

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

**IN RE: TIKTOK, INC.,
CONSUMER PRIVACY
LITIGATION,**

MDL No. 2948

Master Docket No. 20-cv-4699

Judge John Z. Lee

Magistrate Judge Sunil R. Harjani

This Document Relates to All Cases

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	ii
FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. Plaintiffs’ Allegations	2
B. The Risks of TikTok’s Defenses to Plaintiffs and the Class.....	4
C. Litigation and Procedural History	8
D. The Settlement Agreement.....	12
1. Proposed Class Definition.....	12
2. Monetary Relief	12
3. Plan of Allocation	13
4. Injunctive Relief.....	14
5. Notice and Settlement Administration Costs	15
6. Release	16
7. Attorneys’ Fees and Costs for Class Counsel, and Service Awards for Class Representatives	16
8. Class Size Representations and Confirmatory Discovery	17
ARGUMENT	18
A. This Settlement well surpasses the Seventh Circuit’s standards for the approval of class action settlements.....	18
B. The Settlement should be preliminarily approved.	19
1. The Settlement provides substantial relief to the Class, particularly given the risks posed by continued litigation.....	20
2. The Settlement value is well within the range of reasonableness.....	23
3. Continued litigation would be complex, costly, and lengthy.....	32
4. Proposed Class Counsel are competent, well-informed, and experienced and they strongly endorse the Settlement.....	34
5. The Settlement was reached after significant analysis and arm’s-length negotiation.....	34
C. The Class and Subclass should be provisionally certified for settlement purposes.	37
1. The requirements of Rule 23(a) are satisfied.....	38
2. The requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are satisfied.	43
D. Court-Appointed Co-Lead Counsel are experienced and knowledgeable and have dedicated themselves to this case; they should be appointed Class Counsel.....	44
E. The proposed class notice plan provides the best practicable notice and does so in an easily understood format.....	45
F. The Court should schedule a fairness hearing to finally approve the settlement.	47
CONCLUSION.....	47

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Am. Int’l Grp., Inc. v. ACE INA Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 07 C 2898, 2011 WL 3290302 (N.D. Ill. July 26, 2011)	34
<i>Amchem Prods. Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	37, 43
<i>Armstrong v. Bd. of Sch. Dirs. Of the City of Milwaukee</i> , 616 F.2d 305 (7th Cir. 1980)	18, 20, 34
<i>Borcea v. Carnival Corp.</i> , 238 F.R.D. 664 (S.D. Fla. 2006).....	33
<i>Carrier iQ, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , No. 12-md-02330-EMC, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 114235 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2016).....	30
<i>Cotton v. Hinton</i> , 559 F.2d 1326 (5th Cir. 1977)	32
<i>CV Reit, Inc. v. Levy</i> , 144 F.R.D. 690 (S.D. Fla. 1992).....	41
<i>Dohrmann v. Intuit, Inc.</i> , 823 F. App’x 482 (9th Cir. 2020)	5
<i>Eichenberger v. ESPN, Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2017)	23
<i>Facebook Biometric Info. Privacy Litig.</i> , No. 15-cv-03747-JD, 2018 WL 2197546 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2018).....	22
<i>Facebook BIPA</i> , No. 3:15-cv-03747, 2020 WL 4818608 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2020).....	25, 26, 26
<i>Fogarazzao v. Lehman Bros., Inc.</i> , 232 F.R.D. 176 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)	41
<i>Fox v. Asset Acceptance, LLC</i> , No. CV 14-734-GW(FFMx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 193865, at *23 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2015).....	36
<i>Fraley v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 966 F. Supp. 2d 939 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	30

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont.)

	Page(s)
Cases (cont.)	
<i>Gen. Tel. Co. of the Sw. v. Falcon</i> , 457 U.S. 147 (1982).....	44
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	20
<i>Harris v. Circuit City Stores, Inc.</i> , No. 07-cv-2512, 2008 WL 400862 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 7, 2008).....	44
<i>In re AT&T Mobility Wireless Data Servs. Sales Litig.</i> , 270 F.R.D. 330 (N.D. Ill. 2010).....	passim
<i>In re Capital One Telephone Consumer Protection Act Litig.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 3d 781 (N.D. Ill. 2015)	30
<i>In re Equifax Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , MDL Docket No. 2800, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 118209 (N.D. Ga. Mar. 17, 2020)	31
<i>In re Google Buzz Privacy Litig.</i> , No. C 10-00672 JW, 2011 WL 7460099 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2011).....	30
<i>In re Google LLC Street View Electronic Communications Litigation</i> , No. 3:10-md-02184, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47928 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2020)	30
<i>In re Mexico Money Transfer Litig.</i> , 164 F. Supp. 2d 1002 (N.D. Ill. 2000)	34
<i>In re Netflix Privacy Litig.</i> , No. 5:11-cv-00379, 2013 WL 1120801 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2013)	29, 33
<i>In re Nickelodeon Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 827 F.3d 262 (3d Cir. 2016).....	23
<i>In re Nissan Radiator</i> , No. 10 CV 7493 (VB), 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 116720 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2013).....	37
<i>In re Northfield Labs., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 06 C 1493, 2012 WL 366852 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 31, 2012)	46
<i>In re Southwest Airlines Voucher Litig.</i> , No. 11-cv-8176, 2013 WL 4510197 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 26, 2013)	20

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont.)

	Page(s)
Cases (cont.)	
<i>In re Target Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , 892 F.3d 968 (8th Cir. 2018)	32
<i>In re Warner Commc'ns Sec. Litig.</i> , 618 F. Supp. 735 (S.D.N.Y. 1985).....	35
<i>Isby v. Bayh</i> , 75 F.3d 1191 (7th Cir. 1996)	18, 19, 20, 34
<i>Johnson v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 16-cv-5468, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 161155 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 20, 2018)	5
<i>Kaye v. Amicus Mediation & Arbitration Group, Inc.</i> , 300 F.R.D. 67 (D. Conn. 2014).....	43
<i>Kessler v. Am. Resorts International's Holiday Network, Ltd.</i> , No. 05 C, 5944, 2007 WL 4105204 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 14, 2007).....	19
<i>Kline v. Dymatize Enters., LLC</i> , No. 15-CV-2348-AJB-RBB, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 142774 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2016)	36
<i>Lane v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2012)	20, 29, 33
<i>Lo v. Oxnard European Motors, LLC</i> , No. 11CV1009 JLS (MDD), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 144490 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2011).....	36
<i>McCabe v. Crawford & Co.</i> , 210 F.R.D. 631 (N.D. Ill. 2002).....	38
<i>McKinnie v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.</i> , 678 F. Supp. 2d 806 (E.D. Wis. 2009).....	34
<i>Medeiros v. HSBC Card Servs.</i> , No. CV 15-09093 JVS (AFMx), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 178484 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2017) ..	30
<i>Miracle-Pond v. Shutterfly, Inc.</i> , No. 19-cv-04722, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86083 (N.D. Ill. May 15, 2020).....	5
<i>Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 306 (1950).....	45

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.