

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
WESTERN DIVISION**

IN RE: T-MOBILE CUSTOMER DATA) MDL No. 3019
SECURITY BREACH LITIGATION)
) Master Case No. 4:21-md-03019-BCW
)
)
)

**PLAINTIFFS' SUGGESTIONS IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
III. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENT	7
A. The Settlement Class.....	7
B. Benefits of the Settlement.....	8
1. Cash Payments	8
2. Identity Defense Services and Restoration Services.....	9
3. Information Security Spending	10
IV. NOTICE HAS BEEN DISSEMINATED TO THE SETTLEMENT CLASS.....	10
V. THE REACTION OF THE CLASS TO THE SETTLEMENT HAS BEEN OVERWHELMINGLY POSITIVE	14
VI. LEGAL STANDARDS	14
VII. THE SETTLEMENT APPROVAL PROCESS	15
VIII. FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT IS APPROPRIATE.....	16
IX. THE SETTLEMENT SATISFIES THE RULE 23(E) FACTORS	16
A. Class Representatives and Class Counsel Have Adequately Represented the Class	17
B. The Parties Negotiated the Settlement Agreement at Arm’s Length.....	18
C. The Relief Provided for the Settlement Class is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate	19
1. The Value of Settlement Benefits	19
2. The Costs, Risks, and Delay of Trial and Appeal.....	20
3. The Effectiveness of Administration	23
4. The Experience and Views of Class Counsel	24
5. The Proposed Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards.....	25
D. The Proposal Treats Settlement Class Members Equitably	28
E. The Reaction of Class Members Supports Final Approval	29

X.	THE COURT SHOULD CONSIDER AND OVERRULE ALL OBJECTIONS	30
A.	Objections to the Benefits Conferred on the Settlement Class	31
B.	Objections Relating to Notice.....	33
C.	Objection Relating to Article III Standing.....	34
D.	Objections Relating to the Requested Attorneys’ Fees.....	41
1.	There Is No Basis to Adopt Either the “Megafund” or “Sliding Scale” Approach Here.....	42
a.	There Is No “Absence of Eighth Circuit Authority” on How to Evaluate the Reasonableness of a Requested Attorneys’ Fee.....	42
b.	The Approaches Hampe Proposes Are Arbitrary, Inefficient, and Create Perverse Incentives for Plaintiffs’ Attorneys.....	44
2.	There Is No Other Basis to Reduce the Requested Fee Award Here.....	47
a.	The Fee Here Is Consonant with What Other Courts Have Approved and Applying the Seventh or Ninth Circuits’ Approaches Could Actually Result in a Similar (or Even Larger) Award Here	47
b.	The Multiplier Is Not Excessive	54
c.	The <i>Johnson</i> Factors Support Plaintiffs’ Requested Fee	58
3.	A “More Detailed” Lodestar Submission Is Unwarranted	61
4.	The Court Should Not Exclude Professor Brian Fitzpatrick’s Declaration.....	63
XI.	CLASS CERTIFICATION REMAINS APPROPRIATE	66
XII.	CONCLUSION.....	66

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Alexander v. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 05-CV-00038-EMC, 2016 WL 3351017 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2016).....	45, 61
<i>Alig v. Rocket Mortgage, LLC</i> , 52 F.4th 167 (4th Cir. 2022)	36
<i>Allapattah Servs. Inc. v. Exxon Corp.</i> , 454 F. Supp. 2d 1185 (S.D. Fla. 2006)	53
<i>Americas Mining Corp. v. Theriault</i> , 51 A.3d 1213 (Del. 2012)	55
<i>Anderson v. Hannaford Bros. Co.</i> , 659 F.3d 151 (1st Cir. 2011).....	39
<i>Ark. Teacher Ret. Sys. v. State St. Corp.</i> , 25 F.4th 55 (1st Cir. 2022).....	49, 54
<i>Armstrong v. Bd. of Sch. Dirs. of Milwaukee</i> , 616 F.2d 305 (7th Cir. 1980)	25
<i>Ashley v. Reg'l Transp. Dist. & Amalgamated Transit Union Div. 1001 Pension Fund Tr.</i> , No. 05-cv-01567, 2008 WL 384579 (D. Colo. Feb. 11, 2008).....	18
<i>Baldwin v. Nat'l W. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 2021 WL 4206736 (W.D. Mo. Sept. 15, 2021)	40
<i>Baldwin v. Nat'l W. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 2022 WL 16709706 (W.D. Mo. June 16, 2022)	40
<i>Beckman v. KeyBank, N.A.</i> , 293 F.R.D. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2013)	55
<i>Bellows v. NCO Fin. Sys., Inc.</i> , 3:07-CV-01413-W-AJB, 2008 WL 5458986 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2008).....	15
<i>Burkhart v. Wash. Metro. Area Transit Auth.</i> , 112 F.3d 1207 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	65
<i>Burroughs v. Mackie Moving Systems Corp.</i> , No. 4:07CV1944MLM, 2010 WL 1254630 (E.D. Mo. Mar. 24, 2010).....	64
<i>Caligiuri v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 855 F.3d 860 (8th Cir. 2017)	27
<i>Carlsen v. GameStop, Inc.</i> , 833 F.3d 903 (8th Cir. 2016)	38
<i>Carson v. Am. Brands, Inc.</i> , 450 U.S. 79 (1981).....	23
<i>Clemens v. ExecuPharm Inc.</i> , 48 F.4th 146 (3d Cir. 2022)	40

<i>Cohn v. Nelson</i> , 375 F. Supp. 2d 844 (E.D. Mo. 2005).....	15
<i>Custom Hair Designs by Sandy, LLC v. Central Payment Co.</i> , No. 8:17CV310, 2022 WL 3445763 (D. Neb. Aug. 17, 2022).....	54, 57
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	63
<i>Denney v. Deutsche Bank AG</i> , 443 F.3d 253 (2d Cir. 2006).....	35
<i>Drazen v. Pinto</i> , 41 F.4th 1354 (11th Cir. 2022)	36
<i>E. Associated Coal Corp. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.</i> , 475 F. Supp. 586 (W.D. Pa. 1979).....	64
<i>Farrell v. Bank of Am. Corp., N.A.</i> , 827 F. App'x 628 (9th Cir. 2020)	56
<i>Fish v. St. Cloud State Univ.</i> , 295 F.3d 849 (8th Cir. 2002)	61
<i>Frank v. Gaos</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1041 (2019).....	35, 36
<i>Fulton-Green v. Accolade, Inc.</i> , No. 18-274, 2019 WL 4677954 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 24, 2019).....	59
<i>Gardiner v. Walmart, Inc.</i> , No. 20-cv-04618-JSW, 2021 WL 4992539 (N.D. Cal. July 28, 2021)	22
<i>Gordon v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc.</i> , No. 17-cv-01415-CMA-SKC, 2019 WL 6972701 (D. Colo. Dec. 16, 2019).....	20, 21
<i>Greenstein v. Noblr Reciprocal Exch.</i> , 2022 WL 17418972 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 5, 2022).....	36
<i>Grunin v. Int'l House of Pancakes</i> , 513 F.2d 114 (8th Cir. 1975)	33
<i>Halvorson v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.</i> , 718 F.3d 773 (8th Cir. 2013)	35
<i>Hammond v. The Bank of New York Mellon Corp.</i> , No. 08 Civ. 6060 RMB RLE, 2010 WL 2643307 (S.D.N.Y. June 25, 2010)	22
<i>Hardman v. Bd. of Educ. of Dollarway</i> , 714 F.2d 823 (8th Cir. 1983)	43
<i>Harvey v. Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC</i> , 2022 WL 3359174 (9th Cir. 2022)	36
<i>Health Republic Ins. Co. v. United States</i> , 156 Fed. Cl. 67 (2021).....	55, 57

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.