

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

IN RE: TIKTOK, INC., CONSUMER
PRIVACY LITIGATION

This Document Relates to All Cases

MDL No. 2948:16-cv-08637

Master Docket No. 20-cv-4699

Judge John Z. Lee

Magistrate Judge Sunil R. Harjani

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES,
REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES, AND CLASS
REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE AWARDS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. CLASS COUNSEL DEDICATED ENORMOUS RESOURCES TO THIS MATTER AND FACED SIGNIFICANT RISKS TO SUCCESSFULLY RESOLVE THIS CASE WITH DEFENDANTS..... 3

 A. Class Counsel Dedicated Tremendous Resources to Resolve Plaintiffs’ Claims. 3

 B. Class Counsel Faced Significant Risk of Nonpayment. 7

 1. Class Actions are Inherently Risky..... 8

 2. Class Counsel Faced Complex Issues..... 8

 3. Defendants Had Substantial Resources for Their Defense. 9

III. THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS’ FEES ARE REASONABLE UNDER CONTROLLING LAW..... 10

 A. The Settlement Creates a Common Fund from Which Percentage-of-the-Fund is the Appropriate Method for Awarding Attorneys’ Fees..... 10

 B. Plaintiffs’ Requested Fee is an Appropriate Market-Based Fee and Should Be Approved..... 14

 1. Class Counsel Overcame Serious Litigation Risks..... 15

 2. Class Counsel Achieved an Excellent Result 18

 C. A Lodestar Cross-Check Confirms that the Fee Requested is Proper. 20

 D. A “Sliding Scale” Approach is Neither Necessary Nor Appropriate Here..... 23

IV. COUNSEL’S LITIGATION EXPENSES WERE REASONABLY INCURRED AND SHOULD BE APPROVED..... 27

V. THE CLASS REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD RECEIVE SERVICE AWARDS 27

VI. CONCLUSION..... 29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Americana Art China Co., Inc. v. Foxfire Printing and Packaging, Inc.</i> , 743 F.3d 243 (7th Cir. 2014).....	11
<i>Arenson, et al. v. Bd. of Trade of City of Chicago</i> , 372 F. Supp. 1349 (N.D. Ill. 1974).....	10
<i>Beckman v. KeyBank, N.A.</i> , 293 F.R.D. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	22
<i>Blum v. Stenson</i> , 465 U.S. 886 (1984)	14
<i>Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert</i> , 444 U.S. 472 (1980)	10, 11
<i>Brewer v. S. Union Co.</i> , 607 F. Supp. 1511 (D. Colo. 1984)	10
<i>Columbus Drywall & Insulation, Inc. v. Masco Corp.</i> , 2012 WL 12540344 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 26, 2012)	22
<i>Cook v. Niedert</i> , 142 F.3d 1004 (7th Cir. 1998).....	20, 21, 28
<i>Denius v. Dunlap</i> , 330 F.3d 919 (7th Cir. 2003).....	20
<i>Dial Corp. v. News Corp.</i> , 317 F.R.D. 426 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	25
<i>Dohrmann v. Intuit, Inc.</i> , 823 F. App'x 482 (9th Cir. 2020) (reversing).....	15
<i>Exch. Comm'n v. First Secs. Co. of Chicago</i> , 528 F.2d 449 (7th Cir. 1976).....	13
<i>Florin v. Nationsbank of Ga., N.A.</i> , 34 F.3d 560 (7th Cir. 1994).....	7, 13, 21
<i>Gaskill v. Gordon</i> , 160 F.3d 361 (7th Cir. 1998).....	11
<i>Gaskill v. Gordon</i> (“ <i>Gaskill I</i> ,” 942 F. Supp. 382 (N.D. Ill. 1996).....	13
<i>Gastineau v. Wright</i> , 592 F.3d 747 (7th Cir. 2010).....	21
<i>George v. Kraft Foods Glob., Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 13089487 (N.D. Ill. June 26, 2012).....	20
<i>Hale v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 2018 WL 6606079 (S.D. Ill. Dec. 16, 2018).....	12
<i>Harman v. Lyphomed, Inc.</i> , 945 F.2d 969 (7th Cir. 1991).....	21, 22
<i>Heekin, v. Anthem, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 5878032 (S.D. In. Nov. 20, 2012).....	20
<i>Hensley v. Eckerhart</i> , 461 U.S. 424 (1983)	13

<i>Hillson v. Kelly Servs. Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 3446596 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 11, 2017).....	22
<i>Horizon Healthcare Servs., Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 6089713 (D.N.J. Oct. 18, 2016)	22
<i>In re Avandia Mktg., Sales Practices and Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2012 WL 6923367 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 19, 2012)	9
<i>In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2021 WL 5709250 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 1, 2021).....	11, 25
<i>In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 229895 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 1, 2021).....	12
<i>In re Capital One Telephone Consumer Protection Act Litig.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 3d 781 (N.D. Ill. 2015).....	8
<i>In re Dairy Farmers of America, Inc.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 3d 838 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 20, 2015)	20
<i>In re Facebook Biometric Info. Priv. Litig.</i> , 2022 WL 822923 (9th Cir. Mar. 17, 2022)	26
<i>In re Giant Interactive Group, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 279 F.R.D. 151 (S.D.N.Y.).....	2
<i>In re Imax Secs. Litig.</i> , 2012 WL 3133476 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 1, 2012).....	2
<i>In re Lawnmower Engine Horsepower Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.</i> , 733 F. Supp. 2d 997 (E.D. Wis. 2010)	22
<i>In re Northfield Lab., Inc. Secs. Litig.</i> , 2012 WL 2458445 (N.D. Ill. June 26, 2012).....	11
<i>In re Ready-Mixed Concrete</i> , 2010 WL 3282591 (S.D. Ind. Aug. 17, 2010).....	27
<i>In re Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance Secs. Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 5505744 (D.N.J. Oct. 1, 2013)	9
<i>In re Synthroid Mktg. Litig.</i> , 264 F.3d 712 (7th Cir. 2001)	Passim
<i>In re Synthroid Mktg. Litig.</i> , 325 F.3d 974 (7th Cir. 2003)	24, 25
<i>In re VeriFone Holdings, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2014 WL 12646027 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2014).....	22
<i>In re Warner Comm'ns. Secs. Litig.</i> , 618 F. Supp. 735 (S.D.N.Y. 1985)	10
<i>In re WorldCom, Inc. Secs. Litig.</i> , 388 F. Supp. 2d 319 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)	9, 22
<i>Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.</i> , 282 F.R.D. 92 (D.N.J. Mar. 30, 2012).....	9
<i>Jeffboat, LLC v. Dir., Office of Workers' Comp. Programs</i> , 553 F.3d 487 (7th Cir. 2009)	20
<i>Johnson v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 161155 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 20, 2018)	15
<i>Kirchoff v. Flynn</i> , 786 F.2d 320 (7th Cir. 1986).....	7

<i>Kolinek v. Walgreen Co.</i> , 311 F.R.D. 483 (N.D. Ill. 2015)	11
<i>Leung v. XPO Logistics, Inc.</i> , 326 F.R.D. 185 (N.D. Ill. 2018)	20
<i>Matter of Cont'l Illinois Sec. Litig.</i> , 962 F.2d 566 (7th Cir. 1992)	7
<i>Mills v. Elec. Auto-Lite Co.</i> , 396 U.S. 375 (1970)	11, 26
<i>Miracle-Pond v. Shutterfly, Inc.</i> , No. 19-cv-04722, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86083 (N.D. Ill. May 15, 2020).....	15
<i>Montgomery v. Aetna Plywood, Inc.</i> , 231 F.3d 399 (7th Cir. 2000)	11
<i>Paz v. Portfolio Recovery Assocs., LLC</i> , 924 F.3d 949 (7th Cir. 2019)	21
<i>Peter v. DoorDash, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 1967568 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2020).....	15
<i>Schulte v. Fifth Third Bank</i> , 805 F. Supp. 2d 560 (N.D. Ill. Jul. 29, 2011)	22
<i>Silverman v. Motorola Sols., Inc.</i> , 739 F.3d 956 (7th Cir. 2013)	7, 23, 24, 25
<i>Skelton v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 860 F.2d 250 (7th Cir. 1988)	21
<i>Spicer v. Chicago Bd. Options Exch., Inc.</i> , 844 F. Supp. 1226 (N.D. Ill. 1993).....	28
<i>Trist v. First Fed. Savings & Loan Ass'n of Chester</i> , 89 F.R.D. 8 (E.D. Pa. 1980)	10
<i>Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 290 F.3d 1043 (9th Cir. 2002)	22
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 396 F.3d 96 (2d Cir. 2005)	25
<i>Williams v. Gen. Elec. Cap. Auto Lease</i> , 1995 WL 765266 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 26, 1995).....	11
<i>Williams v. Rohm & Haas Pension Plan ("Rohm & Haas IP")</i> , 658 F.3d 629 (7th Cir. 2011)	11, 20
<i>Williams v. Rohm & Haas Pension Plan ("Rohm & Haas IP")</i> , 2010 WL 4723725 (S.D. Ind. Nov. 12, 2010).....	27
<i>Wright v. Nationstar Mortg. LLC</i> , 2016 WL 4505169 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 29, 2016)	20

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.