

1 ALLAN STEYER (Bar No. 100318)
 2 JILL M. MANNING (Bar No. 178849)
 3 D. SCOTT MACRAE (Bar No. 104663)
STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS
ALVAREZ & SMITH LLP
 4 235 Pine Street, 15th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 5 Telephone: (415) 424-3400
 Facsimile: (415) 421-2234
 6 asteyer@steyerlaw.com
 7 jmanning@steyerlaw.com
 smacrae@steyerlaw.com

8 CLIFFORD H. PEARSON (Bar. No. 108523)
 9 DANIEL L. WARSHAW (Bar No. 185365)
 THOMAS J. NOLAN (Bar No. 66992)
 10 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**
 11 15165 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 400
 Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
 12 Telephone: (818) 788-8300
 Facsimile: (818) 788-8104
 13 cpearson@pswlaw.com
 14 dwarshaw@pswlaw.com
 tnolan@pswlaw.com

15 [Additional counsel list on signature page]

16 *Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Class*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

20 CHRISTINA GRACE and KEN POTTER
 21 Individually and on Behalf of All Others
 Similarly Situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 APPLE INC.,

26 Defendant.

CASE NO. 5:17-cv-00551-LHK-NC

CLASS ACTION

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
THEREOF**

Date: February 8, 2021
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Courtroom: 8

28

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 8, 2021 at 1:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as the
3 matter may be heard in the Courtroom of the Honorable Lucy H. Koh, United States District Court,
4 Northern District of California, San Jose Division, 280 South 1st Street, San Jose, CA 95113,
5 Plaintiffs Christina Grace and Ken Potter (“Plaintiffs”) will and hereby do move the Court, pursuant
6 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e), for the entry of an Order granting final approval of the
7 Settlement Agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”).

8 The grounds for this motion are that the proposed settlement is within the necessary range of
9 reasonableness to justify granting final approval pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e).
10 This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
11 Settlement, the Declaration of Daniel L. Warshaw, the Declaration of Cameron R. Azari, the
12 pleadings and papers on file in this action, and such oral and documentary evidence as may be
13 presented at the hearing on this motion.

14 ///

15 ///

16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3	I. INTRODUCTION..... 1
4	II. BACKGROUND..... 2
5	A. Plaintiffs’ Claims..... 2
6	B. Procedural History..... 3
7	III. SUMMARY OF THE SETTLEMENT..... 4
8	A. Mediation and Settlement..... 4
9	B. The Proposed Settlement Class 4
10	C. Monetary Relief..... 5
11	D. Narrowly Tailored Release..... 5
12	E. Class Notice and the Cost of Settlement Administration 6
13	IV. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT 7
14	A. The Settlement is Fair, Reasonable and Adequate 7
15	1. The Strength of Plaintiffs’ Case Compared to the Risk, Expense,
16	Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation..... 8
17	2. The Amount Offered in Settlement..... 10
18	3. The Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status Through Trial..... 12
19	4. The Extent of Discovery Completed and the Stage of the Proceedings..... 12
20	5. The Experience and Views of Counsel 13
21	6. The Reaction of the Class Members to the Proposed Settlement..... 15
22	(a) The Sole Objector is a Disbarred California Attorney and
23	Professional Objector Who is Not a Class Member..... 15
24	7. The Settlement is Not the Product of Collusion..... 21
25	B. The Settlement Class Satisfies Rule 23 and Should be Finally Certified 22
26	1. The Class Representatives and Class Counsel have Vigorously
27	Represented the Class..... 23
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

2. The Class Representatives’ Interests are Aligned with and are Not Antagonistic to the Other Class Members’ Interests.....24

3. The Settlement was Negotiated at Arm’s-Length24

4. The Relief Provided for the Class is Adequate25

V. CONCLUSION25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
1	
2	
3 Cases	
4 <i>AIG, Inc. v. ACE INA Holdings, Inc.</i> ,	
5 Nos. 07-2898, 09-2026, 2012 WL 651727 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 28, 2012).....	18
6 <i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> ,	
7 327 F.R.D. 299 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	11, 14, 21
8 <i>In re Apple Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
9 No. 5:06-CV-05208-JF (HRL), 2011 WL 1877988 (N.D. Cal. May 17, 2011)	18
10 <i>Betancourt v. Advantage Human Resourcing, Inc.</i> ,	
11 No. 14-CV-01788-JST, 2016 WL 344532 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2016).....	11
12 <i>In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> ,	
13 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011).....	8, 21
14 <i>Brown v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
15 3:11-CV-03082-LB, 2016 WL 631880 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 17, 2016).....	16
16 <i>Castaneda v. Burger King Corp.</i> ,	
17 No. C 08-04262 WHA, 2010 WL 2735091 (N.D. Cal. July 12, 2010).....	20
18 <i>Caudle v. Sprint/United Mgmt. Co.</i> ,	
19 No. C 17-06874 WHA, 2019 WL 6841239 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2019).....	11
20 <i>Chambers v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> ,	
21 214 F. Supp. 3d 877 (C.D. Cal. 2016).....	17
22 <i>Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.</i> ,	
23 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004).....	2, 7, 8, 23
24 <i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> ,	
25 955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992).....	7
26 <i>Cobell v. Salazar</i> ,	
27 679 F.3d 909 (D.C. Cir. 2012)	18
28 <i>Collins v. Quincy Bioscience, LLC</i> ,	
No. 19-22864-Civ (MGC) (S.D. Fla.), Dkt. No. 176.....	21
<i>In re Equifax Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> ,	
No. 1:17-MD-2800-TWT, 2020 WL 256132 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 17, 2020).....	15
<i>G. F. v. Contra Costa Cty.</i> ,	
No. 13-CV-03667-MEJ, 2015 WL 4606078 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 2015).....	21

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.