

EXHIBIT A

JOINT DECLARATION OF CLASS COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' APPLICATION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND CLASS REPRESENTATIVE AWARDS

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

In Re: Group Health Plan Litigation

Case No. 23-cv-00267 (JWB/DJF)

**JOINT DECLARATION OF CLASS
COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' APPLICATION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND CLASS
REPRESENTATIVE AWARDS**

We, Class Counsel, declare and state that:

1. We are Class Counsel¹ for the conditionally certified Settlement Class. We submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Application for Attorneys' Fees and Class Representative Awards. Unless otherwise noted, we have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and could and would testify competently to them if called upon to do so.

CLASS COUNSEL EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE

2. Counsel for both sides have significant experience in consumer class-action litigation involving data privacy, including those involving data breaches. Class Counsel are highly experienced in consumer class action litigation, as demonstrated by their firm resumes, and have brought that significant experience to bear in litigating and settling this case. See Class Counsel resumes attached hereto as **Exhibits 1 and 2**.

¹ The capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as those defined in Section II of the Settlement Agreement.

3. Class Counsel collectively have decades of experience litigating consumer class actions, including many involving data breaches, deceptive practices, breach of contract, and other types of allegedly wrongful conduct.

4. Class Counsel have emerged as leaders in nationwide litigation against institutions over data breaches and improper storage and protection of sensitive personal data.

SETTLEMENT

5. This Action, like similar data breaches, presents novel claims presenting a myriad of risks, with complex issues of law and fact.

6. Under the Settlement, Defendants will provide a \$6,000,000.00 Settlement Fund, which represents a significant portion of the estimated class wide damages should Plaintiffs have prevailed on every issue at class certification, trial, and on appeal.

7. Based on their ample experience in similar cases, Class Counsel endorse the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Settlement structure is fair and the allocation and distribution plan is reasonable.

8. The amount of the Settlement is well within the range of reasonableness for data breaches of this size and for the type of information at issue. If approved, the Settlement will provide certain, substantial, and immediate relief to the Settlement Class.

9. There was a risk Plaintiffs' claims would not have survived, or survived in full, on a class-wide basis after a motion to dismiss, motion for summary judgment, and/or Daubert motions on damages methodologies, among other motions. Indeed, the damages

methodologies, while theoretically sound in Plaintiffs' view, remain largely untested in disputed class certification setting and unproven in front of a jury.

10. Time was not on the Settlement Class members' side. While the Parties would be fighting through the foregoing issues, potentially for years to come, the Settlement Class members would be exposed to the ongoing risk of identity theft without the protection of credit monitoring offered by the instant Settlement. Thus, a reasonable settlement is more practical than facing the risks of no recovery at all after years of litigation.

11. In contrast to the risk, cost, and delay posed by proceeding to trial, if it is approved, the Settlement will provide certain, substantial, and immediate relief to the Settlement Class. It ensures that Settlement Class Members with Valid Claims will receive guaranteed compensation now, provides Settlement Class Members with access to valuable and useful Credit Monitoring services and other benefits that may not have been available at trial, and regarding security measures to protect Settlement Class Member's data that may remain with the company. Based on the foregoing, it is Class Counsel's well-informed opinion that, given the uncertainty and further substantial risk and expense of pursuing the Action through contested class certification proceedings, trial and appeal, the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. Plaintiffs likewise believe the Settlement is favorable to their fellow Settlement Class members. Accordingly, the substantial costs, risk, and delay of a trial and appeal support a finding that the proposed Settlement is adequate.

12. Class Counsel needed a high degree of skill, both to settle the matter and to

be prepared to litigate the merits through any potential motion practice, trial, and appeal. Class Counsel's experience handling the most prominent data breach cases and their understanding of the related legal issues from those cases helped them successfully and efficiently prosecute this Action and obtain a substantial result for the Settlement Class. The value achieved through the Settlement is guaranteed, whereas the chances of prevailing on the merits are uncertain. Plaintiffs would face more complex motions to dismiss, class certification, and merits issues going forward were it not for the Settlement.

13. In the event litigation were to continue, Defendants would vigorously defend the case, and the litigation could potentially span for years. Considering all of this, Plaintiffs' likelihood of success at trial is far from certain, and the recovery here is more than adequate under the circumstances.

14. Class Counsel have expended a great deal of time, effort, and expense investigating, litigating, and resolving the Action.

15. Prior to the filing of the Consolidated Class Action Complaint, Class Counsel's work in this matter included investigating the cause and effects of the Facebook Tracking Pixel; interviewing potential clients; evaluating the potential class representatives; contributing to the evaluation of the merits of the case before filing the initial complaints; conducting legal research; conducting extensive research into the Facebook Tracking Pixel and their causes and effects, including conducting further extensive research into cybersecurity practices and standards across similar platforms and industries; and drafting and filing the initial complaints and Consolidated Complaint.

16. After the filing of the Consolidated Class Action Complaint, Class Counsel's work in this matter included briefing and overcoming Defendant's Motion to Dismiss; preparing and exchanging written discovery, including interrogatories and requests for production, a comprehensive Rule 30(b)(6) notice of deposition topics, an extensive protocol for discovery involving electronically stored information, and a protective order; evaluating and conferring with experts in the tracking pixel industry; conducting informal discovery regarding the Facebook Tracking Pixel; reviewing Defendants' documents and information produced prior to the mediation and analyzing those documents and information; drafting a detailed settlement brief, preparing for and participating in a formal settlement conference presided over by Honorable Dulce W. Foster.

17. Following the settlement in principle, Class Counsel's work in this matter included drafting the Settlement Agreement, the relevant notices of Settlement, the Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval, and the Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, and the instant Application for Attorneys' Fees and Class Representative Awards; communicating with defense counsel and the Settlement Administrator on a regular basis; updating and handling questions from our proposed Class Representatives; overseeing the launch and completion of the Notice Program with substantial interaction with the Settlement Administrator; and overseeing the Claim process. Class Counsel have also conferred with our colleagues and with each other regarding strategy and case status, while being mindful to avoid duplicative efforts within our Firms.

18. After the Parties exchanged information sufficient to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their positions, Class Counsel provided settlement conference documents to the Honorable Magistrate Judge Foster, and they advocated zealously during the full-day negotiation to reach the Settlement presently before the Court.

19. In considering and agreeing to settlement, Class Counsel carefully considered a range of additional risks, including: (1) numerous merits issues remained uncertain; (2) the challenges associated with proving damages on a class-wide basis; (3) further developments in the law or the factual record of the case that could undermine Plaintiff's claims; (5) the risk that a jury might award lower damages than what is provided by the Settlement Agreement or no damages at all; (6) the risk both sides faced that a jury could react unfavorably to the evidence presented; and (7) the uncertainties, risks, expense, and significant delays associated with any appeal that would inevitably be pursued following trial and entry of final judgment.

20. Continuing through today, we have continued to work with Defendants and the Settlement Administrator regarding administration and processing of the claims, as well as answering Settlement Class members' questions about the Settlement and corresponding Claims process. Based on our past experience, we and our Firms expect to spend at least another 40 hours seeking final approval, defending the Settlement from any potential objections, and supervising Claims administration and the distribution of the Settlement Fund.

21. Our firms prosecuted this Action on a purely contingent basis. As such, Class Counsel assumed a significant risk of nonpayment or underpayment.

22. This Action has required us and other attorneys at our firms and additional Plaintiffs' counsel to spend time that could have been spent on other matters. At various times during the litigation of this Action, significant amounts of our time have been consumed.

23. Because Class Counsel undertook representation of this matter on a contingency-fee basis, we shouldered the risk of expending substantial costs and time in litigating the Action without any monetary gain in the event of an adverse judgment.

24. We devoted a significant amount of time to prosecuting Plaintiffs' claims efficiently and effectively to ensure that the best possible outcome for the Settlement Class could be achieved. As a result, Settlement Class Counsel's fee request is reasonable.

25. Class Counsel is not aware of other pending individual litigation against Defendants regarding the practices at issue in this Action.

THE REQUESTED ATTORNEYS' FEE IS REASONABLE

26. Plaintiffs request an attorneys' fee award of \$2,000,000.00, which represents one third of the total Settlement Fund. Given the attorneys' fee award sought and the relatively minimal expenses incurred, Class Counsel waives any right to recovery of costs under the Settlement.

27. Class Counsel have not been paid for their extensive efforts in securing the Settlement benefits for the Settlement Class and has not been reimbursed for litigation costs and expenses incurred.

28. Class Counsel, along with the law firms of Zimmerman Reed LLP; and Gustafson Gluek PLLC; Markovits, Stock & DeMarco, LLC; The Lyon Firm; Barrack

Rodos & Bacine; Emerson Firm, PLLC; and Almaeda Law Group worked cohesively to litigate this matter on behalf of the entire class.

29. Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis unaware if they were going to get paid for their services and costs advanced. Class Counsel assumed the risk of this engagement and worked diligently and efficiently to obtain a substantial result.

30. The retention agreements with the Plaintiffs in this Action were contingent fee agreements. No payment of attorneys' fees would occur in this case but for an attorneys' fee award in an individual or class settlement. Class Counsel took on this case with no guarantee they would receive any compensation for their work. Public interest is served by rewarding attorneys who assume representation on a contingent basis with an enhanced fee to compensate them for the risk that might be paid nothing at all for their work. This practice encourages attorneys to assume this risk and allows plaintiffs who would otherwise not be able to hire an attorney to obtain competent counsel.

31. Class Counsel's opportunity cost in pressing the instant litigation was the lost opportunity to pursue other matters while pursuing this Action.

32. As further detailed herein, as of May 20, 2025, Class Counsel has incurred 1,495.40 hours and a total lodestar in this case of \$1,154,201.70, broken down by firm as follows: ²

a. Chestnut & Cambronne, PA - \$445,314.00

² The specific breakdown by each firm is contained in **Exhibit B** and the actions performed are coded per the same category codes used in *Reynolds v. Concordia Univ., St. Paul*, No. CV 21-2560 (JWB/DTS).

- b. Milberg Coleman Bryson – \$ 339,919.70
- c. Zimmerman Reed LLP – \$44,276.50
- d. Gustafson Gluek, PLLC – \$28,700.00
- e. Markovits, Stock & DeMarco, LLC – \$119,308.00
- f. The Lyon Firm – \$41,653.50
- g. Barrack Rodos Bacine – \$52,585.50
- h. Emerson Law Firm – \$21,147.00
- i. Almaeda Law Group – \$61,297.50

33. The fee request of one third of the Settlement Fund results in a lodestar multiplier of 1.73.

34. The rates of Class Counsel and the attorneys that worked on this case ranged from ranged from paralegals at \$190.00/hour, \$375.00/hour (associate attorney), to \$1,141.00/hour (senior partner).

35. Class Counsel routinely survey hourly rates charged by lawyers around the country in published surveys and review continuously, as part of our continuing education, opinions rendered by courts on attorneys' fee requests. Based upon our research, our rates are within the range of lawyers with our level of experience practicing in this area of law. Moreover, they are capped per the rates submitted in the June 6, 2023 letter to the Court.

36. Moreover, based on information provided by Claims Administrator Atticus Administration, the Class's reaction to the fee request has been overwhelmingly positive. No class member has objected on the basis of attorneys' fees and service award and only 67 class members have requested exclusion.

THE SERVICE AWARDS ARE REASONABLE

37. The Settlement Agreement also calls for reasonable service awards to Plaintiffs in the amount of \$2,500.00 each, subject to approval of the Court, in addition to any benefits provided to Settlement Class Members. The Service Awards are meant to recognize Plaintiffs for their efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, including assisting in the investigation of the case, maintaining contact with Class Counsel, reviewing the pleadings, answering Class Counsel's many questions, communicating with Class Counsel during and following the Settlement negotiations, and reviewing the terms of the Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs worked extensively with Class Counsel to respond to numerous inquiries regarding their individual facts and circumstances as the litigation proceeded, including extensive investigation into communications to and from Defendant's Website to their personal Facebook account. They responded to discovery and also provided information relevant to the prosecution of the lawsuit. They actively monitored the litigation through continuous communication with Class Counsel and were available for mediation and subsequent settlement discussions. Plaintiffs also put their personal reputations at risk by being named in the Consolidated Complaint, putting themselves forward for public scrutiny. Plaintiffs were not promised a service award, nor did they condition their representation on the expectation thereof.

38. We strongly believe that the Settlement is favorable for the Settlement Class. The Settlement addresses the types of injury and repercussions sustained by Settlement Class Members in the wake of the Facebook Tracking Pixel. The Settlement was achieved in a case that was both risky and complex. In the opinion of the undersigned, the settlement

is fair, reasonable, adequate, and the request for attorneys' fees and costs and Service Awards should be granted.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true of my own personal knowledge. Executed in Minneapolis, Minnesota this 27th day of May, 2025.

/s/Bryan L. Bleichner
BRYAN L. BLEICHNER

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true of my own personal knowledge. Executed in Chicago, Illinois this 27th day of May, 2025.

/s/Gary M. Klinger
Gary M. Klinger

Exhibit 1



CHESTNUT CAMBRONNE FIRM RESUME

For over 50 years, Chestnut Cambronne PA has been representing clients in class action litigation both in the Twin Cities area and at a national level. Since its inception, Chestnut Cambronne has been engaged in complex litigation throughout the country and has successfully both prosecuted and defended class litigation addressing substantive legal questions in the fields of data security breaches, securities, ERISA, banking, antitrust, and consumer protection law. Representative class action cases in which the firm and its members have been involved with over the past several years include:

In Re: Change Healthcare, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig., No. 24-md-03108 (D. Minn.). A pending multi-district class action against Change Healthcare and United Healthcare, Inc. This is one of the biggest data breaches in United States history. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel over the patient track.

In re: Berry, Dunn, McNeil & Parker Data Security Incident Litigation, Case No. 2:24-cv-00146 (D. Me.). A pending class action against Berry, Dunn, McNeil & Parker, LLC, a Maine-based accounting firm, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Signature Performance, Case No. 8:24-cv-00252-BCB-RCC (D. Neb.). A pending class action against Signature performance, a Nebraska-based health consulting firm, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Loancare Data Breach Litigation, Case No. 3:23-cv-01508 (M.D. Fla.). A pending class action against Loancare, Inc., a Florida-based mortgage provider, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re ESO Solutions, Inc. Data Breach Litigation, Case No. 1:23-cv-01557 (W.D. Tex.). A pending class action against ESO Solutions, Inc., a Texas-based hospital software solutions provider, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Cahill v. Memorial Heart Institute, LLC, Case No. 1:23-cv-168 (E.D. Tenn.). A pending class action against Memorial Heart Institute, a Tennessee-based healthcare network, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Clauson v. Arrowhead Regional Computing Consortium, Case No. 24-cv-131 (D. Minn.). A pending class action against Arrowhead Regional Computing Consortium, a Minnesota-based payroll service provider. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Peoples Bank, as a Successor to Limestone Bank, Data Breach Litig., No. 2023-cv-03043 (S.D. Ohio). A pending class action against Peoples Bank, an Ohio-headquartered bank, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Weirton Medical Center Data Breach Litigation, No. 5:24-cv-61 (N.D.W.Va.). A pending class action against Weirton Medical Center, a West Virginia-based hospital network, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Cinfed Data Breach Litigation, No. 23-cv-00776 (S.D. Ohio). A pending class action against Cinfed Credit Union, a Cincinnati-based credit union, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re R&B Corporation of Virginia d/b/a Credit Control Corporation, Case No. 4:23-cv-00066-JKW-RJK (E.D. Va.). A pending class action against a R&B Corporation of Virginia, a Virginia-based collections company, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re: Group Health Plan Litigation, Case No. 23-cv-00267 (D. Minn.). A pending class action against Group Health Plain, a Minnesota-based healthcare network, alleging wiretapping claims stemming from a Facebook pixel. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Hightower v. Receivables Performance Management, LLC, No. 2:22-cv-01683 (W.D. Wash.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Receivables Performance Management, LLC, a Washington-based debt collection company, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re OrthoAlaska Data Breach Litigation, No. 3:23-cv-00242 (D. Alaska). A pending class action against OrthoAlaska, an Alaska-based orthopedic clinic, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Regents of the University of Minnesota Data Litigation, Case No. 27-cv-23-14056 (Hennepin County, Minnesota). A pending class action against the University of Minnesota, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Interim Plaintiffs' Steering Committee.

In re DISH Network Data Breach Security Litigation, Case No. 1:23-cv-01168 (D.Col.). A pending class action against DISH Network, a Colorado-based cable company, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Whitworth Data Breach Security Litigation, Case No. 2:23-cv-00179-SAB (E.D. Wash.). A pending class action against Whitworth University, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Rasmussen, et al., v. Uintah Health Care Basin, 2:23-cv-0322 (Dt. Ut.). A pending class action on behalf of patients against healthcare network Uintah Health Care Basin, a Utah-based healthcare network, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Johnson v. Yuma Regional Medical Center, No. 2:22-cv-01061 (D. Ariz.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Yuma Regional Medical Center, an Arizona healthcare network, and related entities alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Anderson v. Fortra LLC, No. 23-cv-00533 (D. Minn.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Fortra LLC, a cybersecurity vendor, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In Re: Netgain Technology, LLC, Consumer Data Breach Litigation, No. 21-cv-1210-SRN-LIB (D. Minn.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Netgain Technology alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Hale, et al., v. ARcare, Inc., No. 3:22-cv-00117 (E.D. Ark.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against ARcare, an Arkansas healthcare network, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re CCM Health Data Security Litigation, Case No. 12-cv-24-169 (Chippewa County). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of patients against CCM Health, a Minnesota-based healthcare network, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Tift Regional Health System, Inc. Data Breach Litig., No. 2023cv0313 (Tift County, Georgia). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of patients against Tift Regional Health System, a Georgia-based healthcare network, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Rodriguez v. Mena Regional Hospital Commission d/b/a Mena Regional Health System, No. 2:23-cv-2002 (W.D. Ark.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class action on behalf of medical patients against Mena Regional hospital Commission, an Arkansas Healthcare Network alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

DeSue v. 20/20 Eye Care Network, Inc., No. 21-cv-61275-RAR (S.D. Fla.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against 20/20 Eye Care Network alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Baker v. Parkmobile, LLC, No. 21-cv-2181-SCJ (N.D. Ga.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Parkmobile, LLC alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Interim Plaintiffs' Steering Committee.

Garrett v. Herff Jones, LLC, No. 21-cv-01329-TWP-DLP (S.D. Ind.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Herff Jones alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re EyeMed Vision Care, LLC Data Security Breach Litigation, No. 21-cv-00036-DRC (S.D. Ohio). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against EyeMed alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Luxottica of America, Inc. Data Security Breach Litigation, No. 20-cv-00908-MRB (S.D. Ohio). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Luxottica alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Greenstate Credit Union v. Hy-Vee, Inc., No. 20-cv-00621-DSD-DTS (D. Minn.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against Hy-Vee alleging negligence and violations of the Minnesota Plastic Card Security Act in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner served as co-counsel.

Village Bank v. Caribou Coffee Company, Inc., No. 19-cv-01640-JNE-HB (D. Minn.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against Hy-Vee alleging negligence and violations of the Minnesota Plastic Card Security Act in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner served as court appointed settlement class counsel.

In re WaWa, Inc. Data Security Litig., No. 19-cv-6019-GEKP (E.D. Pa.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against WaWa, Inc. alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner serves on the Financial Institution Track Defendant Discovery and ESI Committee

In re: Equifax, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation, No. 17-md-2800-TWT (N.D. Ga.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against Equifax alleging negligence and other claims in a data security

breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Financial Institution Plaintiffs' Steering Committee.

Midwest Am. Fed. Credit Union v. Arby's Rest. Grp. Inc., No. 17-cv-00514-AT (N.D. Ga.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against Arby's alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Interim Plaintiffs' Executive Committee.

Bellwether Community Credit Union v. Chipotle Mexican Grill, Inc., No. 17-cv-1102 (D. Colo.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against Chipotle alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to Chair of the Executive Committee.

First Choice Fed. Credit Union et al. v. The Wendy's Company et al., No. 2:16-cv-00506 (W.D. Pa.). A resolved class action on behalf of a putative class of financial institutions against Wendy's alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Executive Committee.

In re: The Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation, No. 1:14-md-02583 (TWT) (N.D. Ga.). This is a resolved putative class action against The Home Depot alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach affecting 56 million consumers and tens of thousands of financial institutions. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Financial Institution Plaintiffs' Steering Committee.

In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation, No. 0:14-md-02522 (PAM/JJK) (D. Minn. December 26, 2013). This is a settled class action against Target Corporation alleging negligence and violations of the Minnesota Plastic Card Security Act in a data security breach affecting 70 million consumers and tens of thousands of financial institutions. Chestnut Cambronne served as Co-Lead Counsel for the Financial Institution Class and Coordinating Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs.

In re Pawn America Consumer Data Breach Litigation, No. 21-cv-2544-PJS-HB (D. Minn.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Pawn America and related entities alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Wasserstrom Holdings, Inc., Data Breach Litigation, Case No. 3:23-cv-2424 (S.D. Ohio). A pending class action against Wasserstrom Holdings, Inc., an Ohio-based restaurant supplier, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Kobor v. Skidmore College, No. 1:23-cv-01392 (N.D.N.Y.). A pending class action against Skidmore College, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

In re Precision Imagining, No. 16-2023-CA-00931 (Duval County, Florida). A pending class action against Precision Imagining, a Florida-based imagining company, alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

Phillips v. Bay Bridge Administrators, LLC, No. 1:23-cv-022 (W.D. Tex.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against an insurance administrator alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Philip J. Krzeski was court appointed as Executive Committee Counsel.

Lutz v. Electromed, Inc., No. 21-cv-2198-SRN-DTS (D. Minn.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Electromed alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach. Chestnut Cambronne prosecuted the matter with two additional plaintiffs' law firms.

Walker v. Nautilus, Inc., No. 20-cv-3414-EAS-EPD (S.D. Ohio). A settled consumer protection class action against Nautilus, Inc. alleging Defendant materially misrepresented the horsepower produced by the electric motors in its treadmills. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' counsel.

In re DPP Beef Litig., No. 20-cv-1319-JRT/HB (D. Minn.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of direct purchasers against beef product producers alleging claims of price fixing. Chestnut Cambronne serves as Plaintiffs' Counsel.

Alicia Schaeffer v. Life Time Fitness, Inc. et al., No. 27-cv-20-10513 (Minn. 2020). A class action on behalf of a putative class of group fitness instructors against Life Time Fitness, Inc. alleging Defendants refused to compensate Plaintiff and class members for work performed for their employer's benefit. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' counsel.

Teeda Barclay v. Icon Health & Fitness, Inc., et al., No. 19-cv-02970-ECT-DTS (D. Minn.). A pending consumer protection class action against Icon Health & Fitness and NordicTrack alleging Defendants materially misrepresented the horsepower produced by the electric motors in its treadmills. Bryan L. Bleichner currently serves as Plaintiffs' counsel.

In re Resideo Technologies, Inc. Securities Litig., No. 19-cv-02863-WMW-KMM (D. Minn.). A settled shareholder class action against Resideo and its directors and officers for failing to disclose material information about its spin-off from Honeywell. Chestnut Cambronne served as liaison counsel on this matter.

Delamarter v. Supercuts, Inc., No. 19-3158-DSD-TNL (D. Minn.). A settled class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Supercuts alleging violations of the Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act. Bryan L. Bleichner served as Plaintiff's Counsel.

Kenneth Peterson v. JBS USA Food Company Holdings, et al., No. 19-cv-1129-JRT-HB (D. Minn.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of indirect purchasers against beef product producers alleging claims of price fixing. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' Counsel.

In re: FedLoan Student Loan Servicing Litigation, No. 2:18-md-02833-CDJ (E.D. Pa.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of student loan borrowers against FedLoan Servicing / Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency alleging consumer fraud violations and other claims. Bryan L. Bleichner was court appointed to the Executive Committee.

ASEA/AFSCME Local 52 Health Benefits Trust v. St. Jude Medical, LLC, et al., No. 18-cv-02124-DSD-HB (D. Minn.). A class action on behalf of a putative class of third party health benefits payors against St. Jude Medical and Abbott Laboratories alleging product liability and other claims. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' Counsel.

In Re Pork Antitrust Litigation, No. 18-cv-1776-JRT-HB (D. Minn.). A pending class action on behalf of a putative class of direct purchasers against pork product producers alleging claims of price fixing. Chestnut Cambronne currently serves as Plaintiffs' Counsel.

James Bruner, et al. v. Polaris Industries Inc. et al., No. 18-cv-00939-WMW-DTS (D. Minn.). A class action on behalf of a putative class of consumers against Polaris

Industries alleging product liability claims. Chestnut Cambronne was court appointed as Plaintiffs' Liaison Counsel.

Marie Travis v. Navient Corp. et al., No. 17-cv-04885-JFB-GRB (E.D.N.Y.). A class action on behalf of a putative class of student loan borrowers against Navient Corp. alleging consumer fraud act violations and other claims. Bryan L. Bleichner served as Plaintiffs' Counsel.

Gordon v. Amadeus IT Group, S.A., No. 1:15-cv-05457 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2015). A resolved putative class action alleging collusion and anticompetitive behavior among the companies that provide the systems used by travel agents to link to airline flight and fare information known as global distribution systems (GDS). Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' Counsel in this litigation.

In re: Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litigation, No. 5:15-md-02617 (LHK) (N.D. Cal. March 13, 2015). A settled class action against Anthem alleging negligence and other claims in a data security breach affecting in excess of 80 million consumers. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' Counsel in the litigation.

Gassoway v. Benchmark Energy Transport Services, Inc., (S.D. Tex. February 23, 2015). A certified and settled class action case alleging Benchmark Energy Transport Services deducted and withheld an undisclosed surcharge from trucking owner-operators in violation of Federal Regulations. Chestnut Cambronne served as co-lead counsel for the certified class.

Christian v. National Hockey League, No. 0:14-md-02551 (SRN/JSM) (D. Minn. April 15, 2014). Chestnut Cambronne was court appointed to the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee.

Puerta v. Tile Shop Holdings, Inc., No. 0:14-cv-00786 (ADM/TNL) (D. Minn. March 21, 2014). A settled shareholder class action against Tile Shop Holdings and its directors and officers for failing to disclose material information about a supplier relationship. Chestnut Cambronne served as liaison counsel on this matter.

In re: Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litig., No. 2:13-md-2437; 939 F. Supp. 2d 1371 (E.D. Pa. 2013). A settled antitrust putative class action against domestic manufacturers of drywall alleging price-fixing. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' Counsel in this matter.

Lucas v. SCANA Energy Marketing, Inc., No. 1:12-cv-02356 (SCJ) (N.D. Ga. Feb. 8, 2013). A settled consumer protection class action in which Chestnut Cambronne served as co-lead counsel.

In re: Imprelis Herbicide Mktg., Sales Practices and Products Liability Litig., No. 2:11-md-02284 (GP) (E.D. Pa. Oct. 20, 2011). This is a settled products liability class action against the manufacturer of Imprelis Herbicide, DuPont. The class recovered over \$378 million to date. Chestnut Cambronne served as Plaintiffs' Counsel.

Minneapolis Firefighters' Relief Ass'n v. Medtronic, Inc., No. 08-6324 (PAM/AJB) (D. Minn. 2009); 618 F. Supp. 1016 (D. Minn. 2009); 278 F.R.D. 454 (D. Minn. 2011). This is a settled securities fraud class action in which Chestnut Cambronne was lead and liaison counsel. The class recovered \$80 million.

In re: American Express Anti-Steering Rules Antitrust Litig. (No. II), MDL No. 2221, 764 F. Supp. 2d 1343 (E.D.N.Y. 2010). This is a settled class action alleging that Defendant American Express' policies prohibiting merchants from offering customers incentives to use a particular card or type of payment violated antitrust laws. The case is currently under appellate review before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Mooney v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of North America, No. 06-545 (ADM/FLN); 2010 WL 419962 (D. Minn. Jan. 29, 2010). This was a certified class action in which Chestnut Cambronne was co-lead counsel seeking damages of \$2 billion. After a three-week trial, the jury concluded Allianz made false and misleading statements intentionally in violation of the statute, but did not award damages.

In re United Healthcare, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litig., 631 F.3d 913 (8th Cir. 2011), *affirming* 631 F. Supp. 2d 1151 (D. Minn. 2009). This is a settled shareholder derivative case involving the backdating of stock options. Chestnut Cambronne served as lead counsel and recovered on behalf of the company a settlement valued at \$922 million. Today, it remains the largest recovery in a shareholder derivative case in United States history.

San Francisco Health Plan v. McKesson Corp., No. 1:08-cv-10843 (D. Mass. May 20, 2008). A settled RICO and Clayton Act class action challenging the pricing of pharmaceutical drugs. The class recovered \$82 million. Chestnut Cambronne represented Plaintiff Anoka County.

In re MoneyGram Int'l, Inc. Securities Litig., No. 08-cv-883 (DSD/JJG) (D. Minn. July 22, 2008); 626 F. Supp. 2d 947 (D. Minn. 2009). This is a settled securities fraud class action in which Chestnut Cambronne was co-lead counsel and recovered \$80 million for the class.

Avritt v. Reliastar Life Ins. Co., No. 0:07-cv-01817 (JNE/JJG) (D. Minn. April 9, 2007). This is a settled class action that alleged Defendant defrauded consumers in the sale of its Fixed Annuities. Chestnut Cambronne served as local counsel and recovered \$31 million for the class.

In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litig., No. 1:06-md-01775 (JG/VVP) (E.D.N.Y. June 27, 2006). This is a settled class action alleging a price-fixing conspiracy by dozens of international air cargo carriers. Over \$500 million was recovered for the class.

In re: Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig., MDL No. 1720, 398 F. Supp. 2d 1356 (E.D.N.Y. 2005). A settled class action alleging that the rules Defendants Visa and MasterCard impose upon merchants violate antitrust laws.

In re Xcel Energy, Inc. Sec, Derivative & "ERISA" Litig., 364 F. Supp. 980, 995-996 (D. Minn. 2005); *In re Xcel Energy Securities, Derivative & "ERISA" Litigation*, 286 F. Supp. 2d 1047 (D. Minn. 2003). This was a securities fraud class action in which Chestnut Cambronne was co-lead counsel. The class recovered \$80 million.

Cooper v. Miller, Johnson, Steichen & Kinnard, No. 0:02-cv-01236 (RHK/AJB) (D. Minn. June 5, 2002) This is a settled securities fraud class action in which Chestnut Cambronne served as lead counsel. The class recovered \$5.6 million.

In Re E.W. Blanch Holdings, Inc. Securities Litig., No. 0:01-cv-00258 (JNE/JGL) (D. Minn. Feb. 12, 2001) This is a settled securities fraud class action in which Chestnut Cambronne served as lead counsel. The class recovered \$20 million.

In re Blue Cross Subscriber Litig., No. 19-C3-98-7780 (Minn. Dist. Ct. 1st Dist.) This was a consumer protection class action on behalf of Blue Cross subscribers. Over \$41 million was recovered for Blue Cross policy holders. Chestnut Cambronne served as lead counsel.

Alford v. Mego Mortgage Home Loan Owner Trust 1997-1; Mazur v. Empire Funding Home Loan Owner Trust 1997-1; and Banks, et al. v. FirstPlus Home Loan Trust 1996-

2 (Minn. Dist. Ct. 4th Dist.). These are settled consumer-lending cases in which Chestnut Cambronne acted as co-lead counsel.

Chestnut Cambronne also has experience successfully defending class litigation. *See, e.g., In re K-Tel*, 300 F.3d 881 (8th Cir. 2002); *Wylde v. Champps of New Brighton*, No. 10-cv-4953 (ADM/JJK) (D. Minn. 2011); *Johnson v. BP America, Inc.* No. 12-cv-00417 (RHK/JSM) (D. Minn. 2012). Not only do the results obtained in the above cases attest to the skill and competence of Chestnut Cambronne lawyers in shareholder litigation, various courts have publicly commended Chestnut Cambronne for its efforts:

Plaintiffs' co-lead counsel have significant experience in representing shareholders and shareholder classes in federal securities actions around the country and in this district in particular. Counsel-both the lawyers representing lead plaintiffs and defendants-conducted themselves in an exemplary manner. ... Thus, the effort of counsel in efficiently bringing this case to fair, reasonable and adequate resolution is the best indicator of the experience and ability of the attorneys involved, and this factor supports the court's award of 25%.

In re Xcel Energy, Inc. Sec. Derivative & "ERISA" Litig, 364 F. Supp. 980, 995 (D. Minn. 2005).

Exhibit 2



FIRM RESUME /
BIOGRAPHY OF GARY M. KLINGER



Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman (“Milberg”) is an AV-rated international law firm with more than 100 attorneys and offices across the United States, the European Union, and South America. Combining decades of experience, Milberg was established through the merger of Milberg Phillips Grossman LLP, Sanders Phillips Grossman LLC, Greg Coleman Law PC, and Whitfield Bryson LLP.

Milberg prides itself on providing thoughtful and knowledgeable legal services to clients worldwide across multiple practice areas. The firm represents plaintiffs in the areas of antitrust, securities, financial fraud, consumer protection, automobile emissions claims, defective drugs and devices, environmental litigation, financial and insurance litigation, and cyber law and security.

For over 50 years, Milberg and its affiliates have been protecting victims’ rights. We have recovered over \$50 billion for our clients. Our attorneys possess a renowned depth of legal expertise, employ the highest ethical and legal standards, and pride ourselves on providing stellar service to our clients. We have repeatedly been recognized as leaders in the plaintiffs’ bar and appointed to numerous leadership roles in prominent national mass torts and class actions.

Milberg challenges corporate wrongdoing through class action, mass tort, consumer and shareholder right services, both domestically and globally.

In the United States, Milberg currently holds more than 100 court-appointed full- and co-leadership positions in state and federal courts across the country. Our firm has offices in California, Chicago, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, Washington D.C., and Puerto Rico. Milberg’s commitment to its clients reaches beyond the United States, litigating antitrust, securities, and consumer fraud actions in Europe and South America, with offices located in the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands. Milberg prides itself on providing excellent service worldwide.

The firm’s lawyers have been regularly recognized as leaders in the plaintiffs’ bar by the National Law Journal, Legal 500, Chambers USA, Time Magazine, Lawdragon, and Super Lawyers, among others.

“A powerhouse that compelled miscreant and recalcitrant businesses to pay billions of dollars to aggrieved shareholders and customers.”
- THE NEW YORK TIMES

PRACTICE AREAS

SECURITIES FRAUD

Milberg pioneered the use of class action lawsuits to litigate claims involving investment products, securities, and the banking industry. Fifty years ago, the firm set the standard for case theories, organization, discovery, methods of settlement, and amounts recovered for clients. Milberg remains among the most influential securities litigators in the United States and internationally.

Milberg and its attorneys were appointed Lead Counsel and Co-Lead Counsel in hundreds of federal, state, and multidistrict litigation cases throughout its history.

ANTITRUST & COMPETITION LAW

For over fifty years, Milberg's Antitrust Practice Group has prosecuted complex antitrust class actions against defendants in the healthcare, technology, agriculture, and manufacturing industries engaged in price-fixing, monopolization and other violations of antitrust law and trade restraints.

FINANCIAL LITIGATION

For over fifty years, Milberg's Antitrust Practice Group has prosecuted complex antitrust class actions against defendants in the healthcare, technology, agriculture, and manufacturing industries engaged in price-fixing, monopolization and other violations of antitrust law and trade restraints.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Milberg's Consumer Protection Practice Group focuses on improving product safety and protecting those who have fallen victim to deceptive marketing and advertising of goods and services and/or purchased defective products. Milberg attorneys have served as Lead Counsel and Co-Lead Counsel in hundreds of federal, state, and multidistrict litigation cases alleging the sale of defective products, improper marketing of products, and violations of consumer protection statutes.

DANGEROUS DRUGS & DEVICES

Milberg is a nationally renowned firm in mass torts, fighting some of the largest, wealthiest, and most influential pharmaceutical and device companies and corporate entities in the world. Our experienced team of attorneys has led or co-led numerous multidistrict litigations of defective drugs and medical devices.

EMPLOYMENT & CIVIL RIGHTS

Milberg's Employment & Civil Rights attorneys focus on class actions and individual cases nationwide arising from discriminatory banking and housing practices, unpaid wages and sales commissions, improperly managed retirement benefits, workplace discrimination, and wrongful termination.

ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION & TOXIC TORTS

Milberg's Environmental Litigation & Toxic Torts Practice Group focuses on representing clients in mass torts, class actions, multi-district litigation, regulatory enforcement, citizen suits, and other complex environmental and toxic tort matters. Milberg and its attorneys have held leadership roles in all facets of litigation in coordinated proceedings, with a particular focus on developing the building blocks to establish general causation, which is often the most difficult obstacle in an environmental or toxic tort case.

STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Milberg attorneys are dedicated to defending the Constitutional and statutory rights of individuals and businesses that are subjected to unlawful government exactions and fees by state and local governments or bodies.

CYBERSECURITY & DATA PRIVACY

Milberg is a leader in the fields of cyber security, data breach litigation, and biometric data collection, litigating on behalf of clients – both large and small – to change data security practices so that large corporations respect and safeguard consumers' personal data.

APPELLATE

Consisting of former appellate judges, experienced appellate advocates, and former law clerks who understand how best to present compelling arguments to judges on appeal and secure justice for our clients beyond the trial courts, Milberg's Appellate Practice Group boasts an impressive record of success on appeal in both state and federal courts.

LEADERSHIP ROLES

In re: Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation
In re: Elmiron (Pentosan Polysulfate Sodium) Products Liability Litigation
In re: Johnson & Johnson Talcum Powder Products Marketing, Sales Practices & Products Liability Litigation
In re: Blackbaud Inc., Customer Data Breach Litigation
In re: Paragard IUD Products Liability Litigation
In re: Seresto Flea & Tick Collar, Marketing Sales Practices & Product Liability Litigation
In re: All-Clad Metalcrafters, LLC, Cookware Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation
In re: Allergan Biocell Textured Breast Implant Products Liability Litigation
In re: Zicam Cold Remedy Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation
In re: Guidant Corp. Implantable Defibrillators Product Liability Litigation
In re: Ortho Evra Products Liability Litigation
In re: Yasmin and YAZ (Drospirenone) Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation
In re: Kugel Mesh Hernia Patch Products Liability Litigation
In re: Medtronic, Inc. Sprint Fidelis Leads Products Liability Litigation
In re: Stand 'N Seal Products Liability Litigation
In re: Chantix (Varenicline) Products Liability Litigation
In re: Fosamax (alendronate Sodium) Products Liability Litigation
In re: Benicar (Olmesartan) Products Liability Litigation
In re: Onglyza (Saxagliptin) & Kombiglyze Xr (Saxagliptin & Metformin) Products Liability Litigation
In re: Risperdal and Invega Product Liability Cases
In re: Mirena IUS Levonorgestrel-Related Products Liability Litigation
In re: Incretin-based Therapies Product Liability Litigation
In re: Reglan/Metoclopramide
In re: Levaquin Products Liability Litigation
In re: Zimmer Nexgen Knee Implant Products Liability Litigation
In re: Fresenius Granuflo/Naturalyte Dialysate Products Liability Litigation
In re: Propecia (Finasteride) Products Liability Litigation
In re: Transvaginal Mesh (In Re C. R. Bard, Inc., Pelvic Repair System Products Liability Litigation; In Re Ethicon, Inc., Pelvic Repair System Products Liability Litigation; In Re Boston Scientific, Inc., Pelvic Repair System Products Liability; In Re American Medical Systems, Pelvic Repair System Products Liability, and others)
In re: Fluoroquinolone Product Liability Litigation
In re: Depuy Orthopaedics, Inc., Pinnacle Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation
In re: Recalled Abbott Infant Formula Products Liability Litigation
Home Depot, U.S.A., Inc. v. Jackson
Webb v. Injured Workers Pharmacy, LLC

NOTABLE RECOVERIES

\$4 Billion Settlement

In re: Prudential Insurance Co. Sales Practice Litigation

\$3.2 Billion Settlement

In re: Tyco International Ltd., Securities Litigation

\$1.14 Billion Settlement

In Re: Nortel Networks Corp. Securities Litigation

\$1 Billion-plus Trial Verdict

Vivendi Universal, S.A. Securities Litigation

\$1 Billion Settlement

NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation

\$1 Billion Settlement

W.R. Grace & Co.

\$1 Billion-plus Settlement

Merck & Co., Inc. Securities Litigation

\$775 Million Settlement

Washington Public Power Supply System Securities Litigation

\$586 Million Settlement

In re: Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation

GARY M. KLINGER

Gary M. Klinger is a Senior Partner at Milberg and Chair of its Cybersecurity and Data Privacy Practice Group. Mr. Klinger is recognized as one of the most respected data privacy attorneys in the United States, having been ranked by Chambers and Partners as Band 3 for Privacy & Data Security Litigation (2024)¹ and having been selected to Lawdragon's 500 Leading Litigators in America for his accomplishments in privacy litigation (2024).² Law360 recently highlighted Mr. Klinger's work in the privacy space.³

Mr. Klinger has extensive experience serving as leadership in numerous privacy class actions, including as lead or co-lead counsel in the largest data breaches in the country.⁴ Mr. Klinger and his firm are largely responsible for developing the favorable case law that many plaintiffs rely on in the data breach space.⁵ Mr. Klinger has also successfully litigated privacy class actions through class certification. *E.g.*, *Karpilovsky v. All Web Leads, Inc.*, No. 17 C 1307, 2018 WL 3108884, at *1 (N.D. Ill. 2018).

Over the past 3 years, Mr. Klinger has settled on a classwide basis more than one hundred (100) class actions involving privacy violations, the majority of which are data breaches, in state and federal courts across the country as lead or co-lead counsel. To his knowledge, no other attorney in the country has settled and won court approval of more data breach class actions during this period. Representative cases include:

- *Parris, et al., v. Meta Platforms, Inc.*, Case No.2023LA000672 (18th Cir. DuPage Cty., Ill.) (where Mr. Klinger serves as lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$64.5 million for 4 million consumers in a privacy class action);
- *Boone v. Snap, Inc.*, Case No. 2022LA000708 (18th Cir. DuPage Cty., Ill.) (where Mr. Klinger served as lead counsel and obtained a settlement of \$35 million for 3 million consumers in a privacy class action);
- *In re: East Palestine Train Derailment*, No. 23-cv-00242 (N.D. Ohio) (where Mr. Klinger serves on the leadership team that obtained a settlement of \$600 million in a complex class action).

¹ Only three plaintiffs' lawyers in the country received the distinction of being ranked by Chambers and Partners for Privacy & Data Security Litigation.

²See <https://chambers.com/lawyer/gary-klinger-usa-5:26875006>; <https://www.lawdragon.com/guides/2023-09-08-the-2024-lawdragon-500-leading-litigators-in-america>.

³ <https://www.law360.com/articles/1854005/rising-star-milberg-s-gary-klinger>.

⁴ See, e.g., *Isiah v. LoanDepot, Inc.*, 8:24-cv-00136-DOC-JDE (C.D. Cal.) (where Mr. Klinger is co-lead counsel in a data breach involving more than 17 million consumers); *In re Movelt Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, 1:23-md-03083 (D. Mass.) (where Mr. Klinger was appointed to the leadership committee in multi-district litigation involving a data breach that impacted more than 95 million consumers).

⁵ See e.g., *Webb v. Injured Workers Pharmacy, LLC*, 72 F.4th 365 (1st Cir. 2023) (Milberg attorneys obtained a decision from the First Circuit reversing the dismissal with prejudice of a data breach case and finding Article III standing); *In re Arthur J. Gallagher Data Breach Litig.*, 631 F. Supp. 3d 573, 586 (N.D. Ill. 2022) (Milberg attorneys largely defeated a motion to dismiss in a data breach case involving 3 million consumers); *In re Blackbaud, Inc., Customer Data Breach Litig.*, No. 3:20-MN-02972-JMC, 2021 WL 2718439, at *1 (D.S.C. July 1, 2021) (Milberg attorneys defeated a standing challenge in a 10 million person data breach case).

LOCATIONS

PUERTO RICO

1311 Avenida Juan Ponce de León
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00907

CALIFORNIA

280 South Beverly Drive, Penthouse
Beverly Hills, California 90212

402 West Broadway, Suite 1760
San Diego, California 92101

FLORIDA

201 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200,
Coral Gables, Florida 33134

3833 Central Avenue
St. Petersburg, Florida 33713

ILLINOIS

227 W. Monroe Street, Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

LOUISIANA

5301 Canal Boulevard
New Orleans, Louisiana 70124

MICHIGAN

6905 Telegraph Road, Suite 115
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48301

NEW JERSEY

1 Bridge Plaza North, Suite 675
Fort Lee, New Jersey 07024

NEW YORK

100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500
Garden City, New York 11530

405 E 50th Street
New York, New York 10022

NORTH CAROLINA

900 West Morgan Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

5 West Hargett Street, Suite 812
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

SOUTH CAROLINA

825 Lowcountry Blvd, Suite 101
Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29464

TENNESSEE

800 S. Gay Street, Suite 1100
Knoxville, Tennessee 37929

WASHINGTON

1420 Fifth Ave, Suite 2200
Seattle, Washington 98101

17410 133rd Avenue, Suite 301
Woodinville, Washington 98072

WASHINGTON, D.C.

5335 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Suite 440
Washington, D.C. 20015

NETHERLANDS

UNITED KINGDOM

