

1 Daniel Hutchinson (Bar No. 239458)  
dhutchinson@lchb.com  
2 Lin Y. Chan (Bar No. 255027)  
lchan@lchb.com  
3 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &  
BERNSTEIN, LLP  
4 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111  
5 Telephone: (415) 956-1000  
Facsimile: (415) 956-1008  
6

7 Julian Burns King (Bar No. 298617)  
julian@kingsiegel.com  
8 Elliot J. Siegel (Bar No. 286798)  
elliott@kingsiegel.com  
9 KING & SIEGEL LLP  
724 S. Spring Street, Suite 201  
Los Angeles, California 90014  
10 Telephone: (213) 419-5101  
Facsimile: (213) 465-4803  
11

*Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

12  
13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
15

16 Marcie Le and Karen Dao, individually  
and on behalf of all others similarly  
17 situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 Walgreen Co., an Illinois corporation;  
Walgreen Pharmacy Services Midwest,  
21 LLC, an Illinois limited liability  
company; and Walgreens Boots  
Alliance, a Delaware corporation,  
22

23 Defendants.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. 8:18-cv-01548

**PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED  
MOTION TO DIRECT NOTICE TO  
THE CLASS**

Hon. David O. Carter

Hearing Date: April 5, 2021  
Hearing Time: 8:30 a.m.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Page**

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION..... vi

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. BACKGROUND..... 2

    A. Procedural History ..... 2

    B. Class Certification..... 2

    C. Appeal ..... 3

    D. Settlement Negotiations ..... 3

III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT TERMS ..... 4

    A. Settlement Class ..... 4

    B. Settlement Consideration ..... 4

    C. Proposed Notice Plan ..... 5

    D. Settlement Release ..... 6

IV. LEGAL STANDARD ..... 7

V. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE. .... 7

    A. The Class Has Been Zealously Represented..... 8

    B. The Settlement Agreement Results from Arm’s-Length  
    Negotiations. .... 11

    C. The Settlement Agreement Represents Substantial Relief for the  
    Class. .... 13

        1. The Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate..... 13

        2. Payment to Class Members Is Straightforward. .... 16

        3. Counsel Will Seek Reasonable Attorney’s Fees. .... 17

        4. There Are No Other Related Agreements. .... 18

    D. The Agreement Treats Class Members Equitably. .... 19

VI. THE SETTLEMENT CLASS MERITS CERTIFICATION..... 20

    A. The Numerosity, Commonality, Typicality, and Adequacy  
    Requirements of Rule 23(a) Are Met. .... 21

    B. The Settlement Class Satisfies the Requirements of Rule  
    23(b)(3). .... 21

    C. The Court Should Appoint Class Counsel. .... 23

VII. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE NOTICE PROGRAM AND  
DIRECT NOTICE TO THE SETTLEMENT CLASS. .... 24

VIII. THE FINAL FAIRNESS HEARING SHOULD BE SCHEDULED. .... 25

IX. CONCLUSION ..... 25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page**

**CASES**

*Abelar v. Am. Residential Servs., L.L.C.*,  
No. 19-00726, 2019 WL 6054607 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2019)..... 12

*Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*,  
521 U.S. 591 (1997).....20, 21, 24

*Augustus v. ABM Sec. Servs., Inc.*,  
2 Cal. 5th 257 (2016)..... 17

*Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.*,  
306 F.R.D. 245 (N.D. Cal. 2015)..... 13

*Boyd v. Bank of Am. Corp.*,  
No. 13-cv-0561, 2014 WL 6473804 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2014)..... 18

*Brinker Rest. Corp. v. Superior Court*,  
53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012)..... 17

*Carter v. Anderson Merchs., LP*,  
Nos. 08-0025, 09-0216, 2010 WL 1946784 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2010).....7, 11

*Cicero v. DirecTV, Inc.*,  
No. 07-cv-1182, 2010 WL 2991486 (C.D. Cal. July 27, 2010)..... 18

*Deaver v. Compass Bank*,  
No. 13-cv-0222, 2015 WL 8526982 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2015)..... 14

*Downey Surgical Clinic, Inc. v. Optuminsight, Inc.*,  
No. CV09-5457, 2016 WL 5938722 (C.D. Cal. May 16, 2016)..... 14

*Eisen v. Porsche Cars N. Am., Inc.*,  
No. 2:11-CV-09405-CAS, 2014 WL 439006 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2014) ..... 11

*Epstein v. Walgreen Pharmacy Services Midwest, LLC*,  
No. 19-cv-1323 (C.D. Cal.) ..... 16

*Franco v. Ruiz Food Prods.*,  
No. 10-cv-02354, 2012 WL 5941801 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2012)..... 11

*Gaudin v. Saxon Mortg. Servs., Inc.*,  
No. 11-cv-01663, 2015 WL 7454183 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 23, 2015)..... 19

*Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs.*,  
No. C-06-4068, 2007 WL 221862 (N.D. Cal. 2007)..... 14

*In re Am. Apparel, Inc. S’holder Litig.*,  
No. CV 10-06352, 2014 WL 10212865 (C.D. Cal. July 28, 2014)..... 12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
<i>In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	12
<i>In re Diet Drugs</i> , Nos. 1203, 99-20593, 2000 WL 1222042 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 28, 2000) .....	22
<i>In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. C 06-4333, 2013 WL 12333442 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 8, 2013).....	22
<i>In re Heritage Bond Litig.</i> , No. 02-ml-01475, 2005 WL 1594403 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005) .....	11, 12
<i>In re High-Tech Emp. Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 11-cv-02509, 2015 WL 5159441 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2015) .....	20
<i>In re Hyundai &amp; Kia Fuel Econ. Litig.</i> , 926 F.3d 539 (9th Cir. 2019) .....	7, 20, 21, 22
<i>In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 13-MD-02420, 2020 WL 7264559 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2020) .....	21
<i>In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 213 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	18
<i>In re Online DVD-Rental Antitrust Litig.</i> , 779 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	20, 24
<i>In re Pac. Enters. Sec. Litig.</i> , 47 F.3d 373 (9th Cir. 1995) .....	17
<i>In re Toys “R” Us-Del., Inc. Fair &amp; Accurate Credit Transactions Act (FACTA) Litig.</i> , 295 F.R.D. 438 (C.D. Cal. 2014) .....	11
<i>In re Walgreen Co. Wage &amp; Hour Litig.</i> , No. 11-cv-7664, 2014 WL 12853545 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2014) .....	23
<i>Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.</i> , 1 Cal. 5th 480 (2016) .....	17
<i>Lee v. JPMorgan Chase &amp; Co.</i> , No. 8:13-cv-00511 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 24, 2014) .....	13
<i>Linney v. Cellular Alaska P’ship</i> , 151 F.3d 1234 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	14
<i>Malta v. Federal Home Mortg. Corp.</i> , No. 10-cv-1290, 2013 WL 444619 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2013) .....	23
<i>Nat’l Rural Telecomm. Coop. v. DirecTV</i> , 221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004).....	12, 16

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
<i>Noll v. eBay, Inc.</i> , 309 F.R.D. 593 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	19
<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n of City &amp; Cnty. of San Francisco</i> , 688 F.2d. 615 (9th Cir. 1982) .....	12
<i>Ridgeway v. Walmart Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1066 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	17
<i>Rodriguez v. W. Publ’g Corp.</i> , 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009) .....	7, 15, 16
<i>Roes, 1–2 v. SFBSC Mgmt., LLC</i> , 944 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 2019) .....	7
<i>Singh v. Roadrunner Intermodal Servs., LLC</i> , No. 15-cv-1497, 2019 WL 316814 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2019).....	16
<i>Spann v. J.C. Penney Corp.</i> , 314 F.R.D. 312 (C.D. Cal. 2016).....	24
<i>Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc.</i> , No. 13-cv-02540, 2015 WL 3776765 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2015) .....	14
<i>Tarlecki v. bebe Stores, Inc.</i> , No. C 05-1777, 2009 WL 3720872 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2009) .....	13
<i>Thompson v. Transamerica Life Ins. Co.</i> , No. 18-cv-05422, 2020 WL 6145105 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2020).....	19
<i>Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.</i> , 529 F.2d 943 (9th Cir. 1976) .....	7
<i>Van Vranken v. Atl. Richfield Co.</i> , 901 F. Supp. 294 (N.D. Cal. 1995).....	18
<i>Vandervort v. Balboa Capital Corp.</i> , 8 F. Supp. 3d 1200 (C.D. Cal. 2014) .....	20
<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	17
<i>Weeks v. Kellogg Co.</i> , No. 09-cv-8102, 2013 WL 6531177 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 23, 2013).....	14
<i>White v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.</i> , No. 05-cv-01070 (C.D. Cal.) .....	22
<i>Williams v. MGM-Pathe Commc’n Co.</i> , 129 F.3d 1026 (9th Cir. 1997) .....	18

# 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.