

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

KAYLA QUARLES, individually and on)
behalf of all others similarly situated,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

PRET A MANGER (USA) LIMITED,)

Defendant.)

Case No. 20-cv-7179

Hon. Manish S. Shah
Presiding Judge

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND SUPPORTING MEMORANDUM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND 2

A. The Biometric Information Privacy Act. 2

B. Plaintiff’s allegations. 3

C. Procedural History. 3

D. The proposed Settlement..... 5

1. The Settlement Class..... 5

2. Monetary relief for Settlement Class Members. 5

3. *Cy pres* distributions. 6

4. Settlement Class release..... 6

5. Class Representative Service Award. 7

6. Attorneys’ fees and costs. 7

7. Administration and Notice..... 8

II. ARGUMENT 9

A. The settlement approval process. 9

B. The Settlement warrants preliminary approval..... 11

1. The Class has been adequately represented. 11

2. The Settlement resulted from arm’s length negotiations. 12

3. The proposed Settlement treats Settlement Class Members equally. 14

4. The relief provided to the Settlement Class is more than adequate..... 14

a. The risks of continued litigation weigh, when viewed against the relief provided, weigh in favor of approval. 16

b. The proposed method of distribution is effective. 18

c. The proposed attorney fee award and timing of payment support preliminary approval. 20

C. The Settlement Class should be certified..... 21

1. The Settlement Class is sufficiently numerous. 22

2. Plaintiff’s claims are typical. 22

3. Plaintiff and Counsel are adequate. 23

4. Commonality is satisfied..... 23

5. Common questions predominate..... 24

6.	A class action is the superior means of resolving this dispute.....	25
7.	The Settlement Class is ascertainable.	27
D.	The proposed Notice plan is constitutionally sound.	27
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Aliano v. Joe Caputo & Sons - Algonquin, Inc.,
 No. 09 C 910, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 48323
 (N.D. Ill. May 5, 2011) 18

Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor,
 521 U.S. 591 (1997)..... 21, 26

Aranda v. Caribbean Cruise Line, Inc.,
 No. 12 C 4069, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29400
 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 2, 2017)..... 13

Armstrong v. Bd. of Sch. Dirs. of the City of Milwaukee,
 616 F.2d 305 (7th Cir. 1980) 9

Barnes v. Air Line Pilots Ass'n,
 310 F.R.D. 551 (N.D. Ill. 2015)..... 26

Beaton v. SpeedyPC Software,
 907 F.3d 1018 (7th Cir. 2018) 22

Birchmeier v. Caribbean Cruise Line, Inc.,
 896 F.3d 792 (7th Cir. 2018) 7, 20

Cornejo v. Amcor Rigid Plastics USA, LLC,
 No. 1:18-cv-07018
 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 10, 2020) 20

Felzen v. Andreas,
 134 F.3d 873 (7th Cir. 1998) 9

Fournigault v. Independence One Mortgage Corp.,
 234 F.R.D. 641(N.D. Ill. 2006)..... 11

Goldsmith v. Technology Solutions Co.,
 No. 92 C 4374, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15093
 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 10, 1995)..... 9, 18

Golon v. Ohio Savs. Bank,
 No. 98-cv-7430, 1999 WL 965593
 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 15, 1999)..... 24

Hale v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,
 No. 12-0660-DRH, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 210368
 (S.D. Ill. Dec. 13, 2018)..... 20

In re AT&T Mobility Wireless Data Servs. Sales Litig.,
 270 F.R.D. 330 (N.D. Ill. 2010)..... 14

In re Facebook Biometric Info. Privacy Litig.,
 326 F.R.D. 535 (N.D. Cal. 2018)..... 24, 25

In re Google Buzz Privacy Litig.,
 No. C 10-00672 JW, 2011 WL 7460099
 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2011) 15

In re Google LLC Street View Electronic Communications Litigation,
 No. 3:10-md-02184, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47928
 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2020)..... 15

In re Payment Card Interchange Fee & Merch. Disc. Antitrust Litig.,
 330 F.R.D. 11 (E.D.N.Y. 2019)..... 10

In re Southwest Airlines Voucher Litig.,
 No. 11-cv-8176, 2013 WL 4510197
 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 26, 2013)..... 17

Isby v. Bayh,
 75 F.3d 1191 (7th Cir. 1996) 9

Johnson v. Rest Haven Illiana Christian Convalescent Home, Inc.,
 No. 2019-CH-01813
 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cty. Oct. 18, 2019)..... 15

Jones v. CBC Rest. Corp.,
 No. 1:19-cv-06736
 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 22, 2020)..... 15

Kurgan v. Chiro One Wellness Ctrs. LLC,
 No. 10-cv-1899, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20255
 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 19, 2014)..... 25

Lane v. Facebook, Inc.,
 696 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2012) 15

Langendorf v. Skinnygirl Cocktails, LLC,
 306 F.R.D. 574 (N.D. Ill. 2014)..... 23

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.