

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Lauren Biegel, Greg Maroney, Ryan
Cosgrove, Clive Rhoden, Stephen Bradshaw,
Angela Farve and Christina Henderson,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated, on behalf of themselves
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Blue Diamond Growers,

Defendant.

Case No.: 7:20-cv-03032-CS

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT
OF PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT,
PRELIMINARY CERTIFICATION OF
SETTLEMENT CLASS, AND
APPROVAL OF NOTICE PLAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....	1
II. THE TERMS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT	4
A. Certification of the Settlement Class	4
B. Relief for the Members of the Settlement Class	4
C. Incentive Awards and Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses	4
D. Settlement Notice.....	5
III. ARGUMENT	6
A. The Court Should Preliminarily Approve the Settlement Agreement.....	6
1. Legal Standard	7
2. The Settlement Is Procedurally Fair, as It Is the Result of Good Faith, Arm’s-Length Negotiations by Well-Informed and Highly Experienced Counsel.....	8
3. The Settlement Is Substantively Fair, as Application of the Factors Set Out in <i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i> Demonstrates.....	9
(i) The complexity, expense, and likely duration of litigation	10
(ii) The reaction of the class to the settlement	11
(iii)The stage of the proceedings and the amount of discovery completed	11
(iv)The risks of establishing liability and damages	12
(v) The risk of maintaining class action status through trial	12
(vi)The ability of Defendant to withstand a greater judgment	13
(vii) The range of reasonableness of the settlement in light of the best possible recovery and in light of all	

- the attendant risks of litigation14
- B. The Court Should Preliminarily Certify the Settlement Class.....15
 - 1. The Settlement Class Meets All Prerequisites of Rule 23(a)
 - of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.....16
 - (i) Numerosity.....16
 - (ii) Commonality.....16
 - (iii)Typicality17
 - (iv)Adequacy of representation18
 - 2. The Settlement Class Meets All Rule 23(b)(3)
 - Requirements19
 - (i) Common legal and factual questions predominate in
 - this action19
 - (ii) A class action is the superior means to adjudicate
 - Plaintiffs’ claims20
 - C. The Court Should Approve the Proposed Notice Plan21
- IV. PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF EVENTS
- V. CONCLUSION.....24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Pages(s)
Cases	
<i>Ackerman v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , No. CV-09-0395 (JG), 2010 WL 2925955 (E.D.N.Y. July 21, 2010).....	17
<i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	15, 19
<i>Banyai v. Mazur</i> , No. 00 CIV.9806 SHS, 2007 WL 927583 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2007).....	12
<i>Bezdek v. Vibram USA, Inc.</i> , 809 F.3d 78 (1st Cir. 2015).....	13
<i>Bodon v. Domino’s Pizza, LLC</i> , No. 09-CV-2941 SLT, 2015 WL 588656 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 16, 2015).....	14
<i>Brazil v. Dole Packaged Foods, LLC</i> , No. 12-CV-01831-LHK, 2014 WL 5794873 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2014).....	13
<i>Charron v. Pinnacle Grp. N.Y. LLC</i> , 874 F. Supp. 2d 179 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	13
<i>Charron v. Wiener</i> , 731 F.3d 241 (2d Cir. 2013).....	7, 9, 18
<i>Cicciarella v. Califia Farms, LLC</i> , No. 19-cv-87875 (S.D.N.Y. July 17, 2020).....	6
<i>City of Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.</i> , 495 F.2d 448 (2d Cir. 1974).....	9, 10
<i>D’Amato v. Deutsche Bank</i> , 236 F.3d 78 (2d Cir. 2001).....	8
<i>D.S. ex rel. S.S. v. New York City Dep’t of Educ.</i> , 255 F.R.D. 59 (E.D.N.Y. 2008).....	11
<i>Dupler v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> , 705 F. Supp. 2d 231 (E.D.N.Y. 2010).....	10

Fogarazzao v. Lehman Bros.,
232 F.R.D. 176 (S.D.N.Y. 2005)17

Gen. Tel. Co. of Sw. v. Falcon,
457 U.S. 147 (1982).....13

Hadel v. Gaucho, LLC,
No. 15 CIV. 3706 (RLE), 2016 WL 1060324 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 14, 2016)7, 17

Hall v. ProSource Techs., LLC,
No. 14-CV-2502 (SIL), 2016 WL 1555128 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 11, 2016).....8

Handschu v. Special Servs. Div.,
787 F.2d 828 (2d Cir. 1986).....21

Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.,
150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)21

In re Bear Stearns Companies, Inc. Sec., Derivative, & ERISA Litig.,
909 F. Supp. 2d 259 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....9

In re Med. X-Ray Film Antitrust Litig.,
No. CV-93-5904, 1998 WL 661515 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 7, 1998).....12

In re Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) Products Liab. Litig.,
241 F.R.D. 185 (S.D.N.Y. 2007)18

In re Nassau Cty. Strip Search Cases,
461 F.3d 219 (2d Cir. 2006).....19, 20

In re Nissan Radiator/Transmission Cooler Litig.,
No. 10 CV 7493 VB, 2013 WL 4080946 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2013)17

In re Payment Card Interchange Fee & Merch. Disc. Antitrust Litig.,
986 F. Supp. 2d 207 (E.D.N.Y. 2013)11

In re Sinus Buster Products Consumer Litig.,
No. 12-CV-2429 (ADS)(AKT), 2014 WL 5819921 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 10, 2014).....13

Manley v. Midan Rest. Inc.,
No. 14 CIV. 1693 (HBP), 2016 WL 1274577 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 30, 2016).....7, 8, 10, 11, 17

Marisol A. v. Giuliani,
126 F.3d 372 (2d Cir. 1997).....16, 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.