

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
 5 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594
 steve@hbsslaw.com
 6 robl@hbsslaw.com
 tedw@hbsslaw.com

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

14 *Interim Lead Class Counsel*

15 [Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

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

19 DONALD R. CAMERON, *et al.*,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 APPLE INC.,

23 Defendant.

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

**DEVELOPER PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE
 OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR
 FINAL APPROVAL OF
 SETTLEMENT AND RESPONSE TO
 OBJECTORS**

Date: June 7, 2022

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 June 7, 2022, 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 for 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 Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for an order:

- (1) Granting final approval of the proposed class action settlement with Apple Inc.; and
- (2) Certifying the proposed Settlement Class.

This motion is based on this notice of motion and motion, the accompanying memorandum of points and authorities, the declarations in support of the motion, argument by counsel at the hearing before this Court, such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at the hearing of this motion, and all papers and records on file in this matter.

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 CONTENTS

Page

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

II. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, REASONABLE, AND ADEQUATE 2

III. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT CLASS SATISFIES RULE 23 4

IV. THE APPROVED NOTICE PROGRAM WAS ADEQUATE AND SATISFIED DUE
PROCESS..... 4

 A. The Robust Notice Program Implemented by the Administrator Satisfies Rule 23.... 5

 B. The Results of the Ongoing Claims Process Further Supports That Settlement Class
Members Have Been Provided With Adequate Notice 9

V. THE OBJECTIONS ARE WITHOUT MERIT 11

 A. Apple’s Critique of Plaintiffs’ Fee Request is Without Merit..... 11

 B. Mr. Wytshyn’s Objection Provides No Basis to Deny Final Approval 16

VI. CONCLUSION 17

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(s)

FEDERAL CASES

1		
2		
3		
4	<i>Amin v Mercedes Benz USA, LLC,</i>	
5	2020 WL 5510730 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 11, 2020).....	10
6	<i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.,</i>	
7	327 F.R.D. 299 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	8, 9, 10
8	<i>In re BioScrip, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i>	
9	273 F. Supp. 3d 474 (S.D.N.Y. 2017)	15
10	<i>Ching v. Siemens Indus., Inc.,</i>	
11	2014 WL 2926210 (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2014).....	14
12	<i>Churchill Village LLC v. Gen. Elec.,</i>	
13	361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004)	2, 3
14	<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle,</i>	
15	955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992)	2
16	<i>de Mira v. Heartland Emp't Serv., LLC,</i>	
17	2014 WL 1026282 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2014)	12
18	<i>In re Domestic Airline Travel Antitrust Litig.,</i>	
19	322 F. Supp. 3d 64 (D.D.C. 2018).....	8
20	<i>In re Equifax Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.,</i>	
21	999 F.3d 1247 (11th Cir. 2021)	15
22	<i>Hamilton v. SunTrust Mortg. Inc.,</i>	
23	2014 WL 5419507 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 24, 2014)	10
24	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.,</i>	
25	150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	2, 4
26	<i>Keil v. Lopez,</i>	
27	862 F.3d 685 (8th Cir. 2017)	9
28	<i>In re LinkedIn User Privacy Litig.,</i>	
	309 F.R.D. 573 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	2, 3
	<i>Linney v. Cellular Alaska P'ship,</i>	
	151 F.3d 1234 (9th Cir. 2008)	16
	<i>Moore v. Verizon Commc'n Inc.,</i>	
	2013 WL 4610764 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2013).....	9

1	<i>Nat'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.</i> ,	
2	221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004).....	3
3	<i>In re Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n Grant-in-Aid Cap Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
4	2017 WL 6040065 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2017)	14
5	<i>Norcia v. Samsung Telecomms. Am., LLC</i> ,	
6	2021 WL 3053018 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2021)	9
7	<i>In re Online DVD-Rental Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
8	779 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2015).....	2, 9, 12, 13
9	<i>Perdue v. Kenny A. ex. Rel. Winn</i> ,	
10	559 U.S. 542 (2010)	15
11	<i>Perez v. Asurion Corp.</i> ,	
12	501 F. Supp. 2d 1360 (S.D. Fla. 2007).....	10
13	<i>Perez v. Rash Curtis & Assocs</i> ,	
14	2020 WL 1904533 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2020).....	15
15	<i>Pollard v. Remington Arms Co., LLC</i> ,	
16	896 F.3d 900 (8th Cir. 2018)	10
17	<i>Staton v. Boeing Co.</i> ,	
18	327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003).....	12, 13
19	<i>Sullivan v. DB Invs., Inc.</i> ,	
20	667 F.3d 273 (3d Cir. 2011)	9
21	<i>In re TD Ameritrade Account Holder Litig.</i> ,	
22	2011 WL 4079226 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 13, 2011).....	16
23	<i>Taylor v. Shutterfly, Inc.</i> ,	
24	2021 WL 5810294 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7 2021)	9
25	<i>Touhey v. United States</i> ,	
26	2011 WL 3179036 (C.D. Cal. July 25, 2011)	9
27	<i>In re Toyota Motor Corp. Unintended Acceleration Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prod.</i>	
28	<i>Liab. Litig.</i> ,	
	2013 WL 12327929 (C.D. Cal. July 24, 2013)	12
	<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
	290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002).....	12, 13, 15
	<i>In re Wash. Pub. Power Supply Sys. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
	19 F.3d 1291 (9th Cir. 1994).....	14

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.