

1 Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice*)
 Robert F. Lopez (*pro hac vice*)
 2 Theodore Wojcik (*pro hac vice*)
 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
 3 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
 Seattle, WA 98101
 4 Telephone: (206) 623-7292
 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594
 5 steve@hbsslaw.com
 robl@hbsslaw.com
 6 tedw@hbsslaw.com

7 Shana E. Scarlett (SBN 217895)
 Benjamin J. Siegel (SBN 256260)
 8 Ben M. Harrington (SBN 313877)
 HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
 9 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202
 Berkeley, CA 94710
 10 Telephone: (510) 725-3000
 11 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001
 shanas@hbsslaw.com
 12 bens@hbsslaw.com
 13 benh@hbsslaw.com

Interim Lead Class Counsel

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 18 OAKLAND DIVISION

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| 19 DONALD R. CAMERON, <i>et al.</i> , | |
| | Plaintiffs, |
| 20 | |
| 21 v. | |
| 22 APPLE INC., | |
| | Defendant. |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |

Case No. 4:19-cv-03074-YGR

DEVELOPER PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT WITH APPLE INC.

Date: October 12, 2021
 Time: 2:00 p.m.
 Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
 Location: Courtroom 1- 4th Floor

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 12, 2021, at 2:00 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard by the Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers of the United States District Court of the Northern District of California, located in Courtroom 1, at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612, Developer Plaintiffs will and hereby do move the Court pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23 for an order:

- 1) preliminarily approving the proposed class action settlement with Apple Inc.;
- 2) certifying the settlement class;
- 3) appointing Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP as Class Counsel; and
- 4) approving the manner and form of notice and proposed plan of allocation to class members.

This motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement with Apple Inc., the following memorandum of points and authorities, the accompanying settlement agreement, the pleadings and papers on file in this action, and such other matters as the Court may consider.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|------|---|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | I. | PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1 |
| 3 | II. | BACKGROUND.....2 |
| 4 | A. | Procedural History2 |
| 5 | B. | The Settlement.....3 |
| 6 | 1. | The Settlement Negotiations3 |
| 7 | 2. | The Settlement Consideration and Release of Claims4 |
| 8 | a. | Monetary Relief.....4 |
| 9 | b. | Structural Relief.....5 |
| 10 | c. | Settlement Release.....8 |
| 11 | 3. | The Notice and Distribution Plan9 |
| 12 | III. | LEGAL STANDARD 10 |
| 13 | IV. | THE SETTLEMENT WARRANTS PRELIMINARY APPROVAL..... 11 |
| 14 | A. | The Settlements are Fair, Reasonable and Adequate. 11 |
| 15 | 1. | The Class Has Been Zealously Represented. 11 |
| 16 | 2. | The Settlement Agreement Resulted from Arm’s-Length Negotiations. 11 |
| 17 | 3. | The Settlement Represents Substantial Relief for the Class. 12 |
| 18 | 4. | The Settlement Treats Class Members Equitably. 14 |
| 19 | 5. | The Settlement Satisfies the Remaining Factors Set Forth in the Northern District’s Procedural Guidance 15 |
| 20 | a. | The Settlement Class Appropriately is Narrower than the Class Pleaded in the Complaint..... 15 |
| 21 | b. | The Settlement Release Tracks the Claims Alleged in the Complaint. 17 |
| 22 | c. | Developer Plaintiffs Anticipate a Relatively High Claims Rate. 18 |
| 23 | d. | Angeion Was Selected as Settlement Administrator Through a Competitive Bidding Process. 18 |
| 24 | e. | Counsel Will Request Reasonable Attorneys’ Fees and Reimbursement of Costs..... 19 |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |

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

- f. Plaintiffs Intend to Request Reasonable Service Awards for Class Representatives. 21
- g. Past Distributions..... 22
- B. The Settlement Class Merits Certification. 23
 - 1. Rule 23(a): Numerosity 23
 - 2. Rule 23(a): The Case Involves Questions of Law or Fact Common to the Class..... 23
 - 3. Rule 23(a): Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Typical of the Claims of the Class. 24
 - 4. Rule 23(a): Plaintiffs Will Fairly and Adequately Represent the Interests of the Class. 24
 - 5. Rule 23(b)(2): Injunctive Relief Is Appropriate for Entire Class. 25
 - 6. Rule 23(b)(3): Common Questions of Fact or Law Predominate. 25
 - 7. The Superiority Requirement is Met. 26
- C. The Proposed Notice Program Satisfies Rule 23. 26
- D. The Court Should Appoint Interim Co-Lead Counsel as Settlement Counsel. . 28
- E. Proposed Schedule for Notice and Final Approval 28
- V. CONCLUSION 28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****FEDERAL CASES**

| | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | <i>In re Aftermarket Auto. Lighting Prods. Antitrust Litig.</i> , | |
| 5 | 276 F.R.D. 364 (C.D. Cal. 2011)..... | 27 |
| 6 | <i>Allapattah Servs. Inc v. Exxon Corp.</i> , | |
| 7 | 454 F. Supp. 2d 1185 (S.D. Fla. 2006)..... | 20 |
| 8 | <i>Amador v. Baca</i> , | |
| 9 | 2020 WL 5628938 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2020) | 21 |
| 10 | <i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , | |
| 11 | 521 U.S. 591 (1997) | 17, 26 |
| 12 | <i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> , | |
| 13 | 327 F.R.D. 299 (N.D. Cal. 2018) | 4 |
| 14 | <i>In re Apple Pod iTunes Antitrust Litig.</i> , | |
| 15 | 2008 WL 5574487 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2008) | 26 |
| 16 | <i>B.K. by next Friend Tinsley v. Snyder</i> , | |
| 17 | 922 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 2019)..... | 24 |
| 18 | <i>Brown v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.</i> , | |
| 19 | 2014 WL 6483216 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2014)..... | 16 |
| 20 | <i>Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.</i> , | |
| 21 | 134 F. Supp. 3d 820 (D.N.J. 2015)..... | 26 |
| 22 | <i>In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.</i> , | |
| 23 | 2015 WL 9266493 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2015) | 14 |
| 24 | <i>In re: Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.</i> , | |
| 25 | 2016 WL 3648478 (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2016) | 12 |
| 26 | <i>In re Checking Account Overdraft Litig.</i> , | |
| 27 | 830 F. Supp. 2d 1330 (S.D. Fla. 2011)..... | 20 |
| 28 | <i>Churchill Vill., LLC v. Gen. Elec.</i> , | |
| | 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004)..... | 27 |
| | <i>Congdon v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , | |
| | 2019 WL 2327922 (N.D. Cal. May 31, 2019)..... | 22 |
| | <i>de Mira v. Heartland Emp't Serv., LLC</i> , | |
| | 2014 WL 1026282 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2014) | 19 |

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.