



him, asserting four counts and demanding Taro reimburse his losses. Plaintiff's complaint was amended on September 28, 2023, and asserts the same four counts. Plaintiff has been impacted the same as all Settlement Class Members and have the same interests as them. Plaintiff has assisted in the investigation of this case, reviewed and approved pleadings, stayed in contact with Settlement Class Counsel, and answered Settlement Class Counsel's many questions. Plaintiff is informed of the risks of continued litigation and the benefits of early resolution.

5. Early in this case, the Parties agreed to explore settlement. No Rule 12 motions were filed, and no formal discovery has been conducted. However, in accordance with the Court's Individual Practices, the parties did make substantive submissions in connection with Defendant's anticipated motion to dismiss and addressed their arguments before the Court. Plaintiff thereafter filed an amended complaint.

**b. Negotiations**

6. The Parties engaged early in Federal Rule of Evidence 408 communications and exchanged key information needed to inform their strategies, including the size of the class, the types of data involved in the breach, and information regarding credit monitoring offered by Taro at the time it sent notice of the Security Incident. The parties were subsequently able to make significant progress negotiating a term sheet at arm's length, communicating their positions and evaluating the strengths and weaknesses underlying their claims and defenses.

7. While the negotiations were always collegial, cordial, and professional, there is no doubt that they were adversarial in nature, with both parties forcefully advocating the position of their respective clients.

8. From the start, the Parties agreed they would not negotiate Proposed Class Counsel's attorney fees or Plaintiff's service award until they agreed on the settlement agreement's core terms, thus avoiding conflict between Plaintiff and the Settlement Class.

9. On November 16, 2023, the Parties informed the Court that they reached an agreement in principle on settlement terms. Throughout all negotiations, Settlement Class Counsel and counsel for Taro fought hard for the interests of their respective clients.

10. In the weeks that followed, the Parties diligently negotiated and edited drafts of the Settlement, the Notices, a Claim Form, and other exhibits, and agreed RG2 would serve as Claims Administrator. RG2 has a trusted and proven track record of supporting hundreds of class action administrations, with vast legal administration experience.

#### **COUNSEL'S RECOMMENDATION**

11. My decade-plus years of experience in representing individuals in complex class actions—including data breach actions—informed Plaintiff's settlement position, and the needs of Plaintiff and the proposed Settlement Class. While I believe in the merits of the claims brought in this case, I am also aware that a successful outcome is uncertain and would be achieved, if at all, only after prolonged, arduous litigation with the attendant risk of drawn-out appeals and the potential for no recovery at all. In my experience, it is my opinion that the proposed Settlement of this matter provides significant relief to the Settlement Class Members and warrants the Court's preliminary approval. The Settlement is well within the range of other data breach settlements in the relief that it provides.

12. The Settlement's terms are designed to address the potential harms caused by the data breach, providing credit monitoring and identity theft insurance, as well as reimbursing economic and non-economic losses.

13. This result is particularly favorable given the risks of continued litigation. Plaintiff faced serious risks prevailing on the merits, including proving causation, as well as risk at class certification and at trial, and surviving appeal. A settlement today not only avoids the risks of continued litigation, but it also provides benefits to the Settlement Class Members now as opposed to after years of risky litigation.

14. The Settlement's benefits unquestionably provide a favorable result to the Settlement Class Members, placing the Settlement well within the range of possible final approval and satisfying the requirements for preliminary approval under applicable law. Therefore, the Court should grant preliminary approval.

15. Additionally, the Notice program contemplated by the Settlement provides the best practicable method to reach Settlement Class Members and is consistent with other class action notice programs that have been approved by various courts for similarly situated matters.

16. Thus, Settlement Class Counsel asks the Court to grant preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement and enter the proposed preliminary approval order filed with this motion.

#### **COUNSEL'S QUALIFICATIONS**

17. Turke and Strauss is a law firm in Madison, Wisconsin, that focuses on complex civil and commercial litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection, employment, wage and hour, business, real estate, and debtor-creditor matters.

18. Raina Borrelli is a partner at Turke & Strauss LLP whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data breach, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Borrelli received her J.D. magna cum laude from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2011. Prior to joining Turke & Strauss, Ms. Borrelli was a partner at Gustafson

Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Borrelli is an active member of the Minnesota Women's Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of pro se litigants through the Pro Se Project. Ms. Borrelli has repeatedly been named to the annual Minnesota "Rising Star" Super Lawyers list (2014-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine. She has also been repeatedly certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association (2012-2015; 2018-2020) for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services. In recent years, Ms. Borrelli has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including: *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.); *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, 20-cv-01502 (JRT/HB) (D. Minn.); *In re FCA Monostable Gearshifts Litig.*, 16-md-02744 (E.D. Mich.); *Zeiger v. WellPet LLC*, 17-cv-04056 (N.D. Cal.); *Wyoming v. Procter & Gamble*, 15-cv-2101 (D. Minn.); *In re Big Heart Pet Brands Litig.*, 18-cv-00861 (N.D. Cal.); *Sullivan v. Fluidmaster*, 14-cv-05696 (N.D. Ill.); *Rice v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc.*, 15-cv-00371 (M.D. Pa.); *Gorczynski v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.*, 18-cv-10661 (D.N.J.); *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods*, 18-cv-1736 (C.D. Cal.); *Reynolds, et al., v. FCA US, LLC*, 19-cv-11745 (E.D. Mich.).

19. Ms. Borrelli has significant experience in data privacy litigation and is currently litigating more than fifty data breach cases in courts around the country as lead counsel or co-counsel on behalf of millions of data breach victims, including *In re Netgain Tech. Consumer Data Breach Litig.*, 21-cv-1210 (D. Minn.) (appointed by the court to the Plaintiffs' Interim Executive Committee); *In re C.R. England, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 2:22-cv-374-DAK-JCB (appointed by the court as Interim Co-Lead Counsel); *Medina et al. v. PracticeMax Inc.*, 22-cv-01261-DLR (D. Ariz.) (appointed to Executive Leadership Committee); *Forslund et al. v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Co.*, 1:22-cv-04260 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed as interim co-lead class counsel); *In re Lincare Holdings*,

*Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fla.) (appointed to Interim Executive Leadership Committee); *McLaughlin v. Flagstar*, 22-cv-11470 (E.D. Mich.); *Corra et al. v. Acts Retirement Services, Inc.*, 2:22-cv-02917 (E.D. Pa.); *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp., Inc.*, 22-cv-490 (N.D. Cal.); *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, Case No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.) (data breach settlement on behalf of 500,000 breach victims); *Kunkelman v. Curators of the University of Missouri, d/b/a MU Health Care*, Case No. 21BA-CV00182 (Mo. Cir. Ct., Boone Cty.); *Baldwin v. Nat'l Western Life Ins. Co.*, 21-cv-04066-WJE (W.D. Mo.) (settlement on behalf of 800,000 data breach victims).

20. The Turke & Strauss Firm Resume is attached hereto as **Ex. A**.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, we declare signed under penalty of perjury of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: January 26, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Raina C. Borrelli

Raina C. Borrelli  
**TURKE & STRAUSS LLP**  
613 Williamson St., Suite 201  
Madison, WI 53703  
T: (608) 237-1775  
F: (608) 509-4423  
[raina@turkestrauss.com](mailto:raina@turkestrauss.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the  
Proposed Class*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Raina C. Borrelli, hereby certify that on January 26, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to counsel of record via the ECF system.

DATED this 26th day of January, 2024.

TURKE & STRAUSS LLP

By: /s/ Raina C. Borrelli  
Raina C. Borrelli  
raina@turkestrauss.com  
TURKE & STRAUSS LLP  
613 Williamson St., Suite 201  
Madison, WI 53703  
Telephone: (608) 237-1775  
Facsimile: (608) 509-4423

**— EXHIBIT A —**



# Turke & Strauss LLP

613 Williamson Street, Suite 201  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
P: 608.237.1775  
F: 608.237.4423  
[www.turkestrauss.com](http://www.turkestrauss.com)

## Our Firm

Turke & Strauss is a law firm based in Madison, Wisconsin that focuses on complex civil and commercial litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection, data privacy, data breach, employment, wage and hour, business, and real estate matters. The attorneys of Turke & Strauss have extensive experience in complex litigation, including class actions. The attorneys of Turke & Strauss have prosecuted a variety of multi-million-dollar consumer fraud, product defect, privacy, and antitrust class actions and served as class counsel in cases at the federal level. The defendants in these cases have included companies such as Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., LG Electronics U.S.A., Inc., The Clorox Company, Best Buy, Monsanto Company, Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLC, Stearns Lending, LLC, Fiat Chrysler Automobiles, and American Power & Gas.

## Our Cases

### CONSUMER PROTECTION

#### ***Fowler, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (N.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who were overcharged fees on FHA mortgages. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$30,000,000 in 2018, and final approval was granted in January 2019.

#### ***Jones, et al. v. Monsanto Company (W.D. Mo.)***

Filed on behalf of individuals who purchased mislabeled RoundUp® products. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2020 for \$39,550,000. Final approval was granted in May 2021 and the case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eight Circuit.

#### ***Crawford, et al. v. FCA US LLC (E.D. Mich.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who purchased or leased Dodge Ram 1500 and 1500 Classic vehicles equipped with 3.0L EcoDiesel engines between 2013 and 2019. Plaintiffs allege unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent practices in the Defendants' marketing and sale of vehicles with allegedly defective EGR coolers. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

#### ***In re: Chrysler-Dodge-Jeep EcoDiesel Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation (N.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers against Fiat Chrysler and Bosch alleging unfair, deceptive, and fraudulent practices in the Defendants' marketing and sale of certain EcoDiesel vehicles. The class contained over 100,000 vehicles, including 2014-2016 model-year Jeep Grand Cherokees and Dodge Ram 1500 trucks that were allegedly outfitted with devices that masked actual emission levels. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$307,500,000, and final approval was granted in May 2019.

#### ***Rolland, et al. v. Spark Energy, LLC (D.N.J.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who were forced to pay considerably more for their electricity than they should otherwise have paid due to Spark Energy's deceptive pricing practices. Plaintiff alleges that Spark Energy engages in a bait-and-switch deceptive marketing scheme luring consumers to switch utility companies by offering lower than local utility rates. These lower rates are fixed for only a limited number of months and then switch to a variable market rate that is significantly

higher than the rates local utilities charge. The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$11,000,000 in 2022, and final approval was granted in December 2022.

***Haines v. Washington Trust Bank (Wash. Sup. Ct., King Cty.)***

Turke & Strauss represents consumers who were charged \$35 overdraft fees by Washington Trust Bank on accounts that were never actually overdrawn. Plaintiff filed suit against Washington Trust Bank for the unfair and unlawful assessment of these overdraft fees. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021, and is final approval was granted in November 2021.

***Pryor v. Eastern Bank (Mass. Sup. Ct., Suffolk Cty.)***

Turke & Strauss represents consumers who were charged \$35 overdraft fees by Eastern Bank on accounts that were never actually overdrawn. Plaintiff filed suit against Eastern Bank for the unfair and unlawful assessment of these overdraft fees. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021, and final approval was granted in March 2021.

***Benav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance LLC (W.D. Wash.)***

Turke & Strauss represents consumers who were deceived by Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, an insurance provider that markets and administers pet insurance policies, regarding the true cost of its pet insurance policies. Plaintiffs allege that purchasers of Healthy Paws Pet Insurance's policies found that their policy premiums increased drastically from year to year, at a rate far outpacing the general costs of veterinary medicine, despite Healthy Paws Pet Insurance's representations to the contrary. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

## DATA BREACH

***Walters v. Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group, LLP (N.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers whose private information and personal identifiable information, including credit and debit card numbers, names, mailing addresses, and other personal information, was compromised and stolen from Kimpton Hotel & Restaurant Group by hackers. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2018, and final approval was granted in July 2019.

***Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Milwaukee Cty.)***

Filed on behalf of employees of Aurora Advocate Health, the 10th largest not-for-profit integrated health care system in the United States, whose personally identifiable information was breached and stolen through an email phishing campaign beginning in January 2020. Many of these individuals have lost time

and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in the Circuit Court of Wisconsin for the County of Milwaukee.

***Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc. (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)***

Turke & Strauss represented a class of consumers whose personal health information was compromised and stolen from Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc., a Houston-based billing and collections services firm that provides billing and collection services to healthcare providers across the country. Many of these consumers have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2022 and final approval was granted in July 2022.

***In re BJC Healthcare Data Breach Litigation (Mo. Cir. Ct., St. Louis Cty.)***

Turke & Strauss represented a class of consumers whose personal health information was compromised and stolen from BJC Healthcare, a major regional health system. Many of these consumers lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case settled on a class-wide basis in 2021 and final approval was granted in September 2022.

***Daum, et al. v. K & B Surgical Center, LLC (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.)***

Turke & Strauss represents a class of consumers whose personal health information and protected health information was compromised and stolen from K & B Surgical Center. Many of these consumers have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. The case settled on a class-wide basis in 2022 and preliminary approval is pending the Superior Court of California for the County of Los Angeles.

***In re: Netgain Technology, LLC, Consumer Data Breach Litigation (D. Minn.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers whose personal identifiable information and protected health information was breached and stolen from Netgain Technology, LLC beginning in September 2020. Turke & Strauss partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as a member of the Executive Committee in this multidistrict litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.

***Dusterhoff, et al. v. OneTouchPoint Corp. (E.D. Wisc.)***

Filed on behalf of 2.6 million consumers whose personal identifiable information and protected health information was breached and stolen from OneTouchPoint Corp., a mailing and printing services vendor, beginning in April 2022. Turke & Strauss partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in this litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

***In re Lincare Holdings Inc. Data Breach Litigation (M.D. Fla.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers whose personal identifiable information and protected health information was breached and stolen from Lincare Holdings Inc., a medical products and services provider, beginning in September 2021. Turke & Strauss partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as co-lead counsel for plaintiffs and the class in this multidistrict litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida.

***Forslund, et al. v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company (N.D. Ill.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers whose personal identifiable information was breached and stolen from R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company, a Fortune 500 marketing, packaging, and printing company, beginning in November 2021. Turke & Strauss partner, Raina Borrelli, serves as co-lead counsel for plaintiffs and the class in this litigation. Many of the individuals impacted by the breach have lost time and money responding to the data breach and they face an ongoing risk of identity theft, identity fraud, or other harm. This case is currently pending in The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

## **DATA PRIVACY**

***Patterson v. Respondus, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)***

Filed on behalf of all persons who took an exam using Respondus' online exam proctoring software, Respondus Monitor, in the state of Illinois. Plaintiffs allege that Respondus collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

***Powell v. DePaul University (N.D. Ill.)***

Turke & Strauss represents a class of DePaul University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that DePaul University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

***Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology (N.D. Ill.)***

Turke & Strauss represents a class of DePaul University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that DePaul University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

***Harvey v. Resurrection University (N.D. Ill.)***

Turke & Strauss represents a class of Resurrection University students located in the state of Illinois who were required to take exams using Respondus Monitor, which collects, uses, and discloses students' biometric identifiers and biometric information in violation of Illinois' Biometric Information Privacy Act. Plaintiff alleges that Resurrection University collects students' biometric identifiers and biometric information without written consent and without legally compliant written public policies. This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

## **RIGHT OF PUBLICITY**

***Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (N.D. California)***

Filed on behalf of California residents against PeopleConnect alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that PeopleConnect violates these legal rights by using California residents' names and childhood photographs in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, classmates.com. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

***Boshears, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (W.D. Wash.)***

Filed on behalf of Indiana residents against PeopleConnect alleging violations of Indiana's Right of Publicity Statute and Indiana's common law prohibiting misappropriation of a name or likeness. Plaintiffs allege that PeopleConnect violates these legal rights by using Indiana residents' personalities, including their names and childhood photographs, in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, classmates.com. The case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

***Loendorf v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)***

***Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)***

Both actions were filed on behalf of Illinois residents against PeopleConnect alleging violations of Illinois' Right of Publicity Act and Illinois common law prohibiting unjust enrichment. Plaintiffs allege that PeopleConnect violates these legal rights by using Illinois residents' names, personas, and personal information in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, classmates.com, and unlawfully profiting from it. The cases are pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

***Sessa, et al. v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al. (D. Nev.)***

Filed on behalf of Nevada residents against Ancestry.com alleging violations of Nevada's right to publicity statute, Nevada law prohibiting deceptive trade practice, Nevada common law protection against Intrusion upon Seclusion, and Nevada Unjust Enrichment law. Plaintiffs allege that Ancestry.com violates these legal rights by knowingly misappropriating the photographs, likenesses, names, and identities of Nevada residents for the commercial purpose of selling access to and advertising them in Ancestry.com products and services without their prior consent. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada.

***Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., et al. (N.D. Ill.)***

Filed on behalf of Illinois residents against Ancestry.com alleging violations of Illinois' Right of Publicity Act and Illinois common law prohibiting unjust enrichment. Plaintiffs allege that Ancestry.com violates these legal rights by knowingly misappropriating the photographs, likenesses, names, and identities of Illinois residents for the commercial purpose of selling access to and advertising them in Ancestry.com products and services without their prior consent. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.



***Spindler v. Seamless Contacts Inc. (N.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of California residents against Seamless Contacts Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that Seamless Contacts violates these legal rights by using California residents' names, likenesses, photographs, and personas in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, seamless.ai. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

***Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc. (W.D. Wash.)***

Filed on behalf of California residents against ZoomInfo Technologies Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that ZoomInfo Technologies violates these legal rights by using California residents' names and person information in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, zoominfo.com, as well as selling access to their names and personal information as part of its products. The case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

***Gbeintor v. DemandBase, Inc., et al. (N.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of California residents against DemandBase, Inc. and InsideView Technologies, Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that DemandBase and InsideView Technologies violate these legal rights by using California residents' names, likenesses, photographs, and personas in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website, insideview.com, without their consent. The case is currently on appeal before the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

***Kellman, et al. v. Spokeo, Inc. (N.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of California residents against Spokeo, Inc. alleging violations of California law that recognizes the intellectual property and privacy rights of individuals to control the commercial use of their names and likenesses. Plaintiffs allege that Spokeo violates these legal rights by using California residents' names, likenesses, photographs, and personas in advertisements promoting paid subscriptions to its website without their consent. The case is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

## TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

### ***Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC, et al. (S.D. Ohio)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$6,000,000, and final approval was granted in May 2019.

### ***Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh (D. Mass.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$14,000,000 in 2020. Final approval was granted in October 2021 and the case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

### ***Baldwin, et al. v. Miracle-Ear, Inc., et al. (D. Minn.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated or prerecorded telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* The case settled on a class-wide basis for \$8,000,000 in 2021 and final approval was granted in October 2022.

### ***Goodell, et al. v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC (D. Az.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona.

### ***Doup v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC (N.D. Tex.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry, without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas.

***Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al. (N.D. Ohio)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated or prerecorded telemarketing telephone calls on their cellular telephones without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently on appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

***Learned, et al. v. McClatchy Company, LLC (E.D. Cal.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry and/or who requested Defendant stop calling them, without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

***Rogers, et al. v. Assurance IQ, LLC, et al. (W.D. Wash.)***

Filed on behalf of consumers who received automated solicitation telephone calls on their cellular and residential telephones, some that were listed on the National Do-Not-Call Registry, without their prior express consent within the meaning of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* This case is currently pending in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

## Our Professionals

### SAMUEL J. STRAUSS

Samuel J. Strauss is a founding member of Turke & Strauss LLP. Mr. Strauss concentrates his practice in class action litigation with an emphasis on consumer protection and privacy issues. Mr. Strauss has a national practice and appears in federal courts across the country. Over the course of his career, Mr. Strauss has represented plaintiffs in cases which have resulted in the recovery of hundreds of millions of dollars for consumers.

Mr. Strauss received his J.D. with honors from the University of Washington School of Law in 2013. Prior to forming Turke & Strauss in 2016, Mr. Strauss was an associate at Terrell Marshall Law Group in Seattle, Washington, where he successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts.

Mr. Strauss is a member of bars of the states of Washington, Wisconsin, and Illinois and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington, United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

In recent years, Mr. Strauss has been actively involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Daum, et al. v. K & B Surgical Center, LLC*, No. 21STCV41347 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Joyner v. Behavioral Health Network, Inc.*, No. 2079CV00629 (Mass. Sup. Ct., Hampden Cty.)
- *In re BJC Healthcare Data Breach Litigation*, No. 2022-CC09492 (Mo. Cir. Ct., St. Louis City)
- *Baldwin, et al. v. National Western Life Insurance Company*, No. 2:21-cv-04066 (W.D. Mo.)

- *Pryor v. Eastern Bank*, No. 1984CV03467-BLS1 (Mass. Sup. Ct., Suffolk Cty.)
- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-01502 (D. Minn.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Weister v. Vantage Point AI, LLC*, No. 21-cv-01250 (M.D. Fla.)
- *Lang v. Colonial Penn Life Insurance Company*, No. 21-cv-00165 (N.D. Fla.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Uhhariet v. MyLife.com, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08229 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Crawford v. FCA US LLC*, No. 20-cv-12341 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC*, No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)
- *Jones v. Monsanto Company*, No. 19-cv-00102 (W.D. Mo.)
- *Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al.*, No. 18-cv-00182 (N.D. Ohio)
- *Rolland v. Spark Energy, LLC*, Case. No. 17-cv-02680 (D.N.J.)
- *Evans v. American Power & Gas, LLC*, No. 17-cv-00515 (S.D. Ohio)
- *Fowler v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 17-cv-02092 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Wilkins v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A., et al.*, No. 14-cv-00190 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Ott v. Mortgage Investors Corporation*, No. 14-cv-00645 (D. Or)
- *Booth v. AppStack, et al.*, No. 13-cv-01533 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Melito v. American Eagle Outfitters, Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02440-VEC (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Spencer v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, No. 14-2-30110-3 SEA (Wa. Sup. Ct., King Cty.)

## MARY C. TURKE

Mary C. Turke is a founding member of Turke & Strauss. Ms. Turke concentrates her practice in civil and commercial litigation. Ms. Turke regularly prosecutes consumer class actions, including those involving violations of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. Mr. Turke has extensive experience representing parties in multi-national disputes in both state and federal courts throughout the United States.

Ms. Turke received her J.D. *cum laude* from the University of Wisconsin Law School, Order of the Coif, in 1996. Prior to forming Turke & Strauss in May 2016, Ms. Turke was the managing partner of the Madison, Wisconsin, office of Michel Best & Friedrich LLP, where she practiced civil litigation. Ms. Turke is an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar. Ms. Turke has repeatedly been named to the annual Wisconsin Super Lawyers list (2011-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine as well as The Best Lawyers in America® list (2013-2020) by Woodward/White, Inc. In 2017, shortly after forming Turke & Strauss, Ms. Turke received the Legal Innovator Award from the Wisconsin State Bar.

Ms. Turke is a member of the Wisconsin State Bar and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

In recent years, Ms. Turke has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Goodell, et al. v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Doe v. Northwestern University*, No. 1:21-cv-01579 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Duerr v. Bradley University*, No. 1:21-cv-01096-SLD-JEH (C.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 1:21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)

- *Powell v. DePaul University*, No. 1:21-cv-03001 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Doe v. Chamberlain University*, No. 2021CH01183 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.)
- *Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology*, No. 1:21-cv-02512 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Harvey v. Resurrection University*, No. 1:21-cv-03203 (N.D. Ill.)

## RAINA C. BORRELLI

Raina C. Borrelli is a partner at Turke & Strauss whose practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including data privacy, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Borrelli has served as lead, co-lead, and class counsel in numerous national class actions, including multi-district litigation. Additionally, Ms. Borrelli has substantial experience leading discovery teams in these complex class action matters, as well as in working with class damages experts and class damages models in consumer protection cases.

Ms. Borrelli received her J.D. *magna cum laude* from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2011. Prior to joining Turke & Strauss, Ms. Borrelli was a partner at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Borrelli is an active member of the Minnesota Women's Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of *pro se* litigants through the *Pro Se* Project. Ms. Borrelli has repeatedly been named to the annual Minnesota "Rising Star" Super Lawyers list (2014-2021) by SuperLawyers Magazine. She has also been repeatedly certified as a North Star Lawyer by the Minnesota State Bar Association (2012-2015; 2018-2020) for providing a minimum of 50 hours of pro bono legal services.

Ms. Borrelli is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.

In recent years, Ms. Borrelli has been appointed to leadership positions in a number of data privacy cases, including *In re Netgain Technology, LLC Consumer Data Breach Litigation*, No. 21-cv-01210 (D. Minn.) (Executive Committee member); *Dusterhoff, et al. v. OneTouchPoint Corp.*, No. 2:22-cv-00882 (E.D. Wisc.) (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee member); *In re Lincare Holdings Inc. Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fl.) (co-lead counsel); *Forslund v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company*, No. 1:22-cv-04260 (N.D. Ill.) (co-lead counsel); and *Medina v. PracticeMax Incorporated*, No. 2:22-cv-0126 (D. Az.) (Executive Leadership Committee member). Ms. Borrelli has been substantially involved in a number of



complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Daum, et al. v. K & B Surgical Center, LLC*, No. 21STCV41347 (Cal. Sup. Ct., Los Angeles Cty.)
- *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp*, No. 3:22-cv-00490 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Benedetto, et al. v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*, No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Reese v. Teen Challenge Training Center, Inc.*, No. 00093 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Lhota v. Michigan Avenue Immediate Care, S.C.*, No. 2022CH06616 (Ill. Cir. Ct., Cook Cty.)
- *Johnson, et al. v. Yuma Regional Medical Center*, No. 2:22-cv-01061 (D. Az.)
- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-01502 (D. Minn.)
- *Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Learned, et al. v. McClatchy Company LLC*, No. 2:21-cv-01960 (E.D. Cal.)
- *Lang v. Colonial Penn Life Insurance Company*, No. 21-cv-00165 (N.D. Fla.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-09203 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *DeBose v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-00209 (D.N.J.)
- *Gbeintor, et al. v. DemandBase, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-09470 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Spindler v. Seamless Contacts Inc.*, No. 4:22-cv-00787 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman, et al. v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 3:21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Brown v. Coty, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-02696 (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Benanav v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-00421 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Spindler, et al. v. General Motors LLC*, No. 3:21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Powell v. DePaul University*, No. 1:21-cv-03001 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Fee v. Illinois Institute of Technology*, No. 1:21-cv-02512 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Harvey v. Resurrection University*, No. 1:21-cv-03203 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re FCA Monostable Gearshifts Litig.*, No. 16-md-02744 (E.D. Mich.)

- *Zeiger v. WellPet LLC*, No. 17-cv-04056 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Wyoming v. Procter & Gamble*, No. 15-cv-2101 (D. Minn.)
- *In re Big Heart Pet Brands Litig.*, No. 18-cv-00861 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Sullivan v. Fluidmaster*, No. 14-cv-05696 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Rice v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc.*, No. 15-cv-00371 (M.D. Pa.)
- *Gorzynski v. Electrolux Home Products, Inc.*, No. 18-cv-10661 (D.N.J.)
- *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods*, No. 18-cv-1736 (C.D. Cal.)
- *Reynolds, et al., v. FCA US, LLC*, No. 19-cv-11745 (E.D. Mich.).

## BRITTANY RESCH

Brittany Resch is an associate at Turke & Strauss. Ms. Resch's practice focuses on complex class action litigation, including antitrust litigation, data-breach, Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), false advertising, and consumer protection cases in both state and federal courts around the country. Ms. Resch has substantial experience managing discovery in these complex class action matters.

Ms. Resch received her J.D. from the University of Minnesota Law School in 2015. Prior to joining Turke & Strauss, Ms. Resch was an associate at Gustafson Gluek, where she successfully prosecuted complex class actions in federal and state courts. Ms. Resch also clerked for the Honorable Richard H. Kyle, Senior United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota. Ms. Resch is an active member of the Minnesota Women's Lawyers and the Federal Bar Association, where she has assisted in the representation of *pro se* litigants through the *Pro Se* Project.

Ms. Resch is a member of the Minnesota State Bar Association and has been admitted to practice in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota and the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

In recent years, Ms. Resch has been substantially involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Benedetto v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*, No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *In re Netgain Technology, LLC Consumer Data Breach Litigation*, No. 21-cv-01210 (D. Minn.)
- *Perkins v. WelldyneRx, LLC*, No. 8:22-cv-02051 (M.D. Fla.)
- *Forslund v. R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company*, No. 1:22-cv-04260 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Corra, et al. v. ACTS Retirement Services, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-02917 (E.D. Pa.)
- *Lamie, et al. v. LendingTree, LLC*, No. 3:22-cv-00307 (W.D.N.C.)
- *In re Lincare Holdings Inc. Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:22-cv-01472 (M.D. Fl.)
- *Benanav, et al. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, LLC*, No. 2:20-cv-00421-RSM (W.D. Wash.)
- *Martinez v. ZoomInfo Technologies Inc.*, No. 21-cv-05725 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-09203 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Boshears v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-01222 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Mackey v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00342 (N.D. Ill.)

- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *DeBose v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-00209 (D.N.J.)
- *Gbeintor, et al. v. DemandBase, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:21-cv-09470 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Spindler v. Seamless Contacts Inc.*, No. 4:22-cv-00787 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman, et al. v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 3:21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kis v. Cognism Inc.*, No. 4:22-cv-05322 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Uhhariet v. MyLife.com, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08229 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Brown v. Coty, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-02696 (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Emmrich v. General Motors LLC*, No. 21-cv-05990 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Spindler v. General Motors LLC*, No. 21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Goodell v. Van Tuyl Group, LLC*, No. 20-cv-01657 (D. Az.)
- *Learned, et al. v. McClatchy Company LLC*, No. 2:21-cv-01960 (E.D. Cal.)
- *Clemens v. O'Neil Insurance Company, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-00678 (E.D. Mo.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus University, et al.*, No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Bridges v. Respondus University, et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-01785 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (JRT/KMM) (D. Minn.)
- *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation*, No. 16-cv-08637 (N.D. Ill.)
- *In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litigation*, No. 15-md-02626 (M.D. Fla.)
- *In re Pork Antitrust Litigation*, No. 21-md-02998 (D. Minn.)
- *In re DPP Beef Litigation*,
- *In re Asacol Antitrust Litigation*, No. 15-cv-12730 (D. Mass.)
- *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation*, No. 12-md-02311 (E.D. Mich.)

## ALEX S. PHILLIPS

Alex Phillips is an associate at Turke & Strauss. Mr. Phillips concentrates his practice in complex class action litigation and commercial litigation. He has represented both plaintiffs and defendants in high stakes litigation. Mr. Phillips has successfully obtained trial verdicts on behalf of his clients as well as negotiated numerous high-value settlements.

Mr. Phillips received his J.D. from the University of Wisconsin School of Law in 2017 and has been an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar as well as the Dane, Jefferson, and Dodge County Bar Associations.

In recent years, Mr. Phillips has been involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Benedetto v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority*, No. 210201425 (C.C.P. Phila.)
- *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp*, No. 3:22-cv-00490 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Koeller, et al. v. Numrich Gun Parts Corporation*, No. 1:22-cv-00675 (S.D.N.Y.)
- *Mayhood v. Wilkins Recreational Vehicles, Inc.*, No. E2022-0701 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Steuben Cty.)
- *Perkins v. WelldyneRx, LLC*, No. 8:22-cv-02051 (M.D. Fla.)
- *Batis v. Dun & Bradstreet Holdings, Inc.*, No. 3:22-cv-09124 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Sessa v. Ancestry.com Operations Inc., et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02292 (D. Nev.)
- *Ambramson v. First American Home Warranty Corporation*, No. 2:22-cv-01003 (W.D. Pa.)
- *DeVivo v. Sovereign Lending Group Incorporated*, No. 3:22-cv-05254 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Murray, et al. v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 1:19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Spindler v. General Motors LLC*, No. 21-cv-09311 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Kellman v. Spokeo, Inc.*, No. 21-cv-08976 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Dickson v. Direct Energy, LP, et al.*, No. 18-cv-00182 (N.D. Ohio)
- *Benanav. v. Healthy Paws Pet Insurance, LLC*, No. 20-cv-00421 (W.D. Wash.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC, et al.*, No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)

## ZOG BEGOLLI

Zog Begolli is an associate at Turke & Strauss. Mr. Begolli concentrates his practice in complex class action litigation, with an emphasis on cases involving data privacy, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, various states' consumer protection acts, and financial industry regulations.

Mr. Begolli received his J.D. from the University of Wisconsin School of Law in 2017 and is an active member of the Wisconsin State Bar. During law school, Mr. Begolli was a member of the University of Wisconsin Law and Entrepreneurship Clinic, which provides legal services to nascent entrepreneurs and early stage companies.

In recent years, Mr. Begolli has been actively involved in a number of complex class action matters in state and federal courts including:

- *Baldwin v. Miracle-Ear, Inc.*, No. 20-cv-01502 (JRT/HB) (D. Minn.)
- *Murray v. Grocery Delivery E-Services USA Inc. d/b/a Hello Fresh*, No. 19-cv-12608 (D. Mass.)
- *Learned, et al. v. McClatchy Company LLC*, No. 2:21-cv-01960 (E.D. Cal.)
- *Patterson v. Respondus, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07692 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Grogan v. McGrath RentCorp*, No. 3:22-cv-00490 (N.D. Cal.)
- *In re Netgain Technology, LLC Consumer Data Breach Litigation*, No. 21-cv-01210 (D. Minn.)
- *Reetz v. Advocate Aurora Health, Inc.*, No. 20CV2361 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Branch 22, Milwaukee Cty.)
- *Goetz v. Benefit Recovery Specialists, Inc.*, No. 2020CV000550 (Wis. Cir. Ct., Walworth Cty.)
- *Reese v. Teen Challenge Training Center, Inc.*, No. 00093 (Philadelphia Ct. Common Pleas)
- *Abraham, et al. v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 3:20-cv-09203 (N.D. Cal.)
- *Loendorf v. PeopleConnect, Inc.*, No. 1:22-cv-00051 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Braundmeier v. Ancestry.com Operations, Inc.*, No. 1:20-cv-07390 (N.D. Ill.)
- *Crawford, et al. v. FCA US LLC*, No. 20-cv-12341 (E.D. Mich.)
- *Hudock v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-1220 (D. Minn.)
- *Klaehn, et al. v. Cali Bamboo, LLC, et al.*, No. 19-cv-01498 (S.D. Cal.)
- *Fowler, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 17-cv-02092 (N.D. Cal.)