

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD	:	
ANTITRUST LITIGATION	:	Master File 2:13-cv-20000-RDP
MDL 2406	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	This document relates to
	:	Subscriber Track cases

**SUBSCRIBER PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS SETTLEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION2

II. OVERVIEW OF THE LITIGATION AND SETTLEMENT5

 A. Factual and Procedural Background5

 B. The Settlement.....9

 1. The Settlement Class Members11

 a. The Damages Class11

 b. The Injunctive Relief Class12

 2. Relief for the Benefit of the Settlement Class Members.....13

 a. The Settlement Fund13

 b. Injunctive Relief.....14

 i. The Elimination of the National Revenue Cap on Non-Blue Competition 15

 ii. Opening the Door to Expanded Blue Bids and Competition15

 iii. Local “Best Efforts”16

 iv. Acquisitions16

 v. Non-Provider Contracting for Self-Funded Accounts16

 vi. Most Favored Nation Clauses16

 vii. Monitoring Committee.....17

 c. Settlement Class Release18

 d. Notice Plan.....19

 e. Settlement Rescission.....19

 f. Attorneys’ Fees and Costs21

 C. Plan of Distribution.....21

III. LEGAL STANDARD26

IV. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT SATISFIES RULE 23 AND WILL LIKELY EARN FINAL APPROVAL.....29

 A. Class Representatives and Lead Counsel Have More than Adequately Represented the Settlement Class.29

 B. The Proposed Settlement Is the Result of Arm’s-Length Negotiations.....30

 C. The Relief Provided to the Settlement Classes Is Far More than Adequate, Taking into Account the Considerations Set Forth in Rule 23(e)(2)(C).32

 1. The Costs, Risks, and Delay of Trial and Appeal.....32

2.	The Effectiveness of Any Proposed Method of Distributing Relief to the Class, Including the Method of Processing Class Member Claims	36
D.	The Terms of Any Proposed Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses, Including Timing of Payment	37
E.	The Proposed Settlement Treats Class Members Equitably Relative to One Another	38
F.	The Remaining Non-Duplicative <i>Bennett</i> Factors Are Satisfied.	40
1.	The Settlement Is Well Within the Range of Reasonableness Considering the Range of Possible Alternatives.	40
2.	The Stage of Proceedings at which Settlement Was Achieved Strongly Supports Preliminary Approval.	42
V.	CERTIFICATION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASSES IS LIKELY.	42
A.	The Proposed Classes Will Satisfy Rule 23(a).	43
1.	Numerosity—Rule 23(a)(1).	44
2.	Commonality—Rule 23(a)(2).	44
3.	Typicality—Rule 23(a)(3).	45
4.	Adequacy—Rule 23(a)(4).	47
B.	The Proposed Classes Will Also Satisfy Rules 23(b)(2) and (b)(3).	48
1.	Because the Blues Have Acted on Grounds Generally Applicable to the Injunctive Relief Class, Certification Will Likely Be Appropriate under Rule 23(b)(2).	48
2.	Certification of a Settlement Damages Class and a Self-Funded Sub-Class Is Likely Appropriate under Rule 23(b)(3).	50
a.	Common Issues Predominate.	50
b.	A Class Action Is Superior to Other Methods of Adjudication.	51
VI.	THE PROPOSED PLAN OF DISTRIBUTION WARRANTS PRELIMINARY APPROVAL.	53
VII.	CONCLUSION.	58

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

AA Suncoast Chiropractic Clinic, P.A. v. Progressive Am. Ins. Co.,
938 F.3d 1170 (11th Cir. 2019)48

Amchem Prods. Inc. v. Windsor,
521 U.S. 591 (1997).....43, 47

Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Trust Funds,
568 U.S. 455 (2013).....50

Babineau v. Fed. Express Corp.,
576 F.3d 1183 (11th Cir. 2009)50

Bellocco v. Curd,
2006 WL 4693490 (M.D.Fla. Apr. 6, 2006).....53

Bennett v. Behring Corp.,
737 F.2d 982 (11th Cir. 1984) 28, 40, 41, 42

Bennett v. Boyd Biloxi, LLC,
2016 WL 6668926 (S.D. Ala. Nov. 8, 2016).....43

Borcea v. Carnival Corp.,
238 F.R.D. 664 (S.D. Fla. 2006).....43

Burrows v. Purchasing Power, LLC,
2013 WL 10167232 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 7, 2013)32

Busby v. JRHBW Realty, Inc.,
513 F.3d 1314 (11th Cir. 2008)47

<i>Camp v. City of Pelham</i> , 2014 WL 1764919 (N.D. Ala., May 1, 2014).....	40
<i>Carnegie v. Mut. Sav. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 2004 WL 3715446 (N.D. Ala. Nov. 23, 2004).....	41
<i>Carriuolo v. Gen. Motors Co.</i> , 823 F.3d 977 (11th Cir. 2016)	44
<i>Carroll v. Macy’s, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 3037067 (N.D. Ala. June 5, 2020).....	28
<i>Cifuentes v. Regions Bank</i> , 2014 WL 1153772 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 20, 2014).....	40
<i>City of Livonia Emp. Ret. Sys. v. Wyeth</i> , No. 07 Civ. 10329(RJS), 2013 WL 4399015 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 7, 2013).....	58
<i>Cotton v. Hinton</i> , 559 F.2d 1326 (5th Cir. 1977)	26
<i>Danieli v. Int’l Bus. Mach. Corp.</i> , 2009 WL 6583144 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 16, 2009).....	54
<i>Deas v. Russell Stover Candies, Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 8158201 (N.D. Ala. Dec. 22, 2005)	40
<i>DeBoer v. Mellon Mortg. Co.</i> , 64 F.3d 1171 (8th Cir. 1995)	46
<i>Dubin v. Miller</i> , 132 F.R.D. 269 (D. Colo. 1990)	46
<i>Dujanovic v. MortgageAmerica, Inc.</i> , 185 F.R.D. 660 (N.D. Ala. 1999).....	44
<i>Fabricant v. Sears Roebuck</i> , 202 F.R.D. 310 (S.D. Fla. 2001).....	48
<i>Faught v. Am. Home Shield Corp.</i> , 668 F.3d 1233 (11th Cir. 2011)	37
<i>Fitzgerald v. P.L. Mktg., Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 3621250 (W.D. Tenn. July 2, 2020).....	36, 39
<i>Georgine v. Amchem Products, Inc.</i> , 83 F.3d 610 (3rd Cir. 1996).....	44

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.