

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

ROEI AZAR, Individually and on Behalf of) Case No. 1:19-cv-07665
All Others Similarly Situated,)
Plaintiff,) CLASS ACTION
vs.) Judge Matthew F. Kennelly
GRUBHUB INC., et al.,) Magistrate Judge Jeffrey Cole
Defendants.)

)

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF LEAD PLAINTIFF'S
UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| II. BACKGROUND | 2 |
| A. Procedural History | 2 |
| B. The Parties' Arm's-Length and Informed Negotiations | 3 |
| C. The Terms of the Settlement..... | 3 |
| III. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT WARRANTS PRELIMINARY APPROVAL..... | 4 |
| A. The Settlement Satisfies the Standards for Approval | 5 |
| 1. Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel Have Adequately Represented the Class..... | 5 |
| 2. The Proposed Settlement Is the Result of Good Faith Arm's-Length Negotiations..... | 6 |
| 3. The Proposed Settlement Is Adequate in Light of the Costs and Risks of Continued Litigation..... | 6 |
| 4. The Proposed Settlement Satisfies the Remaining Rule 23(e)(2) Factors..... | 8 |
| B. The Class Satisfies the Standards for Class Certification..... | 9 |
| 1. Rule 23(a)(1) – Numerosity | 10 |
| 2. Rule 23(a)(2) – Commonality | 10 |
| 3. Rule 23(a)(3) – Typicality | 11 |
| 4. Rule 23(a)(4) – Adequacy of Representation | 11 |
| 5. Rule 23(b)(3) – Predominance and Superiority | 12 |
| IV. THE PROPOSED NOTICE PROGRAM IS APPROPRIATE | 13 |
| V. PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF EVENTS..... | 14 |
| VI. CONCLUSION..... | 15 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page |
|--|------------|
| CASES | |
| <i>Abrams v. Van Kampen Funds, Inc.</i> , 2002 WL 1989401 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 27, 2002) | 10 |
| <i>Am. Int'l Grp., Inc. v. ACE INA Holdings, Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 3290302 (N.D. Ill. July 26, 2011)..... | 5 |
| <i>Amchem Prods. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997)..... | 9, 12 |
| <i>In re Allstate Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2020 WL 7490280 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 21, 2020)..... | 12 |
| <i>In re Bank One Sec. Litig./First Chicago S'holder Claims</i> , 2002 WL 989454 (N.D. Ill. May 14, 2002)..... | 10, 11, 12 |
| <i>In re Groupon, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2014 WL 5245387 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 23, 2014) | 11, 12 |
| <i>In re Groupon, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 12 C 2450, ECF 359, slip op. (N.D. Ill. Apr. 8, 2016)..... | 13 |
| <i>In re TikTok, Inc. Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 565 F. Supp. 3d 1076 (N.D. Ill. 2021) | 5 |
| <i>Isby v. Bayh</i> , 75 F.3d 1191 (7th Cir. 1996) | 4 |
| <i>Keele v. Wexler</i> , 149 F.3d 589 (7th Cir. 1998) | 11 |
| <i>Lowry v. RTI Surgical Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 20 C 01939, ECF 103, slip op. (N.D. Ill. Sept. 22, 2021)..... | 13 |
| <i>Mortimer v. Diplomat Pharmacy, Inc.</i> , No. 1:19-cv-01735, ECF 135, slip op. (N.D. Ill. Jan. 27, 2022)..... | 13 |
| <i>Pension Tr. Fund v. Assisted Living Concepts, Inc.</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 199190 (E.D. Wis. Dec. 19, 2013)..... | 6 |
| <i>Retsky Family Ltd. P'ship v. Price Waterhouse LLP</i> , 2001 WL 1568856 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 10, 2001)..... | 7 |
| <i>Roth v. Aon Corp.</i> , 238 F.R.D. 603 (N.D. Ill. 2006)..... | 9 |

| | Page |
|--|------------|
| <i>Schleicher v. Wendt,</i> 618 F.3d 679 (7th Cir. 2010) | 9, 12 |
| <i>Silverman v. Motorola, Inc.,</i> 259 F.R.D. 163 (N.D. Ill. 2009)..... | 11 |
| <i>Suchanek v. Sturm Foods, Inc.,</i> 764 F.3d 750 (7th Cir. 2014) | 10 |
| <i>Tatz v. Nanophase Techs. Corp.,</i> 2003 WL 21372471 (N.D. Ill. June 13, 2003) | 10 |
| <i>Wong v. Accretive Health, Inc.,</i> 773 F.3d 859 (7th Cir. 2014) | 5, 6, 7 |
| STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS | |
| 15 U.S.C. | |
| §78u-4(a)(3)(B)..... | 2 |
| §78u-4(a)(4) | 1 |
| §78u-4(a)(7) | 13 |
| Federal Rules of Civil Procedure | |
| Rule 23 | 9 |
| Rule 23(a)..... | 9, 12 |
| Rule 23(a)(1) | 10 |
| Rule 23(a)(2)..... | 10 |
| Rule 23(a)(3)..... | 11 |
| Rule 23(a)(4) | 11 |
| Rule 23(b) | 9 |
| Rule 23(b)(3)..... | 9, 12 |
| Rule 23(e)..... | 4, 5 |
| Rule 23(e)(1)..... | 13 |
| Rule 23(e)(1)(B)..... | 4, 5, 13 |
| Rule 23(e)(1)(B)(ii)..... | 9 |
| Rule 23(e)(2)..... | 4, 5, 8, 9 |
| Rule 23(e)(2)(A) | 5, 6 |
| Rule 23(e)(2)(A)-(D) | 5 |
| Rule 23(e)(2)(B)..... | 6 |
| Rule 23(e)(2)(C)(i)..... | 6 |
| Rule 23(e)(2)(C)-(D)..... | 8 |

| | Page |
|---|------|
| SECONDARY AUTHORITIES | |
| David F. Herr, <i>Manual for Complex Litigation</i> , §13.14 (4th ed. 2019)..... | 4 |

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.