

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

IN RE: DAILY FANTASY SPORTS
LITIGATION

This Document Relates to:
All Cases

MDL No. 1:16-md-02677-GAO

**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' AND DEFENDANT DRAFTKINGS INC.'S
JOINT MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT
AND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED NOTICE OF THE SETTLEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 2

 I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY OF THE ACTION..... 2

 II. SETTLEMENT OF THE ACTION..... 3

 A. Negotiations Producing Settlement..... 3

 B. The Material Terms Of The Proposed Settlement. 4

 1. Settlement Class..... 4

 2. Settlement Relief..... 5

 a. Financial Benefits To Settlement Class Members. 5

 b. Incentive Payment To The Proposed Class
 Representative Plaintiffs. 5

 c. Injunctive Relief..... 6

 3. Released Claims..... 7

ARGUMENT 8

 I. THE LEGAL STANDARDS FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF A
 CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT ARE SATISFIED. 8

 A. Legal Standards For Preliminary Approval Of A Class Action
 Settlement. 8

 B. The Settlement Here Is Fair, Reasonable And Adequate. 10

 1. Plaintiffs And Class Counsel Have Adequately Represented
 The Class..... 10

 2. The Settlement Proposal Was Negotiated At Arm’s Length. 11

 3. The Relief Provided For The Settlement Class Is Adequate,
 Taking Into Account Relevant Factors. 11

 a. The Settlement Relief Is Adequate. 11

 i Injunctive Relief..... 11

	ii	Financial Relief.....	12
	b.	The Complexity, Expense, And Duration Of the Litigation Favor Settlement.	12
	c.	The Risks Of Establishing Liability And Damages Favor Settlement.	13
	d.	The Proposed Attorneys’ Fees Are Fair And Reasonable.	14
	4.	The Proposed Settlement Treats Class Members Equitably Relative To Each Other.....	14
II.		THE COURT SHOULD CONDITIONALLY CERTIFY THE CLASS FOR PURPOSES OF SETTLEMENT.	15
	A.	The Requirements Of Rule 23(a) Are Satisfied.....	15
		1. The Class Is So Numerous That Joinder Of All Members Is Impracticable.....	15
		2. There Are Questions Of Law And Fact Common To All Class Members.....	16
		3. Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Typical Of Those Of The Class.....	17
		4. The Proposed Class Representative Plaintiffs Have And Will Continue To Fairly And Adequately Protect The Interests Of The Class.....	17
	B.	The Requirements of Rule 23(b) Are Satisfied.....	18
		1. Common Issues Predominate Because Legal And Factual Questions Involve Proof Common To Plaintiffs And Class Members.	18
		2. Class Treatment Is Superior To Individual Resolutions.	19
III.		THE PROPOSED CLASS NOTICE IS CONSISTENT WITH FIRST CIRCUIT STANDARDS AND PROVIDES ADEQUATE NOTICE TO CLASS MEMBERS FOR CLAIMS, OBJECTIONS AND OPT OUTS.....	20
IV.		THE PROPOSED CLASS REPRESENTATIVE PLAINTIFFS SHOULD BE PRELIMINARILY APPOINTED AS CLASS REPRESENTATIVES AND PLAINTIFFS’ COUNSEL SHOULD BE PRELIMINARILY APPOINTED AS CLASS COUNSEL.	22
V.		A FINAL APPROVAL HEARING SHOULD BE SCHEDULED.....	22

CONCLUSION..... 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Amchem Prods. Inc. v. Woodward</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997)	19
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Trust Funds</i> , 133 S. Ct. 1184 (2013)	18
<i>Andrews v. Bechtel Power Corp.</i> , 780 F.2d 124 (1st Cir.1985)	17
<i>Bezdek v. Vibram USA Inc.</i> , 79 F. Supp. 3d 324 (D. Mass.), aff'd, 809 F.3d 78 (1st Cir. 2015)	8, 9
<i>Brown v. Am. Honda (In re New Motor Vehicles Canadian Exp. Antitrust Litig.)</i> , 522 F.3d 6 (1st Cir. Me. 2008)	15, 18
<i>Bussie v. Allmerica Fin. Corp.</i> , 50 F.Supp.2d 59 (D. Mass. 1999).....	8
<i>City P'ship Co. v. Atl. Acquisition Ltd. P'ship</i> , 100 F.3d 1041 (1st Cir.1996)	9
<i>Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i> , 495 F.2d 448 (2d Cir.1974)	9
<i>Elkins v. Equitable Life Ins. of Iowa</i> , No. Civ A96-296-Civ-T-17B, 1998 WL 1333741 (M.D. Fla. Jan 27, 1998).....	19
<i>In re Evergreen Ultra Short Opportunities Sec. Litig.</i> , 275 F.R.D. 382 (D. Mass. 2011)	17
<i>Gintis v. Bouchard Transp. Co.</i> , 596 F.3d 64 (1st Cir. 2010)	19
<i>Gulbankian v. MW Mfrs., Inc.</i> , 2014 WL 7384075 (D. Mass. 2014).....	9
<i>Hochstadt v. Bos. Sci. Corp.</i> , 708 F. Supp. 2d 95 (D. Mass. 2010).....	18
<i>In re Initial Pub. Offering Sec. Litig. ("In re IPO")</i> , 471 F.3d 24 (2d Cir. 2006)	17
<i>Lannan v. Levy & White</i> , 186 F. Supp. 3d 77 (D. Mass. 2016).....	15, 16, 19
<i>In re Lupron Mktg. and Sales Practices Litig.</i> , 228 F.R.D. 75 (D. Mass. 2005)	18

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.