Dispute Resolution Section of the International Bar Association and the Section of International Law of the American Bar Association on class certification. Ms. Savett participated in a mock hearing before a United States Court on whether to certify a worldwide class action that includes large numbers of European class members.

Ms. Savett has written numerous articles on securities and complex litigation issues in professional publications, including:

- "After the Fall – A Plaintiff's Perspective," with Phyllis M. Parker, *PLI Corporate Law and Practice Course Handbook Series No. B-2475*, pg. 73-105, April 2019
- "Plaintiffs' Vision of Securities Litigation: Current Trends and Strategies," 1762 *PLL* October 2009
- "Primary Liability of 'Secondary' Actors Under the PSLRA," I *Securities Litigation Report*, (Glasser) November 2004
- "Securities Class Actions Since the 1995 Reform Act: A Plaintiffs Perspective," 1442 *PLI Corp. 13*, September – October 2004
- "Securities Class Actions Since the 1995 Reform Act: A Plaintiffs Perspective," SJ084 ALI-ABA 399, May 13-14, 2004
- "The 'Indispensable Tool' of Shareholder Suits," *Directors & Boards*, Vol. 28, February 18, 2004
- "Plaintiffs Perspective on How to Obtain Class Certification in Federal Court in a Non-Federal Question Case," 679 *PLI*, August 2002
- "Hurdles in Securities Class Actions: The Impact of Sarbanes-Oxley From a Plaintiffs Perspective," 9 *Securities Litigation and Regulation Reporter* (Andrews), December 23, 2003
- "Securities Class Actions Since the 1995 Reform Act: A Plaintiffs Perspective," SG091 ALI-ABA, May 2-3, 2002
- "Securities Class Actions Since the 1995 Reform Act: A Plaintiffs Perspective," SF86 ALI-ABA 1023, May 10, 2001
- "Greetings From the Plaintiffs' Class Action Bar: We'll be Watching," SE082 ALI-ABA739, May 11, 2000
- "Preventing Financial Fraud," B0-00E3 *PLJB0-00E3* April – May 1999
- "Shareholders Class Actions in the Post Reform Act Era," SD79 ALI-ABA 893, April 30, 1999

- “What to Plead and How to Plead the Defendant’s State of Mind in a Federal Securities Class Action,” with Arthur Stock, *PLI*, ALI/ABA 7239, November 1998
- “The Merits Matter Most: Observations on a Changing Landscape Under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995,” 39 *Arizona Law Review* 525, 1997
- “Everything David Needs to Know to Battle Goliath,” ABA Tort & Insurance Practice Section, The Brief, Vol. 20, No.3, Spring 1991
- “The Derivative Action: An Important Shareholder Vehicle for Insuring Corporate Accountability in Jeopardy,” *PLIH4-0528*, September 1, 1987
- “Prosecution of Derivative Actions: A Plaintiffs Perspective,” *PLIH4-5003*, September 1, 1986

Ms. Savett is widely recognized as a leading litigator and a top female leader in the profession by local and national legal rating organizations.

In 2019, *The Legal Intelligencer* named Ms. Savett a “Distinguished Leader,” and in 2018 she was named to the *Philadelphia Business Journal*’s 2018 Best of the Bar: Philadelphia’s Top Lawyers.

*The Legal Intelligencer* and *Pennsylvania Law Weekly* named her one of the “56 Women Leaders in the Profession” in 2004.

In 2003-2005, 2007-2013, and 2015-2016, Berger Montague was named to the *National Law Journal*’s “Hot List” of 12-20 law firms nationally “who specialize in plaintiffs’ side litigation and have excelled in their achievements.” The firm is on the *National Law Journal*’s “Hall of Fame,” and Ms. Savett’s achievements were mentioned in many of these awards.

Ms. Savett was named a “Pennsylvania Top 50 Female Super Lawyer” and/or a “Pennsylvania Super Lawyer” from 2004 through 2021 by Thomson Reuters after an extensive nomination and polling process among Pennsylvania lawyers.

In 2006 and 2007, she was named one of the “500 Leading Litigators” and “500 Leading Plaintiffs’ Litigators” in the United States by *Lawdragon*. In 2008, Ms. Savett was named as one of the “500 Leading Lawyers in America.” Also in 2008, she was named one of 25 “Women of the Year” in Pennsylvania by *The Legal Intelligencer* and *Pennsylvania Law Weekly*, which stated on May 19, 2008 in the *Women in the Profession* in *The Legal Intelligencer* that she “has been a prominent figure nationally in securities class actions for years, and some of her recent cases have only raised her stature.” In June 2008, Ms. Savett was named by *Lawdragon* as one of the “100 Lawyers You Need to Know in Securities Litigation.”

Unquestionably, it is because of Ms. Savett, who for decades has been in the top leadership of the firm, that the firm has a remarkably high proportion of women lawyers and shareholders.

Ms. Savett has aggressively sought to hire women, without regard to age or whether they are “right out of law school.” Several of the women who have children are able to continue working at

the firm because Ms. Savett has instituted a policy of flexible work time and fosters an atmosphere of cooperation, teamwork and mutual respect. As a result, the women attorneys stay on and have long and productive careers while still maintaining a balanced life. Ms. Savett has a personal understanding of the challenges and satisfactions that women experience in practicing law while raising a family. Ms. Savett has three children and five grandchildren. One of her daughters and her daughter-in-law are lawyers.

Ms. Savett has taught those around her more than good lawyering. She places great emphasis in her own life on devotion to family, community service and involvement in charitable organizations. She teaches others by her example and her obvious interest in their efforts and achievements.

Ms. Savett is a well-known leader of the Philadelphia legal, business, cultural and Jewish community. She is an exemplary citizen who spends endless hours of her after-work time helping others in the community.

From 2011 – 2014, Ms. Savett served as President and Board Chair of the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia (JFGP), a community of over 215,000 Jewish people. She is only the third woman to serve as the President, the top lay leader of the Federation, in the 117 years of its existence.

Ms. Savett also serves on the Board of the National Liberty Museum, The National Museum of American Jewish History, and the local and national boards of American Associates of Ben Gurion University of the Negev. She had previously served as Chairperson of the Southeastern Pennsylvania State of Israel Bonds Campaign and has served as a member of the National Cabinet of State of Israel Bonds. In 2005, Ms. Savett received The Spirit of Jerusalem Medallion, the State of Israel Bonds' highest honor.

Ms. Savett has used her positions of leadership in the community to identify and help promote women as volunteer leaders. Ms. Savett has selected a few worthy causes to which she tirelessly dedicates herself. According to leaders of The Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia, Ms. Savett is viewed by many women in the philanthropic world as a role model.

Ms. Savett earned her J.D. from the University of Pennsylvania Law School and a B.A. *summa cum laude* from the University of Pennsylvania. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Ms. Savett has three married children, four grandsons, and two granddaughters. She enjoys tennis, biking, physical training, travel, and collecting art, especially glass and sculpture.

#### **Merrill G. Davidoff – Executive Shareholder, Chair *Emeritus***

Merrill G. Davidoff is Chairman *Emeritus* and an Executive Shareholder, in addition to his continuing work as Co-Chairman of the Antitrust Department and Chairman of the Environmental



Group. Mr. Davidoff has litigated and tried a wide range of antitrust, commodities, securities and environmental class actions.

In *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1409, Mr. Davidoff was co-lead counsel in class actions that resulted in settlements of \$386 million.

In a long-running environmental class action on behalf of property owners whose land was contaminated by plutonium from a neighboring nuclear weapons facility (Rocky Flats near Denver, Colorado), Mr. Davidoff served as lead counsel and lead trial counsel in a 2005-2006 trial that resulted in a \$554 million jury verdict, third largest of 2006. In 2009 the Rocky Flats trial team, led by Mr. Davidoff, received the prestigious Public Justice Award for "Trial Lawyer of the Year." A 2010 decision by the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the judgment that had been won in the district court, but Berger Montague persevered and sought entry of judgment under alternative state law grounds. After losing this battle in the district court, plaintiffs appealed to the 10th Circuit again, and, after an appeal argued by Mr. Davidoff, the Court of Appeals (by then-judge, now Justice, Neil Gorsuch) reversed and held that plaintiffs could proceed on state law nuisance grounds. Just before competing petitions for certiorari were to be decided by the Supreme Court, a settlement of \$375 million was announced in May 2016. The settlement received final approval on April 28, 2017.

Mr. Davidoff also concentrates his practice in representation for commodities futures and options traders as well as derivatives matters. He was co-lead counsel for the customer class in *In re MF Global Holdings Limited Investment Litigation*, which settled for well over a billion dollars and resulted in the recovery and return of 100% of lost customer funds after MF Global's October 31, 2011 collapse.

Mr. Davidoff has represented diverse clients, including many companies, sports organizations, trading firms and governmental entities. In the *Qwest* securities litigation, Mr. Davidoff represented New Jersey, securing a \$45 million "opt-out" settlement, and also represented New Jersey in "opt-out" litigation against the former public accounting firm for Lehman Brothers Inc.

Mr. Davidoff served as co-lead and trial counsel for a plaintiff class in the first mass tort class action trial in a federal court which resulted in a precedent-setting settlement for class members, *In re Louisville Explosions Litigation*. In the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission ("CRTC") Decisions (*Challenge Communications, Ltd. v. Bell Canada*), Mr. Davidoff was lead counsel for Applicant (plaintiff) in three evidentiary hearings before the CRTC. The hearings resulted in the first precedent-breaking Bell Canada's monopoly over the telecommunications equipment which was connected to its telephone network. He was lead counsel in the *Revco Securities Litigation*, an innovative "junk bond" class action, which settled for \$36 million. Mr. Davidoff was lead plaintiffs' counsel and lead trial counsel in *In re Melridge Securities Litigation* tried to jury verdicts for \$88 million (securities fraud) and \$240 million (RICO). He was co-lead counsel for the class in *In re Graphite Electrodes Antitrust Litigation*, an international price-fixing case which yielded settlements ranging from 18% to 32% of the plaintiffs' and class' purchases from the defendants (aggregate settlements totaled \$134 million). He was

one of co-lead counsel in the *Ikon Securities Litigation*, in which a settlement of \$111 million was obtained. He was co-lead counsel and designated lead trial counsel in the *In Re Sunbeam Securities Litigation*, where settlements of \$142 million were reached. One of his areas of concentration is representation in commodities futures and options matters, and expertise in derivatives. He has represented market-makers on the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, where he owned a member firm in the 1990s, as well as broker-dealers and market-makers on other exchanges.

### **Daniel Berger – Executive Shareholder**

Daniel Berger graduated with honors from Princeton University and Columbia Law School, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone academic scholar. He is a senior member and Executive Shareholder. Over the last two decades, he has been involved in complicated commercial litigation including class action securities, antitrust, consumer protection and bankruptcy cases. In addition, he has prosecuted important environmental, mass tort and civil rights cases during this period. He has led the Firm's practice involving improprieties in the marketing of prescription drugs and the abuse of marketing exclusivities in the pharmaceutical industry, including handling landmark cases involving the suppression of generic competition in the pharmaceutical industry. For this work, he has been recognized by the *Law360* publication as a "titan" of the plaintiffs' Bar ("Titan of the Plaintiffs Bar: Daniel Berger" *Law360*, September 23, 2014).

In the civil rights area, he has been counsel in informed consent cases involving biomedical research and human experimentation by federal and state governmental entities. He also leads the firm's representation of states and other public bodies and agencies.

Mr. Berger has frequently represented public institutional investors in securities litigation, including representing the state pension funds of Pennsylvania, Ohio and New Jersey in both individual and class action litigation. He also represents Pennsylvania and New Jersey on important environmental litigation involving contamination of groundwater by gasoline manufacturers and marketers.

Mr. Berger has a background in the study of economics, having done graduate level work in applied microeconomics and macroeconomic theory, the business cycle, and economic history. He has published law review articles in the *Yale Law Journal*, the *Duke University Journal of Law and Contemporary Problems*, the *University of San Francisco Law Review* and the *New York Law School Law Review*. Mr. Berger is also an author and journalist who has been published in *The Nation* magazine, reviewed books for *The Philadelphia Inquirer* and authored a number of political blogs, including in *The Huffington Post* and the Roosevelt Institute's *New Deal 2.0*. He has also appeared on MSNBC as a political commentator.

Mr. Berger has been active in city government in Philadelphia and was a member of the Mayor's Cultural Advisory Council, advising the Mayor of Philadelphia on arts policy, and the Philadelphia Cultural Fund, which was responsible for all City grants to arts organizations. Mr. Berger was also a member of the Pennsylvania Humanities Council, one of the State organizations through which

the NEA makes grants. Mr. Berger also serves on the board of the Wilma Theater, Philadelphia's pre-eminent theater for new plays and playwrights.

### **Shanon J. Carson – Executive Shareholder**

Shanon J. Carson is an Executive Shareholder of the firm. He Co-Chairs the Employment & Unpaid Wages, Consumer Protection, Defective Products, and Defective Drugs and Medical Devices Departments and is a member of the Firm's Commercial Litigation, Employee Benefits & ERISA, Environment & Public Health, Insurance Fraud, Predatory Lending and Borrowers' Rights, and Technology, Privacy & Data Breach Departments.

Mr. Carson has achieved the highest peer-review rating, "AV," in Martindale-Hubbell, and has received honors and awards from numerous publications. In 2009, Mr. Carson was selected as one of 30 "Lawyers on the Fast Track" in Pennsylvania under the age of 40. In both 2015 and 2016, Mr. Carson was selected as one of the top 100 lawyers in Pennsylvania, as reported by Thomson Reuters. In 2018, Mr. Carson was named to the *Philadelphia Business Journal's* "2018 Best of the Bar: Philadelphia's Top Lawyers."

Mr. Carson is often retained to represent plaintiffs in employment cases, wage and hour cases for minimum wage violations and unpaid overtime, ERISA cases, consumer cases, insurance cases, construction cases, automobile defect cases, defective drug and medical device cases, product liability cases, breach of contract cases, invasion of privacy cases, false advertising cases, excessive fee cases, and cases involving the violation of state and federal statutes. Mr. Carson represents plaintiffs in all types of litigation including class actions, collective actions, multiple plaintiff litigations, and single plaintiff litigation. Mr. Carson is regularly appointed by federal courts to serve as lead counsel and on executive committees in class actions and mass torts.

Mr. Carson is frequently asked to speak at continuing legal education seminars and other engagements and is active in nonprofit and professional organizations. Mr. Carson currently serves on the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers Association (PTLA) and as a Co-Chair of the PTLA Class Action/Mass Tort Committee. Mr. Carson is also a member of the American Association for Justice, the American Bar Foundation, Litigation Counsel of America, the National Trial Lawyers - Top 100, and the Pennsylvania Association for Justice.

While attending the Dickinson School of Law of the Pennsylvania State University, Mr. Carson was senior editor of the Dickinson Law Review and clerked for a U.S. District Court Judge. Mr. Carson currently serves on the Board of Trustees of the Dickinson School of Law of the Pennsylvania State University.

### **Todd S. Collins – Executive Shareholder**

Todd S. Collins has led scores of securities and ERISA litigations over his 38 years at the firm, winning recoveries in the hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of plaintiffs and the classes

they represent. He chairs the firm's ERISA practice, and he serves on the firm's Executive Committee and as the firm's Chief Counsel. Mr. Collins, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, won the 1978 Henry C. Laughlin Prize for Legal Ethics.

Mr. Collins has served as lead counsel or co-lead counsel in numerous cases that have achieved significant benefits on behalf of the Class. These cases include: *In re AMF Bowling Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.) (\$20 million recovery, principally against investment banks, where defendants asserted that Class suffered no damages); *In re Aero Systems, Inc. Securities Litigation* (S.D. Fla.) (settlement equal to 90 percent or more of Class members' estimated damages); *Price v. Wilmington Trust Co.* (Del. Ch.) (in litigation against bank trustee for breach of fiduciary duty, settlement equal to 70% of the losses of the Class of trust beneficiaries); *In re Telematics International, Inc. Securities Litigation* (S.D. Fla.) (settlements achieved, after extensive litigation, following 11th Circuit reversal of dismissal below); *In re Ex-Cell-O Securities Litigation* (E.D. Mich.); *In re Sequoia Systems, Inc.* (D. Mass.); *In re Sapiens International, Inc. Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Datastream Securities Litigation* (D.S.C.); *Copland v. Tolson* (Pa. Common Pleas) (on eve of trial, in case against corporate principals for breach of fiduciary duty, settlement reached that represented 65% or more of claimants' losses, with settlement funded entirely from individual defendants' personal funds); and *In re IKON Office Solutions, Inc. Securities Litigation* (E.D. Pa.). In *IKON*, where Mr. Collins was co-lead counsel as well as the chief spokesman for plaintiffs and the Class before the Court, plaintiffs' counsel created a fund of \$111 million for the benefit of the Class.

In addition, Mr. Collins has served as lead or co-lead counsel in several of the leading cases asserting the ERISA rights of 401(k) plan participants. Mr. Collins has served as co-lead counsel in *In re Lucent Technologies, Inc. ERISA Litigation* (D.N.J.); *In re Nortel Networks Corp. ERISA Litigation* (M.D. Tenn.); *In re SPX Corporation ERISA Litigation* (W.D. N.C.); and *King v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.* (D. Nev.). In *Lucent*, Mr. Collins and his team achieved a settlement consisting of \$69 million for the benefit of plan participants, as well as substantial injunctive relief with respect to the operation of the 401(k) plans.

Mr. Collins is at the forefront of litigation designed to achieve meaningful corporate governance reform. Recently, he brought to a successful conclusion two landmark cases in which corporate therapeutics are at the core of the relief obtained. In *Oorbeek v. FPL Group, Inc.* (S.D. Fla.), a corporate derivative action brought on behalf of the shareholders of FPL Group, plaintiffs challenged excessive "change of control" payments made to top executives. In the settlement, plaintiffs recovered not only a substantial cash amount but also a range of improvements in FPL's corporate governance structure intended to promote the independence of the outside directors.

Similarly, in *Ashworth Securities Litigation* (S.D. Cal.), a Section 10(b) fraud case, in which Mr. Collins was co-lead counsel, plaintiffs again have been successful in recovering millions of dollars and also securing important governance changes. In this case, the changes focused on strengthening the accounting function and improving revenue recognition practices.

In corporate acquisition cases, Mr. Collins has served as co-lead counsel in cases such as *In re Portec Rail Products, Inc. Shareholders Litig.* (C.P. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania) (tender offer enjoined), *Silberman v. USANA Health Sciences, Inc. et. al.* (D. Utah) (offer enjoined on plaintiffs' motion).

### **Michael Dell'Angelo – Executive Shareholder**

Michael Dell'Angelo is an Executive Shareholder in the Antitrust, Commercial Litigation, Commodities & Financial Instruments practice groups and Co-Chair of the Securities department. He serves as co-lead counsel in a variety of complex antitrust cases, including *Le, et al. v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 15-1045 (D. Nev.) (alleging the Ultimate Fighting Championship ("UFC") obtained illegal monopoly power of the market for Mixed Martial Arts promotions and suppressed the compensation of MMA fighters).

Mr. Dell'Angelo is responsible for winning numerous significant settlements for his clients and class members. Most recently, as co-lead counsel, Mr. Dell'Angelo helped to reach settlements totaling more than \$190 million in the multidistrict litigation *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litig.*, No. 13-md-2437 (E.D. Pa.). There, in granting final approval to the last settlement, the court observed about Mr. Dell'Angelo and his colleagues that "Plaintiffs' counsel are experienced antitrust lawyers who have been working in this field of law for many years and have brought with them a sophisticated and highly professional approach to gathering persuasive evidence on the topic of price-fixing." *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litig.*, No. 13-md-2437, 2018 WL 3439454, at \*18 (E.D. Pa. July 17, 2018). "[I]t bears repeating," the court emphasized, "that the result attained is directly attributable to having highly skilled and experienced lawyers represent the class in these cases." *Id.*

Mr. Dell'Angelo also serves or has recently served as co-lead counsel or class counsel in numerous cases alleging price-fixing or other wrongdoing affecting a variety of financial instruments, including *In re Commodity Exchange, Inc., Gold Futures and Options Trading Litig.*, 1:14-MD-2548-VEC (S.D.N.Y.) (\$102 million settlement pending approval; litigation is ongoing as to the remaining defendants); *In re Platinum and Palladium Antitrust Litig.*, No. 14-cv-09391-GHW (S.D.N.Y.); *Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.*, 1:17-cv-03139-LGS (S.D.N.Y.) (\$23.6 million in settlements); *In re Libor-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litig.*, No. 11-md-2262 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$187 million in settlements pending final approval); *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund, et al. v. Bank of Am. Corp., et al.*, No. 14 Civ. 7126-JMF (S.D.N.Y.) (\$504.5 million in settlements); *In re Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litig.*, No. 11-cv-3600 (S.D.N.Y.); and *In re London Silver Fixing, Ltd. Antitrust Litig.*, No. 14-md-2573 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$38 million settlement pending approval; litigation is ongoing as to the remaining defendants).

Mr. Dell'Angelo also serves as lead counsel in numerous individual antitrust cases on behalf of purchasers of rail freight services from the four major rail carriers in the United States.

*The National Law Journal* featured Mr. Dell'Angelo in its profile of Berger Montague for a special annual report entitled "Plaintiffs' Hot List." *The National Law Journal's* Hot List identifies the top

plaintiff practices in the country. The Hot List profile focused on Mr. Dell'Angelo's role in the MF Global litigation (*In re MF Global Holding Ltd. Inv. Litig.*, No. 12-MD-2338-VM (S.D.N.Y.)). In *MF Global*, Mr. Dell'Angelo represented former commodity account holders seeking to recover approximately \$1.6 billion of secured customer funds after the highly publicized collapse of MF Global, a major commodities brokerage. At the outset of this high-risk litigation, the odds appeared grim: MF Global had declared bankruptcy, leaving the corporate officers, a bank, and a commodity exchange as the only prospect for the recovery of class's misappropriated funds. Nonetheless, four years later, a result few would have believed possible was achieved. Through a series of settlements, the former commodity account holders recovered more than 100 percent of their missing funds, totaling over \$1.6 billion.

Mr. Dell'Angelo has been recognized consistently as a Pennsylvania Super Lawyer, a distinction conferred upon him annually since 2007. He is regularly invited to speak at Continuing Legal Education (CLE) and other seminars and conferences, both locally and abroad. In response to his recent CLE, "How to Deal with the Rambo Litigator," Mr. Dell'Angelo was singled out as "One of the best CLE speakers [attendees] have had the pleasure to see."

#### **E. Michelle Drake – Executive Shareholder**

E. Michelle Drake is an Executive Shareholder in the Firm's Minneapolis office. With career settlements and verdicts valued at more than \$150 million, Michelle has had great success in a wide variety of cases.

Michelle focuses her practice primarily on consumer protection, improper credit reporting, and financial services class actions. Michelle is empathetic towards her clients and unyielding in her desire to win. Possessing a rare combination of an elite academic pedigree and real-world trial skills, Michelle has successfully gone toe-to-toe with some of the world's most powerful companies.

Michelle helped achieve one of the largest class action settlements in a case involving improper mortgage servicing practices associated with force-placed insurance, resulting in a settlement valued at \$110 million for a nationwide class of borrowers who were improperly force-placed with overpriced insurance. Michelle also served as liaison counsel and part of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee on behalf of consumers harmed in the Target data breach, a case she helped successfully resolve on behalf of over ninety million consumers whose data was affected by the breach. In 2015, Michelle resolved a federal class action on behalf of a group of adult entertainers in New York for \$15 million. Most recently, Michelle has been successful in litigating numerous cases protecting consumers' federal privacy rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act, securing settlements valued at over \$10 million on behalf of tens of thousands of consumers harmed by improper background checks and inaccurate credit reports in the last two years alone.

Michelle was admitted to the bar in 2001 and has since served as lead class counsel in over fifty class and collective actions alleging violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, various states' unfair and deceptive trade

practices acts, breach of contract and numerous other pro-consumer and pro-employee causes of action.

Michelle serves on the Board of the National Association of Consumer Advocates, is a member of the Partner's Council of the National Consumer Law Center, and is an At-Large Council Member for the Consumer Litigation Section for the Minnesota State Bar Association. She was named as a Super Lawyer in 2013-2018 and was named as a Rising Star prior to that. Michelle was also appointed to the Federal Practice Committee in 2010 by the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. She has been quoted in the New York Times and the National Law Journal, and her cases were named as "Lawsuits of the Year" by Minnesota Law & Politics in both 2008 and 2009.

Michelle began her practice of law by defending high stakes criminal cases as a public defender in Atlanta. Michelle has never lost her desire to litigate on the side of the "little guy."

### **David F. Sorensen – Executive Shareholder**

David Sorensen is an Executive Shareholder and Co-Chair of the Firm's antitrust department. He graduated from Duke University (A.B. 1983) and Yale Law School (J.D. 1989), and clerked for the Hon. Norma L. Shapiro (E.D. Pa.). He concentrates his practice on antitrust and environmental class actions.

Mr. Sorensen co-tried *Cook v. Rockwell Int'l Corp.*, No. 90-181 (D. Colo.) and received, along with the entire trial team, the "Trial Lawyer of the Year" award in 2009 from the Public Justice Foundation for their work on the case, which resulted in a jury verdict of \$554 million in February 2006, after a four-month trial, on behalf of thousands of property owners near the former Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant located outside Denver, Colorado. The jury verdict was then the largest in Colorado history, and was the first time a jury has awarded damages to property owners living near one of the nation's nuclear weapons sites. In 2008, after extensive post-trial motions, the District Court entered a \$926 million judgment for the plaintiffs. The jury verdict in the case was vacated on appeal in 2010. In 2015, on a second trip to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, Plaintiffs secured a victory with the case being sent back to the district court. In 2016, the parties reached a \$375 million settlement, which received final approval in 2017.

Mr. Sorensen played a major role in the Firm's representation of the State of Connecticut in *State of Connecticut v. Philip Morris, Inc., et al.*, in which Connecticut recovered approximately \$3.6 billion (excluding interest) from certain manufacturers of tobacco products. And he served as co-lead class counsel in *Johnson v. AZHHA, et al.*, No. 07-1292 (D. Ariz.), representing a class of temporary nursing personnel who had been underpaid because of an alleged conspiracy among Arizona hospitals. The case settled for \$24 million.

Mr. Sorensen also has played a leading role in numerous antitrust cases representing direct purchasers of prescription drugs. Many of these cases have alleged that pharmaceutical manufacturers have wrongfully kept less expensive generic drugs off the market, in violation of

the antitrust laws. Many of these cases have resulted in substantial cash settlements, including *In re: Namenda Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, (S.D.N.Y.) (\$750 million settlement – largest single-defendant settlement ever for a case alleging delayed generic competition); *King Drug Co. v. Cephalon, Inc.*, (E.D. Pa.) (\$512 million partial settlement); *In re: Aggrenox Antitrust Litigation* (\$146 million settlement); *In re Loestrin 24 Fe Antitrust Litigation* (\$120 million); *In re: K-Dur Antitrust Litigation* (\$60.2 million); *In re: Prandin Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* (\$19 million); *In re: Doryx Antitrust Litigation* (\$15 million); *In re: Skelaxin Antitrust Litigation* (\$73 million); *In re: Wellbutrin XL Antitrust Litigation* (\$37.50 million); *In re: Oxycontin Antitrust Litigation* (\$16 million); *In re: DDAVP Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* (\$20.25 million settlement following precedent-setting victory in the Second Circuit, which Mr. Sorensen argued, see 585 F.3d 677 (2d Cir. 2009)); *In re: Nifedipine Antitrust Litigation* (\$35 million); *In re: Terazosin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1317 (S.D. Fla.) (\$74.5 million); and *In re: Remeron Antitrust Litigation* (\$75 million). Mr. Sorensen is serving as co-lead counsel or on the executive committee of numerous similar, pending cases.

In 2017, the American Antitrust Institute presented its Antitrust Enforcement Award to Mr. Sorensen and others for their work on the *K-Dur* case. In 2019, Mr. Sorensen and others were recognized again by the AAI for their work on the *King Drug* case, being awarded the Outstanding Antitrust Litigation Achievement in Private Law Practice. Mr. Sorensen and his team received the same award in 2020 for their work on the *Namenda* case. Also in 2020, *Law360* named Mr. Sorensen a Competition MVP of the Year.

## **Shareholders**

### **Glen L. Abramson – Shareholder**

Glen L. Abramson is a Shareholder in the Philadelphia office. He concentrates his practice on complex consumer protection, product defects, and financial services litigation, and representing public and private institutional investors in securities fraud class actions and commercial litigation.

Mr. Abramson has served as co-lead counsel in numerous successful consumer protection and securities fraud class actions, including:

*Casey v. Citibank, N.A.*, No. 5:12-cv-00820 (N.D.N.Y.). As Co-Lead Counsel, Mr. Abramson obtained a settlement valued at \$110 million in this consolidated class action on behalf of nationwide classes of borrowers whose mortgage loans were serviced by Citibank or CitiMortgage and who were force-placed with hazard, flood or wind insurance.

*In re Oppenheimer Rochester Funds Group Securities Litigation*, No. 09-md-02063-JLK-KMT (D. Colo.). As Co-Lead Counsel, Mr. Abramson represented shareholders in Oppenheimer municipal bond funds in connection with losses suffered during the financial crisis of 2008. The case settled in 2014 for \$89.5 million.



*In re Tremont, Securities Law, State Law, and Insurance Litig.*, No. 1:08-cv-11117-TPG. Mr. Abramson represented insurance policyholders who lost money in connection with the Madoff Ponzi scheme. The combined cases were settled for more than \$100 million.

*In re Mutual Fund Investment Litig.*, No. 04-md-15861-CCB. As Co-Lead Counsel, Mr. Abramson represented shareholders of various mutual fund families who lost money as the result of market timing in mutual funds. Mr. Abramson was lead counsel for Scudder/Deutsche Bank mutual fund shareholders and helped orchestrate combined settlements of more than \$14 million.

*In re Fleming Companies, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 03-md-1530 (E.D. Tex.). As Co-Lead Counsel, Mr. Abramson represented shareholders of Fleming Companies, Inc. in connection with losses suffered as a result of securities fraud by Fleming and its auditors and underwriters. The case resulted in a \$93.5 million settlement.

Prior to joining Berger Montague, Mr. Abramson practiced at Dechert LLP in Philadelphia, where he handled complex commercial litigation, product liability, intellectual property, and civil rights disputes. While at Dechert, Mr. Abramson co-chaired a civil rights trial in federal court that led to a six-figure verdict. Mr. Abramson also spent three years as a professional equities trader.

Mr. Abramson is a graduate of Cornell University (B.A. *with distinction* 1993) and Harvard Law School (*cum laude* 1996). He is a past member of the Harvard Legal Aid Bureau and is a member of Cornell University's Phi Beta Kappa honors society.

#### **John G. Albanese – Shareholder**

John Albanese is a Shareholder in the Minneapolis office. Mr. Albanese concentrates his practice on consumer protection with a focus on Fair Credit Reporting Act violations related to criminal background checks. Mr. Albanese has also prosecuted class actions related to illegal online lending, unfair debt collection, privacy breaches, and other consumer law issues. Mr. Albanese is regularly invited to speak on consumer law and litigation issues. Mr. Albanese has obtained favorable decisions for consumers in state and federal courts all over the country. He also frequently represents consumer advocacy groups as *amici curiae* at the appellate level.

Mr. Albanese is a graduate of Columbia Law School and Georgetown University. At Columbia, he was a managing editor of the Columbia Law Review and was elected to speak at graduation by his classmates. Mr. Albanese clerked for Magistrate Judge Geraldine Brown in the Northern District of Illinois.

#### **Joy P. Clairmont – Shareholder**

Joy Clairmont is a Shareholder in the Whistleblower, *Qui Tam* & False Claims Act Group, which has recovered more than \$3 billion for federal and state governments, as well as over \$500 million for the firm's whistleblower clients. Ms. Clairmont also has experience practicing in the area of securities fraud litigation.

Ms. Clairmont has been investigating and litigating whistleblower cases for over fifteen years and has successfully represented whistleblower clients in federal and state courts throughout the United States. On behalf of her whistleblower clients, Ms. Clairmont has pursued fraud cases involving a diverse array of companies: behavioral health facilities, a national retail pharmacy chain, a research institution, pharmaceutical manufacturers, skilled nursing facilities, a national dental chain, mortgage lenders, hospitals and medical device manufacturers.

Most notably, Ms. Clairmont has participated in several significant and groundbreaking cases involving fraudulent drug pricing:

***United States ex rel. Streck v. AstraZeneca, LP, et al., C.A. No. 08-5135 (E.D. Pa.):*** a Medicaid rebate fraud case which settled in 2015 for a total of \$55.5 million against three pharmaceutical manufacturers, AstraZeneca, Cephalon, and Biogen. The case alleged that the defendants did not properly account for millions of dollars of payments to wholesalers for drug distribution and other services. As a result, the defendants underpaid the government in rebates owed under the Medicaid Drug Rebate Program.

***United States ex rel. Kieff and LaCorte v. Wyeth and Pfizer, Inc., Nos. 03-12366 and 06-11724-DPW (D. Mass.):*** a Medicaid rebate fraud case involving Wyeth's acid-reflux drug, Protonix, which settled for \$784.6 million in April 2016.

**"AWP" Cases:** a series of cases in federal and state courts against many of the largest pharmaceutical manufacturers, including Bristol-Myers Squibb, Boehringer Ingelheim, and GlaxoSmithKline, for defrauding the government through false and inflated price reports for their drugs, which resulted in more than \$2 billion in recoveries for the government.

Earlier in her career, Ms. Clairmont gained experience litigating securities fraud class actions including, most notably, *In Re Sunbeam Securities Litigation*, a class action which led to the recovery of over \$142 million for the class of plaintiffs in 2002.

Ms. Clairmont graduated in 1995 with a B.A. *cum laude* from George Washington University and in 1998 with a J.D. from George Washington University Law School.

#### **Caitlin G. Coslett – Shareholder**

Caitlin G. Coslett is a Co-Chair of the firm's Antitrust Department. She concentrates her practice on complex litigation, including antitrust and mass tort litigation.

Ms. Coslett represents classes of direct purchasers of pharmaceutical drugs who allege that drug manufacturers have violated federal antitrust law by wrongfully keeping less-expensive generic drugs off the market and/or by wrongfully impeding generic competition. Her work on generic suppression cases has contributed to significant settlements totaling hundreds of millions of dollars, including in the cases of *In re Solodyn (Minocycline Hydrochloride) Antitrust Litigation* (for which Ms. Coslett served as Co-Lead Counsel), *In re Lidoderm Antitrust Litigation*, and *In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litigation*. Ms. Coslett is currently litigating several similar antitrust

pharmaceutical cases, such as *In re Effexor XR Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Bystolic Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Intuniv Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Lamictal Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Novartis and Par Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Opana ER Antitrust Litigation*, and *In re Suboxone (Buprenorphine Hydrochloride and Naloxone) Antitrust Litigation*. She was honored for “Outstanding Antitrust Litigation Achievement by a Young Lawyer” for her work in *In re Lidoderm Antitrust Litigation*.

Ms. Coslett’s experience litigating antitrust class actions also includes *In re CRT Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation*, *In re Steel Antitrust Litigation*, and *In re Urethane [Polyether Polyols] Antitrust Litigation*.

Ms. Coslett also played a significant role in the post-trial litigation in *Cook v. Rockwell International Corporation*, a mass tort class action brought on behalf of thousands of property owners near the Rocky Flats nuclear plant in Colorado. The case settled for \$375 million following a successful appeal to the Tenth Circuit and, in ruling for the plaintiffs on appeal, then-Judge Neil Gorsuch (who is now a Supreme Court Justice) praised Class Counsel’s successful “judicial jiu jitsu” in litigating the case through the second appeal.

Ms. Coslett was named a “Next Generation Lawyer” by *The Legal 500 United States 2019* in the Civil Litigation/Class Actions: Plaintiff category and was selected as a Rising Star by Super Lawyers every year from 2014 – 2021. She has served as pro bono counsel for clients referred by the AIDS Law Project of Pennsylvania and Philly VIP and is a member of the National LGBT Bar Association.

A Philadelphia native, Ms. Coslett graduated *magna cum laude* from Haverford College with a B.S. in mathematics and economics and graduated *cum laude* from New York University School of Law. At NYU Law, Ms. Coslett was a Lederman/Milbank Fellow in Law and Economics and an articles selection editor for the NYU Review of Law and Social Change. Prior to law school, she was an economics research assistant at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, D.C. Ms. Coslett was formerly one of the top 75 rated female chess players in the U.S.

### **Andrew C. Curley – Shareholder**

Andrew C. Curley is a Shareholder in the Antitrust practice group. He concentrates his practice in the area of complex antitrust litigation.

Mr. Curley served as Co-Lead Class Counsel on behalf of a class of independent truck stops and other retail merchants in *Marchbanks Truck Service, Inc. v. Comdata Network, Inc.*, Case No. 07-1078 (E.D. Pa.). The *Marchbanks* litigation settled in January 2014 for \$130 million and significant prospective relief in the form of, among other things, meaningful and enforceable commitments by the largest over-the-road trucker fleet card issuer in the United States to modify or not to enforce those portions of its merchant services agreements that plaintiffs challenged as anticompetitive, and that an expert economist has determined to be worth an additional \$260 million to \$491 million (bringing the total value of the settlement to between \$390 and \$621 million).

Mr. Curley is also involved in a number of antitrust cases representing direct purchasers of prescription drugs. These cases have alleged that pharmaceutical manufacturers have wrongfully kept less expensive generic drugs off the market, in violation of the antitrust laws. Those cases include: *In re Solodyn Antitrust Litig.*, 14 MD 2503 (D. Mass.) (\$76 million settlements); and *In re Aggrenox Antitrust Litig.*, No. 3:14-md-02516 (D. Conn.) (\$146 million settlement); *In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig.*, No. 12-MD-2343 (E.D. Tenn.) (\$73 million settlement); *In re Wellbutrin XL Antitrust Litig.*, No. 08-2431 (E.D. Pa.) (\$37.5 million settlement with one of two defendants); *In re Opana ER Antitrust Litig.*, No. 14-cv-10150 (N.D. Ill.) and *In re Niaspan Antitrust Litig.*, No. 12-MD-2460 (E.D. Pa.).

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Curley practiced in the litigation department of a large Philadelphia law firm where he represented clients in a variety of industries in complex commercial litigation in both state and federal court.

### **Josh P. Davis – Shareholder**

Josh supervises the Firm's San Francisco Bay Area Office. He focuses his practice on antitrust, appeals, class certification, and class action and complex litigation ethics. He is one of the leading scholars in the nation on antitrust procedure, class certification, and ethics in class actions and complex litigation.

Josh is currently a Research Professor at the University of California, Hastings College of the Law, where he is associated with the Center for Litigation and Courts, and the Director of the Center for Law and Ethics at the University of San Francisco School of Law. He has also taught at the Willamette University College of Law and the Georgetown University Law Center. He has testified before Congress on matters related to civil procedure and presented on matters related to private antitrust enforcement before the U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission.

Josh received a CLAY California Attorney of the Year Award in Antitrust in 2016. His law review article, "Defying Conventional Wisdom: The Case for Private Antitrust Enforcement," 48 Ga. L. Rev. 1 (2013), won the 2014 award for best academic article from George Washington University School of Law and Institute on Competition Law. His scholarship has been cited by multiple federal appellate and trial courts. He has published dozens of articles and book chapters on antitrust, civil procedure, class certification, legal ethics, and legal philosophy, among other topics. He regularly presents throughout the country and the world at scholarly and professional conferences and symposia on aggregate litigation, civil procedure, and ethics. Recently, he has written various articles and book chapters on artificial intelligence (AI) and the law and is completing his first book, "Unnatural Law: AI, Consciousness, Ethics, and Legal Theory" (forthcoming in Cambridge University Press 2022/23).

Josh graduated from N.Y.U. School of Law in 1993, where he won the Frank H. Sommer Memorial Award for top general scholarship and achievement in his class, served as the Articles Editor for the N.Y.U. Law Review, and was admitted to the Order of the Coif. After law school, he was a law clerk for Patrick E. Higginbotham of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. He was a

partner at Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, until 2000, when he entered full-time legal academia until joining the Firm in 2022.

### **Lawrence Deutsch – Shareholder**

Mr. Deutsch has been involved in numerous major shareholder class action cases. He served as lead counsel in the Delaware Chancery Court on behalf of shareholders in a corporate governance litigation concerning the rights and valuation of their shareholdings. Defendants in the case were the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, the Exchange's Board of Trustees, and six major Wall Street investment firms. The case settled for \$99 million and also included significant corporate governance provisions. Chancellor Chandler, when approving the settlement allocation and fee awards on July 2, 2008, complimented counsel's effort and results, stating, "Counsel, again, I want to thank you for your extraordinary efforts in obtaining this result for the class." The Chancellor had previously described the intensity of the litigation when he had approved the settlement, "All I can tell you, from someone who has only been doing this for roughly 22 years, is that I have yet to see a more fiercely and intensely litigated case than this case. Never in 22 years have I seen counsel going at it, hammer and tong like they have gone at it in this case."

Mr. Deutsch was one of principal trial counsel for plaintiffs in *Fred Potok v. Floorgraphics, Inc., et al.* (Phila Co. CCP 080200944 and Phila Co. CCP 090303768) resulting in an \$8 million judgment against the directors and officers of the company for breach of fiduciary duty.

Over his 25 years working in securities litigation, Mr. Deutsch has been a lead attorney on many substantial matters. Mr. Deutsch served as one of lead counsel in the *In Re Sunbeam Securities Litigation* class action concerning "Chainsaw" Al Dunlap (recovery of over \$142 million for the class in 2002). As counsel on behalf of the City of Philadelphia he served on the Executive Committee for the securities litigation regarding *Frank A. Dusek, et al. v. Mattel Inc., et al.* (recovery of \$122 million for the class in 2006).

Mr. Deutsch served as lead counsel for a class of investors in Scudder/Deutsche Bank mutual funds in the nationwide *Mutual Funds Market Timing* cases. Mr. Deutsch served on the Plaintiffs' Omnibus Steering Committee for the consortium of all cases. These cases recovered over \$300 million in 2010 for mutual fund purchasers and holders against various participants in widespread schemes to "market time" and late trade mutual funds, including \$14 million recovered for Scudder/Deutsche Bank mutual fund shareholders.

Mr. Deutsch has been court-appointed Lead or a primary attorney in numerous complex litigation cases: *NECA-IBEW Pension Trust Fund, et al. v. Precision Castparts Corp., et al.* (Civil Case No. 3:16-cv-01756-YY); *Fox et al. v. Prime Group Realty Trust, et al.* United States District Court Northern District of Illinois (Civil Case No. 1:12-cv-09350) (\$8.25 million settlement pending); served as court-appointed lead counsel in *In Re Inergy LP Unitholder Litigation* (Del. Ch. No. 5816-VCP ) (\$8 million settlement).

Mr. Deutsch served on a team of lead counsel in *In Re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation*, E.D.Pa. MDL NO. 11-2270 (\$103.9 million settlement); *Tim George v. Uponor, Inc., et*

*al.*, United States District Court, District of Minnesota, Case No. 12-CV-249 (ADM/JJK) (\$21 million settlement); *Batista, et al. v. Nissan North America, Inc.*, United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, Miami Division, Case No. 1:14-cv-24728 (settlement valued at \$65,335,970.00).

In addition to his litigation work, Mr. Deutsch has been a member of the firm's Executive Committee and also manages the firm's paralegals. He has also regularly represented indigent parties through the Bar Association's VIP Program, including the Bar's highly acclaimed representation of homeowners facing mortgage foreclosure.

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Deutsch served in the Peace Corps from 1973-1976, serving in Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, and Belize. He then worked for ten years at the United States General Services Administration.

Mr. Deutsch is a graduate of Boston University (B.A. 1973), George Washington University's School of Government and Business Administration (M.S.A. 1979), and Temple University's School of Law (J.D. 1985). He became a member of the Pennsylvania Bar in 1986 and the New Jersey Bar in 1987. He has also been admitted to practice in Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the First Circuit Court of Appeals, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Court of Federal Claims as well as various jurisdictions across the country for specific cases.

#### **Candice J. Enders – Shareholder**

Candice J. Enders is a Shareholder in the Antitrust practice group. She concentrates her practice in complex antitrust litigation.

Ms. Enders has significant experience investigating and developing antitrust cases, navigating complex legal and factual issues, negotiating discovery, designing large-scale document reviews, synthesizing and distilling conspiracy evidence, and working with economic experts to develop models of antitrust impact and damages. Her work on antitrust conspiracy cases has contributed to significant settlements totaling hundreds of millions of dollars, including in *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation*, No. 13-2437 (E.D. Pa.) (\$190 million in total settlements); *In re Commodity Exchange, Inc. Gold Futures & Options Trading Litigation*, No. 14-2548 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$60 million settlement with Deutsche Bank preliminarily approved; preliminary approval of \$42 million settlement with Defendant HSBC pending; litigation continuing against remaining defendants); *In re Microcrystalline Cellulose Antitrust Litigation*, No. 01-111 (E.D. Pa.) (\$50 million settlement achieved shortly before trial).

In addition to her case work, Ms. Enders contributes to the administration of the firm by serving as the firm's Attorney Recruitment Coordinator, Paralegal Coordinator, and a member of the Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Task Force.

#### **Michael T. Fantini – Shareholder**

Michael T. Fantini is a Shareholder in the Consumer Protection and Commercial Litigation practice groups. Mr. Fantini concentrates his practice on consumer class action litigation.

Mr. Fantini has considerable experience in notable consumer cases such as: *In re TJX Companies Retail Security Breach Litigation*, Master Docket No. 07-10162 (D. Mass) (class action brought on behalf of persons whose personal and financial data were compromised in the largest computer theft of personal data in history - settled for various benefits valued at over \$200 million); *In re Educational Testing Service Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching: Grade 7-12 Litigation*, MDL No. 1643 (E.D. La. 2006) (settlement of \$11.1 million on behalf of persons who were incorrectly scored on a teachers' licensing exam); *Block v. McDonald's Corporation*, No: 01CH9137 (Cir. Ct. Of Cook County, Ill.) (settlement of \$12.5 million where McDonald's failed to disclose beef fat in french fries); *Fitz, Inc. v. Ralph Wilson Plastics Co.*, No. 1-94-CV-06017 (D. N.J.) (claims-made settlement whereby fabricators fully recovered their losses resulting from defective contact adhesives); *Parker v. American Isuzu Motors, Inc.*; No: 3476 (CCP, Philadelphia County) (claims-made settlement whereby class members recovered \$500 each for their economic damages caused by faulty brakes); *Crawford v. Philadelphia Hotel Operating Co.*, No: 04030070 (CCP Phila. Cty. 2005) (claims-made settlement whereby persons with food poisoning recovered \$1,500 each); *Melfi v. The Coca-Cola Company* (settlement reached in case involving alleged misleading advertising of Enviga drink); *Vaughn v. L.A. Fitness International LLC*, No. 10-cv-2326 (E.D. Pa.) (claims made settlement in class action relating to failure to cancel gym memberships and improper billing); *In re Chickie's & Pete's Wage and Hour Litigation*, Master File No. 12-cv-6820 (E.D. Pa.) (settled class action relating to failure to pay proper wage and overtime under FLSA).

Notable security fraud cases in which Mr. Fantini was principally involved include: *In re PSINet Securities Litigation*, No: 00-1850-A (E.D. Va.) (settlement in excess of \$17 million); *Ahearn v. Credit Suisse First Boston, LLC*, No: 03-10956 (D. Mass.) (settlement of \$8 million); and *In re Nesco Securities Litigation*, 4:01-CV-0827 (N.D. Okla.).

Mr. Fantini has represented the City of Chicago in an action against certain online travel companies, such as Expedia, Hotels.com, and others, for their alleged failure to pay hotel taxes. He also represented the City of Philadelphia in a similar matter.

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Fantini was a litigation associate with Dechert LLP. At George Washington University Law School, he was a member of the Moot Court Board. From 2017 - 2021, Mr. Fantini was named a Pennsylvania Super Lawyer by Thomson Reuters.

#### **Michael J. Kane – Shareholder**

Michael J. Kane, a Shareholder of the firm, is a graduate of Rutgers University and Ohio Northern University School of Law, with distinction, where he was a member of the Law Review. Mr. Kane is admitted to practice in Pennsylvania and various federal courts.

Mr. Kane joined the antitrust practice in 2005. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Kane was affiliated with Mager, White & Goldstein, LLP where he represented clients in complex commercial litigation

involving alleged unlawful business practices including: violations of federal and state antitrust and securities laws, breach of contract and other unfair and deceptive trade practices. Mr. Kane has extensive experience working with experts on economic issues in antitrust cases, including impact and damages. Mr. Kane has served in prominent roles in high profile antitrust, securities, and unfair trade practice cases filed in courts around the country.

Currently, Mr. Kane is one the lead attorneys actively litigating and participating in all aspects of the *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1720 (E.D.N.Y.) alleging, *inter alia*, that certain of Visa and MasterCard rules, including anti-steering restraints and default interchange fees, working in tandem have caused artificially inflated interchange fees paid by Merchants on credit and debit card transactions. After over a decade of litigation, a settlement of as much as \$6.24 billion and no less than \$5.54 billion was preliminary approved in January 2019. He is also one of the lead counsel in *Contant, et al. v. Bank of America Corp., et al.*, 1:17-cv-03139-LGS (S.D.N.Y.) alleging a conspiracy among horizontal competitors to fix the prices of foreign currencies and certain foreign currency instruments to recover damages caused by defendants on behalf of plaintiffs and members of a proposed class of indirect purchasers of FX instruments from defendants.

Mr. Kane was also one of the lead lawyers in *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur, Inc.*, No. 2:11-cv-07178-JMV-MAH (D.N.J.), a certified class action of over 26,000 physician practices, other healthcare providers, and vaccine distributors direct purchasers, alleging that defendant Sanofi engaged in anticompetitive conduct to maintain its monopoly in the market for MCV4 vaccines resulting in artificially inflated prices for Sanofi's MCV4 vaccine Menactra and the MCV4 vaccine Menveo. In October 2017 the court granted final approval the \$61.5 million settlement.

Mr. Kane also had a leading role in *Ross v. American Express Company* (S.D.N.Y.) (\$49.5 million settlement achieved after more than 7 years of litigation and after summary judgment was denied). In the related matter *Ross v. Bank of America* (S.D.N.Y.) involving claims that the defendant banks and American Express unlawfully acted in concert to require cardholders to arbitrate disputes, including debt collections, and to preclude cardholders from participating in any class actions, Mr. Kane was one of the primary trial counsel in the five week bench trial. Mr. Kane also has had a prominent role in several antitrust cases against pharmaceutical companies challenging so-called pay for delay agreements wherein the brand drug company allegedly seeks to delay competition from generic equivalents to the brand drug through payments by the brand drug company to the generic drug company. Mr. Kane served as co-lead counsel in *In re Microsoft Corporation Massachusetts Consumer Protection Litigation* (Mass. Super. Ct., Middlesex Cty.), in which plaintiffs alleged that as a result of Microsoft Corporation's anticompetitive practices, Massachusetts consumers paid more than they should have for Microsoft's operating systems and software. The case was settled for \$34 million. Other cases in which Mr. Kane has had a prominent role include: *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litig.* (S.D.N.Y.) (settlement for \$336 million and injunctive relief); *In re Nasdaq Market Makers Antitrust Litig.* (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Compact Disc Antitrust Litig.* (C.D. Cal.); *In re WorldCom, Inc. Securities Litig.* (S.D.N.Y.); *In re Lucent Technologies, Inc. Securities Litig.* (D.N.J.); *City Closets LLC v. Self*



*Storage Assoc., Inc.* (S.D.N.Y.); *Rolite, Inc. v. Wheelabrator Environmental Sys. Inc.*, (E.D. Pa.); and *Amin v. Warren Hospital* (N.J. Super.).

### **Robert Litan – Shareholder**

Robert Litan is a Shareholder in the Antitrust practice group. Litan is one of the few practicing lawyers (in any field, including antitrust) with a PhD in economics and an extensive research and testimonial career in economics. During his legal career, Litan has specialized in administrative and antitrust litigation, concentrating on economic issues, working closely with economic experts (having been a testimonial witness in more than 20 legal and administrative proceedings himself). He previously was a partner with Powell, Goldstein, Frazier and Murphy (Washington, D.C. and Atlanta) and Korein Tillery (St. Louis Chicago). He began his legal career as an Associate at Arnold & Porter (Washington, D.C.)

Litan has directed economic research at three leading national organizations: the Brookings Institution, the Kauffman Foundation and Bloomberg Government.

Litan has held several appointed positions in the federal government. In 1993, he was appointed Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, where he oversaw civil non-merger litigation and the Department's positions on regulatory matters, primarily in telecommunications. During his tenure, he settled the Department's antitrust lawsuit against the Ivy League and MIT for fixing financial aid awards, oversaw the Department's first monopolization case against Microsoft (resulting in 1994 consent decree) and the initial stages of the Antitrust Division's price fixing case against Nasdaq (also resulting in a consent decree). In 1995, Litan was appointed Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, where he oversaw the budgets of five cabinet level agencies.

Litan has co- chaired two panels of studies for the National Academy of Sciences (Measuring Innovation and Disaster Loan Estimation), has served on one other NAS Committee (Use of Scientific Evidence), and consulted for NAS (on energy modeling). He has also been a member of the Presidential-Congressional Commission on the Causes of the Savings and Loan Crisis (1991-93).

Litan has consulted for a broad range of private and governmental organizations, including the U.S. Justice Department (antitrust division), the U.S. Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, and the Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee, the Monetary Authority of Singapore and the World Bank.

Litan has been adjunct professor teaching banking law at the Yale Law School and a Lecturer in Economics at Yale University. He also has taught economics and counter-insurgency at the U.S. Army Command General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth

### **Patrick F. Madden – Shareholder**

Patrick F. Madden is a Shareholder in the Antitrust, Consumer Protection, Insurance Fraud, and Predatory Lending and Borrowers' Rights practice groups. His practice principally focuses on class actions concerning antitrust violations, financial practices, and insurance products.

Mr. Madden has served in key roles in multiple nationwide consumer class actions. For example, he represented homeowners whose mortgage loan servicers force-placed extraordinarily high-priced insurance on them and allegedly received a kickback from the insurer in exchange. Collectively, Mr. Madden's force-placed insurance settlements have made more than \$175 million in recoveries available to class members.

He has also represented plaintiffs in antitrust class actions. For example, Mr. Madden represents a proposed class of elite mixed martial arts fighters in an antitrust lawsuit against the Ultimate Fighting Championship. *Le, et al. v. Zuffa, LLC*, No. 15-cv-1045 (D. Nev.). Mr. Madden also represents a proposed class of broiler chicken farmers in an antitrust suit against the major chicken processing companies for colluding to suppress compensation to the farmers.

Prior to attending law school, Mr. Madden worked at the United States Department of Labor, Office of Labor-Management Standards as an investigator during which time he investigated allegations of officer election fraud and financial crimes by union officers and employees. While at Temple Law School, Mr. Madden was the Executive Editor of Publications for the Temple Journal of Science, Technology & Environmental Law.

#### **Peter Muhic – Shareholder**

Mr. Muhic is a Shareholder in the firm's Consumer Protection Department.

Earlier in his career, Mr. Muhic was a partner of Cozen O'Connor in Philadelphia and then Kessler Topaz Meltzer Check in Radnor, where he focused on ERISA, fiduciary, FLSA and consumer protection claims. Mr. Muhic has tried cases to verdict in numerous states and has obtained hundreds of millions of dollars in relief for investors, consumers and employees throughout the country. Most recently, he was a founding partner of LeVan Muhic Stapleton LLC where he prosecuted class and collective actions and litigated complex commercial cases.

#### **Ellen T. Noteware – Shareholder**

Ms. Noteware has successfully represented investors, retirement plan participants, employees, consumers, and direct purchasers of prescription drug products in a variety of class action cases. She currently chairs the firm's Pro Bono Committee.

Ms. Noteware served on the trial team for *Cook v. Rockwell Int'l Corp.* No. 90-181 (D. Colo.) and received, along with the entire trial team, the "Trial Lawyer of the Year" award in 2009 from the Public Justice Foundation for their work on the case, which resulted in a jury verdict of \$554 million in February 2006, after a four-month trial, on behalf of thousands of property owners near the former Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant located outside Denver, Colorado. The jury verdict was then the largest in Colorado history, and was the first time a jury has awarded damages to property owners living near one of the nation's nuclear weapons sites. In 2008, after extensive post-trial

motions, the District Court entered a \$926 million judgment for the plaintiffs. The jury verdict in the case was vacated on appeal in 2010. In 2015, on a second trip to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, Plaintiffs secured a victory with the case being sent back to the district court. In 2016, the parties reached a \$375 million settlement, which received final approval in 2017.

Ms. Noteware also has played a leading role in numerous antitrust cases representing direct purchasers of prescription drugs. Many of these cases have alleged that pharmaceutical manufacturers have wrongfully kept less expensive generic drugs off the market, in violation of the antitrust laws. Many of these cases have resulted in substantial cash settlements, including *In re: Namenda Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, (S.D.N.Y.) (\$750 million settlement – largest single-defendant settlement ever for a case alleging delayed generic competition); *In re Loestrin 24 Fe Antitrust Litigation*, (D.R.I.) (\$120 million settlement 3 weeks before trial was set to begin); *In re Ovcon Antitrust Litigation*, (D.D.C.) (\$22 million settlement); *In re Tricor Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, (D. Del.) (\$250 million settlement); *Meijer, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories*, (N.D. Cal.) (Norvir) (\$52 million); and *In re Celebrex*, No. 14-cv-00361 (E.D. Va.) (\$95 million).

Ms. Noteware is also extensively involved in litigating breach of fiduciary duty class action cases under the Employee Retirement Income Securities Act ("ERISA"). Her ERISA settlements include: *In re Nortel Networks Corp. ERISA Litigation* (M.D. Tenn.) (\$21 million settlement); *In re Lucent Technologies, Inc. ERISA Litigation* (D.N.J.) (\$69 million settlement); *In re SPX Corporation ERISA Litigation* (W.D.N.C.) (\$3.6 million settlement); *Short v. Brown University*, (D.R.I.) (\$3.5M settlement plus requirement that independent adviser for ERISA plans be retained); *Dougherty v. The University of Chicago*, No. 1:17-cv-03736 (N.D. Ill.) (\$6.5M settlement); and *Nicolas v. The Trustees of Princeton University*, No. 3:17-cv-03695 (D.N.J.) (settlement announced).

Ms. Noteware is a graduate of Cornell University (B.S. 1989) and the University of Wisconsin-Madison Law School (J.D. *cum laude* 1993) where she won the Daniel H. Grady Prize for the highest grade point average in her class, served as Managing Editor of the Law Review, and earned Order of the Coif honors. She is currently a member of the Pennsylvania, New York, and District of Columbia bars.

### **Phyllis Maza Parker – Shareholder**

Phyllis Maza Parker is a Shareholder at the firm. She is a member of the firm's Securities and Investor Protection Department, where she focuses on complex securities class action litigation under the federal securities laws, representing both individual and institutional investors. She is also a member of the firm's Employment Law Department representing employees in class and collective action wage and hour employment cases.

Among securities class action cases, Ms. Parker served on the team as co-lead counsel for the Class in *In re Xcel Energy, Inc. Securities Litigation* (D. Minn.). The case, which settled for \$80 million, was listed among the 100 largest securities class action settlements in the United States since the enactment of the 1933-1934 Securities Acts. Among other cases, she has also served as co-lead counsel in *In re Reliance Group Holdings, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$15 million

settlement); *In re The Loewen Group, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$6 million settlement); as lead counsel in *In re Veeco Instruments Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$5.5 million settlement on the eve of trial); as co-lead counsel in *In re Nuvelo, Inc. Securities Litigation* (\$8.9 million settlement); and, most recently, as co-lead counsel in *Coady v. Perry, et al.* (IndyMac Bancorp, Inc.) (\$6.5 million settlement).

While studying for her J.D. at Temple, Ms. Parker was a member of the Temple Law Review. She published a Note on the subject of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines in the Temple Law Review, Vol. 67, No. 4, 1994, which has been cited by a court and in a law review article. After her first year of law school, Ms. Parker interned with the Honorable Dolores K. Sloviter of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Following law school, Ms. Parker clerked for the Honorable Murray C. Goldman of the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

Ms. Parker was named to the Lawdragon 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyers in America in 2020, 2021 and 2022. She is fluent in Hebrew and French.

### **Russell D. Paul – Shareholder**

Russell Paul is a Shareholder in the Consumer Protection, Qui Tam/Whistleblower, and Securities/Governance/Shareholder Rights practice groups and heads the Automobile Defect practice area. He concentrates his practice on consumer class actions, securities class actions and derivative suits, complex securities, and commercial litigation matters, and False Claims Act suits.

Mr. Paul has successfully litigated and led consumer protection and product defect actions in the automotive, pet food, soft drink, and home products industries. He has been appointed to a leadership position in several automotive defect cases. See *Francis v. General Motors, LLC*, No. 2:19-cv-11044-DML-DRG (E.D. Mich.), ECF No. 40 (appointed as member of Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *Weston v. Subaru of America, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-05876 (D.N.J.), ECF No. 49 (appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel); *Miller v. Ford Motor Co.*, No. 2:20-cv-01796 (E.D. Cal.) ECF No. 60 (appointed to Interim Class Counsel Executive Committee) and *Powell v. Subaru of America, Inc.*, No. 1:19-cv-19114 (D.N.J.), ECF No. 26 (appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel). Mr. Paul has litigated securities class actions against Tyco International Ltd., Baxter Healthcare Corp., ALSTOM S.A., Able Laboratories, Inc., Refco Inc., Toll Brothers and the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae). He has also litigated derivative actions in various state courts around the country, including in the Delaware Court of Chancery. Mr. Paul has also briefed and argued several federal appeals, including in the Third, Sixth and Ninth Circuits.

In addition to securities litigation, Mr. Paul has broad corporate law experience, including mergers and acquisitions, venture capital financing, proxy contests, and general corporate matters. He began his legal career in the New York office of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom.

Mr. Paul has been designated a "Pennsylvania Super Lawyer" and a "Top Attorney in Pennsylvania."

Mr. Paul graduated from the Columbia University School of Law (J.D. 1989) where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar, served on the Moot Court Review Board, was an editor of Pegasus (the law school's catalog) and interned at the United States Attorneys' Office for the Southern District of New York. He completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Pennsylvania, earning a B.S. in Economics from the Wharton School (1986) and a B.A. in History from the College of Arts and Sciences (1986). He was elected to the Beta Gamma Sigma Honors Society.

**Barbara A. Podell – Shareholder**

Barbara A. Podell is a Shareholder in the Securities practice group at the firm. She concentrates her practice on securities class action litigation.

Ms. Podell graduated from the University of Pennsylvania (*cum laude*) and the Temple University School of Law (*magna cum laude*), where she was Editor-in-Chief of the Temple Law Quarterly.

Ms. Podell was one of the firm's senior attorneys representing the Pennsylvania State Employees' Retirement System ("SERS") as the lead plaintiff in the *In re CIGNA Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 02-CV-8088 (E.D. Pa.), a federal securities fraud class action in which SERS moved for, and was appointed, lead plaintiff. CIGNA allegedly concealed crucial operational problems, which, once revealed, caused the company's stock price to fall precipitously. The firm obtained a \$93 million settlement. This was a remarkable recovery because there were no accounting restatements, government investigations, typical indicators of financial fraud, or insider trading. Moreover, the case was settled on the eve of trial (22.7% of losses recovered).

Before joining the firm, Ms. Podell was a founding member of Savett Frutkin Podell & Ryan, P.C., and before that, a shareholder at Kohn, Savett, Klein & Graf and an associate at Dechert LLP, all in Philadelphia.

**Camille Fundora Rodriguez – Shareholder**

Ms. Rodriguez is a Shareholder in the firm's Employment Law, Consumer Protection, and Lending Practices & Borrowers' Rights practice groups. Ms. Rodriguez primarily focuses on wage and hour class and collective actions arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act and state laws.

Prior to joining the firm, Ms. Rodriguez practiced in the litigation department at a boutique Philadelphia law firm where she represented clients in a variety of personal injury, disability, and employment discrimination matters. Ms. Rodriguez is a graduate of Widener University School of Law.

Ms. Rodriguez is an active member of the Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, and Hispanic Bar Associations.

**Martin I. Twersky – Shareholder**

Martin I. Twersky is a Shareholder in the Antitrust Department. He has considerable experience in litigation involving a wide range of industries including oil and gas, banking, airline, waste

hauling, agricultural chemicals and other regulated industries. For more than 40 years, Mr. Twersky has successfully represented numerous plaintiffs and defendants in both individual and class actions pending in state and federal courts.

Mr. Twersky has played a leading role in the following class action cases among others: *In re Containerboard Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Ill.) (where settlements of more than \$350 million were obtained for the class; see 306 F.R.D. 585 (N.D. Ill., 2015) (certifying class)); *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.) (as a member of the Executive Committee, he helped obtain settlements of more than \$200 million and he received specific praise from the court for co-managing the major discovery effort; see 2004 WL 1221350 at \*10); *In re Graphite Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.) (settlements of more than \$120 million); *In re Catfish Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Miss.) (as a member of the trial team he helped obtain settlements of more than \$27 million); *In re Revco Securities Litigation* (N.D. Ohio) ("Junk Bond" class action where settlements of \$36 million were reached and where he received judicial praise from Senior District Court Judge William K. Thomas for the "specialized, highly competent and effective quality of the legal services." See 1993 CCH Fed Sec. L. Rep. at Para. 97,809); *Bogosian v. Gulf Oil* (E.D. Pa.) (landmark litigation with settlements and injunctive relief on behalf of a nationwide class of gasoline dealers). In *Bogosian*, District Judge Donald Van Artsdalen praised class counsel as follows: "Despite the extreme uncertainties of trial, plaintiffs' counsel were able to negotiate a cash settlement of a not insubstantial sum, and in addition, by way of equitable relief, substantial concessions by the defendants..."; see 621 f. supp 27, 31 (E.D. Pa. 1985); and *Lease Oil Antitrust* (S.D. Tex.), where in a significant class action decision, the Fifth Circuit affirmed the granting of an injunction prohibiting settlements in related state court actions (see 200 F.3d 317 (5th Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 530 U.S. 1263). Mr. Twersky was appointed one of the co-lead counsel in *In re Abrasive Grains Antitrust Litig.* (95-cv-7574) (W.D.N.Y.).

Mr. Twersky has also played a key role in various non-class action cases, such as *Kutner Buick v. America Motors*, 848 F.2d 614 (3rd Circuit 1989) (breach of contract) (cited in the Advisory Committee Notes to the 1991 Amendment to Rule 50, Fed. R. Civ. P.), *Florham Park v. Chevron* (D.N.J. 1988) (Petroleum Marketing Act case), and *Frigitemp v. IDT Corp.*, 638 F. Supp. 916 (S.D. N.Y. 1986) and 76 B.R. 275, 1987 LEXIS 6547 (S.D. N.Y. 1987) (RICO case brought by the Trustee of Frigitemp Corp. against General Dynamics and others involving extortion of kickbacks from Frigitemp officers). Mr. Twersky also served prominently in savings-and-loan related securities and fraud litigation in federal and state courts in Florida, where the firm represented the Resolution Trust Corporation and officers of a failed bank in complex litigation involving securities, RICO and breach of fiduciary duty claims. E.g., *Royal Palm v. Rapaport*, Civ. No. 88-8510 (S.D. Fla.) and *Rapaport v. Burgoon*, CL-89-3748 (Palm Beach County).

#### **Daniel J. Walker – Shareholder**

Dan Walker is a Shareholder of the firm, which he rejoined in July 2017 after serving three years in the Health Care Division at the Federal Trade Commission. Mr. Walker practices in the firm's Washington, D.C. office.

While at the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Walker investigated and litigated antitrust matters in the health care industry. In addition to leading various nonpublic investigations in the pharmaceutical and health information technology sectors, Mr. Walker litigated *Federal Trade Commission v. AbbVie Inc., et al.*, a case alleging that a brand pharmaceutical manufacturer engaged in sham patent litigation to delay generic competition, and *Federal Trade Commission v. Cephalon Inc.*, a "pay-for-delay" lawsuit over a brand pharmaceutical manufacturer's payment to four generic competitors in return for the generics' agreement to delay entry into the market. The Cephalon case settled shortly before trial for \$1.2 billion-the largest equitable monetary relief ever secured by the Federal Trade Commission-as well as significant injunctive relief.

During his time in private practice, Mr. Walker has litigated cases on behalf of plaintiffs and defendants in many areas of law, including antitrust, financial fraud, breach of contract, bankruptcy, and intellectual property. Mr. Walker has helped recover hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of plaintiffs, including in *In re Titanium Dioxide Antitrust Litigation* (with settlements totaling \$163.5 million for purchasers of titanium dioxide), *In re High Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation* (with settlements totaling \$435 million for workers in the high tech industry), and *Adriana Castro, M.D., P.A., et al. v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.*, No. 11-cv-07178 (D.N.J.) (with a \$61.5 million settlement pending court approval for purchasers of pediatric vaccines). Mr. Walker was also a member of the team that recovered the funds lost by account holders during MF Global's collapse and a member of the trial team that successfully represented the Washington Mutual stockholders seeking to recover investments lost in the bankruptcy.

In addition, Mr. Walker has spoken frequently on antitrust issues, including on the intersection of antitrust and intellectual property in the health care industry.

Mr. Walker is a *magna cum laude* graduate of Amherst College and Cornell University Law School, where he was an Articles Editor for the Cornell Law Review. Before entering private practice, Mr. Walker clerked for the Honorable Richard C. Wesley of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

## **Senior Counsel**

### **Andrew Abramowitz – Senior Counsel**

Andrew Abramowitz, Senior Counsel in the Securities Department, concentrates his practice in shareholder litigation, representing investors in matters under the federal securities laws and state law governing breach of fiduciary duty. Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Abramowitz was a partner with a prominent Philadelphia law firm where he practiced for more than twenty years.

Mr. Abramowitz has served as one of the lead counsel in numerous cases, including, of note, *In re Parmalat Securities Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.), often referred to as "the Enron of Europe," which was a worldwide securities fraud involving an international dairy conglomerate; *In re SCOR Holding (Switzerland) AG Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.), the first case ever to secure recovery for investors in both a U.S. jurisdiction and a foreign forum; and *In re Abbott Depakote Shareholder Derivative Litigation* (N.D. Ill.), involving the off-label marketing of an anti-seizure drug.

Other notable cases in which Mr. Abramowitz played a significant role include: *Howard v. Liquidity Services, Inc.* (D.D.C.); *In re The Bancorp, Inc. Securities Litigation* (D. Del.); *In re Life Partners Holdings, Inc. Derivative Litigation* (W.D. Tex.); *In re Synthes Inc. Shareholder Litigation* (Del. Ch.); *In re Atheros Communications, Inc. Shareholder Litigation* (Del. Ch.); *Utah Retirement Systems v. Strauss* (American Home Mortgage) (E.D.N.Y.); *In re PSINet, Inc. Securities Litigation* (E.D. Va.); *Penn Federation BMW v. Norfolk Southern Corp.* (E.D. Pa.); *Inter-Local Pension Fund of the Graphic Communications Conference of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. Cybersource Corp.* (Del. Ch.).

He previously served as Legal Counsel to Tradeoffs, a popular health policy podcast launched by a prominent Philadelphia journalist.

Mr. Abramowitz graduated *cum laude* from Franklin & Marshall College (1993) where he earned membership in Phi Beta Kappa. He earned a J.D. from the University of Maryland School of Law (1996), where he was Assistant Editor for *The Business Lawyer*, published jointly with the American Bar Association.

He was a long-standing member of the Corporate Advisory Board of the Pennsylvania Association of Public Employee Retirement Systems (PAPERS), an organization dedicated to educating trustees and fiduciaries of public pension funds throughout Pennsylvania. He has also participated for more than fifteen years in the University of Pennsylvania School of Law's Mentoring Program, in which he mentors international students in the L.L.M. program about the practice of law in the U.S. He has written and spoken extensively on matters relating to securities litigation and corporate governance.

Mr. Abramowitz is also the author of two novels, *A Beginner's Guide to Free Fall* (Lake Union Publishing, 2019), and *Thank You, Goodnight* (Touchstone/Simon & Schuster, 2015).

#### **Natisha Aviles – Senior Counsel**

Natisha Aviles is Senior Counsel in the firm's Antitrust practice group. She concentrates her practice on complex antitrust litigation.

#### **Jennifer Elwell – Senior Counsel**

Jennifer Elwell is Senior Counsel in the firm's Consumer Protection group. She concentrates her practice in complex civil litigation involving actions brought on behalf of consumers for corporate wrongdoing and consumer fraud.

#### **Abigail J. Gertner – Senior Counsel**

Abigail J. Gertner is an attorney in the firm's Philadelphia office and practices in the firm's Consumer Protection and ERISA Litigation practice groups.

Before joining the firm, Ms. Gertner worked at both plaintiff and defense firms, where she gained experience in complex litigation, including consumer fraud, ERISA, toxic tort, and antitrust



matters. She concentrates her current practice on automotive defect, consumer fraud, and ERISA class actions.

Ms. Gertner graduated from Santa Clara University School of Law in 2003, where she interned for the Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office in the Child and Elder Abuse Unit. She completed her undergraduate studies at Tulane University in 2000, earning a B.S. in Psychology and a B.A. in Classics.

She is also active in her community, formerly serving as a Youth Aid Panel chairperson for Upland in Delaware County. She now serves on the Upland Borough Council, beginning her four-year term in January 2020.

Ms. Gertner is admitted to practice in state courts in Pennsylvania and New Jersey; and the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the District of New Jersey, and the Eastern District of Michigan.

#### **Karen L. Handorf – Senior Counsel**

Karen L. Handorf is Senior Counsel at Berger Montague and a member of the firm's Employee Benefits & ERISA practice group, where she represents the interests of employees, retirees, plan sponsors, plan participants and beneficiaries in employee benefit and ERISA cases in the district court and on appeal. Ms. Handorf brings four decades of ERISA knowledge to Berger Montague's practice, where she will focus on emergent issues in health care, with a particular focus on the actions of insurance carrier TPAs that exercise fiduciary duties under ERISA-covered health plans. Ms. Handorf also advises employers and other plan sponsors on the provisions in their administrative service agreements that might cause them to unwittingly violate ERISA or other employee benefit laws. Ms. Handorf is also focused on other legal violations related to patient health care under other (non-ERISA) federal statutes and state consumer statutes in her efforts to address the exorbitant health care costs facing most Americans.

Prior to joining Berger Montague, Ms. Handorf was a partner at another prominent plaintiffs' class action firm and the immediate-past chair and then co-chair of that firm's Employee Benefits/ERISA practice group, where she led efforts in identifying, litigating, and when necessary, appealing often novel employee benefits issues. In that role, Ms. Handorf was one of the pioneers of the church plan litigation against organizations claiming to be exempt from ERISA due to their affiliation with or status as religious organizations.

Prior to that, Ms. Handorf had a distinguished career in government service. She spent 25 years at the Department of Labor, where, among other senior positions, she was the Deputy Associate Solicitor in the Plan Benefits Security Division. During her tenure at the Department of Labor, Ms. Handorf played a major role in formulating and litigating the Government's position on a wide variety of ERISA issues, from conception through expression in amicus briefs filed by the United States Solicitor General in the United States Supreme Court.

#### **Matthew Hartman – Senior Counsel**

Matthew Hartman is Senior Counsel in the firm's San Diego office. He primarily practices in complex litigation.

**Joseph C. Hashmall – Senior Counsel**

Joe Hashmall, Senior Counsel, is a member of the firm's Consumer Protection practice group. In that practice group, Mr. Hashmall primarily focuses on consumer class actions concerning financial and credit reporting practices.

Mr. Hashmall is a graduate of the Grinnell College and the Cornell University School of Law. During law school, Mr. Hashmall served as the Executive Editor of the Cornell Legal Information Institute's Supreme Court Bulletin and as an Editor for the Cornell International Law Journal. Mr. Hashmall has also worked as law clerk for President Judge Bonnie B. Leadbetter of the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court and for the Honorable David J. Ten Eyck of the Minnesota District Court.

**J. Quinn Kerrigan – Senior Counsel**

J. Quinn Kerrigan is Senior Counsel in the firm's Consumer Protection practice group. He concentrates his practice in the area of complex consumer litigation, prosecuting actions against corporate defendants and other institutions for violations of state and federal law, including state causes of action challenging unfair and deceptive practices.

Before joining the firm, Mr. Kerrigan gained notable experience litigating antitrust and consumer class actions, corporate mergers, derivative claims, and insurance coverage disputes.

Mr. Kerrigan is admitted to practice in state courts in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and the District of New Jersey.

Mr. Kerrigan is a graduate of Temple University's Beasley School of Law and John Hopkins University.

**Joseph P. Klein – Senior Counsel**

Joseph Klein is Senior Counsel in the Antitrust practice group and focuses his work on complex antitrust litigation.

**David A. Langer – Senior Counsel**

David A. Langer is Senior Counsel in the Antitrust practice group. He concentrates his practice in complex antitrust litigation.

Mr. Langer has had a primary role in the prosecution of the following antitrust class actions: *In re Currency Conversion Fee Antitrust Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.) (after 5½ years of litigation, through the close of fact and expert discovery, achieved a settlement consisting of \$336 million and injunctive relief for a class of U.S. Visa and MasterCard cardholders; extraordinary settlement participation from class members drawing more than 10 million claimants in one of the largest consumer

antitrust class actions); *Ross and Wachsmuth v. American Express Co., et al.* (S.D.N.Y.) (\$49.5 million settlement achieved after more than 7 years of litigation and after summary judgment was denied); *Ross, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. (USA), et al.* (S.D.N.Y.) (obtained settlements with four of the nations' largest card issuers (Bank of America, Capital One, Chase and HSBC) to drop their arbitration clauses for their credit cards for 3.5 years, and a settlement with the non-bank defendant arbitration provider (NAF), who agreed to cease administering arbitration proceedings involving business cards for 3.5 years); and *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.) (helped obtain settlements of more than \$200 million dollars).

Mr. Langer was one of the trial team chairs in the 5-week consolidated bench trial of arbitration antitrust claims in *Ross v. American Express* and *Ross v. Bank of America*, where the Honorable William H. Pauley, III of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, commended the "extraordinary talents of Plaintiffs' counsel."

Mr. Langer has also had a primary role in appellate proceedings, obtaining relief for his clients in a number of matters, including *Ross, et al. v. American Express Co., et al.*, 547 F.3d 137 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (precluding an alleged co-conspirator from relying on the doctrine of equitable estoppel to invoke arbitration clauses imposed by its competitor co-conspirators); *Ross, et al. v. Bank of America, N.A. (USA), et al.*, 524 F.3d 217 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (holding that antitrust plaintiffs possess Article III standing to challenge the defendants' collusive imposition of arbitration clauses barring participation in class actions); *In re Pharmacy Benefit Managers Antitrust Litig.*, 700 F.3d 109 (3d Cir. 2012) (finding opposing party waived the right to compel arbitration and reversing district court).

While at Vermont Law School, Mr. Langer was Managing Editor and a member of the Vermont Law Review.

### **Natalie Lesser – Senior Counsel**

Natalie Lesser is Senior Counsel in the firm's Consumer Protection and Employee Benefits & ERISA practice groups. She concentrates her practice on automotive defect, consumer fraud, and ERISA class actions.

Before joining the firm, Ms. Lesser gained experience at both plaintiff and defense firms, litigating complex matters involving consumer fraud, securities fraud, and managed care disputes.

Ms. Lesser is admitted to practice in state courts in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the District of New Jersey, and the Eastern District of Michigan, and the United States Courts of Appeals for the Third Circuit and the Ninth Circuit.

Ms. Lesser received her law degree from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law in 2010 and her undergraduate degree in English from the State University of New York at Albany in 2007. While attending the University of Pittsburgh School of Law, Ms. Lesser was Editor in Chief of the University of Pittsburgh Law Review.

**Hans Lodge – Senior Counsel**

Hans Lodge is a zealous advocate and is dedicated to protecting the rights of consumers in and out of court. Hans assists consumers who have been denied jobs or housing due to inaccurate criminal history information reporting in their employment/tenant background check reports. Hans also assists consumers who have been denied credit due to inaccurate information reporting in their credit reports and have suffered harm due to unlawful debt collection behavior.

Hans is an aggressive and strategic litigator who has a reputation of working tirelessly to get favorable outcomes for his clients. Hans understands how frustrating it can be trying to deal with background check companies, credit reporting agencies, credit bureaus, and debt collectors, and has a passion for helping clients navigate these areas of the law during their times of need.

Prior to joining the firm, Hans combined his passions for fighting for the little guy and oral advocacy by representing consumers in individual and class action litigation where he held businesses, banks, background check companies, credit bureaus, and debt collectors accountable for illegal practices. As an Associate Attorney at a consumer rights law firm, Hans represented consumers who had trouble paying their bills and were abused and harassed by debt collection agencies, some of whom had their motor vehicles wrongfully repossessed, bringing numerous individual and class action claims under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA).

Hans also represented consumers who had trouble obtaining credit, employment, and housing due to inaccuracies in their credit reports and background check reports, bringing numerous individual and class action claims under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). As an Associate Attorney at a national employment and consumer protection law firm, Hans represented consumers who purchased defective products and employees misclassified as independent contractors, bringing class action claims under consumer protection statutes and the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).

Hans grew up in the Twin Cities and received his Bachelor's Degree from Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter, Minnesota, where he double-majored in Political Science and Communication Studies and graduated with honors. His first experience resolving quasi-legal disputes began as a Student Representative on the Campus Judicial Board, where he served for three years and resolved numerous complex disputes between students and the College. His interests in sports and ethics took him to New Zealand, Australia, and Fiji, where he studied Sports Ethics.

During his time at Marquette University Law School, Hans concentrated his legal studies on civil litigation and sports law. As a second-year law student, Hans gained valuable experience working as a law clerk for the Honorable Joan F. Kessler at the Wisconsin Court of Appeals. He also served as a member of the Marquette Sports Law Review where he wrote and edited articles about legal issues impacting the sports industry.

As a member of Marquette Law's moot court team, his brief writing and oral advocacy skills earned him a regional championship and an appearance in the national competition at the New York City Bar Association. Hans was also a member of Marquette's mock trial team, finishing in third place at the regional competition at the Daley Center in Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. Lodge is admitted to practice law in the United States District Court, District of Minnesota; United States District Court, Western District of Wisconsin; and both Minnesota and Wisconsin state courts.

In addition to practicing law, Hans is an Adjunct Professor at Concordia University, St. Paul, where he teaches a sports law course in the Master of Arts in Sports Management program. He is also a professionally-trained umpire and umpires Little League, high school, college, legion, and amateur baseball throughout Minnesota. In his free time, Hans enjoys working out, long distance running, road biking, bowling, going to concerts, playing ping pong and softball, and kayaking on Lake Minnetonka.

#### **Jeffrey L. Osterwise – Senior Counsel**

Mr. Osterwise pursues relief for consumers and businesses in a broad array of matters.

Mr. Osterwise litigates class actions on behalf of consumers who have been damaged by automobile manufacturers that conceal known defects in their vehicles and refuse to fulfill their warranty obligations. His experience includes actions against General Motors, Nissan North America, American Honda Motor Company, among others.

Mr. Osterwise also has substantial experience advising consumers and businesses of their rights with respect to a variety of other defective products. He has helped injured parties pursue their claims arising from defects in pharmaceuticals, solar panels, riding lawn tractors, and HVAC and plumbing products.

In addition to defective product claims, Mr. Osterwise has fought to protect consumers from unfair business practices. For example, he has represented clients deceived by their auto insurance carriers and consumers improperly billed by a national health club chain.

Mr. Osterwise also has significant experience representing the interests of shareholders in securities fraud and corporate governance matters. And, he represented the City of Philadelphia and the City of Chicago in separate actions against certain online travel companies for their failure to pay hotel taxes.

#### **Kerri Petty – Senior Counsel**

Kerri Petty is Senior Counsel for the firm and concentrates her practice on complex litigation.

#### **Alexandra Korohey Piazza – Senior Counsel**

Alexandra Korohey Piazza, Senior Counsel, is a member of the firm's Employment Law, Consumer Protection and Lending Practices & Borrowers' Rights practice groups. In the Employment Law practice group, Ms. Piazza primarily focuses on wage and hour class and collective actions arising under state and federal law. Ms. Piazza's work in the Consumer

Protection and Lending Practices & Borrowers' Rights practice groups involves consumer class actions concerning financial practices.

Ms. Piazza is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and Villanova University School of Law. During law school, Ms. Piazza served as a managing editor of the Villanova Sports and Entertainment Law Journal and as president of the Labor and Employment Law Society. Ms. Piazza also interned at the United States Attorney's Office and served as a summer law clerk for the Honorable Eduardo C. Robreno of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

#### **Jacob M. Polakoff – Senior Counsel**

Since joining the firm in 2006, Mr. Polakoff has concentrated his practice on the prosecution of class actions and other complex litigation, including the representation of plaintiffs in consumer protection, securities, and commercial cases.

Mr. Polakoff currently represents homeowners throughout the country in various product liability actions concerning defective construction products, including plumbing and roofing. He served on the teams of co-lead counsel in two nationwide class action plumbing lawsuits: (i) against NIBCO, Inc., claiming that NIBCO's cross-linked polyethylene (PEX) plumbing tubes and component parts were defective and prematurely failed (\$43.5 million settlement), and (ii) in *George v. Uponor, Inc., et al.*, a class action about Uponor's high zinc yellow brass PEX plumbing fittings (\$21 million settlement).

He represented the shareholders of the Philadelphia Stock Exchange in *Ginsburg v. Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc., et al.*, in the Delaware Court of Chancery, which settled for in excess of \$99 million in addition to significant corporate governance provisions. He also is on the team of co-lead counsel representing the shareholders of Patriot National, Inc., and helped secure a \$6.5 million settlement with the bankrupt company's directors and officers.

Mr. Polakoff's experience also includes representing entrepreneurs and small businesses in actions against Fortune 500 companies.

Mr. Polakoff was selected as a Pennsylvania Super Lawyer in 2021, an honor conferred upon only the top 5% of attorneys in Pennsylvania. He was previously selected as a Pennsylvania Super Lawyer – Rising Star in 2010 and 2013-2019.

Mr. Polakoff is a 2006 graduate of the joint J.D./M.B.A. program at the University of Miami, where he was the recipient of the Dean's Certificate of Achievement in Legal Research & Writing, was awarded a Graduate Assistantship and was honored with the Award for Academic Excellence in Graduate Studies.

He holds a 2002 B.S.B.A. from Boston University's School of Management, where he concentrated in finance.

Mr. Polakoff is the Judge of Election for Philadelphia's 30th Ward, 1st Division. He was also a member of the planning committee and the sponsorship sub-committee for the Justice for All 5K from its inception. The event benefited Community Legal Services of Philadelphia, which provides free legal services, in civil matters, to low-income Philadelphians.

#### **Geoffrey C. Price – Senior Counsel**

Geoffrey C. Price is Senior Counsel in the firm's antitrust division, specializing in complex litigation related to pharmaceuticals, investment fraud, and general anti-competitive business practices.

#### **Richard Schwartz – Senior Counsel**

Richard Schwartz is Senior Counsel in the Antitrust practice group. Mr. Schwartz concentrates his practice in the area of complex antitrust litigation with a focus on representation of direct purchasers of prescription drugs.

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Schwartz was an attorney in the New York and Philadelphia offices of a firm where he represented plaintiffs in a variety of matters before trial and appellate courts with a focus on antitrust and shareholder class actions.

Mr. Schwartz is a member of the teams prosecuting a number of antitrust class actions on behalf of direct purchasers of prescription drugs in which the purchasers allege that generic drugs have been illegally kept off the market. Those cases include *In re Opana ER Antitrust Litigation*, No. 14-cv-10151 (N.D. Ill.); *In re Suboxone*, No. 13-MD-2445 (E.D. Pa.); *In re Solodyn*, No. 14-MD-2503 (D. Mass.) and *In re Celebrex*, No. 14-cv-00361 (E.D. Va.).

Mr. Schwartz is admitted to practice in New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois.

#### **Julie Selesnick – Senior Counsel**

Julie S. Selesnick is Senior Counsel at Berger Montague and a member of the firm's Employee Benefits & ERISA practice group, where she represents the interests of employees, retirees, plan sponsors, plan participants and beneficiaries in employee benefit and ERISA cases in the district court and on appeal. Ms. Selesnick's practice is focused on health care, where she brings more than a decade of insurance coverage experience to good use focusing on the behaviors of insurance carrier TPAs that exercise fiduciary duties under ERISA-covered health plans and counseling employers and other plan sponsors on provisions in their administrative service agreements that might cause them to unwittingly violate ERISA or other employee benefit laws. Ms. Selesnick is also focused on other legal violations related to patient health care under various federal statutes and state consumer statutes to help everyday American's bring down the out-of-control health care costs they face.

Prior to joining Berger Montague, Ms. Selesnick was of counsel at another prominent plaintiffs' class action firm, where she practiced primarily in the ERISA group representing plaintiffs in class cases related to 401K excessive fee disputes, actuarial equivalence pension issues, church plan litigation, and cases against third-party administrators for

breach of fiduciary duty in connection with their administration of ERISA-covered group health plans. Ms. Selesnick also worked in that firm's Consumer Protection group litigating consumer class action lawsuits and policyholder insurance coverage actions on behalf of individual and class plaintiffs.

Prior to that, Ms. Selesnick was a partner at a Washington D.C. law firm in both the insurance coverage and employment law groups, where she represented carriers in insurance coverage litigation and subrogation litigation in state and federal courts throughout the United States, and represented both employers and employees in employment litigation, as well as negotiating severance agreements and reviewing and updating employee handbooks. Ms. Selesnick has first chair trial experience in jury and bench trials and has experience with arbitration and mediation of complex disputes.

Ms. Selesnick is an accomplished writer and has written numerous legal and non-legal articles and blog posts. She has also contributed to ERISA Litigation textbooks and cumulative supplements, and written materials for use in health-care litigation conferences.

Ms. Selesnick graduated with a B.A., cum laude, from the San Diego State University and was elected Phi Beta Kappa and Pi Sigma Alpha, and she received her J.D., from the George Washington University School of Law, where she was a member of the George Washington University Law Review and was inducted into the Order of the Coif.

#### **Lane L. Vines – Senior Counsel**

Lane L. Vines's practice is concentrated in the areas of securities/investor fraud, consumer and *qui tam* litigation. For more than 17 years, Mr. Vines has prosecuted both class action and individual opt-out securities cases for state government entities, public pension funds, and other large investors. Mr. Vines also represents consumers in class actions involving unlawful and deceptive practices, as well as relators in *qui tam*, whistleblower and False Claims Act litigations. Mr. Vines is admitted to practice law in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and numerous federal courts.

Mr. Vines also has experience in the defense of securities and commercial cases. For example, he was one of the firm's principal attorneys defending a public company which obtained a pre-trial dismissal in full of a proposed securities fraud class action against a gold mining company based in South Africa. See *In re DRDGold Ltd. Securities Litigation*, 05-cv-5542 (VM), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7180 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2007).

During law school, Mr. Vines was a member of the Villanova Law Review and served as a Managing Editor of *Outside Works*. In that role, he selected outside academic articles for publication and oversaw the editorial process through publication.



Prior to law school, Mr. Vines worked as an auditor for a Big 4 public accounting firm and a property controller for a commercial real estate development firm, and served as the Legislative Assistant to the Minority Leader of the Philadelphia City Council.

Mr. Vines has achieved the highest peer rating, "AV Preeminent" in Martindale-Hubbell for legal abilities and ethical standards. Mr. Vines is admitted to practice law in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and several federal courts.

### **Dena Young – Senior Counsel**

Dena Young is Senior Counsel in the firm's Consumer Protection practice group. She concentrates her practice in the area of complex consumer litigation, prosecuting actions against pharmaceutical and product manufacturers for violations of state and federal law.

Before joining the firm, Dena worked for prominent law firms in the Philadelphia region where she worked on personal injury and mass tort cases involving dangerous and defective medical devices, pharmaceutical, and consumer products including Talcum Powder, Transvaginal Mesh, Roundup, Risperdal, Viagra, Zofran, and Xarelto. She also assisted in the prosecution of cases on behalf of the U.S. Government and other government entities for violations of federal and state false claims acts and anti-kickback statutes.

Recently, the Honorable Brian R. Martinotti appointed Dena to serve on the plaintiffs' steering committee (PSC) of MDL 2921 in the *Allergan BIOCELL Textured Breast Implant Products Liability Litigation*, situated in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. In this case, Dena represents plaintiffs diagnosed with breast implant associated anaplastic large cell lymphoma (BIA-ALCL), a deadly form of cancer caused by Allergan's textured breast implants.

Early in her legal career, Dena represented clients diagnosed with devastating asbestos-related diseases, including mesothelioma and lung cancer. Cases she handled resulted in millions of dollars in settlements for her clients.

During law school, Dena represented defendants in preliminary hearings and misdemeanor trials while working for the Defender Association of Philadelphia. She also clerked for the Animal Protection Litigation section of the United States Humane Society. In 2008-2009, Young worked for the Honorable Renee Cardwell Hughes of Philadelphia's Court of Common Pleas.

In 2010, she received her Juris Doctor degree, with honors, from Drexel University's Thomas R. Kline School of Law where she founded the School's Student Animal Legal Defense Fund chapter.

Dena is admitted to practice in state courts in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey.

### **Associates**

**Hope Brinn – Associate**

Hope Brinn is an Associate in the firm's Antitrust group. Prior to joining the firm, Ms. Brinn clerked for the Honorable Janet Bond Arterton in the District of Connecticut. Ms. Brinn graduated from the University of Michigan Law School, where she was a senior editor for the Michigan Law Review, and the executive notes editor for the Michigan Journal of Race & the Law.

Prior to law school, Ms. Brinn worked at The Philadelphia School and Breakthrough of Greater Philadelphia.

**William H. Ellerbe – Associate**

William H. Ellerbe is an Associate in the Philadelphia office and practices in the firm's Whistleblower, *Qui Tam* & False Claims Act group, which has collectively recovered more than \$3 billion for federal and state governments, as well as over \$500 million for the firm's whistleblower clients. Mr. Ellerbe represents whistleblowers in litigation across the country and also actively assists in investigating and evaluating potential whistleblower claims before a lawsuit is filed.

Mr. Ellerbe received an A.B. in English from Princeton University. He graduated *magna cum laude* from the University of Michigan Law School and also received a certificate in Science, Technology, and Public Policy from the Ford School of Public Policy. During law school, Mr. Ellerbe was an Associate Editor of the *Michigan Telecommunications and Technology Law Review* and an active member of both the Environmental Law Society and the Native American Law Students Association.

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Ellerbe clerked for the Honorable Anne E. Thompson of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. He also worked as a white collar and commercial litigation associate at two large corporate defense firms.

Mr. Ellerbe is admitted to practice in the state courts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, as well as the Third and Fourth Circuit Courts of Appeals and the United State District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the Middle District of Pennsylvania, the District of New Jersey, the Southern District of New York, and the Eastern District of New York.

**William H. Fedullo – Associate**

William H. Fedullo is an Associate in the firm's Philadelphia office, practicing in the Whistleblower, *Qui Tam* & False Claims Act group, which has collectively recovered more than \$3 billion for federal and state governments, as well as over \$500 million for the firm's whistleblower clients. Mr. Fedullo represents whistleblowers in active litigation throughout the country. He also assists in the pre-litigation investigation and evaluation of potential whistleblower claims.

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Fedullo was a commercial litigation associate at a large full-service Philadelphia law firm. His practice there focused on protecting small businesses that had been the victims of usurious "merchant cash advance" lending practices. He also took an active role in

franchisee rights litigation in the hospitality industry. He served as lead associate in numerous state and federal litigations as well as AAA and JAMS arbitrations. His accomplishments included primarily authoring briefs that obtained critical injunctive relief in bet-the-business arbitration; primarily authoring dispositive and appellate briefs in parallel state and federal actions against one of the largest debt collection companies in the world, resulting in a federal court denying a motion to dismiss a consumer's Fair Debt Collections Practices Act claims; and authoring a complaint brought by over ninety hotel franchisees against a prominent international hotel franchisor. Additionally, Mr. Fedullo played key roles in several other cases that resulted in favorable verdicts or settlements for his clients.

Mr. Fedullo received a Bachelor of Arts from Swarthmore College with High Honors, with a major in Philosophy and minor in English Literature. He graduated from the University of Pennsylvania Law School *cum laude*. In law school, he was an executive editor of the Penn Law Journal of Constitutional Law, where he published a Comment, "Classless and Uncivil." He also worked as a research assistant for the reporter for the forthcoming Restatement (Third) of Conflicts of Law, and as a teaching assistant at the Wharton School of Business for the undergraduate class "Constitutional Law and Free Enterprise." He was the recipient of the 2019 Penn Law Fred G. Leebron Memorial Prize for Best Paper in Constitutional Law for his paper "Original Public Meaning Originalism and Women Presidents." Finally, he received honors from both the Philadelphia Bar Association and Penn Law for his involvement in pro bono activities, which included serving as a board member for the Custody and Support Assistance Clinic, a student-run organization that provides legal assistance to low-income Philadelphians facing family law issues; working on low-income housing and utility issues at Community Legal Services; and working as a certified legal intern in the Civil Practice Clinic, litigating several cases for low-income Philadelphians before the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

Mr. Fedullo is admitted to practice law in the state courts of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as well as the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

### **Najah Jacobs – Associate**

Ms. Jacobs is an Associate in the firm's Consumer Protection & ERISA Departments.

Prior to joining Berger Montague, Najah Jacobs was an associate at Stevens & Lee, P.C., where she focused her practice on commercial litigation matters with an emphasis on litigation involving financial products and representation of broker-dealers in FINRA arbitration matters related to the purchase and sale of securities and insurance products. Prior to that, Najah was an associate at a large New Jersey law firm, where she defended large oil companies in complex statewide environmental litigation. During her time there, Najah played a major role in formulating a defense strategy and obtaining a favorable disposition for the City of Philadelphia in a constitutional rights case brought by the Fraternal Order of Police over an alleged "do not call list."

Najah graduated from Drexel University Thomas R. Kline School of Law, where she was an active leader. Najah served as the President of the Black Law Students Association, a Law School Ambassador, a Diversity and Inclusion Fellow, and as a Marshall Brennan Constitutional Literacy

Fellow, where she taught high school students about their constitutional rights. Najah was also the Executive Symposium Editor of the Drexel Law Review and a competitor on Drexel's nationally recognized Trial Team, leading the group to back-to-back victories in national mock trial competitions against some of the nation's top law schools. During law school, Najah served as a judicial extern for the Honorable Robert B. Kugler of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey and also served as an intern for the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office. At graduation, Najah received the Faculty Award for Contributions to the Intellectual Life of the Law School and the Thomas R. Kline School of Law Trial Team Award for Outstanding Advocacy.

Najah is currently an adjunct faculty member at the Kline School of Law, serving as a coach and mentor for teams competing in national trial advocacy competitions. In her spare time, Najah enjoys playing basketball, mentoring high school and college students, and hosting events for her non-profit organization, which focuses on giving back to underserved communities.

#### **Ariana B. Kiener – Associate**

Ariana B. Kiener is an Associate in the firm's Minneapolis office and practices in the firm's Consumer Protection group.

Before joining the firm, Ms. Kiener worked for several years in education, first as a classroom teacher (through a Fulbright Scholarship in Northeastern Thailand) and eventually as the communications director for an education advocacy nonprofit organization. While in law school, she clerked at the Firm and served as a Certified Student Attorney and Student Director with the Mitchell Hamline Employment Discrimination Mediation Representation Clinic.

#### **Julia McGrath – Associate**

Julia McGrath is an Associate in the firm's Antitrust practice group. She represents consumers, businesses, and public entities in complex class action litigation, prosecuting anticompetitive conduct such as price-fixing, bid-rigging, and illegal monopolization.

Ms. McGrath has challenged anticompetitive conduct in a variety of industries, including the single-serve coffee industry in *In Re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Antitrust Litigation*; the pharmaceutical industry in *In Re: Ranbaxy Generic Drug Application Antitrust Litigation* (D. Mass) and *In Re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.); and the financial industry in *In re London Silver Fixing Ltd. Antitrust Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.) and *In re: GSE Bonds Antitrust Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.).

Prior to law school, Ms. McGrath had a successful career in government and politics. She worked on political campaigns at the local, state, and federal level. She's advised top-tier congressional, gubernatorial, and U.S. Senate candidates in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and served as the Finance Director for U.S. Senator Bob Casey. In 2013, she was appointed by President Obama to serve as Special Assistant to the Mid-Atlantic Regional Administrator of the U.S. General Services Administration.

Ms. McGrath earned her J.D., *cum laude*, from Temple University Beasley School of Law and her B.A. in History from Boston University.

#### **Amey J. Park – Associate**

Amey J. Park is an Associate in the firm's Philadelphia office and practices in the firm's Consumer Protection and Commercial Litigation practice groups.

Before joining the firm, Ms. Park was an associate in the litigation department of a large corporate defense firm. She represented corporate and individual clients in complex commercial litigation, product liability, and personal injury matters in a wide variety of industries, including financial services, insurance, trust administration, and real estate. Ms. Park also represented clients *pro bono*, serving as first-chair counsel in a federal jury trial for violations of an inmate's constitutional rights by law enforcement officers and assisting a young refugee seeking asylum in federal immigration court.

Ms. Park is admitted to practice in state courts in Pennsylvania and New Jersey; the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and the District of New Jersey; and the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

#### **Sophia Rios – Associate**

Sophia Rios is an associate in the firm's San Diego office and practices in the Consumer Protection and Antitrust practice groups.

Before joining the firm, Sophia was an associate in the litigation department of a large international law firm. She represented corporate and individual clients in consumer protection, complex commercial litigation, securities, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) matters. In her *pro bono* practice, Sophia assisted refugees seeking asylum in the United States.

Sophia is committed to furthering diversity and inclusion in law firms. She serves on the firm's Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Task Force. Sophia has also participated in the Leadership Council on Legal Diversity's Pathfinder Program.

While at Stanford Law School, Sophia served as an extern Legal Adviser in the Office of Commissioner Julie Brill at the Federal Trade Commission in Washington, DC. Sophia co-founded the Stanford Critical Law Society, which serves as a student forum for the discussion of the relationship between law and race. Sophia was a Lead Article Editor for the Stanford Environmental Law Journal.

Before beginning law school, Sophia attended UC Berkeley and served as an intern on the White House Council of Environmental Quality. She is a first-generation college student and a San Diego native.

**Reginald L. Streater – Associate**

Reginald L. Streater, an Associate, is a member of the firm's Employment & Unpaid Wages, Consumer Protection, and Predatory Lending and Borrowers' Rights practice groups. In the Employment & Unpaid Wages practice group, Mr. Streater focuses on discrimination and wage and hour class and collective actions arising under state and federal law. Mr. Streater's work in the Consumer Protection and Predatory Lending and Borrowers' Rights practice groups involves consumer class actions concerning financial practices. Mr. Streater is a member of the firm's Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Task Force.

Before joining the firm, Mr. Streater was an associate at a large regional law firm where his practice focused on commercial and complex litigation. His clients ranged from individuals and small businesses to large corporations and public entities. Mr. Streater handled a variety of litigation matters, including contract disputes, usury claims, federal claims, federal civil rights claims, insurance matters, employment claims, fraud claims, and tort claims in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, where he has federal and state trial experience. His prior work experience also includes positions with the Pennsylvania Innocence Project and the District Office of State Representative Brian Sims of Philadelphia.

Mr. Streater graduated from Temple University's College of Liberal Arts where he studied Political Science and African American Studies. There he was inducted into Pi Sigma Alpha – the National Political Science Honor Society. Subsequently, Mr. Streater graduated from Temple University Beasley School of Law, where he was an active leader within the Temple Law community. Mr. Streater served as the first Black President of the Student Bar Association, President of the Black Law Students Association, and as an Advisor to the Affinity Group Coalition. Mr. Streater was Staff Editor for Volume 31 of the Temple International & Comparative Law Journal, and he served as a teaching assistant for the Integrated Transactional Advocacy Program and the Integrated Trial Advocacy Program. He was a Rubin Public Interest Law Honor Society Fellow, as well as a member of the National Lawyers Guild Temple Law Chapter and Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity. During law school, Reggie received the Henry J. Richardson III Award, the Captain Robert Miller Knox Award, and the H. Monica Rasch Memorial Award. He was also the recipient of the Barristers Association of Philadelphia Merit Scholarship, the McCool Scholarship, and the Conwell Scholarship.

**Mark Suter – Associate**

Mark Suter is an Associate in the firm's Philadelphia office. He represents businesses, workers, consumers, and public entities in complex civil litigation, including class and collective actions, with a focus on antitrust, labor, and consumer protection matters.

Mr. Suter has successfully challenged price-fixing, bid-rigging, and other anticompetitive conduct in a wide array of industries, including as co-trial counsel in *In re Capacitors Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal.) (\$451.5 million in settlements to date); co-lead counsel in *In re Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.) (\$190.7 million total settlements); co-lead counsel in *In re Commodity Exchange, Inc., Gold Futures and Options Trading Litigation* (S.D.N.Y.) (\$102 million in settlements to date); counsel for the City and County of Denver in *In re Liquid Aluminum Sulfate*

*Antitrust Litigation* (D.N.J.) (\$90.5 million total settlements); and co-lead counsel in *In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation* (E.D.N.Y.) (\$80 million total settlements). Among other matters, he currently serves as co-lead counsel in *Le, et al v. Zuffa, LLC d/b/a Ultimate Fighting Championship* (D. Nev.), representing a class of professional mixed martial arts fighters, and *Fusion Elite All Stars, et al. v. Varsity Brands, LLC, et al.* (W.D. Tenn.) on behalf of a proposed class of All Star Cheer gyms and parents. Mr. Suter also represents whistleblowers in *qui tam* or False Claims Act litigation against companies that have committed fraud against the government.

Mr. Suter serves as Co-Chair for the Young Lawyers Division of the Committee to Support Antitrust Laws (COSAL) and on the Executive Committee for Community Legal Services Justice Rising Advocates. He maintains an active pro bono practice partnering with local public interest organizations and volunteering at juvenile expungement clinics.

Mr. Suter graduated from Rutgers Law School with *magna cum laude* and Order of the Coif honors. While in law school, he served as Senior Editor of the *Rutgers Law Review* and represented children and families as part of the Rutgers Child Advocacy Clinic. Mr. Suter received his B.A. in Philosophy and Political Science from McGill University.

#### **Y. Michael Twersky – Associate**

Y. Michael Twersky concentrates his practice primarily on representing plaintiffs in complex litigation, including on insurance, antitrust, and environmental matters.

In the past, Mr. Twersky has worked on a wide variety of insurance matters including an insurance case in which a Federal District Court found on Summary Judgement that a large insurance company had breached its policy when it denied benefits under an accidental death insurance plan. Mr. Twersky has also worked on a number of antitrust class actions alleging that pharmaceutical manufacturers wrongfully kept less expensive generic drugs off the market, in violation of the antitrust laws, including: *In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litigation*, 1:12-md-02343 (E.D. Tenn.) (\$73 million settlement in 2014), and *In re Solodyn Antitrust Litig.*, 14 MD 2503 (D. Mass.) (combined settlements in excess of \$76 million in 2018). Mr. Twersky has also represented inmates in connection with allegations that various inmate calling services charged unreasonable rates and fees in violation of the Federal Communication Act.

Currently, Mr. Twersky is litigating a number of complex class actions related to insurance products, including proposed class actions in multiple forums against a workers' compensation insurance company alleging that the company deceptively sold illegal workers' compensation programs that were not properly filed with state regulators. *E.g.*, *Shasta Linen Supply, Inc. v Applied Underwriters et al.*, No. 2:16-cv-0158 (N.D. Cal.). Mr. Twersky is also involved in a proposed class action in Federal Court brought on behalf of Alaska-enrolled Medicaid Healthcare Providers against the developers of the Alaska Medicaid Management Information System Company alleging that providers were harmed as a result of the negligent and faulty design and implementation of the MMIS system. *See South Peninsula Hospital et al v. Xerox State Healthcare, LLC*, 3:15-cv-00177 (D. Alaska). Mr. Twersky is also involved in environmental

litigation on behalf of various states to recover the costs of remediation for contamination to groundwater resources.

Mr. Twersky graduated from Temple University Beasley School of Law in 2011, where he was a member of the Rubin Public Interest Law Honors Society and a Class Senator. In addition, Mr. Twersky advised various clients in business matters as part of Temple University's Business Law Clinic.

### **Michaela Wallin – Associate**

Michaela Wallin is an Associate in the Antitrust and Employment Law practice groups. Ms. Wallin's work in the Antitrust group involves complex class actions, including those alleging that pharmaceutical manufacturers have wrongfully kept less expensive drugs off the market, in violation of the antitrust laws. In the Employment Law Group, Ms. Wallin focuses on wage and hour class and collective actions arising under federal and state law.

Prior to joining the firm, Ms. Wallin served as a law clerk for the Honorable James L. Cott of the United States District Court of the Southern District of New York. She also completed an Equal Justice Works Fellowship at the ACLU Women's Rights Project, where she worked to challenge local laws that target domestic violence survivors for eviction and impede tenants' ability to call the police.

Ms. Wallin is a graduate of Columbia Law School, where she was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. Ms. Wallin graduated *magna cum laude* from Bowdoin College, where she was Phi Beta Kappa and a Sarah and James Bowdoin Scholar.

## **Counsel**

### **Alexandra Antoniou – Counsel**

Alexandra Antoniou is an attorney in the firm's Philadelphia office, and works in the firm's Auto Defect practice area.

### **James P.A. Cavanaugh – Counsel**

James P.A. Cavanaugh has experience working in antitrust matters, with a focus on the suppression of generic competition by major pharmaceutical manufacturers. Jim is an experienced litigator having previously established and managed for some years his own general practice law firm, prior to working in antitrust matters in more recent years. That law practice emphasized litigation, including workers' compensation, employment law, civil rights, and personal injury claims.

In that practice, Jim advocated for the establishment of case law precedent in *Dr. Joe John Doe v. TRIS Mental Health Services*, 298 N.J. Super. 677 (1996) permitting the disabled, for the first time, to proceed anonymously in the New Jersey Superior Courts.



Jim's experience included investigating the facts of a workplace explosion involving a faulty truck rim, coordination of physical evidence, close consultation with a Drexel University engineering expert, and ultimate settlement for injured plaintiff.

Jim's community contributions include pro bono representation of an amicus curiae (friend of the court) the National Association of Social Workers opposing discriminatory policies in the widely followed *James Dale v. Boy Scouts of America*, 160 N.J. 562 (1999) case [see also 530 U.S. 640 (2000)].

Jim was appointed by the Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court to sit on the NJ Supreme Court Task Force on Lesbian & Gay Issues, whose purpose was to examine discrimination in the courts and the legal profession and to adopt recommendations.

### **Carl Copenhaver – Counsel**

Carl Copenhaver is Counsel in the Firm's Antitrust Department. Carl has almost 18 years of experience in complex securities and antitrust class action litigation as a discovery specialist. Over that span, he has worked independently, and later through his own discovery firm, with a wide variety of firms on a range of cases assisting in discovery and evidentiary-related matters.

Mr. Copenhaver received his Bachelor of Arts with Scholastic Distinction in History and a concentration in African American Studies from Carleton College, graduating magna cum laude. He was a member of the Mortar Board National Honor Society and was a nationally ranked member of the tennis team while winning multiple All-Conference Awards.

Mr. Copenhaver attended The George Washington University Law School where he was a Murray Snyder Public Interest Fellow and worked with local and national civil rights organizations on Fair Housing issues.

### **Stephen Farese – Counsel**

Stephen Farese is Counsel in the Firm's Antitrust Department.

Stephen has over eighteen years of solid e-discovery experience and has developed significant technical skills on various e-discovery software platforms. Since 2004, he has helped large and small firms with their e-discovery needs including document productions, witness preparation, and quality control. He has interfaced with and assisted partners and associates in finding optimal ways to cull large document collections and has assisted them in the development of protocols setting the rules upon which the remaining documents are to be coded by reviewers.

Stephen has significant document review experience and is fully capable of handling a review from its initial stage (raw document collection) through to the use of legally supportable search terms to cull the initial population of documents into a subset to be reviewed by reviewers for responsiveness and privilege. He has an in-depth knowledge of attorney-client privilege and work product rules and has been instrumental in 2<sup>nd</sup> level (QC) and privilege reviews including privilege log creation.

Stephen has been hired as an E-discovery Subject Matter Expert on the document review side of the e-discovery equation. He is proficient in dealing with clients in answering their questions and presenting PowerPoint presentations illustrating costs and workflow. His legal background

also positions him in a unique position of being able to assist in the writing of substantive review protocols and have the technical expertise to design and implement the necessary review coding panels.

Stephen Received his JD from Widener University School of Law in 1998. He is actively licensed in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New York.

#### **Daniel E. Listwa – Counsel**

Daniel E. Listwa has worked on a number of antitrust matters, with a focus on the suppression of generic competition by major pharmaceutical manufacturers. Before joining the firm, Mr. Listwa clerked for the Honorable J. Brian Johnson of the Lehigh County Court of Common Pleas, and was an associate at a medical malpractice defense firm in Blue Bell, PA. While in law school, Mr. Listwa was a staff writer for the Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review, and interned at the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

#### **Ivy Marsnik – Counsel**

Ivy L. Marsnik is a litigation attorney based out of the Firm's Minneapolis office where she focuses her current practice on representing individuals who have been harmed by violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.

Prior to joining Berger Montague, Ms. Marsnik worked on behalf of individual plaintiffs at a premier employment and civil rights law firm and in several legal counsel positions at the Minnesota state legislature. She has also provided legal services to individual clients at Tubman, a nonprofit serving survivors of domestic violence, and at a University of Minnesota Law School clinic where she worked primarily as an advocate for tenants' rights.

#### **Stacy Savett – Counsel**

Stacy Savett is a Staff Attorney in the firm's Employment & Unpaid Wages Group. She focuses on wage and hour class and collective actions arising under federal and state laws.

### **Of Counsel**

#### **H. Laddie Montague Jr. – Chair *Emeritus* & Of Counsel**

H. Laddie Montague Jr. is Chairman *Emeritus* of the firm, in addition to his continuing work as Of Counsel. Mr. Montague was Chairman of the firm from 2003 to 2016 and served as a member of the firm's Executive Committee for decades, having joined the firm's predecessor David Berger, P.A., at its inception in 1970.

In addition to being one of the courtroom trial counsel for plaintiffs in the mandatory punitive damage class action in the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litigation*, Mr. Montague has served as lead or co-lead counsel in many class actions, including, among others, *High Fructose Corn Syrup Antitrust Litigation* (2006), *In re Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation* (1993) and *Bogosian v. Gulf Oil Corp.* (1984), a nationwide class action against thirteen major oil companies. Mr. Montague was co-lead counsel for the State of Connecticut in its litigation against the tobacco industry. He is

currently co-lead counsel in several pending class actions. In addition to the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litigation*, he has tried several complex and protracted cases to the jury, including three class actions: *In re Master Key Antitrust Litigation* (1977), *In re Corrugated Container Antitrust Litigation* (1980) and *In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation*, M.D.L. (1997-1998). For his work as trial counsel in the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litigation*, Mr. Montague shared the Trial Lawyers for Public Justice 1995 Trial Lawyer of the Year Award.

Mr. Montague has been repeatedly singled out by *Chambers USA: America's Leading Lawyers for Business* as one of the top antitrust attorneys in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He is lauded for his stewardship of the firm's antitrust department, referred to as "the dean of the Bar," stating that his peers in the legal profession hold him in the "highest regard," and explicitly praised for, among other things, his "fair minded[ness]." He also is or has been listed in *Lawdragon*, *An International Who's Who of Competition Lawyers*, and *The Legal 500: United States (Litigation)*. He has repeatedly been selected by *Philadelphia Magazine* as one of the top 100 lawyers in Pennsylvania. Mr. Montague has also been one of the only two inductees in the American Antitrust Institute's inaugural Private Antitrust Enforcement Hall of Fame.

He has been invited and made a presentation at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (Paris, 2006); the European Commission and International Bar Association Seminar (Brussels, 2007); the Canadian Bar Association, Competition Section (Ottawa, 2008); and the 2010 Competition Law & Policy Forum (Ontario).

Mr. Montague is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania (B.A. 1960) and the Dickinson School of Law (L.L.B. 1963), where he was a member of the Board of Editors of the Dickinson Law Review. He is the former Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Dickinson School of Law of Penn State University and current Chairman of the Dickinson Law Association.

#### **Harold Berger –Of Counsel, Executive Shareholder *Emeritus***

Judge Berger is an Executive Shareholder *Emeritus* & Of Counsel. He participated in many complex litigation matters, including the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litigation*, No. A89-095, in which he served on the case management committee and as Co-Chair of the national discovery team. He also participated in the *Three Mile Island Litigation*, No. 79-0432 (M.D. Pa.), where he acted as liaison counsel, and in the nationwide school asbestos property damage class action, *In re Asbestos School Litigation*, Master File No. 83-0268 (E.D. Pa.), where the firm served as co-lead counsel.

A former Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia, he has long given his service to the legal community and the judiciary. He is also active in law and engineering alumni affairs at the University of Pennsylvania and in other philanthropic endeavors. He serves as a member of Penn's Board of Overseers and as Chair of the Friends of Penn's Biddle Law Library, having graduated from both the engineering and law schools at Penn. Judge Berger also serves on the Executive Board of Penn Law's Center for Ethics and Rule of Law. In 2017, he was the recipient of Penn Law's Inaugural Lifetime Commitment Award, which recognizes graduates "who through a lifetime of service and commitment to Penn Law have truly set a new standard of excellence."

He is past Chair of the Federal Bar Association's National Committee on the Federal and State Judiciary and past President of the Federal Bar Association's Eastern District Chapter. He is the author of numerous law review articles, has lectured extensively before bar associations and at universities, and has served as Chair of the International Conferences on Global Interdependence held at Princeton University. Judge Berger has served as Chair of the Aerospace Law Committees of the American, Federal and Inter-American Bar Associations and, in recognition of the importance and impact of his scholarly work, was elected to the International Academy of Astronautics in Paris.

As his biographies in *Who's Who in America*, *Who's Who in American Law* and *Who's Who in the World* outline, he is the recipient of numerous awards, including the Special Service Award of the Pennsylvania Conference of State Trial Judges, a Special American Bar Association Presidential Program Award and Medal, and a Special Federal Bar Association Award for distinguished service to the Federal and State Judiciary. He has been given the highest rating (AV Preeminent) for legal ability as well as the highest rating for ethical standards by Martindale-Hubbell. Judge Berger was also presented with a Lifetime Achievement Award in 2014 by *The Legal Intelligencer* in recognition of figures who have helped shape the law in Pennsylvania and who had a distinct impact on the legal profession in the Commonwealth.

He is a permanent member of the Judicial Conference of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and has served as Chair of both the Judicial Liaison and International Law Committees of the Philadelphia Bar Association. He has also served as National Chair of the FBA's Alternate Dispute Resolution Committee.

Recipient of the Alumnus of the Year Award of the Thomas McKean Law Club of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, he was further honored by the University's School of Engineering and Applied Science by the dedication of the Harold Berger Biennial Distinguished Lecture and Award given to a technical innovator who has made a lasting contribution to the quality of our lives. He was also honored by the University by the dedication of an auditorium and lobby bearing his name and by the dedication of a student award in his name for engineering excellence.

Long active in diverse, philanthropic, charitable, community and inter-faith endeavors Judge Berger serves as a Lifetime Honorary Trustee of the Federation of Jewish Charities of Greater Philadelphia, as a Director of the National Museum of Jewish History, as a National Director of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) in its endeavors to assist refugees and indigent souls of all faiths, as A Charter Fellow of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association and as a member of the Hamilton Circle of the Philadelphia Bar Foundation.

Among other honors and awards, as listed above, Judge Berger was honored by the University of Pennsylvania Law School at its annual Benefactors' Dinner and is the recipient of the "Children of the American Dream" award of HIAS for his leadership in the civic, legal, academic and Jewish communities.

**Gary E. Cantor – Of Counsel**

Gary E. Cantor is Of Counsel in the Philadelphia office. He concentrates his practice on securities and commercial litigation and derivatives valuations.

Mr. Cantor served as co-lead counsel in *Steiner v. Phillips, et al. (Southmark Securities)*, Consolidated C.A. No. 3-89-1387-X (N.D. Tex.), (class settlement of \$82.5 million), and *In re Kenbee Limited Partnerships Litigation*, Civil Action No. 91-2174 (GEB), (class settlement involving 119 separate limited partnerships resulting in cash settlement, oversight of partnership governance and debt restructuring (with as much as \$100 million in wrap mortgage reductions)). Mr. Cantor also represented plaintiffs in numerous commodity cases.

In recent years, Mr. Cantor played a leadership role in *In re Oppenheimer Rochester Funds Group Securities Litigation* (\$89.5 million settlement on behalf of investors in six tax-exempt bond mutual funds managed by OppenheimerFunds, Inc.), No. 09-md-02063-JLK (D. Col.); *In re KLA-Tencor Corp. Securities Litigation*, Master File No. C-06-04065-CRB (N.D. Cal.) (\$65 million class settlement); *In re Sepracor Inc. Securities Litigation*, Civil Action no. 02-12235-MEL (D. Mass.) (\$52.5 million settlement.); *In re Sotheby's Holding, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 00 Civ. 1041 (DLC) (S.D.N.Y.) (\$70 million class settlement). He was also actively involved in the *Merrill Lynch Securities Litigation* (class settlement of \$475 million) and *Waste Management Securities Litigation* (class settlement of \$220 million).

For over 20 years, Mr. Cantor also has concentrated on securities valuations and the preparation of event or damage studies or the supervision of outside damage experts for many of the firm's cases involving stocks, bonds, derivatives, and commodities. Mr. Cantor's work in this regard has focused on statistical analysis of securities trading patterns and pricing for determining materiality, loss causation and damages as well as aggregate trading models to determine class-wide damages.

Mr. Cantor was a member of the Moot Court Board at University of Pennsylvania Law School where he authored a comment on computer-generated evidence in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review. He graduated from Rutgers College with the highest distinction in economics and was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

#### **Peter R. Kahana –Of Counsel**

Peter R. Kahana is Of Counsel in the Insurance and Antitrust practice groups. He concentrates his practice in complex civil and class action litigation involving relief for insurance policyholders and consumers of other types of products or services who have been victimized by fraudulent conduct and unfair business practices.

Significant class cases vindicating the rights of insurance policyholders or consumers in which Mr. Kahana was appointed as co-class counsel have included: settlement in 2012 for \$90 million of breach of fiduciary duty and negligence claims (certified for trial in 2009) on behalf of a class of former policyholder-members of Anthem Insurance Companies, Inc. ("Anthem") alleging the class was paid insufficient cash compensation in connection with Anthem's conversion from a

mutual insurance company to a publicly-owned stock insurance company (a process known as "demutualization") (*Ormond v. Anthem, Inc., et al.*, USDC, S.D. Ind., Case No. 1:05-cv-01908 (S.D. Ind. 2012)); settlement in 2010 for \$72.5 million of a nationwide civil RICO and fraud class action (certified for trial in 2009) against The Hartford and its affiliates on behalf of a class of personal injury and workers compensation claimants for the Hartford's alleged deceptive business practices in settling these injury claims for Hartford insureds with the use of structured settlements (*Spencer, et al. v. The Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc., et al.*, 256 F.R.D. 284 (D. Conn. 2009)); settlement in 2009 for \$75 million of breach of contract, Unfair Trade Practices Act and insurance bad faith tort claims on behalf of a class of West Virginia automobile policyholders (certified for trial in 2007) alleging that Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company failed to properly offer and provide them with state-required optional levels of uninsured and underinsured motorist coverage (*Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company v. O'Dell, et al.*, Circuit Court of Roane County, W. Va., Civ. Action No. 00-C-37); and, settlement in 2004 for \$20 million on behalf of a class of cancer victims alleging that their insurer refused to pay for health insurance benefits for chemotherapy and radiation treatment (*Bergonzi v. CSO, USDC, D.S.D.*, Case No. C2-4096). For his efforts in regard to the Bergonzi matter, Mr. Kahana was named as the recipient of the American Association for Justice's Steven J. Sharp Public Service Award, which is presented annually to those attorneys whose cases tell the story of American civil justice and help educate state and national policymakers and the public about the importance of consumers' rights.

Mr. Kahana has also played a leading role in major antitrust and environmental litigation, including cases such as *In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation* (\$723 million settlement), *In re Ashland Oil Spill Litigation* (\$30 million settlement), and *In re Exxon Valdez* (\$287 million compensatory damage award and \$507.5 million punitive damage award). In connection with his work as a member of the trial team that prosecuted *In re The Exxon Valdez*, Mr. Kahana was selected in 1995 to share the Trial Lawyer of the Year Award by the Public Justice Foundation.

### **Susan Schneider Thomas – Of Counsel**

Susan Schneider Thomas concentrates her practice on *qui tam* litigation.

Ms. Thomas has substantial complex litigation experience. Before joining the firm, she practiced law at two Philadelphia area firms, Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis and Greenfield & Chimicles, where she was actively involved in the litigation of complex securities fraud and derivative actions.

Upon joining the firm, Ms. Thomas concentrated her practice on complex securities and derivative actions. In 1986, she joined in establishing Zlotnick & Thomas where she was a partner with primary responsibility for the litigation of several major class actions including *Geist v. New Jersey Turnpike Authority*, C.A. No. 92-2377 (D.N.J.), a bond redemption case that settled for \$2.25 million and *Burstein v. Applied Extrusion Technologies*, C.A. No. 92-12166-PBS (D. Mass.), which settled for \$3.4 million.

Upon returning to the firm, Ms. Thomas has had major responsibilities in many securities and consumer fraud class actions, including *In re CryoLife Securities Litigation*, C.A. No. 1:02-CV-1868 BBM (N.D.Ga.), which settled in 2005 for \$23.25 million and *In re First Alliance Mortgage Co.*, Civ. No. SACV 00-964 (C.D.Cal.), a deceptive mortgage lending action which settled for over \$80 million in cooperation with the FTC. More recently, Ms. Thomas has concentrated her practice in the area of healthcare *qui tam* litigation. As co-counsel for a team of whistleblowers, she worked extensively with the U.S. Department of Justice and various State Attorney General offices in the prosecution of False Claims Act cases against pharmaceutical manufacturers that recovered more than \$2 billion for Medicare and Medicaid programs and over \$350 million for the whistleblowers. She has investigated or is litigating False Claims Act cases involving defense contractors, off-label marketing by drug and medical device companies, federal grant fraud, upcoding and other billing issues by healthcare providers, drug pricing issues and fraud in connection with for-profit colleges and student loan programs.

#### **Tyler E. Wren – Of Counsel**

Mr. Wren is a trial lawyer with over 35 years of experience in both the public and private sectors.

Mr. Wren has represented both plaintiffs and defendants in a broad spectrum of litigation matters, including class actions, environmental, civil rights, commercial disputes, personal injury, insurance coverage, election law, zoning and historical preservation matters and other government affairs. Mr. Wren routinely appears in both state and federal courts, as well as before local administrative agencies.

Following his graduation from law school, Mr. Wren served as staff attorney to the Committee of Seventy, a local civic watchdog group. Mr. Wren then spent a decade in the Philadelphia City Solicitor's Office in various positions in which his litigation and counseling skills were developed: Chief Assistant City Solicitor for Special Litigation and Appeals, Divisional Deputy City Solicitor for the Environment, Counsel to the Philadelphia Board of Ethics and Counsel to the Philadelphia Planning Commission. After leaving government employ and before joining the Firm in 2010, Mr. Wren was in private practice, including nine years with the Sprague and Sprague firm, headed by nationally recognized litigator Richard Sprague.