

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND
FOR BROWARD COUNTY FLORIDA**

ABBY GRUBOR and JULIETTE BLATT,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BAREFOOT DREAMS, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CACE26003507

**DECLARATION OF PHILIP L.
FRAIETTA IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Hon. Michele Towbin Singer

Div. 21

Pursuant to Fla. Stat. Ann. § 92.525, I hereby declare, and state as follows:

1. I am a Managing Partner at Bursor & Fisher, P.A., which has been retained to represent Plaintiffs Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt ("Plaintiffs") in this matter. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, filed herewith. I am entering this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. This Declaration is based upon my personal knowledge. If called upon to testify to the matters stated herein, I could and would competently do so.

2. I am a member in good standing of the Illinois, New York, New Jersey, California, and Michigan State Bars; the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the Western District of New York, the Northern District of New York, the District of New Jersey, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the Northern District of Illinois, the Central District of Illinois, the Northern District of California, the Central District of California, and the Eastern District of California; and

the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, Sixth, and Ninth Circuits.

3. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Parties' Class Action Settlement Agreement, and the exhibits attached thereto.

4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is the proposed Preliminary Approval Order.

5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 3** is a true and correct copy of the firm resume of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Bursor & Fisher, P.A., is well suited to continue to represent the Plaintiffs and Settlement Class in this matter.

6. My firm, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., has extensive experience litigating class actions of similar size, scope, and complexity to the instant action. My firm and I have been lead counsel in numerous privacy-related class actions across the United States. *See, e.g., Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, Case No. 16-cv-03396 (N.D. Cal.) (\$75.6 million class wide settlement); *Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, Case No. 15-cv-03934 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$50 million class wide settlement); *Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-02444 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$16.375 million class wide settlement); *Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast*, Case No. 15-cv-05671 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$13.75 million class wide settlement); *Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-01812 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$8.225 million class wide settlement); *Moeller v. American Media, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-11367 (E.D. Mich.) (\$7.6 million class wide settlement); *Kokoszki v. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.*, Case No. 19-cv-10302 (E.D. Mich.) (\$3.85 million class wide settlement).

7. In addition, my firm has also been recognized by courts across the country for its expertise. *See Ex. 3; see also Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.*, 297 F.R.D. 561, 566 (S.D.N.Y. 2014) (Rakoff, J.) ("Bursor & Fisher, P.A., are class action lawyers who have experience litigating consumer claims. . . . The firm has been appointed class counsel in dozens of cases in both federal

and state courts, and has won multi-million dollar verdicts or recoveries in five [now six] class action jury trials since 2008”); *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, 2020 WL 1904533, at *16 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2020) (Gonzalez Rogers, J.) (noting Bursor & Fisher achieved “extraordinarily good” results in the litigation).

8. The Settlement negotiated by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel represents substantial relief for the proposed Settlement Class. Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendant has agreed to pay \$8.00 to each Claimant who files a timely valid claim, and the proposed Settlement Class likely encompasses hundreds of thousands of website users.

9. The Parties agreed to the terms of the Settlement through experienced counsel. The Settlement is the product of a thorough pre-filing investigation, efficiently prosecuted litigation, and extensive arm’s-length negotiations between the Parties spanning several months, including with the assistance of a neutral mediator, Marc E. Isserles, Esq. of JAMS New York. As part of this confidential mediation process, Defendant provided Plaintiffs’ Counsel with information about the putative class, and pre-mediation briefing was provided to Mr. Isserles.

10. Plaintiffs and Proposed Class Counsel recognize that despite our belief in the strength of Plaintiffs’ claims and Plaintiffs’ and the Class’s ability to ultimately secure a favorable judgment at trial, the expense, duration, and complexity of protracted litigation would be substantial and the outcome of trial uncertain.

11. Plaintiffs and Proposed Class Counsel are also mindful that absent a settlement, the success of Defendant’s various defenses in this case could deprive the Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members of any potential relief whatsoever. Defendant is represented by highly experienced attorneys who have made clear that absent a settlement, they were prepared to continue their vigorous defense of this case. Plaintiffs and Proposed Class Counsel are also aware that Defendant

firmly denies all charges of wrongdoing or liability and the material allegations of the Complaint and intends to pursue several legal and factual defenses. If successful, the defenses could result in the Settlement Class receiving no payment or relief whatsoever. Due at least in part to their cutting-edge nature and the rapidly evolving law, privacy cases, including tracking pixel cases such as this one, generally face substantial hurdles, even just to make it past the pleading stage. Class certification is another hurdle, which would be hotly contested, for which success is certainly not guaranteed. Looking beyond trial, Plaintiffs are also keenly aware that Defendant could appeal the merits of any adverse decision, and that considering the statutory damages in play it would argue—in both the trial and appellate courts—for a reduction of damages based on due process concerns. *See, e.g., Golan v. FreeEats.com, Inc.*, 930 F.3d 950, 957 (8th Cir. 2019) (statutory award in TCPA class action of \$1.6 billion reduced to \$32 million), *but see U.S. v. Dish Network L.L.C.*, 954 F.3d 970, 980 (7th Cir. 2020), *cert. dismissed, Dish Network L.L.C. v. U.S.*, 141 S. Ct. 729 (2021) (statutory award of \$280 million for violating various telemarketing statutes over 65 million times did not violate due process).

12. Taking these realities into account, Plaintiffs and Proposed Class Counsel believe that the relief provided by the settlement weighs heavily in favor of a finding that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and well within the range of approval.

13. Proposed Class Counsel has diligently investigated, prosecuted, and dedicated resources to the claims in this action and will continue to do so throughout its pendency.

14. Plaintiffs have also diligently and adequately prosecuted this action through Class Counsel by, among other things, assisting in Class Counsel's investigation, reviewing draft pleadings and filings, promptly providing documents and information to Class Counsel, acting in the best interest of the Settlement Class, remaining available for consultation throughout settlement

negotiations, and reviewing and signing the class-wide Settlement Agreement.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above and foregoing is true and accurate.

Executed this 23rd day of April 2026 at White Plains, New York.

/s Philip L. Fraietta

Philip L. Fraietta

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN
AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY FLORIDA

ABBY GRUBOR and JULIETTE BLATT,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BAREFOOT DREAMS, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CACE26003507

Hon. Michele Towbin Singer

Div. 21

CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement¹ (“Agreement”) is entered into by and among Plaintiffs Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt (“Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, and Defendant Barefoot Dreams, Inc. (“Barefoot” or “Defendant”), as of the date last signed below. Plaintiffs and Defendant are collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.” This Agreement is intended by the Parties to fully, finally, and forever resolve, discharge, and settle the Released Claims (as defined herein), upon and subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and subject to Final Approval of the Court.

RECITALS

A. Well before filing the Complaint in this Action, the Parties began discussing early resolution of their dispute.

¹ All capitalized terms herein shall have the same meanings as those defined in Section 1 (below).

B. These discussions led to an agreement between the Parties to engage in an all-day mediation, which the Parties agreed would take place before Marc E. Isserles, Esq. of JAMS New York, an experienced neutral with decades of experience in class action litigation.

C. In advance of the mediation, the Parties exchanged informal discovery and information necessary to evaluate liability and damages. Given that the information exchanged was similar to the information that would have been provided in formal discovery related to the issues of class certification and summary judgment, the Parties had sufficient information to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses.

D. The Parties engaged in a full-day mediation session. The Parties negotiations were arms-length and hard fought. At the end of the day, the Parties agreed on the material terms of this classwide Settlement.

E. On February 27, 2026, Plaintiff Grubor, a Florida resident, and Plaintiff Blatt, a California resident, filed the instant action in this Court, alleging violations of the Florida Security of Communications Act (“FSCA”), Fla. Stat. § 934.03, *et seq.*; the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (the “ECPA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2511, *et seq.*; the California Invasion of Privacy Act (“CIPA”), Cal. Penal Code § 631; CIPA § 632; the Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act (the “CDAFA”), Cal. Penal Code § 502; and the California Constitution.

F. At all times, Defendant has denied and continues to deny any wrongdoing whatsoever and has denied and continues to deny that it committed, or threatened or attempted to commit, any wrongful act or violation of law or duty alleged in the Action. Nonetheless, taking into account the uncertainty and risks inherent in any litigation, Defendant has concluded it is desirable and beneficial that the Action be fully and finally settled and terminated in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement. This Agreement is a compromise, and the Agreement, any related documents, and any negotiations resulting in it shall not be

construed as or deemed to be evidence of or an admission or concession of liability or wrongdoing on the part of Defendant, or any of the Released Parties, with respect to any claim of any fault or liability or wrongdoing or damage whatsoever.

G. Plaintiffs believe the claims asserted in the Action against Defendant have merit and that they would have prevailed at summary judgment and/or trial. Nonetheless, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel recognize that Defendant has raised factual and legal defenses that present a risk that Plaintiffs may not prevail. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel also recognize the expense and delay associated with continued prosecution of the Action against Defendant through class certification, summary judgment, trial, and any subsequent appeals. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have also taken into account the uncertain outcome and risks of litigation, especially in complex class actions, as well as the difficulties inherent in such litigation. Therefore, Plaintiffs believe it is desirable that the Released Claims be fully and finally compromised, settled, and resolved with prejudice. Based on their evaluation, Class Counsel has concluded that the terms and conditions of this Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and that it is in the best interests of the Settlement Class to settle the claims raised in the Action pursuant to the terms and provisions of this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and among Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class, and each of them, and Defendant, subject to Final Approval, in consideration of the benefits flowing to the Parties from the Agreement set forth herein, that the Action and the Released Claims shall be finally and fully compromised, settled, and released, and the Action shall be dismissed with prejudice, upon and subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement.

AGREEMENT

1. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Settlement Agreement, the following terms have the meanings specified below:

1.1 “Action” means *Grubor, et al v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc.*, Case No. CACE26003507, pending in the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County.

1.2 “Agreement” or “Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement” means this settlement agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendant, along with all exhibits hereto.

1.3 “Cash Payment” means the \$8.00 (USD) in cash that Settlement Class Members who submit Valid Claims will receive as a Settlement Class Member benefit subject to the Settlement Benefit Cap

1.4 “Claim Form” means the document substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit A*, as approved by the Court. The Claim Form, to be completed by Settlement Class Members who wish to file a Claim for payment, shall be available in electronic and paper format in the manner described below. Regardless of format, each Claim Form must include a unique ID assigned to each and every Settlement Class Member.

1.5 “Claims Deadline” means the date by which all Claim Forms must be postmarked or received to be considered timely and shall be set as a date sixty (60) days after the Notice Date. The Claims Deadline shall be clearly set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order as well as in the Notice and the Claim Form. Failure to submit a timely claim by the Claims Deadline will prevent a Settlement Class Member from receiving a Cash Payment from the Settlement Fund.

1.6 “Claims Process” means the process by which Settlement Class Members submit Claim Forms to the Settlement Administrator for the election of the benefits available under the Settlement.

1.7 “**Class Counsel**” means Stephen A. Beck and Philip L. Fraietta of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.

1.8 “**Class List**” means the list of Settlement Class Members prepared by Defendant using information in Defendant’s records and provided to the Settlement Administrator for purposes of sending Notice. The Class List shall contain the Settlement Class Members’ names and email addresses.

1.9 “**Class Representatives**” means the named Plaintiffs in this Action, Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt.

1.10 “**Court**” means the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County and the Judge presiding over the Action, Michele Towbin Singer.

1.11 “**Defendant**” means Barefoot Dreams, Inc., the defendant in the Action.

1.12 “**Defendant’s Counsel**” means Aaron Charfoos, David Coogan, and Stephanie Balitzer of Paul Hastings LLP.

1.13 “**Effective Date**” means the day after the entry of the Final Approval Order, provided no objections are made to the Settlement. If there are objections to the Settlement, then the Effective Date shall be the later of (a) thirty (30) days after entry of the Final Approval Order if no appeals are taken from the Final Approval Order, or (b) if appeals are taken from the Final Approval Order, then the earlier of thirty (30) days after the last appellate court ruling affirming the Final Approval Order or thirty (30) days after the entry of a dismissal of the appeal.

1.14 “**Email Notice**” means the email form of Notice, substantially in the form attached as *Exhibit B*, that shall be sent to all Settlement Class Members notifying them of the Settlement, and which shall bear a unique ID and PIN number attributable to each and every Settlement Class Member, which will be required both to access the claims submission portal on the Settlement

Website and as an entry on each Claim Form to reduce the incidents of fraudulent Claim Form submissions.

1.15 “Fee Award” means the amount of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of expenses awarded by the Court to Class Counsel, which will be paid by Defendant out of the Settlement Fund, and which will not exceed one third of the Settlement Fund.

1.16 “Final Approval” means the final approval of the Settlement, which occurs when the Court enters the Final Approval Order, substantially in the form attached to the Motion for Final Approval.

1.17 “Final Approval Hearing” means the hearing before the Court where the Parties will request the Final Judgment to be entered by the Court approving the Settlement Agreement, the Fee Award, and the Service Award to the Class Representatives.

1.18 “Final Approval Order” means the final order the Court enters granting Final Approval of the Settlement, substantially in the form submitted with the Motion for Final Approval that certifies the class, approves the terms and conditions of the Agreement, appoints Class Counsel, and sets the dates and deadlines for effectuating the settlement

1.19 “Final Judgment” means the Final Judgment and Order to be entered by the Court approving the Agreement after the Final Approval Hearing.

1.20 “Long Form Notice” means the long form notice of the Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as *Exhibit C*, that shall be posted on the Settlement Website and shall be available to Settlement Class members by mail on request made to the Settlement Administrator.

1.21 “Motion for Final Approval” means the motion that Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file with the Court seeking Final Approval of the Settlement following approval of the relevant moving papers by Defendant.

1.22 “Motion for Preliminary Approval” means the motion that Plaintiffs shall file with the court seeking Preliminary Approval of the Settlement following approval of the relevant moving papers by Defendant.

1.23 “Notice” means the Email Notice and Long Form Notice that Plaintiffs will ask the Court to approve in connection with the Motion for Preliminary Approval, as well as the Settlement Website and the Settlement Class member toll-free telephone line.

1.24 “Notice Date” means thirty (30) days after Preliminary Approval and the date by which Notice must commence.

1.25 “Notice Program” means the methods provided for in this Agreement for giving Notice to the Settlement Class and consists of the Claim Form (*Exhibit A*), Email Notice (*Exhibit B*), and Long Form Notice (*Exhibit C*), (or forms substantially similar to Exhibits A-C) along with the Settlement Website, and the Settlement Class member toll-free telephone line.

1.26 “Objection/Exclusion Deadline” means the date by which a written objection to this Settlement Agreement or a request for exclusion from Settlement Class must be postmarked and/or filed with the Court, which shall be designated as a date no later than sixty (60) days after the Notice Date and no sooner than fourteen (14) days after papers supporting the Fee Award and Final Approval are filed with the Court and posted to the Settlement Website listed in Paragraph 4.1(d), or such other date as ordered by the Court..

1.27 “Party” means Plaintiffs or Defendant and “Parties” means Plaintiffs and Defendant collectively.

1.28 “Plaintiffs” means Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt, the Plaintiffs in the Action.

1.29 “Preliminary Approval” means the preliminary approval of the Settlement, which occurs when the Court enters the Preliminary Approval Order, substantially in the form submitted with the Motion for Preliminary Approval.

1.30 “Preliminary Approval Order” means the order preliminarily approving the Settlement and proposed Notice Program, substantially in the form submitted with the Motion for Preliminary Approval.

1.31 “Releases” means the releases and waiver set forth in Section 3 of this Agreement.

1.32 “Released Claims” means any and all actual, potential, filed, known or unknown, fixed or contingent, claimed or unclaimed, suspected or unsuspected, claims, demands, liabilities, rights, causes of action, contract or agreements, extra contractual claims, damages, punitive, exemplary or multiplied damages, expenses, costs, attorneys’ fees, and/or obligations (including “Unknown Claims” as defined below), whether in law or in equity, accrued or unaccrued, direct, individual or representative, of every nature and description whatsoever, whether based state, federal, local, statutory, or common law or any other law, rule or regulation, against Released Parties, or any of them, arising out of any facts, transactions, events, matters occurrences, acts, disclosures, statements, representations, omissions or failures to act regarding the alleged disclosure, use, retention, interception or transfer of information of or related to the Settlement Class Members through use of the Meta pixel, Attentive code, cookies, pixels, session replay, or other internet tracking, analytics, and/or advertising technologies, including all claims that were brought or could have been brought in the Action relating to such information belonging to any and all Releasing Parties. The Final Approval Order shall also enjoin Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class from instituting or participating in any lawsuit, regulatory, or other proceeding arising out of or related in any way to the Released Claims or that are covered by the releases provided for in any final non-appealable approval of the Settlement Agreement provided, however, that Plaintiffs or a Settlement Class Member shall be permitted to comply with a valid subpoena or court order concerning the Released Claims.

1.33 “Released Parties” means Barefoot Dreams, Inc., as well as any and all of its respective present or past heirs, executors, estates, administrators, predecessors, successors, assigns, parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, related companies, divisions, joint venturers, owners, licensors, licensees, associates, affiliates, employers, employees, agents, consultants, independent contractors, insurers, reinsurers, executives, board members, directors, managing directors, officers, partners, principals, members, attorneys, accountants, financial and other advisors, underwriters, shareholders, lenders, auditors, investment advisors, direct or indirect security holders, legal representatives, successors in interest, and any person in legal privity with them.

1.34 “Releasing Parties” means Plaintiffs, Settlement Class Members who have not opted-out of the Settlement, and all of their respective present or past heirs, executors, estates, administrators, predecessors, successors, assigns, parent companies, subsidiaries, associates, affiliates, employers, employees, agents, consultants, independent contractors, insurers, directors, managing directors, officers, partners, principals, members, attorneys, accountants, financial and other advisors, underwriters, shareholders, lenders, auditors, investment advisors, legal representatives, successors in interest, assigns and companies, firms, trusts, and corporations.

1.35 “Reversionary Payment” means the refund Defendant will receive after the completion of the Claims Process and payment of Claims, expenses, and fees out of the Settlement Fund as provided herein. Defendant will provide Settlement Administrator with the requisite wire transfer details to facilitate the Reversionary Payment.

1.36 “Service Awards” means the payment the Court may award the Plaintiffs for serving as the representatives of the Settlement Class, which shall be up to \$5,000 per representative, to be paid from the Settlement Fund

1.37 “Settlement Administrator” means Epiq Systems, Inc. The Settlement Administrator shall formulate a notice plan designed to achieve at least 75% reach, which will include direct notice by email, with two reminder notices.

1.38 “Settlement Administration Costs” means the fees and expenses incurred by the Settlement Administrator in providing Notice, processing claims, responding to inquiries from members of the Settlement Class, mailing checks for Valid Claims, and related services. Settlement Administration Expenses shall be paid by Defendant out of the Settlement Fund in an amount not to exceed \$150,000.

1.39 “Settlement Benefit Cap” shall mean Defendant’s maximum financial obligation in this matter as set forth in Paragraph 1.42.

1.40 “Settlement Fund” shall mean the amount of one million nine hundred thirty-four thousand three hundred twenty-eight dollars (\$1,934,328.00 USD), plus, in the event the number of class members exceeds 241,791, an incremental increase of \$8.00 USD per additional class member. This Settlement Fund shall represent Defendant’s maximum financial obligation in this matter (i.e. the “Settlement Benefit Cap”). In the event that the final number of Settlement Class Members exceeds 300,000, the Parties agree to negotiate a new Settlement Fund in good faith. The Settlement Benefit Cap shall be comprised of: (i) all payments made to Settlement Class members on Valid Claims; (ii) any Fee Award and Expenses approved by the Court; (iii) any Service Awards approved by the Court; (iv) any Settlement Administration Expenses approved by the Court, (v) any Taxes and Tax-Related Expenses; and (vi) any other reasonable expenses that may be incurred in connection with the Settlement or administration of the Settlement. All funds remaining in the Settlement Fund after the aforementioned payments shall revert back to Defendant as defined above as “Reversionary Payment.”

1.41 “Settlement Class” means all living United States residents who purchased a product from www.barefootdreams.com or any of Defendant’s associated URLs from October 14, 2023 to and through the date of Notice. Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, their subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or their parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the Settlement Class; (4) any persons who have released claims relating to the Action; and (5) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons.

1.42 “Settlement Class Member” means any member of the Settlement Class.

1.43 “Settlement Website” means a website, referenced in Section 4.1(e) below, to be established, operated, and maintained by the Settlement Administrator for purposes of providing notice and otherwise making available to the Settlement Class Members the documents, information, and the password-protected online claims submission process. Although the Settlement Website will be publicly available and will allow public access of the Long Form Notice and relevant Court orders, access to the online claims submission process on the Settlement Website shall require potential claimants to accurately enter their individually assigned Unique ID and PIN number in order to submit a Claim Form.

1.44 “Unknown Claims” means claims that could have been raised in the Action and that any or all of the Releasing Parties do not know or suspect to exist, which, if known by him or her, might affect his or her agreement to release the Released Parties or the Released Claims or might affect his or her decision to agree, object or not to object to the Settlement. Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties shall be deemed to have, and shall have, expressly waived

and relinquished, to the fullest extent permitted by law, the provisions, rights and benefits of § 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER, WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR OR RELEASED PARTY.

Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties also shall be deemed to have, and shall have, waived any and all provisions, rights and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States, or principle of common law, or the law of any jurisdiction outside of the United States, which is similar, comparable or equivalent to § 1542 of the California Civil Code. The Releasing Parties acknowledge that they may discover facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true with respect to the subject matter of this release, but that it is their intention to finally and forever settle and release the Released Claims, notwithstanding any Unknown Claims they may have, as that term is defined in this Paragraph.

1.45 “Valid Claims” means a Claim Form submitted by a Settlement Class Member that is (a) submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Settlement; (b) accurately, fully, and truthfully completed and executed, with all of the information requested in the Claim Form, by a Settlement Class Member; (c) signed physically or by e-signature by a Settlement Class Member personally; (d) matched with the Unique ID and PIN number assigned to each Settlement Class Member; (e) returned via mail and postmarked by the Claims Deadline, or, if submitted online through the password-protected claims submission portal on the Settlement Website, submitted by 11:59 p.m. Eastern time on the Claims Deadline; and (f) determined to be valid by the Settlement Administrator.

2. SETTLEMENT RELIEF.

2.1 Payments to Settlement Class Members. Defendant will pay or cause to be paid from the Settlement Fund, and subject to the Settlement Benefit Cap, the following: (i) Cash Payments to Settlement Class Members who submit Valid Claims (ii) the Settlement Administration Costs actually incurred by the Settlement Administrator as described in Section 4 below; (iii) Class Counsel's Fee Award; (iv) the Class Representatives' Service Award; and (v) any other reasonable fees incurred in connection with the Settlement and/or its administration.

(a) Settlement Class Members shall have until the Claims Deadline to submit an Approved Claim. Each Settlement Class Member with an Approved Claim shall be entitled to receive a Cash Payment of \$8.00 USD.

(b) In the event that Valid Claims for Cash Payments exceed the Settlement Fund, all Cash Payments shall each be reduced *pro rata*.

2.2 Schedule of Payments. Defendant will make payments in accordance with the following:

(a) *Settlement Administration Costs.* Amounts for notice and Settlement administration, to be paid from the Settlement Fund within thirty (30) days of when such amounts are invoiced to Defendant and become due and owing, in an amount not to exceed \$150,000.

(b) *Fee Award.* An amount equal to the Court-approved Fee Award, payable within ten (10) days of the Effective Date.

(c) *Service Award.* An amount equal to Plaintiffs' Court-approved Service Awards, payable within ten (10) days of the Effective Date.

(d) *Cash Payment.* An amount equal to \$8.00 multiplied by the number of Valid Claims, which amount is to be paid thirty (30) days after the Final Judgment.

2.3 Claims Process. Each Settlement Class Member will be entitled to submit a Claim Form for a Cash Payment, consistent with this Section and as determined by the Court.

(a) *Cash Payment.* Each Settlement Class member may file a Claim Form that will, if determined to be a Valid Claim, entitle him or her to a cash payment of \$8.00.

(b) *Method of Payment.* Each Settlement Class Member may choose to receive his or her Cash Payment via Venmo, PayPal, or Zelle. If a Settlement Class Member cannot receive payment via Venmo, PayPal, or Zelle, they may request a check instead.

(c) *Cash Payment.* Cash payments for Valid Claims will be made thirty (30) days after the Final Judgment.

2.4 Proof of Claim. A maximum of one Claim, submitted on a single Claim Form, may be submitted by each Settlement Class Member.

2.5 Review of Claims. The Settlement Administrator will be responsible for reviewing all Claim Forms to determine their validity. The Settlement Administrator will reject any Claim Form that does not comply in any material respect with the instructions on the Claim Form or is submitted after the Claims Deadline.

2.6 Uncleared Checks or Failed Electronic Payments. Those Settlement Class Members whose Cash Payment checks are not cleared within 180 days after issuance will forfeit their Cash Payment and Defendant will have no further obligation to make any further payment pursuant to this Settlement or otherwise to such Settlement Class Members. With respect to those Settlement Class Members whose electronic payment (Venmo, PayPal, or Zelle) fails to process or is not claimed within thirty (30) days of issuance, the Settlement Administrator shall make reasonable efforts to contact the Settlement Class Member and allow him or her to provide alternative payment details. The Class Member must submit alternative payment details no later than thirty (30) days of being contacted by the Settlement Administrator for this purpose or by the

Claims Deadline, whichever is earlier. Unpaid funds from uncleared checks, unclaimed electronic payments, or electronic payments which fail to process will revert back to Defendant along with any other unpaid funds remaining after administration of the Settlement Agreement, all as part of the Reversionary Payment.

2.7 Resolution of Settlement Fund. Two-hundred and twenty (220) days after the Effective Date—after resolution of the Claims Process, and payment of Settlement Administration Costs, Fee Award, Service Award, and all other reasonable fees incurred in connection with the Settlement and administration thereof—all remaining moneys in the Settlement Fund (including but not limited to any Uncleared Checks or Failed Electronic Payments) shall revert back to Defendant as the Reversionary Payment.

3. RELEASE.

3.1 The obligations incurred pursuant to this Settlement shall be a full and final disposition of the Action and any and all Released Claims, as against all Released Parties.

3.2 Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties, and each of them, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Final Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims against the Released Parties, and each of them. Further, upon the Effective Date, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, each Settlement Class Member, shall, either directly, indirectly, representatively, or in any capacity, be permanently barred and enjoined from filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in, or participating (as a class member or otherwise) in any lawsuit, action, or other proceeding in any jurisdiction (other than participation in the Settlement as provided herein) against any Released Party based on the Released Claims.

4. NOTICE TO THE CLASS.

4.1 The Notice Program shall consist of the following:

(a) **Settlement Class List.** No later than twenty-eight (28) days after Preliminary Approval, Defendant shall produce the Class List in electronic form from its records that includes the names, email addresses, and last known U.S. Mail addresses to the extent available, belonging to Settlement Class Members. Class Counsel's assent to this Agreement shall constitute consent on behalf of the Settlement Class to disclose this information. A copy of the Class List shall be provided to Class Counsel. Class Counsel shall not use the Settlement Class List, or any information contained within it, for any other purposes other than administering the Settlement, and shall take reasonable measures to protect the information from any third-party disclosure. Class Counsel may not send advertisements, solicitations, or communications to the Settlement Class to solicit Settlement Class Members to retain Class Counsel for any other matters or disputes.

(b) **Direct Notice.** In the event that the Court preliminarily approves the Settlement Agreement, no later than the Notice Date, the Settlement Administrator shall send Notice via email substantially in the form attached as **Exhibit B**, along with an electronic link to the Claim Form, to all Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Class List. In the event transmission of email notice results in any "bounce-backs," the Settlement Administrator shall, where reasonable, correct any issues that may have caused the "bounce-back" to occur and make a second attempt to re-send the email notice.

(c) **Reminder Notice.** Within thirty (30) and again with ten (10) days prior to the Claims Deadline, the Settlement Administrator shall again send Email Notice (with minor, non-material modifications to indicate that it is a reminder email rather than an initial notice), along with an electronic link to the Claim Form, to all Settlement Class Members for whom a valid email address is available in the Class List.

(d) **Settlement Website.** Within thirty (30) days from entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, Notice shall be provided on a website at www.barefootdreamsclasssettlement.com which shall be administered and maintained by the Settlement Administrator and shall include the ability to file Claim Forms online through a claims submission portal upon entry of an accurate Unique ID and PIN number assigned to each Settlement Class Member. The Notice provided on the Settlement Website shall be substantially in the form of **Exhibit C** hereto.

4.2 The Notice shall advise the Settlement Class of their rights, including the right to be excluded from, comment upon, and/or object to the Settlement or any of its terms. The Notice shall specify that any objection to the Settlement Agreement, and any papers submitted in support of said objection, shall be considered by the Court at the Final Approval Hearing only if, on or before the Objection Deadline approved by the Court and specified in the Notice, the Settlement Class Member making the objection files notice of an intention to do so and at the same time (a) files copies of such papers he or she proposes to be submitted at the Final Approval Hearing with the Clerk of the Court and copies to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel, or alternatively, if the objection is from a Settlement Class Member represented by counsel, files any objection through the Court's electronic filing system, and (b) sends copies of such papers by mail, hand, or overnight delivery service to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel.

4.3 Any Settlement Class Member who intends to object to this Agreement must present the objection in writing to the Court, which must be personally signed by the objector, and must include: (1) the objector's name and address; (2) an explanation of the basis upon which the objector claims to be a Settlement Class Member; (3) all grounds for the objection, including all citations to legal authority and evidence supporting the objection; (4) the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting the objector in

connection with the preparation or submission of the objection or who may profit from the pursuit of the objection; and (5) a statement indicating whether the objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either personally or through counsel who files an appearance with the Court in accordance with the Local Rules).

4.4 If a Settlement Class Member or any objector's counsel has objected to any class action settlement where the objector or their counsel asked for or received any payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection, or any related appeal, without any modification to the settlement, then the objection must include a statement identifying each such case by full case caption and amount of payment received. Any challenge to the Settlement, the Final Approval Order, or the Final Judgment shall be pursuant to appeal under the applicable rules of appellate procedure and not through a collateral attack.

4.5 Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel may take discovery on any objector or their counsel, including taking depositions and propounding document requests.

4.6 A Settlement Class Member may request to be excluded from the Settlement Class by sending a written request postmarked on or before the Exclusion Deadline approved by the Court and specified in the Notice. To exercise the right to be excluded, a member of the Settlement Class must timely send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator as specified in the Notice, providing his/her name and address, a signature, the name and number of the case, and a statement that he or she wishes to be excluded from the Settlement Class for purposes of this Settlement. A request to be excluded that does not include all of this information, or that is sent to an address other than that designated in the Notice, or that is not postmarked within the time specified, shall be invalid, and the Settlement Class Member serving such a request shall be a member(s) of the Settlement Class and shall be bound as a Settlement Class Member by this Agreement, if approved. Any member of the Settlement Class who validly elects to be excluded

from this Agreement shall not: (i) be bound by any orders or the Final Judgment; (ii) be entitled to relief under this Settlement Agreement; (iii) gain any rights by virtue of this Agreement; or (iv) be entitled to object to any aspect of this Agreement. The request for exclusion must be personally signed by the Person requesting exclusion. So-called “mass” or “class” opt-outs shall not be allowed. To be valid, a request for exclusion must be postmarked or received by the date specified in the Notice. Any Settlement Class Member who filed an objection and an opt-out request will be deemed to have opted-out regardless of which was filed first.

4.7 The Final Approval Hearing shall be no earlier than seventy-five (75) days after the Notice Date.

4.8 Any Settlement Class Member who does not, using the procedures set forth in this Agreement and the Notice, either seek exclusion from the Settlement Class or timely file a Valid Claim shall not be entitled to receive a Cash payment, but will otherwise be bound by all of the terms of this Agreement, including the terms of the Final Judgment to be entered in the Action and the Releases provided for in the Agreement, and will be barred from bringing any action against any of the Released Parties concerning the Released Claims.

4.9 For the convenience of the Parties and Settlement Class Members, below is a schedule of all proposed deadlines:

EVENT	PROPOSED DEADLINE
Deadline to Provide Settlement Administrator with Class List	28 Days After Preliminary Approval Order
Notice Date	30 Days After Preliminary Approval Order
Motion for Final Approval, inclusive of Application for Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Service Awards	45 Days After Notice Date
Claims Deadline	60 Days After Notice Date
Objection/Exclusion Deadline	60 Days After Notice Date
Final Approval Hearing	No earlier than 75 Days After Notice Date

EVENT	PROPOSED DEADLINE
Payment of Fee Award	Within 10 Days After Final Judgment
Payment of Service Award	Within 10 Days of the Effective Date
Cash Payment Funds Wired to Settlement Administrator	14 Days After Effective Date
Cash Payments for Valid Claims Sent to Settlement Class Members	30 Days After Effective Date
Reversionary Payment to Defendant	220 Days After Effective Date

5. SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION.

5.1 The Settlement Administrator shall, under the supervision of the Court, administer the relief provided by this Settlement by processing Claim Forms in a rational, responsive, cost effective, and timely manner. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain reasonably detailed records of its activities under this Agreement. The Settlement Administrator shall maintain all such records as are required by applicable law in accordance with its normal business practices and such records will be made available to Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel upon request. The Settlement Administrator shall also provide reports and other information to the Court as the Court may require. The Settlement Administrator shall provide Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel with information concerning Notice, administration, and implementation of Settlement. Without limiting the foregoing, the Settlement Administrator shall:

(a) Forward to Defendant’s Counsel, with copies to Class Counsel, all original documents and other materials received in connection with the administration of the Settlement, and all copies thereof, within thirty (30) days after the date on which all Claim Forms have been finally approved or disallowed in accordance with the terms of this Agreement;

(b) Receive requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class and other requests and promptly provide to Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel copies thereof.

If the Settlement Administrator receives any exclusion forms or other requests after the deadline for the submission of such forms and requests, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly provide copies thereof to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel;

(c) Provide weekly reports to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel, including without limitation, reports regarding the number of Claim Forms received, the number approved by the Settlement Administrator, and the categorization and description of Claim Forms rejected, in whole or in part, by the Settlement Administrator; and

(d) Make available for inspection by Class Counsel or Defendant's Counsel the Claim Forms received by the Settlement Administrator at any time upon reasonable notice.

5.2 The Settlement Administrator shall be obliged to employ reasonable procedures to screen claims for abuse or fraud and deny Claim Forms where there is evidence of abuse or fraud. The Settlement Administrator will reject any claim that does not comply in any material respect with the instructions on the Claim Form or the terms of Paragraphs 1.45 or 2.4 above, or is submitted after the Claims Deadline. Each claimant who submits an invalid Claim Form to the Settlement Administrator must be given a notice of the Claim Form's deficiency and an opportunity to cure the deficiency within twenty-one (21) days of the date of the notice. The Settlement Administrator may contact any Person who has submitted a Claim Form to obtain additional information necessary to verify the Claim Form. The Settlement Administrator shall ensure that the Settlement Website requires the entry of a Unique ID and PIN number to access the claims submission portal. In addition, all Claim Forms (whether filed online, by email, or by mail) shall include a Unique ID and PIN number assigned to each Class Member. In addition, the Settlement Administrator shall monitor for standard signs of abuse or fraud, such as repeated ID addresses and shall use CAPTCHA tools for Claim Forms on the Settlement Website.

5.3 Defendant's Counsel and Class Counsel shall have the right to challenge the acceptance or rejection of a Claim Form submitted by Settlement Class Members and to obtain and review supporting documentation relating to such Claim Form. The Settlement Administrator shall follow any agreed decisions of Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel as to the validity of any disputed submitted Claim Form. To the extent Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel are not able to agree on the disposition of a challenge, the disputed claim shall be submitted to the Honorable Michele Towbin Singer for binding determination.

5.4 In the exercise of its duties outlined in this Agreement, the Settlement Administrator shall have the right to reasonably request additional information from the Parties or any Settlement Class Member.

6. TERMINATION OF SETTLEMENT.

6.1 Defendant or the Class Representatives on behalf of the Settlement Class, shall have the right to terminate this Agreement by providing written notice of the election to do so to all other Parties hereto within twenty-one (21) days of any of the following events: (i) the Court's refusal to grant Preliminary Approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (ii) the Court's refusal to grant Final Approval of this Agreement in any material respect; (iii) the Court's refusal to enter the Final Judgment in this Action in any material respect; or (iv) the date upon which the Final Judgment is modified or reversed in any material respect by the Appellate Court or the Supreme Court.

6.2 The Parties agree that the Court's failure to approve, in whole or in part, the Fee Award to Class Counsel and/or the Service Awards set forth shall not prevent the Agreement from becoming effective, nor shall it be grounds for termination. The procedures for any application for approval of attorneys' fees, expenses, or Service Award are to be considered by the Court

separately from the Court's consideration of the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of the Settlement.

7. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER AND FINAL APPROVAL ORDER.

7.1 Promptly after the execution of this Agreement, Class Counsel shall submit this Agreement together with its Exhibits to the Court and shall move the Court for Preliminary Approval of the settlement set forth in this Agreement; certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only; appointment of Class Counsel and the Class Representative; and entry of a Preliminary Approval Order, which order shall set a Final Approval Hearing date and approve the Notice and Claim Form for dissemination substantially in the form of *Exhibits A–C*, hereto. Class Counsel shall provide the moving papers to Defendant's counsel for review 3 days prior to filing. The Preliminary Approval Order shall also authorize the Parties, without further approval from the Court, to agree to and adopt such amendments, modifications and expansions of the Settlement Agreement and its implementing documents (including all exhibits to this Agreement) so long as they are consistent in all material respects with the terms of the Settlement and do not limit or impair the rights of the Settlement Class.

7.2 Defendant's agreement as to certification of the Settlement Class is solely for purposes of effectuating the Settlement and no other purpose. Defendant retains all of its objections, arguments, and defenses with respect to class certification and any other issue, and reserves all rights to contest class certification and any other issue if the Settlement set out in this Agreement does not result in entry of the Final Approval Order and Final Judgment, if the Court's approval is reversed or vacated on appeal, if this Settlement is terminated as provided herein, or if the Settlement set forth in this Agreement otherwise fails to become effective. The Parties acknowledge that there has been no stipulation to any classes or certification of any classes for any purpose other than effectuating the Settlement, and that if the Settlement set forth in this Settlement

Agreement is not finally approved, if the Court's approval is reversed or vacated on appeal, if this Settlement Agreement is terminated as provided herein, or if the Settlement set forth in this Settlement Agreement otherwise fails to become effective, this agreement as to certification of the Settlement Class becomes null and *void ab initio*, and this Settlement Agreement or any other settlement-related statement may not be cited regarding certification of the Class, or in support of an argument for certifying any class for any purpose related to this Action or any other proceeding.

7.3 At the time of the submission of this Agreement to the Court as described above, Class Counsel shall request that, after Notice is given, the Court hold a Final Approval Hearing and approve the Settlement of the Action as set forth herein.

7.4 After Notice is given, the Parties shall request and seek to obtain from the Court a Final Judgment, which will (among other things):

(a) find that the Court has personal jurisdiction over all Settlement Class Members and that the Court has subject matter jurisdiction to approve the Agreement, including all exhibits thereto;

(b) approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to, and in the best interests of, the Settlement Class Members; direct the Parties and their counsel to implement and consummate the Agreement according to its terms and provisions; and declare the Agreement to be binding on, and have *res judicata* and preclusive effect in all pending and future lawsuits or other proceedings maintained by or on behalf of Plaintiffs and Releasing Parties;

(c) find that the Notice implemented pursuant to the Agreement (1) constitutes the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (2) constitutes notice that is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Agreement, and to

appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (3) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (4) meets all applicable requirements of the Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the Florida Constitution, and the rules of the Court;

(d) find that the Class Representatives and Class Counsel adequately represent the Settlement Class for purposes of entering into and implementing the Agreement;

(e) dismiss the Action (including all individual claims and Settlement Class Claims presented thereby) on the merits and with prejudice, without fees or costs to any party except as provided in the Settlement;

(f) incorporate the Release set forth above, make the Release effective as of the date of the Effective Date, and forever discharge the Released Parties as set forth herein;

(g) permanently bar and enjoin all Settlement Class Members who have not been properly excluded from the respective Settlement Class from filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in, or participating (as class members or otherwise) in, any lawsuit or other action in any jurisdiction based on the Released Claims;

(h) without affecting the finality of the Final Judgment for purposes of appeal, retain jurisdiction as to all matters relating to administration, consummation, enforcement, and interpretation of the Settlement and the Final Judgment, and for any other necessary purpose; and

(i) incorporate any other provisions, as the Court deems necessary and just.

8. CLASS COUNSEL'S ATTORNEYS' FEES AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES AND SERVICE AWARD.

8.1 Class Counsel may receive, subject to Court approval, attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses not to exceed one-third of the Settlement Fund. Class Counsel will petition the Court for an award of such attorneys' fees and Defendant agrees to not object to or otherwise challenge,

directly or indirectly, Class Counsel's petition for reasonable attorneys' fees and for reimbursement of costs and expenses if limited to the amount set forth in this Paragraph. Class Counsel, in turn, agrees to seek no more than the amount set forth in this Paragraph from the Court in attorneys' fees and for reimbursement of costs and expenses.

8.2 The Fee Award shall be payable within ten (10) days after the Court's Final Judgment, subject to Class Counsel executing the Undertaking Regarding Attorneys' Fees and Costs (the "Undertaking") attached hereto as *Exhibit D*, and providing all payment routing information and tax I.D. numbers for Class Counsel. Payment of the Fee Award shall be made by the Settlement Administrator by wire transfer to Class Counsel in accordance with the instructions to be jointly provided by Class Counsel, after completion of necessary forms by Class Counsel, including but not limited to W-9 forms. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if for any reason the Final Judgment is reversed or rendered void as a result of an appeal(s) then any Persons or firms who shall have received the funds shall be severally liable for payments made pursuant to this subparagraph, and shall return such funds to the Defendant. Additionally, should any parties to the Undertaking dissolve, merge, declare bankruptcy, become insolvent, or cease to exist prior to the final payment to Settlement Class Members, those parties shall execute a new undertaking guaranteeing repayment of funds within fourteen (14) days of such an occurrence.

8.3 Subject to Court approval, Plaintiffs will seek a Service Award in the amount of \$5,000 each (\$10,000 total) for their work as Class Representatives payable by the Defendant from the Settlement Fund. These Service Awards are in addition to any Cash Payment the Plaintiffs may Claim under the Settlement. Such award will be paid in the form of a check to the Class Representative that is sent in care of Class Counsel within ten (10) days of the Effective Date.

9. CONDITIONS OF SETTLEMENT, EFFECT OF DISAPPROVAL, CANCELLATION OR TERMINATION.

9.1 The Effective Date of this Settlement Agreement shall not occur unless and until each of the following events occurs and shall be the date upon which the last (in time) of the following events occurs:

- (a)** The Parties and their counsel have executed this Agreement;
- (b)** The Court has entered the Preliminary Approval Order;
- (c)** The Court has entered the Final Approval Order approving the Agreement, following Notice to the Settlement Class, and has entered the Final Judgment, or a judgment consistent with this Agreement in all material respects; and
- (d)** The Final Judgment has become Final, as defined above, or, in the event that the Court enters an order and final judgment in a form other than that provided above (“Alternative Judgment”) and that has the consent of the Parties, such Alternative Judgment becomes Final.

9.2 If some or all of the conditions specified in the previous paragraph are not met, or in the event that this Agreement is not approved by the Court, or the settlement set forth in this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective in accordance with its terms, then this Settlement Agreement shall be canceled and terminated subject to Paragraph 6.1 unless Class Counsel and Defendant’s Counsel mutually agree in writing to proceed with this Agreement. If any Party is in material breach of the terms hereof, and fails to cure such material breach within thirty (30) days of notice, any other Party, provided that it is in substantial compliance with the terms of this Agreement, may terminate this Agreement on notice to all of the Parties.

9.3 If this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective for the reasons set forth in Paragraphs 6.1 and 9.1–9.2 above, the Parties shall be restored to their respective positions in the Action as of the date of the signing of this Agreement. In such event, any Final Judgment or other order entered by the Court in accordance with the terms of this Agreement shall be treated

as vacated, *nunc pro tunc*, and the Parties shall be returned to the *status quo ante* with respect to the Action as if this Agreement had never been entered into.

10. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

10.1 The Parties (a) acknowledge that it is their intent to consummate this Settlement; and (b) agree, subject to their fiduciary and other legal obligations, to cooperate to the extent reasonably necessary to effectuate and implement all terms and conditions of this Agreement, to exercise their reasonable best efforts to accomplish the foregoing terms and conditions of this Agreement, to secure Final Approval, and to defend the Final Judgment through any and all appeals. Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel agree to cooperate with one another in seeking Court approval of the Settlement Agreement, entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, and the Final Judgment, and promptly to agree upon and execute all such other documentation as may be reasonably required to obtain final approval of the Agreement.

10.2 The Parties intend this Settlement to be a final and complete resolution of all disputes between them with respect to the Released Claims by Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class and each or any of them, on the one hand, against the Released Parties, and each or any of the Released Parties, on the other hand. Accordingly, the Parties agree not to assert in any forum that the Action was brought by Plaintiffs or defended by Defendant, or each or any of them, in bad faith or without a reasonable basis.

10.3 The Parties have relied upon the advice and representation of counsel, selected by them, concerning their respective legal liability for the claims hereby released. The Parties have read and understand fully the above and foregoing agreement and have been fully advised as to the legal effect thereof by counsel of their own selection and intend to be legally bound by the same.

10.4 Whether or not the Effective Date occurs or the Settlement is terminated, neither this Agreement nor the Settlement contained herein, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of this Agreement or the settlement:

(a) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission, concession or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claims, the truth of any fact alleged by the Plaintiffs, the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in the Action, the violation of any law or statute, the reasonableness of the settlement amount or the Fee Award, or of any alleged wrongdoing, liability, negligence, or fault of the Released Parties, or any of them;

(b) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against Defendant, as an admission, concession or evidence of any fault, misrepresentation or omission with respect to any statement or written document approved or made by the Released Parties, or any of them;

(c) is, may be deemed, or shall be used, offered or received against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission or concession with respect to any liability, negligence, fault or wrongdoing as against any Released Parties, in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal. However, the Settlement, this Agreement, and any acts performed and/or documents executed in furtherance of or pursuant to this Agreement and/or Settlement may be used in any proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Agreement. Further, if this Settlement is approved by the Court, any Party or any of the Released Parties may file this Agreement and/or the Final Judgment in any action that may be brought against such Party or Parties in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction,

or any other theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim;

(d) is, may be deemed, or shall be construed against Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class, the Releasing Parties, or each or any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, as an admission or concession that the consideration to be given hereunder represents an amount equal to, less than or greater than that amount that could have or would have been recovered after trial; and

(e) is, may be deemed, or shall be construed as or received in evidence as an admission or concession against Plaintiffs, the Settlement Class, the Releasing Parties, or each and any of them, or against the Released Parties, or each or any of them, that any of Plaintiff's claims are with or without merit or that damages recoverable in the Action would have exceeded or would have been less than any particular amount.

10.5 The headings used herein are used for the purpose of convenience only and are not meant to have legal effect.

10.6 The waiver by one Party of any breach of this Agreement by any other Party shall not be deemed as a waiver of any other prior or subsequent breaches of this Agreement.

10.7 All of the exhibits to this Agreement are material and integral parts thereof and are fully incorporated herein by this reference.

10.8 This Agreement and its Exhibits set forth the entire agreement and understanding of the Parties with respect to the matters set forth herein, and supersede all prior negotiations, agreements, arrangements and undertakings with respect to the matters set forth herein. No representations, warranties or inducements have been made to any Party concerning this Settlement Agreement or its Exhibits other than the representations, warranties and covenants contained and memorialized in such documents. This Agreement may be amended or modified

only by a written instrument signed by or on behalf of all Parties or their respective successors-in-interest.

10.9 Except as otherwise provided herein, each Party shall bear its own costs.

10.10 Plaintiffs represent and warrant that they have not assigned any claim or right or interest therein as against the Released Parties to any other Person or Party and that they are fully entitled to release the same.

10.11 Each counsel or other Person executing this Settlement Agreement, any of its Exhibits, or any related settlement documents on behalf of any Party hereto, hereby warrants and represents that such Person has the full authority to do so and has the authority to take appropriate action required or permitted to be taken pursuant to the Agreement to effectuate its terms. Class Counsel in particular warrants that they are authorized to execute this Settlement Agreement on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class (subject to Final Approval by the Court after notice to all Settlement Class Members), and that all actions necessary for the execution of this Settlement Agreement have been taken.

10.12 This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts. Signature by digital means, facsimile, or in PDF format will constitute sufficient execution of this Agreement. All executed counterparts and each of them shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument. A complete set of original executed counterparts shall be filed with the Court if the Court so requests.

10.13 This Settlement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors and assigns of the Parties hereto and the Released Parties.

10.14 The Court shall retain jurisdiction with respect to implementation and enforcement of the terms of this Agreement, and all Parties hereto submit to the jurisdiction of the Court for purposes of implementing and enforcing the Settlement embodied in this Agreement.

10.15 This Settlement Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida.

10.16 This Agreement is deemed to have been prepared by counsel for all Parties, as a result of arm's-length negotiations among the Parties. Because all Parties have contributed substantially and materially to the preparation of this Agreement, it shall not be construed more strictly against one Party than another.


10.17 Where this Agreement requires notice to the Parties, such notice shall be sent to counsel for the Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class: Philip L. Fraietta, Bursor & Fisher P.A., 50 Main Street, Suite 475, White Plains, NY 10606; and counsel for the Defendant: Aaron Charfoos, Paul Hastings LLP, 71 South Wacker Drive Suite 4500, Chicago, IL 60606.

10.18 Plaintiffs and/or Class Counsel shall not, at any time, issue press releases or make other public statements regarding the Settlement or the Action (apart from filings with the Court as necessary to obtain Approval of the Settlement) unless Defendant agrees to such press releases or public statements in advance; provided that Class Counsel may post Court orders regarding the Action and brief summaries of those orders on their website(s) without permission from Defendant, so long as any reference in such order(s) to materials subject to any confidentiality obligations are properly redacted. This provision shall not prohibit Class Counsel from communicating with any person in the Settlement Class regarding the Settlement (subject to compliance with any and all applicable confidentiality obligations). The Parties further agree that they will not make or publish written statements which are disparaging to the reputation of the other or their current or former corporate parents and affiliates.

IT IS SO AGREED TO BY THE PARTIES:

Dated: 04/09/2026

PLAINTIFF ABBY GRUBOR

By: 
Abby Grubor (Apr 9, 2026 11:07:43 EDT)

Abby Grubor, individually and as representative of the Class

Dated: 04/09/2026


PLAINTIFF JULIETTE BLATT

By: 
Juliette Blatt (Apr 9, 2026 09:28:22 PDT)

Juliette Blatt, individually and as representative of the Class

Dated: 4/10/2026

BAREFOOT DREAMS, INC.

Signed by:
By: 

Name: David Cappicille
Title: President

Dated: 04/09/2026

BURSOR & FISHER P.A.

By: 

Philip L. Fraietta

Class Counsel

Dated: 4/10/2026

PAUL HASTINGS LLP

Signed by:
By: 

Aaron Charfoos

Attorney for Defendant

EXHIBIT A

Grubor, et. al., v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc.

Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit, Broward County, Florida

Case No. CACE26003507

Settlement Claim Form

If you are a Settlement Class Member and wish to receive a payment, your completed Claim Form must be postmarked on or before [REDACTED], or submitted online on or before [REDACTED].

Please read the full notice of this settlement (available at [\[hyperlink\]](#)) carefully before filling out this Claim Form.

To be eligible to receive any benefits from the settlement obtained in this class action lawsuit, you must submit this completed Claim Form online or by mail:

ONLINE: Submit this Claim Form.

MAIL: [ADDRESS]

PART ONE: CLAIMANT INFORMATION & PAYMENT METHOD ELECTION

Provide your name and contact information below. It is your responsibility to notify the Settlement Administrator of any changes to your contact information after the submission of your Claim Form.

FIRST NAME

LAST NAME

STREET ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP CODE

EMAIL ADDRESS

UNIQUE PURCHASER ID

ASSIGNED PIN NUMBER

POTENTIAL CASH PAYMENT: You may be entitled to receive an **\$8.00** cash payment if between October 14, 2023 through the date of Notice of this class action settlement (as defined in the Settlement Agreement), you purchased a product from barefootdreams.com.

The cash will be sent in the form of an electronic payment. Please select from the options below:

Venmo Venmo Username: _____

QUESTIONS? VISIT [\[hyperlink\]](#) OR CALL [\[NUMBER\]](#) TOLL-FREE

PayPal PayPal Email: _____

Zelle Zelle Email: _____

If you are unable to receive your cash payment through an electronic method, please check the box below to receive your cash payment by check:

Check Confirm Mailing Address: _____

PART TWO: ATTESTATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that between October 14, 2023 through the date of Notice of this class action settlement, I purchased a product from barefootdreams.com, and that all of the information on this Claim Form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that my Claim Form may be subject to audit, verification, and Court review.

SIGNATURE

DATE

Please keep a copy of your Claim Form for your records.

EXHIBIT B

From: BarefootClassSettlement@barefootdreamsclasssettlement.com
To: JonQClassMember@domain.com
Re: Legal Notice of Class Action Settlement

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
Grubor, et al. v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc., Case No. CACE26003507
(Circuit Court of the 17th Judicial Circuit, Broward County, Florida)

Our Records Indicate You Purchased a Product From barefootdreams.com and May Be Entitled to a Payment From a Class Action Settlement.

Your Unique User ID is : []

Your Unique PIN Number is: []

You will need this ID and PIN Number to access the Settlement Website Claims Portal and for your Claim Form.

A court authorized this notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

This notice is to inform you that a settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant, Barefoot Dreams, Inc., disclosed its customers' personally identifiable information ("PII") to third parties via tracking technologies from Meta Platforms, Inc., Attentive Mobile Inc., and other tracking, analytics, and/or advertising technologies without consent in violation of the Florida Security of Communications Act ("FSCA"), Fla. Stat. § 934.03, *et seq.*; the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (the "ECPA"), 18 U.S.C. § 2511, *et seq.*; the California Invasion of Privacy Act ("CIPA"), Cal. Penal Code § 631; CIPA § 632; the Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act (the "CDAFA"), Cal. Penal Code § 502; and the California Constitution. Defendant denies all of Plaintiffs' claims in the lawsuit and maintains that it did nothing wrong, but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the expense, burdens and uncertainties associated with continuing the case.

Am I a Class Member? Our records indicate you may be a Class Member. Class Members are all United States residents who purchased a product from www.barefootdreams.com or any of Defendant's associated URLs from October 14, 2023, to and through **the date of this Notice**.

What Can I Get? You **must** submit a Claim Form **[hyperlink]** to receive a payment of \$8.00. Defendant has agreed to pay all valid claims to the Settlement Class, together with notice and administrative expenses, approved attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, and a service award to the Class Representatives.

How Do I Get a Payment? You **must** submit a timely and complete Claim Form **no later than [claims deadline]**. You can file a claim by clicking **[here]**. Your payment will come by check

unless you elect to receive payment electronically by PayPal, Venmo, or Zelle. Claim Forms must be submitted online by 11:59 p.m. EST on [DATE] or postmarked and mailed by [DATE].

What are My Other Options? You may exclude yourself from the Class by sending a letter to the settlement administrator no later than [objection/exclusion deadline]. If you exclude yourself, you cannot get a settlement payment, but you keep any rights you may have to sue the Defendant over the legal issues in the lawsuit. You and/or your lawyer have the right to appear before the Court and/or object to the proposed settlement. Your written objection must be filed no later than [objection/exclusion deadline]. Specific instructions about how to object to, or exclude yourself from, the Settlement are available at www.barefootdreamsclasssettlement.com. If you file a claim or do nothing, and the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by all of the Court's orders and judgments. In addition, your claims relating to the alleged disclosure of personal information and product purchase information to third parties in this case against the Defendant will be released.

Who Represents Me? The Court has appointed Stephen A. Beck and Philip L. Fraietta of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. to represent the class. This attorney is called Class Counsel. You will not be charged for these lawyers. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

When Will the Court Consider the Proposed Settlement? The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at _____ m. on [date] in Courtroom WW-15170 at the Broward County Courthouse located at 201 S.E. 6th Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301-3303 or by Zoom webinar. At that hearing, the Court will: hear any objections concerning the fairness of the settlement; determine the fairness of the settlement; decide whether to approve Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs; and decide whether to award the Class Representatives \$5,000 each for their service in helping to bring and settle this case. Defendant has agreed to pay Class Counsel reasonable attorneys' fees in an amount to be determined by the Court. Class Counsel is entitled to seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, but the Court may award less than this amount.

How Do I Get More Information? For more information, including the full Notice, Claim Form and Settlement Agreement go to, contact the settlement administrator at 1-____-____-____ or Barefoot Dreams Privacy Settlement Administrator, [address], or call Class Counsel at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX.

EXHIBIT C

CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

Grubor, et al., v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc., Case No. CACE26003507

If You Purchased A Product From barefootdreams.com Between October 14, 2023, Through [the Date of] this Notice, You May Be Entitled to a Payment From a Class Action Settlement.

A court authorized this notice. You are not being sued. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit claiming that Defendant Barefoot Dreams, Inc., disclosed its customers’ personally identifiable information (“PII”) to third parties via the Meta Platforms, Inc. and Attentive Mobile Inc. tracking technologies and other tracking, analytics, and/or advertising technologies without consent in violation of the Florida Security of Communications Act (“FSCA”), Fla. Stat. § 934.03, *et seq.*; the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (the “ECPA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2511, *et seq.*; the California Invasion of Privacy Act (“CIPA”), Cal. Penal Code § 631; CIPA § 632; the Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act (the “CDAFA”), Cal. Penal Code § 502; and the California Constitution. Defendant denies all of Plaintiffs’ claims in the lawsuit and maintains that it did nothing wrong but has agreed to the settlement to avoid the expense, burden and uncertainties associated with continuing the case.
- You are included if you are a United States resident who purchased a product from www.barefootdreams.com or any of Defendant’s associated URLs from October 14, 2023, to and through [the date of this Notice of the class action settlement].
- Persons included in the Settlement will be eligible to submit a Claim Form to receive a cash payment of \$8.00.
- Read this notice carefully. Your legal rights are affected whether you act, or don’t act.

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS IN THIS SETTLEMENT	
SUBMIT A CLAIM FORM BY [DATE]	Fill out the attached Settlement Claim Form and submit it no later than [DATE]. This is the only way to receive payment.
EXCLUDE YOURSELF BY [DATE]	Submit a request for exclusion no later than [DATE]. You will receive no benefits, but you will retain any rights you currently have to sue the Defendant about the claims in this case. If you exclude yourself, you will receive no payment and cannot object or speak at the hearing.
OBJECT BY [DATE]	Write to the Court no later than [DATE] explaining why you don’t like the Settlement. You can still submit a Settlement Claim Form. If the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by it.
GO TO THE HEARING BY [DATE]	Ask to speak in Court about your opinion of the Settlement at the hearing on [DATE]. You can still submit a Settlement Claim Form. If the Court approves the Settlement, you will be bound by it.

DO NOTHING

You **will not** get a share of the Settlement benefits and will give up your rights to sue the Defendant about the claims in this case.

Your rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this Notice.

All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, dated [DATE].

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why was this Notice issued?

A Court authorized this notice because you have a right to know about a proposed Settlement of this class action lawsuit and about all of your options, before the Court decides whether to give final approval to the Settlement. This Notice explains the lawsuit, the Settlement, and your legal rights.

The case is called *Grubor et al. v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc.*, Case No. CACE26003507, pending in the Circuit Court of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit for Broward County, Florida. The individuals who sued are called the Plaintiffs. The Defendant is Barefoot Dreams, Inc.

2. What is a class action?

In a class action, one or more people called the class representative (in this case, Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt) sue on behalf of a group or a “class” of people who have similar claims. In a class action, the court resolves the issues for all class members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Class.

3. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit claims that Defendant violated the Florida Security of Communications Act, Fla. Stat. § 934.03, *et seq.*; the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2511, *et seq.*; the California Invasion of Privacy Act, Cal. Penal Code § 631–632; the Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act, Cal. Penal Code § 502; and the California Constitution by disclosing their customers’ personally identifiable information (“PII”) to third parties via third party tracking, analytics, and/or advertising technologies without consent. The Defendant denies all of Plaintiffs’ claims in the lawsuit and maintains that it did nothing wrong.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

This matter has not gone to trial and the Court has not decided in favor of either Plaintiffs or Defendant. Plaintiffs and Defendants do not agree regarding the merits of Plaintiffs’ allegations

and recovery if Plaintiffs were to prevail at trial on each claim. By agreeing to settle, both sides avoid the cost and risk of a trial, and people who submit valid timely claims will get compensation. The Representative Plaintiffs and their attorneys believe the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and, thus, best for the Settlement Class and its members. The settlement does NOT mean that Defendant did anything wrong.

WHO'S INCLUDED IN THE SETTLEMENT?

5. How do I know if I am in the Settlement Class?

The **Settlement Class** is defined as:

All United States residents who purchased a product from www.barefootdreams.com or any of Defendant's associated URLs from October 14, 2023, to and through [\[the date of this Notice of the class action settlement\]](#). Excluded from the Settlement Class are (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action and members of their families; (2) the Defendant, their subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or their parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; (4) any persons who have released claims relating to the Action; and (5) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons.

THE SETTLEMENT BENEFITS

6. What does the Settlement provide?

Each Settlement Class Member who files a valid claim will receive a cash payment of \$8.00, subject to Court approval. In addition, Defendant has agreed to pay the costs of notice and administration of the settlement, approved attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, and service awards to the Class Representatives.

A detailed description of the settlement benefits can be found in the [Settlement Agreement](#). [\[insert hyperlink\]](#)

7. How much will my payment be?

You **must** submit a Settlement Claim Form (see instructions below) to receive a payment. **If you submit a valid Settlement Claim Form, you will receive an \$8.00 cash payment.**

You must provide proof of your Settlement Class membership when filing a claim by providing the [unique Notice ID and PIN Number](#) on the notice you received by e-mail. If for some reason you did not receive this information, but believe you are a Settlement Class Member, please call 1-[XXX-XXX-XXXX](#) to verify your identity and receive further information on how to file a claim.

8. When will I get my payment?

The hearing to consider the fairness of the settlement is scheduled for [Final Approval Hearing Date]. If the Court approves the settlement, eligible Class Members whose claims were approved by the Settlement Administrator will receive their payment 30 days after the Settlement has been finally approved and any appeals process is complete. The payment will be made in the form of an electronic payment by either PayPal, Venmo, or Zelle. If you are unable to receive payment through an electronic method you may select to receive your cash payment by check. All checks will expire and become void 180 days after they are issued.

HOW TO GET BENEFITS

9. How do I get a payment?

You **must** complete and submit a Settlement Claim Form to receive a payment. You may submit a Settlement Claim Form electronically on the Settlement Website by clicking [here](#) [insert hyperlink]. Settlement Claim Forms must be submitted online by 11:59 p.m. ET on [date] or postmarked and mailed by [date].

The Claims Administrator will process your claim and determine whether you are an Authorized Claimant. Please contact the Claims Administrator if you disagree with any determinations made by the Claims Administrator regarding your Proof of Claim. If you are unsatisfied with the determinations, you may ask the Court, which retains jurisdiction over all Settlement Class Members and the claims-administration process, to decide the issue by submitting a written request.

REMAINING IN THE SETTLEMENT

10. What am I giving up if I stay in the Class?

If the Settlement becomes final, you will give up your right to sue Defendant for the claims this Settlement resolves. The Settlement Agreement describes the specific claims you are giving up against the Defendant. You will be “releasing” the Defendant and certain of their affiliates described in Section 1.33 of the Settlement Agreement. Unless you exclude yourself (*see* Question 14), you are “releasing” the claims, regardless of whether you submit a claim or not. It means that all of the Court’s orders will apply to you and legally bind you. The Settlement Agreement is available through the “court documents” link on the website.

The Settlement Agreement describes the released claims with specific descriptions, so read it carefully. If you have any questions you can talk to the lawyers listed in Question 12 for free or you can, of course, talk to your own lawyer if you have questions about what this means.

11. What happens if I do nothing at all?

If you do nothing, you won't get any benefits from this Settlement. But, unless you exclude yourself, you won't be able to start a lawsuit or be part of any other lawsuit against the Defendant or the Released Parties (as defined in the Settlement Agreement) for the claims being resolved by this Settlement.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

12. Do I have a lawyer in the case?

The Court has appointed Stephen Beck and Philip Fraietta of Bursor & Fisher P.A. to be the attorneys representing the Settlement Class. They are called "Class Counsel." They believe, after conducting an extensive investigation, that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. You will not be charged for this lawyer. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer in this case, you may hire one at your expense.

13. How will the lawyers be paid?

Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses will be paid by Defendant out of the Settlement Fund and awarded by the Court. Class Counsel is entitled to seek no more than one-third of the Settlement Fund, but the Court may award less than this amount.

As approved by the Court, the Class Representatives will apply to be paid a service award paid by Defendant out of the Settlement Fund for helping to bring and settle the case. Class Representatives Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt may seek up to \$5,000 each as a service award, but the Court may award less than this amount.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

14. How do I get out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself from the Settlement, you must mail or otherwise deliver a letter (or request for exclusion) stating that you want to be excluded from the *Grubor, et al., v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc.*, Case No. CACE26003507 settlement. Your letter or request for exclusion must also include your name, your address, your signature, the name and number of this case, and a statement that you wish to be excluded. You must mail or deliver your exclusion request no later than **[objection/exclusion deadline]** to:

Barefoot Dreams Privacy Settlement
0000 Street
City, ST 00000

You cannot exclude yourself by telephone or by e-mail.

If you properly exclude yourself, you will not receive a payment from the Net Settlement Fund, you cannot object to the Settlement, and you will not be legally bound by the judgment in this case.

15. If I don't exclude myself, can I sue the Defendant for the same thing later?

No. Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue the Defendant for the claims being resolved by this Settlement.

16. If I exclude myself, can I get anything from this Settlement?

No. If you exclude yourself you will not be entitled to any benefits of the settlement, and you should not submit a Settlement Claim Form to ask for benefits.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

17. How do I object to the Settlement?

If you're a Class Member, you can object to the Settlement if you don't like any part of it. You can give reasons why you think the Court should not approve it. The Court will consider your views. To object, you must file with the Court a letter or brief stating that you object to the Settlement in *Blatt, et al., v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc.*, Case No. CACE26003507 and identify all your reasons for your objections (including citations and supporting evidence) and attach any materials you rely on for your objections. Your letter or brief must also include your name, an explanation of the basis upon which you claim to be a Settlement Class Member, the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting you in connection with your objection, and your signature. If you, or an attorney assisting you with your objection, have ever objected to any class action settlement where you or the objecting attorney has asked for or received payment in exchange for dismissal of the objection (or any related appeal) without modification to the settlement, you must include a statement in your objection identifying each such case by full case caption. You must also mail or deliver a copy of your letter or brief to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel listed below.

Class Counsel will file with the Court and post on this website its request for attorneys' fees by **[two weeks prior to objection deadline]**.

If you want to appear and speak at the Final Approval Hearing to object to the Settlement, with or without a lawyer (explained below in answer to Question Number 21), you must say so in your letter or brief. File the objection with the Court and mail a copy to these two different places postmarked no later than **[objection deadline]**.

Court	Class Counsel	Defendant's Counsel
Judge Michele Towbin Singer	Bursor & Fisher, P.A.	Paul Hastings LLP

Circuit Court for the 17th Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County 201 S.E. 6th Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301	Stephen A. Beck 701 Brickell Ave., Suite 2100 Miami, FL 33131-2800 Philip L. Fraietta 50 Main Street, Suite 475 White Plains, NY 10606	Aaron Charfoos 71 S. Wacker Drive, 45th Floor Chicago, IL 60606
---	---	--

18. What’s the difference between objecting and excluding myself from the Settlement?

Objecting simply means telling the Court that you don’t like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Class. Excluding yourself from the Class is telling the Court that you don’t want to be part of the Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you.

THE COURT’S FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

19. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?

The Court will hold the Final Approval Hearing at [redacted] m. on [date] in WW-15170 at the Broward County Courthouse located at 201 S.E. 6th Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301-3303 or by Zoom webinar. The purpose of the hearing will be for the Court to determine whether to approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Class; to consider the Class Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees and expenses; and to consider the request for a service award to the Class Representative. At that hearing, the Court will be available to hear any objections and arguments concerning the fairness of the Settlement.

The hearing may be postponed to a different date or time without notice, so it is a good idea to check [www.barefootdreamsclasssettlement.com] or call 1-[redacted].

20. Do I have to come to the hearing?

No. Class Counsel will answer any questions the Court may have. But, you are welcome to come at your own expense. If you send an objection or comment, you don’t have to come to Court to talk about it. As long as you filed and mailed your written objection on time, the Court will consider it. You may also pay another lawyer to attend, but it’s not required.

21. May I speak at the hearing?

You may ask the Court for permission to speak at the Fairness Hearing. To do so, you must include in your letter or brief objecting to the settlement a statement saying that it is your “Notice of Intent to Appear in *Grubor, et al. v. Barefoot Dreams, Inc.*, Case No.

CACE26003507.” It must include your name, address, telephone number and signature as well as the name and address of your lawyer, if one is appearing for you. Your objection and notice of intent to appear must be filed with the Court and postmarked no later than **[objection deadline]**, and be sent to the addresses listed in Question 17.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

22. Where do I get more information?

This Notice summarizes the Settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement. You can get a copy of the Settlement Agreement at www.barefootdreamsclasssettlement.com. You may also write with questions to Barefoot Dreams Privacy Settlement, P.O. Box 0000, City, ST 00000. You can call the Settlement Administrator at 1-800-000-0000 or Class Counsel at 1-XXX-XXX-XXXX, if you have any questions. Before doing so, however, please read this full Notice carefully. You may also find additional information elsewhere on the case website.

EXHIBIT D

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE
SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN
AND FOR BROWARD COUNTY FLORIDA

ABBY GRUBOR and JULIETTE BLATT,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BAREFOOT DREAMS, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CACE26003507

Hon. Michele Towbin Singer

Div. 21

**STIPULATION REGARDING UNDERTAKING RE: ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS,
AND EXPENSES**

Plaintiffs Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt ("Plaintiffs") and Defendant Barefoot Dreams, Inc. ("Defendant") (collectively, "the Parties"), by and through and including their undersigned counsel, stipulate and agree as follows:

WHEREAS, Bursor & Fisher, P.A. (the "Firm") desires to give an undertaking (the "Undertaking") for repayment of its share of the award of attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses approved by the Court, and

WHEREAS, the Defendant does not object to the Undertaking.

NOW, THEREFORE, Plaintiffs' counsel, on behalf of himself as individual and as agent for his law firm, hereby submits himself and his law firm to the jurisdiction of the Court for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this Undertaking.

Capitalized terms used herein without definition have the meanings given to them in the Settlement Agreement.

By receiving any payments pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Firm and its shareholders, members, and/or partners submit to the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of the

Seventeenth Judicial Circuit in and for Broward County, Florida for the enforcement of and any and all disputes relating to or arising out of the reimbursement obligation set forth herein and the Settlement Agreement.

In the event that the Final Settlement Order and Judgment or any part of it is vacated, overturned, reversed, or rendered void as a result of an appeal, or the Settlement Agreement is voided, rescinded, or otherwise terminated for any other reason, or the Final Settlement Order and Judgment are upheld, but the attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses awarded by the Court or any part of them are vacated, modified, reversed, or rendered void as a result of an appeal, the Firm shall, within thirty (30) days repay to Defendant or Defendant's insurer, based upon written instructions provided by Defendant's Counsel, the full amount of the attorneys' fees and costs paid to the Firm from the Settlement Fund, including any accrued interest.

This Undertaking and all obligations set forth herein shall expire upon finality of all direct appeals of the Final Settlement Order and Judgment.

In the event the Firm fails to repay to Defendant any of attorneys' fees and costs that are owed to either pursuant to this Undertaking, the Court shall, upon application of Defendant, and notice to the Firm, summarily issue orders, including but not limited to judgments and attachment orders against the Firm, and may make appropriate findings for sanctions for contempt of court.

The undersigned stipulate, warrant, and represent that he has both actual and apparent authority to enter into this stipulation, agreement, and undertaking on behalf of the Firm.

This Undertaking may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. Signatures by facsimile shall be as effective as original signatures.

The undersigned declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that they have read and understand the foregoing and that it is true and correct.

IT IS SO STIPULATED THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD:

DATED: April 9, 2026

BURSOR & FISHER P.A.



By: Philip L. Fraietta
On behalf of Plaintiff Blatt, Plaintiff
Grubor, and putative class members

DATED: 4/10/2026, 2026

PAUL HASTINGS LLP

Signed by:



By: ^{39DA157966314E5} Aaron Charfoos
On behalf of Defendant Barefoot Dreams, Inc.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND
FOR BROWARD COUNTY FLORIDA**

ABBY GRUBOR and JULIETTE BLATT,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BAREFOOT DREAMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. CACE26003507

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

Hon. Michele Towbin Singer

Div. 21

Plaintiffs Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt (“Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, and Defendant Barefoot Dreams, Inc. (“Defendant”) have agreed to settle this Action pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth in an executed Settlement Agreement and Release (hereinafter, “Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement”). The Parties reached the Settlement through several months of arm’s-length negotiations between experienced counsel. Under the Settlement Agreement, subject to the terms and conditions therein and subject to Court approval, Plaintiffs and the proposed Settlement Class will fully, finally, and forever resolve, discharge, and release their claims.

The Settlement Agreement has been filed with the Court, and Plaintiffs and proposed Class Counsel have filed an Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement. Upon considering the Motion, the Settlement Agreement and all exhibits thereto, the record in these proceedings, the representations and recommendations of counsel, and the requirements of law, the Court finds that: (1) this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the Parties to this Action; (2) the proposed Settlement Class meets the requirements of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and should be certified for settlement purposes only; (3) the person and entities

identified below should be appointed Class Representatives and Class Counsel; (4) the Settlement is the result of informed, good-faith, arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and their capable and experienced counsel, and is not the result of collusion; (5) the Settlement is within the range of reasonableness and should be preliminarily approved; (6) the proposed Notice program and proposed forms of Notice satisfy Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and constitutional due process requirements, and are reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, class certification, the terms of the Settlement, Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses ("Fee Application") and request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement, Class Counsel's Fee Application, and/or the request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs; (7) good cause exists to schedule and conduct a Final Approval Hearing, to assist the Court in determining whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and enter the Final Approval Order, and whether to grant Class Counsel's Fee Application and request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs; and (8) the other related matters pertinent to the Preliminary Approval of the Settlement should also be approved.

Based on the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** as follows:

1. As used in this Preliminary Approval Order, unless otherwise noted, capitalized terms shall have the definitions and meanings accorded to them in the Settlement Agreement.
2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and Parties to this proceeding pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and Fla. Stat. § 26.012(2).
3. Venue is proper in this Court.

Provisional Class Certification and Appointment of Class Representatives and Class Counsel

4. It is well established that “[a] class may be certified solely for purposes of settlement [if] a settlement is reached before a litigated determination of the class certification issue.” *Borcea v. Carnival Corp.*, 238 F.R.D. 664, 671 (S.D. Fla. 2006) (internal quotation marks omitted). In deciding whether to provisionally certify a settlement class, a court must consider the same factors that it would consider in connection with a proposed litigation class – *i.e.*, all Rule 23(a) factors and at least one subsection of Rule 23(b) must be satisfied – except that the Court need not consider the manageability of a potential trial, since the settlement, if approved, would obviate the need for a trial. *Id.*; *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 620 (1997).

5. The Court finds, for settlement purposes, that the Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 factors are present, and that certification of the proposed Settlement Class is appropriate under Rule 1.220. The Court therefore provisionally certifies the following Settlement Class:

All living United States residents who purchased a product from www.barefootdreams.com or any of Defendant’s associated URLs from October 14, 2023, to and through the date of Notice.

The Settlement Class excludes the following: (a) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action, any members of their families, or any staff, employees or law clerks that directly work for the Judge or Magistrate presiding over this Action; (b) the Defendant, its subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (c) persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the class; and (d) the legal representatives, successors or assigns of any such excluded persons.

6. Specifically, the Court finds, for settlement purposes and conditioned on final certification of the proposed class and on the entry of the Final Approval Order, that the Settlement Class satisfies the following factors of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220:

a. Numerosity: In the Action, approximately thousands of individuals are members of the proposed Settlement Class. The proposed Settlement Class is thus so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

b. Commonality: “[C]ommonality requires the plaintiff to demonstrate that the class members ‘have suffered the same injury,’” and the plaintiff’s common contention “must be of such a nature that it is capable of classwide resolution – which means that determination of its truth or falsity will resolve an issue that is central to the validity of each one of the claims in one stroke.” *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 131 S. Ct. 2541, 2551 (2011) (citation omitted). Here, the commonality requirement is satisfied. Multiple questions of law and fact centering on Defendant’s class-wide practices are common to the Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class, are alleged to have injured all members of the Settlement Class in the same way and would generate common answers central to the viability of the claims were this case to proceed to trial.

c. Typicality: The Plaintiffs’ claims are typical of the Settlement Class because they concern the same alleged practices by Defendant, arise from the same legal theories, and allege the same types of harm and entitlement to relief. Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 is therefore satisfied. *See Kornberg v. Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc.*, 741 F.2d 1332, 1337 (11th Cir. 1984) (typicality satisfied where claims “arise from the same event or pattern or practice and are based on the same legal theory”); *Murray v. Auslander*, 244 F.3d 807, 811 (11th Cir. 2001) (named plaintiffs are typical of the class where they “possess the same interest and suffer the same injury as the class members”).

d. Adequacy: Adequacy under Rule 1.220 relates to: (1) whether the proposed class representative has interests antagonistic to the class; and (2) whether the proposed class counsel has the competence to undertake the litigation at issue. *See Fabricant v. Sears Roebuck*, 202 F.R.D.

310, 314 (S.D. Fla. 2001). Here, adequacy is satisfied because there are no conflicts of interest between the Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class, and Plaintiffs have retained competent counsel to represent them and the Settlement Class. Class Counsel regularly engages in consumer class litigation, complex litigation, and other litigation like this Action, and have dedicated substantial resources to the prosecution of the Action. Moreover, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have vigorously and competently represented the Settlement Class in the Action. *See Lyons v. Georgia-Pacific Corp. Salaried Employees Rel. Plan*, 221 F.3d 1235, 1253 (11th Cir. 2000).

e. Predominance and Superiority: Rule 1.220 is satisfied because the common legal and alleged factual issues here predominate over individualized issues, and resolution of the common issues for the members of the Settlement Class in a single, coordinated proceeding is superior to thousands of individual lawsuits addressing the same legal and factual issues. With respect to predominance, “[c]ommon issues of fact and law . . . ha[ve] a direct impact on every class member’s effort to establish liability that is more substantial than the impact of individualized issues in resolving the claim or claims of each class member.” *Sacred Heart Health Sys., Inc. v. Humana Military Healthcare Servs., Inc.*, 601 F.3d 1159, 1170 (11th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted). Here, common questions present a significant aspect of the case and can be resolved for all members of the Settlement Class in a single adjudication. In a liability determination, those common issues would predominate over any issues that are unique to individual members of the Settlement Class. Moreover, each member of the Settlement Class has claims that arise from the same or similar alleged Defendant’s practices as well as the same legal theories.

7. The Court appoints Plaintiffs Abby Grubor and Juliette Blatt as Class Representatives.

8. The Court appoints Philip L. Fraietta and Stephen A. Beck from Bursor & Fisher P.A. as Class Counsel.

9. The Court recognizes that Defendant reserves all its defenses and objections against and rights to oppose any request for class certification if the proposed Settlement does not become Final for any reason. Defendant also reserves its defenses to the merits of the claims asserted in the event the Settlement does not become Final for any reason.

Preliminary Approval of the Settlement

10. At the preliminary approval stage, the Court's task is to evaluate whether the Settlement is within the "range of reasonableness." 4 NEWBERG ON CLASS ACTIONS § 11.26. "Preliminary approval is appropriate where the proposed settlement is the result of the parties' good faith negotiations, there are no obvious deficiencies and the settlement falls within the range of reason." *Smith v. Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co.*, 2010 WL 2401149, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Jun. 15, 2010). Settlement negotiations that involve arm's length, informed bargaining with the aid of experienced counsel support a preliminary finding of fairness. *See* Manual for Complex Litigation, Third, § 30.42 (West 1995) ("A presumption of fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness may attach to a class settlement reached in arm's-length negotiations between experienced, capable counsel after meaningful discovery.") (internal quotation marks omitted).

11. The Court preliminarily approves the Settlement, together with all exhibits attached to the Settlement Agreement, as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court finds that the Settlement was reached in the absence of collusion, is the product of informed, good-faith, arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and their capable and experienced counsel. The Court further finds that the Settlement, including the exhibits attached to the Settlement Agreement, is within the range of reasonableness and possible judicial approval, such that: (a) a presumption of fairness

is appropriate for the purposes of preliminary settlement approval; and (b) it is appropriate to effectuate notice to the Settlement Class, as set forth below and in the Settlement Agreement, and schedule a Final Approval Hearing to assist the Court in determining whether to grant Final Approval to the Settlement and enter a Final Approval Order.

Approval of Class Notice and the Claims Process

12. The Court approves the form and content of the Class notices, substantially in the forms attached to the Settlement Agreement, as well as the Claim Form attached thereto. The Court further finds that the Class Notice program described in the Settlement Agreement is the best practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice program is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to inform the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of a Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement, Class Counsel's Fee Application and the request for Service Awards for Plaintiff, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement. The Class notices and Class Notice program constitute sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Class notices and Class Notice program satisfy all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and the Constitutional requirement of Due Process.

13. Epiq Systems, Inc. shall serve as the Administrator of the Settlement ("Administrator").

14. The Administrator shall implement the Class Notice program, as set forth below and in the Settlement Agreement, using the Class notices substantially in the forms attached to the Settlement Agreement and approved by this Preliminary Approval Order. Notice shall be provided to the members of the Settlement Class pursuant to the Class Notice program, as specified in the Settlement Agreement and approved by this Preliminary Approval Order. The Class Notice

program shall include, to the extent necessary, mail and e-mail Notice, and the Long-Form Notice, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and below.

Notice

15. The Administrator shall administer Notice as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Notice shall be completed no later than thirty (30) days after this Preliminary Approval Order. The Administrator shall administer two Reminder Notices, one thirty (30) days prior to the Claims Deadline and one ten (10) days prior to the Claims Deadline.

Settlement Website

16. The Administrator shall establish a Settlement Website as a means for Settlement Class members to obtain notice of, and information about, the Settlement. The Settlement Website shall be established as soon as practicable following Preliminary Approval, but no later than before commencement of the Class Notice program. The Settlement Website shall include the Settlement Agreement, the Long-Form Notice, the Preliminary Approval Order, and other such documents as Class Counsel and counsel for Defendant agree to include. These documents shall remain on the Settlement Website until at least forty-five (45) days following the Claim Deadline.

17. The Administrator is directed to perform all substantive responsibilities with respect to effectuating the Class Notice program, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

Final Approval Hearing, Opt-Outs, and Objections

18. A Final Approval Hearing shall be held before this Court on _____, 2026 at _____ to determine whether to grant Final Approval to the Settlement and to enter a Final Approval Order, and whether Class Counsel's Fee Application and request for Service Awards for the Class Representatives should be granted.

19. Any person within the Settlement Class who wishes to be excluded from the Settlement Class may exercise their right to opt-out of the Settlement Class by following the opt-out procedures set forth in the Settlement Agreement and in the Notices at any time during the Opt-Out Period. To be valid and timely, opt-out requests must be received by all those listed in the Long-Form Notice on or before the last day of the Opt-out Period, which is sixty (60) days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval (“Opt-Out Deadline”), and mailed to the addresses indicated in the Long Form Notice.

20. Any Settlement Class Member may object to the Settlement, Class Counsel’s Fee Application, or the request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs. Any such objections must be mailed to the Clerk of the Court, Class Counsel, and Defendant’s Counsel, at the addresses indicated in the Long-Form Notice. For an objection to be considered by the Court, the objection must be postmarked no later than the Opt-Out Deadline, as set forth in the Notice. To be valid, an objection must include the following information:

- a. the name of the Action;
- b. the objector’s full name, address, and telephone number;
- c. an explanation of the basis upon which the objector claims to be a Settlement Class Member;
- d. all grounds for the objection, accompanied by any legal support for the objection known to the objector or his counsel;
- e. the number of times in which the objector has objected to a class action settlement within the five years preceding the date that the objector files the objection, the caption of each case in which the objector has made such an objection, and a copy

of any orders related to or ruling upon the objector's prior such objections that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case;

- f. the identity of all counsel who represent the objector, including any former or current counsel who may be entitled to compensation for any reason related to the objection to the Settlement or Fee Application;
- g. a copy of any orders related to or ruling upon counsel's or the counsel's law firm's prior objections made by individuals or organizations represented by that firm that were issued by the trial and appellate courts in each listed case in which the objector's counsel and/or counsel's law firm have objected to a class action settlement within the preceding five years;
- h. any and all agreements that relate to the objection or the process of objecting—whether written or oral—between objector or objector's counsel and any other person or entity;
- i. the identity of all counsel (if any) representing the objector who will appear at the Final Approval Hearing;
- j. a statement confirming whether the objector intends to personally appear and/or testify at the Final Approval Hearing;
- k. a list of all persons who will be called to testify at the Final Approval Hearing in support of the objection; and
- l. the objector's signature (an attorney's signature is not sufficient).

Further Papers in Support of Settlement and Attorney's Fee Application

21. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file their Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, Fee Application and request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs, no later than thirty (30)

days before the Final Approval Hearing.

22. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file their responses to timely filed objections to the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Fee Application and/or request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs no later than forty-five (45) days after the Notice Date.

Effect of Failure to Approve Settlement

23. If the Settlement is not finally approved by the Court, or for any reason the Parties fail to obtain a Final Approval Order as contemplated in the Settlement, or the Settlement is terminated pursuant to its terms for any reason, then the following shall apply:

- a. All orders and findings entered in connection with the Settlement shall become null and void and have no further force and effect, shall not be used or referred to for any purpose whatsoever, and shall not be admissible or discoverable in any other proceeding;
- b. Nothing in this Preliminary Approval Order is, or may be construed as, any admission or concession by or against Defendant or Plaintiffs on any point of fact or law; and
- c. Neither the Settlement terms nor any publicly disseminated information regarding the Settlement, including, without limitation, the Class Notice, court filings, orders and public statements, may be used as evidence. In addition, neither the fact of, nor any documents relating to, either Party's withdrawal from the Settlement, any failure of the Court to approve the Settlement and/or any objections or interventions may be used as evidence.

Stay/Bar of Other Proceedings

24. All proceedings in the Action are stayed until further order of the Court, except as

may be necessary to implement the terms of the Settlement. Pending final determination of whether the Settlement should be approved, Plaintiffs, all persons in the Settlement Class, and persons purporting to act on their behalf are enjoined from commencing or prosecuting (either directly, representatively or in any other capacity) against any of the Released Parties any action or proceeding in any court, arbitration forum or tribunal asserting any of the Released Claims.

25. Based on the foregoing, the Court sets the following schedule for the Final Approval Hearing and the actions which must take place before and after it:

EVENT	PROPOSED DEADLINE
Deadline to Provide Settlement Administrator with Class List	28 Days After Preliminary Approval Order
Notice Date	30 Days After Preliminary Approval Order
Motion for Final Approval, inclusive of Application for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards	45 Days After Notice Date
Claims Deadline	60 Days After Notice Date
Objection/Exclusion Deadline	60 Days After Notice Date
Final Approval Hearing	No earlier than 75 Days After Notice Date
Payment of Fee Award	Within 10 Days After Final Judgment
Payment of Service Award	Within 10 Days of the Effective Date
Cash Payment Funds Wired to Settlement Administrator	14 Days After Effective Date
Cash Payments for Valid Claims Sent to Settlement Class Members	30 Days After Effective Date
Reversionary Payment to Defendant	220 Days After Effective Date

DONE and **ORDERED** in Chambers at Broward County, Florida, this ___ day of _____, 2026.

HON. MICHELE TOWBIN SINGER
Circuit Court Judge

Copies furnished to: Counsel of Record



50 MAIN STREET
WHITE PLAINS, NY 10606

www.bursor.com

1990 N. CALIFORNIA BLVD.
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

1330 AVE. OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019

701 BRICKELL AVENUE
MIAMI, FL 33131

FIRM RESUME

With offices in Florida, New York, and California, BURSOR & FISHER lawyers have represented both plaintiffs and defendants in state and federal courts throughout the country.

The lawyers at our firm have an active civil trial practice, having won multi-million-dollar verdicts or recoveries in six of six class action jury trials since 2008. Our most recent class action trial victory came in May 2019 in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel and won a \$267 million jury verdict against a debt collector found to have violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act. During the pendency of the defendant's appeal, the case settled for \$75.6 million, the largest settlement in the history of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

In August 2013 in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel, we won a jury verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (II)*, we obtained a \$50 million jury verdict in favor of a certified class of 150,000 purchasers of the Avacor Hair Regrowth System. The legal trade publication VerdictSearch reported that this was the second largest jury verdict in California in 2009, and the largest in any class action.

The lawyers at our firm have an active class action practice and have won numerous appointments as class counsel to represent millions of class members, including customers of Honda, Verizon Wireless, AT&T Wireless, Sprint, Haier America, and Michaels Stores as well as purchasers of Avacor™, Hydroxycut, and Sensa™ products. Bursor & Fisher lawyers have been court-appointed Class Counsel or Interim Class Counsel in:

1. *O'Brien v. LG Electronics USA, Inc.* (D.N.J. Dec. 16, 2010) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of LG French-door refrigerators,
2. *Ramundo v. Michaels Stores, Inc.* (N.D. Ill. June 8, 2011) to represent a certified nationwide class of consumers who made in-store purchases at Michaels Stores using a debit or credit card and had their private financial information stolen as a result,
3. *In re Haier Freezer Consumer Litig.* (N.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2011) to represent a certified class of purchasers of mislabeled freezers from Haier America Trading, LLC,
4. *Rodriguez v. CitiMortgage, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 14, 2011) to represent a certified nationwide class of military personnel against CitiMortgage for illegal foreclosures,

5. *Rossi v. The Procter & Gamble Co.* (D.N.J. Jan. 31, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Crest Sensitivity Treatment & Protection toothpaste,
6. *Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp. et al.* (D.N.J. Feb. 21, 2012) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of mislabeled Maytag Centennial washing machines from Whirlpool Corp., Sears, and other retailers,
7. *In re Sensa Weight Loss Litig.* (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Sensa weight loss products,
8. *In re Sinus Buster Products Consumer Litig.* (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2012) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers,
9. *Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Capatriti 100% Pure Olive Oil,
10. *Forcellati v. Hyland's, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of children's homeopathic cold and flu remedies,
11. *Ebin v. Kangadis Family Management LLC, et al.* (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2014) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Capatriti 100% Pure Olive Oil,
12. *In re Scotts EZ Seed Litig.* (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 26, 2015) to represent a certified class of purchasers of Scotts Turf Builder EZ Seed,
13. *Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., et al.* (E.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2015) to represent a certified class of purchasers of mislabeled KitchenAid refrigerators from Whirlpool Corp., Best Buy, and other retailers,
14. *Hendricks v. StarKist Co.* (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2015) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of StarKist tuna products,
15. *In re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Card Litig.* (N.D. Cal. May 8, 2015) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of NVIDIA GTX 970 graphics cards,
16. *Melgar v. Zicam LLC, et al.* (E.D. Cal. March 30, 2016) to represent a certified ten-jurisdiction class of purchasers of Zicam Pre-Cold products,
17. *In re Trader Joe's Tuna Litigation* (C.D. Cal. December 21, 2016) to represent purchaser of allegedly underfilled Trader Joe's canned tuna.
18. *In re Welspun Litigation* (S.D.N.Y. January 26, 2017) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of Welspun Egyptian cotton bedding products,
19. *Retta v. Millennium Products, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. January 31, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of Millennium kombucha beverages,
20. *Moeller v. American Media, Inc.,* (E.D. Mich. June 8, 2017) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
21. *Hart v. BHH, LLC* (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2017) to represent a nationwide class of purchasers of Bell & Howell ultrasonic pest repellers,
22. *McMillion v. Rash Curtis & Associates* (N.D. Cal. September 6, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received calls from Rash Curtis & Associates,

23. *Lucero v. Solarcity Corp.* (N.D. Cal. September 15, 2017) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received telemarketing calls from Solarcity Corp.,
24. *Taylor v. Trusted Media Brands, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 17, 2017) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
25. *Gasser v. Kiss My Face, LLC* (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2017) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of cosmetic products,
26. *Gastelum v. Frontier California Inc.* (S.F. Superior Court February 21, 2018) to represent a certified California class of Frontier landline telephone customers who were charged late fees,
27. *Williams v. Facebook, Inc.* (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2018) to represent a proposed nationwide class of Facebook users for alleged privacy violations,
28. *Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2018) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
29. *Bayol v. Health-Ade* (N.D. Cal. August 23, 2018) to represent a proposed nationwide class of Health-Ade kombucha beverage purchasers,
30. *West v. California Service Bureau* (N.D. Cal. September 12, 2018) to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received calls from California Service Bureau,
31. *Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corporation* (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 14, 2018) to represent a nationwide class of purchasers of protein shake products,
32. *Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2018) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
33. *Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel Inc. d/b/a Holiday Cruise Line* (N.D. Ill. Mar. 21, 2019) to represent a certified class of individuals who received calls from Holiday Cruise Line,
34. *Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson* (E.D. Cal. March 29, 2019) to represent a certified class of purchasers of Benecol spreads labeled with the representation “No Trans Fat,”
35. *Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. April 24, 2019) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
36. *Galvan v. Smashburger* (C.D. Cal. June 25, 2019) to represent a proposed class of purchasers of Smashburger’s “Triple Double” burger,
37. *Kokoszki v. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Feb. 7, 2020) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
38. *Russett v. The Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co.* (S.D.N.Y. May 28, 2020) to represent a class of insurance policyholders that were allegedly charged unlawful paper billing fees,
39. *In re: Metformin Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation* (D.N.J. June 3, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of generic diabetes medications that were contaminated with a cancer-causing carcinogen,

40. *Hill v. Spirit Airlines, Inc.* (S.D. Fla. July 21, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of passengers whose flights were cancelled by Spirit Airlines due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19, and whose tickets were not refunded,
41. *Kramer v. Alterra Mountain Co.* (D. Colo. July 31, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of purchasers to recoup the unused value of their Ikon ski passes after Alterra suspended operations at its ski resorts due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
42. *Qureshi v. American University* (D.D.C. July 31, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by American University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
43. *Hufford v. Maxim Inc.* (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2020) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
44. *Desai v. Carnegie Mellon University* (W.D. Pa. Aug. 26, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Carnegie Mellon University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
45. *Heigl v. Waste Management of New York, LLC* (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 27, 2020) to represent a class of waste collection customers that were allegedly charged unlawful paper billing fees,
46. *Stellato v. Hofstra University* (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 18, 2020) to represent a proposed nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Hofstra University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
47. *Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc.* (C.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), to represent consumers who purchased defective chainsaws,
48. *Soo v. Lorex Corporation* (N.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2020), to represent consumers whose security cameras were intentionally rendered non-functional by manufacturer,
49. *Miranda v. Golden Entertainment (NV), Inc.* (D. Nev. Dec. 17, 2020), to represent consumers and employees whose personal information was exposed in a data breach,
50. *Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, Inc.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Feb. 4, 2021), to represent a certified nationwide class of individuals who received text messages from SmileDirectClub, in alleged violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act,
51. *Suren v. DSV Solutions, LLC* (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Apr. 8, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
52. *De Lacour v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.* (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 23, 2021), to represent a certified class of consumers who purchased allegedly “natural” Tom’s of Maine products,
53. *Wright v. Southern New Hampshire University* (D.N.H. Apr. 26, 2021), to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Southern New Hampshire University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,

54. *Sahlin v. Hospital Housekeeping Systems, LLC* (Cir. Ct. Williamson Cnty. May 21, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
55. *Landreth v. Verano Holdings LLC, et al.* (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. June 2, 2021), to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.
56. *Rocchio v. Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey*, (Sup. Ct., Middlesex Cnty. October 27, 201), to represent a certified nationwide class of students for fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Rutgers due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
57. *Malone v. Western Digital Corp.*, (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2021), to represent a class of consumers who purchased hard drives that were allegedly deceptively advertised,
58. *Jenkins v. Charles Industries, LLC*, (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Dec. 21, 2021) to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
59. *Frederick v. Examsoft Worldwide, Inc.*, (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. Jan. 6, 2022) to represent a certified class of exam takers who used virtual exam proctoring software, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
60. *Isaacson v. Liqui-Box Flexibles, LLC, et al.*, (Cir. Ct. Will Cnty. Jan. 18, 2022) to represent a certified class of employees who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
61. *Goldstein et al. v. Henkel Corp.*, (D. Conn. Mar. 3, 2022) to represent a proposed class of purchasers of Right Guard-brand antiperspirants that were allegedly contaminated with benzene,
62. *McCall v. Hercules Corp.*, (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Westchester Cnty. Mar. 14, 2022) to represent a certified class of who laundry card purchasers who were allegedly subjected to deceptive practices by being denied cash refunds,
63. *Lewis v. Trident Manufacturing, Inc.*, (Cir. Ct. Kane Cnty. Mar. 16, 2022) to represent a certified class of workers who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
64. *Croft v. Spinx Games Limited, et al.*, (W.D. Wash. Mar. 31, 2022) to represent a certified class of Washington residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Washington law,
65. *Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC*, (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022) to represent a certified class of Illinois residents whose identities were allegedly used without their consent in alleged violation of the Illinois Right of Publicity Act,
66. *Rivera v. Google LLC*, (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. Apr. 25, 2022) to represent a certified class of Illinois residents who appeared in a photograph in Google Photos, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
67. *Loftus v. Outside Integrated Media, LLC*, (E.D. Mich. May 5, 2022) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,

68. *D'Amario v. The University of Tampa*, (S.D.N.Y. June 3, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by The University of Tampa due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
69. *Fittipaldi v. Monmouth University*, (D.N.J. Sept. 22, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of students for tuition and fee refunds after their classes were moved online by Monmouth University due to the novel coronavirus, COVID-19,
70. *Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al.* (Cir. Ct. Henderson Cnty. Oct. 3, 2022) to present a certified class of Kentucky residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Kentucky law,
71. *Cruz v. The Connor Group, A Real Estate Investment Firm, LLC*, (N.D. Ill. Oct. 26, 2022) to represent a certified class of workers who used a fingerprint clock-in system, in alleged violation of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act,
72. *Delcid et al. v. TCP HOT Acquisitions LLC et al.* (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 2022) to represent a certified nationwide class of purchasers of Sure and Brut-brand antiperspirants that were allegedly contaminated with benzene,
73. *Kain v. The Economist Newspaper NA, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Dec. 15, 2022) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
74. *Strano v. Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Jan. 6, 2023) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
75. *Moeller v. The Week Publications, Inc.* (E.D. Mich. Jan. 6, 2023) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
76. *Ambrose v. Boston Globe Media Partners, LLC* (D. Mass. May 25, 2023) to represent a nationwide class of newspaper subscribers who were also Facebook users under the Video Privacy Protection Act,
77. *In re: Apple Data Privacy Litigation*, (N.D. Cal. July 5, 2023) to represent a putative nationwide class of all persons who turned off permissions for data tracking and whose mobile app activity was still tracked on iPhone mobile devices,
78. *Young v. Military Advantage, Inc. d/b/a Military.com* (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. July 26, 2023) to represent a nationwide class of website subscribers who were also Facebook users under the Video Privacy Protection Act,
79. *Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd.* (Cir. Ct. Henderson Cnty. Aug. 15, 2023) to represent a certified class of Kentucky residents who lost money playing mobile applications games that allegedly constituted illegal gambling under Kentucky law,
80. *Kotila v. Charter Financial Publishing Network, Inc.* (W.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2024) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,
81. *Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research* (W.D. Mich. Feb. 21, 2024) to represent a class of magazine subscribers under the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act,

82. *Norcross v. Tishman Speyer Properties, et al.* (S.D.N.Y. May 17, 2024) to represent a class of online ticket purchasers under New York Arts & Cultural Affairs Law § 25.07(4).

SCOTT A. BURSOR

Mr. Bursor has an active civil trial practice, having won multi-million verdicts or recoveries in six of six civil jury trials since 2008. Mr. Bursor's most recent victory came in May 2019 in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, in which Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel and won a \$267 million jury verdict against a debt collector for violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA).

In *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.* (2013), where Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel, the jury returned a verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc.* (2009), the jury returned a \$50 million verdict in favor of the plaintiff and class represented by Mr. Bursor. The legal trade publication VerdictSearch reported that this was the second largest jury verdict in California in 2009.

Class actions are rarely tried to verdict. Other than Mr. Bursor and his partner Mr. Fisher, we know of no lawyer that has tried more than one class action to a jury. Mr. Bursor's perfect record of six wins in six class action jury trials, with recoveries ranging from \$21 million to \$299 million, is unmatched by any other lawyer. Each of these victories was hard-fought against top trial lawyers from the biggest law firms in the United States.

Mr. Bursor graduated from the University of Texas Law School in 1996. He served as Articles Editor of the Texas Law Review, and was a member of the Board of Advocates and Order of the Coif. Prior to starting his own practice, Mr. Bursor was a litigation associate at a large New York based law firm where he represented telecommunications, pharmaceutical, and technology companies in commercial litigation.

Mr. Bursor is a member of the state bars of New York, Florida, and California, as well as the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, Ninth and Eleventh Circuits, and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, and the Eastern District of Michigan.

Representative Cases

Mr. Bursor was appointed lead or co-lead class counsel to the largest, 2nd largest, and 3rd largest classes ever certified. Mr. Bursor has represented classes including more than 160 million class members, roughly 1 of every 2 Americans. Listed below are recent cases that are representative of Mr. Bursor's practice:

Mr. Bursor negotiated and obtained court-approval for two landmark settlements in *Nguyen v. Verizon Wireless* and *Zill v. Sprint Spectrum* (the largest and 2nd largest classes ever certified). These settlements required Verizon and Sprint to open their wireless networks to

third-party devices and applications. These settlements are believed to be the most significant legal development affecting the telecommunications industry since 1968, when the FCC's Carterfone decision similarly opened up AT&T's wireline telephone network.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum, L.P.* representing a class of approximately 2 million California consumers who were charged an early termination fee under a Sprint cellphone contract, asserting claims that such fees were unlawful liquidated damages under the California Civil Code, as well as other statutory and common law claims. After a five-week combined bench-and-jury trial, the jury returned a verdict in June 2008 and the Court issued a Statement of Decision in December 2008 awarding the plaintiffs \$299 million in cash and debt cancellation. Mr. Bursor served as lead trial counsel for this class again in 2013 during a month-long jury trial in which Sprint asserted a \$1.06 billion counterclaim against the class. Mr. Bursor secured a verdict awarding Sprint only \$18.4 million, the exact amount calculated by the class's damages expert. This award was less than 2% of the damages Sprint sought, less than 6% of the amount of the illegal termination fees Sprint charged to class members. In December 2016, after more than 13 years of litigation, the case was settled for \$304 million, including \$79 million in cash payments plus \$225 million in debt cancellation.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *White v. Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless* representing a class of approximately 1.4 million California consumers who were charged an early termination fee under a Verizon cellphone contract, asserting claims that such fees were unlawful liquidated damages under the California Civil Code, as well as other statutory and common law claims. In July 2008, after Mr. Bursor presented plaintiffs' case-in-chief, rested, then cross-examined Verizon's principal trial witness, Verizon agreed to settle the case for a \$21 million cash payment and an injunction restricting Verizon's ability to impose early termination fees in future subscriber agreements.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *Thomas v. Global Visions Products Inc.* Mr. Bursor represented a class of approximately 150,000 California consumers who had purchased the Avacor® hair regrowth system. In January 2008, after a four-week combined bench-and-jury trial, Mr. Bursor obtained a \$37 million verdict for the class, which the Court later increased to \$40 million.

Mr. Bursor was appointed class counsel and was elected chair of the Official Creditors' Committee in *In re Nutraquest Inc.*, a Chapter 11 bankruptcy case before Chief Judge Garrett E. Brown, Jr. (D.N.J.) involving 390 ephedra-related personal injury and/or wrongful death claims, two consumer class actions, four enforcement actions by governmental agencies, and multiple adversary proceedings related to the Chapter 11 case. Working closely with counsel for all parties and with two mediators, Judge Nicholas Politan (Ret.) and Judge Marina Corodemus (Ret.), the committee chaired by Mr. Bursor was able to settle or otherwise resolve every claim and reach a fully consensual Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, which Chief Judge Brown approved in late 2006. This settlement included a \$12.8 million recovery to a nationwide class of consumers who alleged they were defrauded in connection with the purchase of Xenadrine® dietary supplement products.

Mr. Bursor was the lead trial lawyer in *In re: Pacific Bell Late Fee Litigation*. After filing the first class action challenging Pac Bell's late fees in April 2010, winning a contested

motion to certify a statewide California class in January 2012, and defeating Pac Bell's motion for summary judgment in February 2013, Mr. Bursor obtained final approval of the \$38 million class settlement. The settlement, which Mr. Bursor negotiated the night before opening statements were scheduled to commence, included a \$20 million cash payment to provide refunds to California customers who paid late fees on their Pac Bell wireline telephone accounts, and an injunction that reduced other late fee charges by \$18.6 million.

L. TIMOTHY FISHER

L. Timothy Fisher has an active practice in consumer class actions and complex business litigation and has also successfully handled a large number of civil appeals.

Mr. Fisher has been actively involved in numerous cases that resulted in multi-million dollar recoveries for consumers and investors. Mr. Fisher has handled cases involving a wide range of issues including nutritional labeling, health care, telecommunications, corporate governance, unfair business practices and consumer fraud. With his partner Scott A. Bursor, Mr. Fisher has tried five class action jury trials, all of which produced successful results. In *Thomas v. Global Vision Products*, Mr. Fisher obtained a jury award of \$50,024,611 — the largest class action award in California in 2009 and the second-largest jury award of any kind. In 2019, Mr. Fisher served as trial counsel with Mr. Bursor in *Perez v. Rash Curtis & Associates*, where the jury returned a verdict for \$267 million in statutory damages under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Mr. Fisher was admitted to the State Bar of California in 1997. He is also a member of the bars of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern and Eastern Districts of California, the Northern District of Illinois, the Eastern District of Michigan, and the Eastern District of Missouri. Mr. Fisher taught appellate advocacy at John F. Kennedy University School of Law in 2003 and 2004. In 2010, he contributed jury instructions, a verdict form and comments to the consumer protection chapter of Justice Elizabeth A. Baron's *California Civil Jury Instruction Companion Handbook* (West 2010). In January 2014, Chief Judge Claudia Wilken of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California appointed Mr. Fisher to a four-year term as a member of the Court's Standing Committee on Professional Conduct.

Mr. Fisher received his Juris Doctor from Boalt Hall at the University of California at Berkeley in 1997. While in law school, he was an active member of the Moot Court Board and participated in moot court competitions throughout the United States. In 1994, Mr. Fisher received an award for Best Oral Argument in the first-year moot court competition.

In 1992, Mr. Fisher graduated with highest honors from the University of California at Berkeley and received a degree in political science. Prior to graduation, he authored an honors thesis for Professor Bruce Cain entitled "The Role of Minorities on the Los Angeles City Council." He is also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Representative Cases

Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (Alameda County Superior Court). Mr. Fisher litigated claims against Global Vision Products, Inc. and other individuals in connection with the sale and marketing of a purported hair loss remedy known as Avacor. The case lasted more than seven years and involved two trials. The first trial resulted in a verdict for plaintiff and the class in the amount of \$40,000,000. The second trial resulted in a jury verdict of \$50,024,611, which led to a \$30 million settlement for the class.

In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases - Handset Locking Actions (Alameda County Superior Court). Mr. Fisher actively worked on five coordinated cases challenging the secret locking of cell phone handsets by major wireless carriers to prevent consumers from activating them on competitive carriers' systems. Settlements have been approved in all five cases on terms that require the cell phone carriers to disclose their handset locks to consumers and to provide unlocking codes nationwide on reasonable terms and conditions. The settlements fundamentally changed the landscape for cell phone consumers regarding the locking and unlocking of cell phone handsets.

In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases - Early Termination Fee Cases (Alameda County Superior Court and Federal Communications Commission). In separate cases that are a part of the same coordinated litigation as the Handset Locking Actions, Mr. Fisher actively worked on claims challenging the validity under California law of early termination fees imposed by national cell phone carriers. In one of those cases, against Verizon Wireless, a nationwide settlement was reached after three weeks of trial in the amount of \$21 million. In a second case, which was tried to verdict, the Court held after trial that the \$73 million of flat early termination fees that Sprint had collected from California consumers over an eight-year period were void and unenforceable.

Selected Published Decisions

Melgar v. Zicam LLC, 2016 WL 1267870 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 30, 2016) (certifying 10-jurisdiction class of purchasers of cold remedies, denying motion for summary judgment, and denying motions to exclude plaintiff's expert witnesses).

Salazar v. Honest Tea, Inc., 2015 WL 7017050 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2015) (denying motion for summary judgment).

Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., 2015 WL 1932484 (E.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2015) (certifying California class of purchasers of refrigerators that were mislabeled as Energy Star qualified).

Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc., 78 F.Supp.3d 1252 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (denying motion to dismiss claims alleging unlawful late fees under California Civil Code § 1671).

Forcellati v. Hyland's, Inc., 2015 WL 9685557 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2015) (denying motion for summary judgment in case alleging false advertising of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

Bayol v. Zipcar, Inc., 2014 WL 4793935 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2014) (denying motion to transfer venue pursuant to a forum selection clause).

Forcellati v. Hyland's Inc., 2014 WL 1410264 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014) (certifying nationwide class of purchasers of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

Hendricks v. StarKist Co., 30 F.Supp.3d 917 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (denying motion to dismiss in case alleging underfilling of 5-ounce cans of tuna).

Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool Corp., 2013 WL 5781673 (E.D. Cal. October 25, 2013) (denying motion to dismiss in case alleging that certain KitchenAid refrigerators were misrepresented as Energy Star qualified).

Forcellati v. Hyland's Inc., 876 F.Supp.2d 1155 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (denying motion to dismiss complaint alleging false advertising regarding homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children).

Clerkin v. MyLife.com, 2011 WL 3809912 (N.D. Cal. August 29, 2011) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss in case alleging false and misleading advertising by a social networking company).

In re Cellphone Termination Fee Cases, 186 Cal.App.4th 1380 (2010) (affirming order approving \$21 million class action settlement).

Gatton v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., 152 Cal.App.4th 571 (2007) (affirming order denying motion to compel arbitration).

Selected Class Settlements

Melgar v. Zicam (Eastern District of California) - \$16 million class settlement of claims alleging cold medicine was ineffective.

Gastelum v. Frontier California Inc. (San Francisco Superior Court) - \$10.9 million class action settlement of claims alleging that a residential landline service provider charged unlawful late fees.

West v. California Service Bureau, Inc. (Northern District of California) - \$4.1 million class settlement of claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp. (Southern District of New York) - \$9 million class settlement of false advertising claims against protein shake manufacturer.

Morris v. SolarCity Corp. (Northern District of California) - \$15 million class settlement of claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

Retta v. Millennium Products, Inc. (Central District of California) - \$8.25 million settlement to resolve claims of bottled tea purchasers for alleged false advertising.

Forcellati v. Hyland's (Central District of California) – nationwide class action settlement providing full refunds to purchasers of homeopathic cold and flu remedies for children.

Dei Rossi v. Whirlpool (Eastern District of California) – class action settlement providing \$55 cash payments to purchasers of certain KitchenAid refrigerators that allegedly mislabeled as Energy Star qualified.

In Re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation (Northern District of California) - \$4.5 million class action settlement of claims alleging that a computer graphics card was sold with false and

misleading representations concerning its specifications and performance.

Hendricks v. StarKist Co. (Northern District of California) – \$12 million class action settlement of claims alleging that 5-ounce cans of tuna were underfilled.

In re Zakskorn v. American Honda Motor Co. Honda (Eastern District of California) – nationwide settlement providing for brake pad replacement and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses in case alleging defective brake pads on Honda Civic vehicles manufactured between 2006 and 2011.

Correa v. Sensa Products, LLC (Los Angeles Superior Court) - \$9 million settlement on behalf of purchasers of the Sensa weight loss product.

In re Pacific Bell Late Fee Litigation (Contra Costa County Superior Court) - \$38.6 million settlement on behalf of Pac Bell customers who paid an allegedly unlawful late payment charge.

In re Haier Freezer Consumer Litigation (Northern District of California) - \$4 million settlement, which provided for cash payments of between \$50 and \$325.80 to class members who purchased the Haier HNCM070E chest freezer.

Thomas v. Global Vision Products, Inc. (Alameda County Superior Court) - \$30 million settlement on behalf of a class of purchasers of a hair loss remedy.

Guyette v. Viacom, Inc. (Alameda County Superior Court) - \$13 million settlement for a class of cable television subscribers who alleged that the defendant had improperly failed to share certain tax refunds with its subscribers.

JOSEPH I. MARCHESE

Joseph I. Marchese is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joe focuses his practice on consumer class actions, employment law disputes, and commercial litigation. He has represented corporate and individual clients in a wide array of civil litigation, and has substantial trial and appellate experience.

Joe has diverse experience in litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of mislabeling, false or misleading advertising, privacy violations, unlawful and junk fees, data breach claims, and violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Joe also has significant experience in multidistrict litigation proceedings. Recently, he served on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In Re: Blue Buffalo Company, Ltd. Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2562, which resulted in a \$32 million consumer class settlement. Currently, he serves on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee for Economic Reimbursement in *In Re: Valsartan Products Liability Litigation*, MDL. No. 2875.

Joe is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York,

and the Eastern District of Michigan, as well as the United States Courts of Appeals for the First, Second and Sixth Circuits.

Joe graduated from Boston University School of Law in 2002 where he was a member of The Public Interest Law Journal. In 1998, Joe graduated with honors from Bucknell University.

Selected Published Decisions:

Farwell v. Google, LLC, 595 F. Supp. 3d 702 (C.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), denying defendant's motion to dismiss BIPA claims brought on behalf of Illinois students using Google's Workspace for Education platform.

Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 269 F. Supp. 3d 172 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 7, 2017), granting plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment on state privacy law violations in putative class action.

Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 192 F. Supp. 3d 427 (S.D.N.Y. June 17, 2016), denying publisher's motion to dismiss its subscriber's allegations of state privacy law violations in putative class action.

In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

In re Michaels Stores Pin Pad Litigation, 830 F. Supp. 2d 518 (N.D. Ill. 2011), denying retailer's motion to dismiss its customers' state law consumer protection and privacy claims in data breach putative class action.

Selected Class Settlements:

Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation, Case No. 22-cv-0188-HYJ-RSK (W.D. Mich. 2024) – final approval granted for \$52.5 million class settlement to resolve claims of periodical subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Edwards v. Mid-Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, Case No. 22-cv-00562-TJM-CFH (N.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$2.2 million class settlement to resolve claims alleging unlawfully charged overdraft fees on accounts with sufficient funds.

Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, LLC, Case No. 2020-CH-07269 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$11.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged TCPA violations.

Marquez v. Google LLC, Case No. 2021-CH-1460 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$100 million class settlement to resolve alleged BIPA violations of Illinois residents appearing on the Google Photos platform.

Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc., Case No. 15-cv-09279-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$50 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast, Case No. 15-cv-05671-NRB (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$13.75 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation, Case No. 12-cv-4727-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$47 million class settlement to resolve false advertising claims of purchasers of combination grass seed product.

In Re: Blue Buffalo Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation, Case No. 14-MD-2562-RWS (E.D. Mo. 2016) – final approval granted for \$32 million class settlement to resolve claims of pet owners for alleged false advertising of pet foods.

Rodriguez v. Citimortgage, Inc., Case No. 11-cv-4718-PGG (S.D.N.Y. 2015) – final approval granted for \$38 million class settlement to resolve claims of military servicemembers for alleged foreclosure violations of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, where each class member was entitled to \$116,785 plus lost equity in the foreclosed property and interest thereon.

O'Brien v. LG Electronics USA, Inc., et al., Case No. 10-cv-3733-DMC (D.N.J. 2011) – final approval granted for \$23 million class settlement to resolve claims of Energy Star refrigerator purchasers for alleged false advertising of the appliances' Energy Star qualification.

SARAH N. WESTCOT

Sarah N. Westcot is the Managing Partner of Bursor & Fisher's Miami office. She focuses her practice on consumer class actions, complex business litigation, and mass torts.

She has represented clients in a wide array of civil litigation, and has substantial trial and appellate experience. Sarah served as trial counsel in *Ayyad v. Sprint Spectrum L.P.*, where Bursor & Fisher won a jury verdict defeating Sprint's \$1.06 billion counterclaim and securing the class's recovery of more than \$275 million in cash and debt relief.

Sarah also has significant experience in high-profile, multi-district litigations. She currently serves on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re Zantac (Ranitidine) Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2924 (S.D. Florida). She also serves on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In re Apple Inc. App Store Simulated Casino-Style Games Litigation*, MDL No. 2985 (N.D. Cal.) and *In Re: Google Play Store Simulated Casino-Style Games Litigation*, MDL No. 3001 (N.D. Cal.).

Sarah is admitted to the State Bars of California and Florida, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Central, Southern, and Eastern Districts of California, the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, and the bars of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Eighth, and Ninth Circuits.

Sarah received her Juris Doctor from the University of Notre Dame Law School in 2009. During law school, she was a law clerk with the Cook County State's Attorney's Office in Chicago and the Santa Clara County District Attorney's Office in San Jose, CA, gaining early trial experience in both roles. She graduated with honors from the University of Florida in 2005.

Sarah is a member of The National Trial Lawyers Top 100 Civil Plaintiff Lawyers, and was selected to The National Trial Lawyers Top 40 Under 40 Civil Plaintiff Lawyers for 2022.

PHILIP L. FRAIETTA

Philip L. Fraietta is the Managing Partner of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.'s White Plains office. Phil focuses his practice on data privacy, complex business litigation, and consumer class actions. Phil has been named a "Rising Star" in the New York Metro Area by Super Lawyers[®] every year since 2019.

Phil has significant experience in litigating consumer class actions, particularly those involving privacy claims under statutes such as the Michigan Preservation of Personal Privacy Act, the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act, and Right of Publicity statutes. Since 2016, Phil has recovered over \$100 million for class members in privacy class action settlements. In addition to privacy claims, Phil has significant experience in litigating and settling class action claims involving false or misleading advertising.

Phil is admitted to the State Bars of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Michigan, and California, the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the Western District of New York, the Northern District of New York, the District of New Jersey, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the Northern District of Illinois, the Central District of Illinois, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Third, and Ninth Circuits. Phil was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Phil received his Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law in 2014, graduating cum laude. During law school, Phil served as an Articles & Notes Editor for the Fordham Law Review, and published two articles. In 2011, Phil graduated cum laude from Fordham University with a B.A. in Economics.

Selected Published Decisions:

Garner v. Me-TV National Limited Partnership, 132 F.4th 1022 (7th Cir. Mar. 28, 2025), reversing grant of motion to dismiss under federal Video Privacy Protection Act and specifying standard for being a "consumer" under the Act.

Jancik v. WebMD LLC, 2025 WL 560705 (N.D. Ga. Feb 20, 2025), certifying the first ever contested class under the federal Video Privacy Protection Act.

Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC, 2022 WL 971479 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2022), certifying class of Illinois residents for alleged violations of Illinois' Right of Publicity Act by background reporting website.

Kolebuck-Utz v. Whitepages, Inc., 2021 WL 157219 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 22, 2021), denying defendant's motion to dismiss for alleged violations of Ohio's Right to Publicity Law.

Porter v. NBTY, Inc., 2019 WL 5694312 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 4, 2019), denying supplement manufacturer's motion for summary judgment on consumers' allegations of false advertising relating to whey protein content.

Boelter v. Hearst Communications, Inc., 269 F. Supp. 3d 172 (S.D.N.Y. 2017), granting plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment on state privacy law violations in putative class action.

Selected Class Settlements:

Ramos v. ZoomInfo Technologies, LLC, Case No. 21-cv-02032-CPK (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for \$29.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged statutory right of publicity violations.

Awad v. AMC Entertainment Holdings, Inc., Index No. 607322/2024 (Sup. Ct. Nassau Cnty. 2024) – final approval granted for \$12.3 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged New York ticket fee claims.

Schreiber v. Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Case No. 22-cv-00188-HYJ (W.D. Mich. 2024) – final approval granted for \$52.5 million class settlement to resolve claims of newsletter subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Fischer v. Instant Checkmate LLC, Case No. 19-cv-04892-MSS (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for \$10.1 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged statutory right of publicity violations.

Young v. Military Advantage, Inc., Case No. 2023LA000535 (Cir. Ct. DuPage Cnty. 2023) – final approval granted for \$7.35 million class settlement to resolve claims of newsletter subscribers for alleged federal Video Privacy Protection Act claims.

Rivera v. Google LLC, Case No. 2021-CH-1460 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2022) – final approval granted for \$100 million class settlement to resolve alleged BIPA violations of Illinois residents appearing in photos on the Google Photos platform.

Edwards v. Hearst Communications, Inc., Case No. 15-cv-09279-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$50 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Ruppel v. Consumers Union of United States, Inc., Case No. 16-cv-02444-KMK (S.D.N.Y. 2018) – final approval granted for \$16.375 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Moeller v. Advance Magazine Publishers, Inc. d/b/a Condé Nast, Case No. 15-cv-05671-NRB (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$13.75 million class settlement to resolve claims of magazine subscribers for alleged statutory privacy violations.

Benbow v. SmileDirectClub, LLC, Case No. 2020-CH-07269 (Cir. Ct. Cook Cnty. 2021) – final approval granted for \$11.5 million class settlement to resolve claims for alleged TCPA violations.

Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp., Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final approval granted for \$9 million class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.

NEAL J. DECKANT

Neal J. Deckant is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A., where he serves as the firm's Head of Information & e-Discovery. Neal focuses his practice on complex business litigation and consumer class actions. Prior to joining Bursor & Fisher, Neal counseled low-income homeowners facing foreclosure in East Boston.

Neal is admitted to the State Bars of California and New York, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, and the bars of the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second and Ninth Circuits.

Neal received his Juris Doctor from Boston University School of Law in 2011, graduating cum laude with two Dean's Awards. During law school, Neal served as a Senior Articles Editor for the Review of Banking and Financial Law, where he authored two published articles about securitization reforms, both of which were cited by the New York Court of Appeals, the highest court in the state. Neal was also awarded Best Oral Argument in his moot court section, and he served as a Research Assistant for his Securities Regulation professor. Neal has also been honored as a 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 Super Lawyers Rising Star. In 2007, Neal graduated with Honors from Brown University with a dual major in East Asian Studies and Philosophy.

Selected Published Decisions:

Martinelli v. Johnson & Johnson, 2019 WL 1429653 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2019), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of Benecol spreads labeled with the representation "No Trans Fats."

Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp., 2017 WL 6513347 (D.N.J. Dec. 20, 2017), granting class certification of consumer protection claims brought by purchasers of Maytag Centennial washing machines marked with the “Energy Star” logo.

Duran v. Obesity Research Institute, LLC, 204 Cal. Rptr. 3d 896 (Cal. Ct. App. 2016), reversing and remanding final approval of a class action settlement on appeal, regarding allegedly mislabeled dietary supplements, in connection with a meritorious objection.

Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al., 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting individual and law firm defendants’ motion for judgment as a matter of law on plaintiff’s claims for retaliation and defamation, as well as for all claims against law firm partners, Nadeem and Lubna Faruqi.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor’s motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported “100% Pure Olive Oil” product.

Selected Class Settlements:

In Re NVIDIA GTX 970 Graphics Chip Litigation, Case No. 15-cv-00760-PJH (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2016) – final approval granted for \$4.5 million class action settlement to resolve claims that a computer graphics card was allegedly sold with false and misleading representations concerning its specifications and performance.

Hendricks v. StarKist Co., 2016 WL 5462423 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016) – final approval granted for \$12 million class action settlement to resolve claims that 5-ounce cans of tuna were allegedly underfilled.

In re: Kangadis Food Inc., Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014) – class action claims resolved for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy, following claims that its olive oil was allegedly sold with false and misleading representations.

Selected Publications:

Neal Deckant, *X. Reforms of Collateralized Debt Obligations: Enforcement, Accounting and Regulatory Proposals*, 29 Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 79 (2009) (cited in *Quadrant Structured Products Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, 16 N.E.3d 1165, 1169 n.8 (N.Y. 2014)).

Neal Deckant, *Criticisms of Collateralized Debt Obligations in the Wake of the Goldman Sachs Scandal*, 30 Rev. Banking & Fin. L. 407 (2010) (cited in *Quadrant Structured Products Co., Ltd. v. Vertin*, 16 N.E.3d 1165, 1169 n.8 (N.Y. 2014); *Lyon Village Venetia, LLC v. CSE Mortgage LLC*, 2016 WL 476694, at *1 n.1 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. Feb. 4, 2016); Ivan Ascher, Portfolio

Society: On the Capitalist Mode of Prediction, at 141, 153, 175 (Zone Books / The MIT Press 2016); Devon J. Steinmeyer, *Does State National Bank of Big Spring v. Geithner Stand a Fighting Chance?*, 89 Chi.-Kent. L. Rev. 471, 473 n.13 (2014)).

YITZCHAK KOPEL

Yitzchak Kopel is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Yitz focuses his practice on consumer class actions and complex business litigation. He has represented corporate and individual clients before federal and state courts, as well as in arbitration proceedings.

Yitz has substantial experience in successfully litigating and resolving consumer class actions involving claims of consumer fraud, data breaches, and violations of the telephone consumer protection act. Since 2014, Yitz has obtained class certification on behalf of his clients five times, three of which were certified as nationwide class actions. Bursor & Fisher was appointed as class counsel to represent the certified classes in each of the cases.

Yitz is admitted to the State Bars of New York and New Jersey, the bar of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second, Eleventh, and Ninth Circuits, and the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, Eastern District of New York, Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern District of Wisconsin, Northern District of Illinois, and District of New Jersey.

Yitz received his Juris Doctorate from Brooklyn Law School in 2012, graduating *cum laude* with two Dean's Awards. During law school, Yitz served as an Articles Editor for the Brooklyn Law Review and worked as a Law Clerk at Shearman & Sterling. In 2009, Yitz graduated *cum laude* from Queens College with a B.A. in Accounting.

Selected Published Decisions:

Bassaw v. United Industries Corp., 482 F.Supp.3d 80, 2020 WL 5117916 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 31, 2020), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning insect foggers.

Poppiti v. United Industries Corp., 2020 WL 1433642 (E.D. Mo. Mar. 24, 2020), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning citronella candles.

Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc., 2019 WL 6699188 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 9, 2019), granting summary judgment on behalf of certified class in robocall class action.

Krumm v. Kittrich Corp., 2019 WL 6876059 (E.D. Mo. Dec. 17, 2019), denying motion to dismiss claims in putative class action concerning mosquito repellent.

Crespo v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 394 F. Supp. 3d 260 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), denying defendant's motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action regarding Raid insect fogger.

Bakov v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc., 2019 WL 1294659 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 21, 2019), certifying a class of persons who received robocalls in the state of Illinois.

Bourbia v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 375 F. Supp. 3d 454 (S.D.N.Y. 2019), denying defendant's motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action regarding mosquito repellent.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 323 F. Supp. 3d 560 (S.D.N.Y. 2018), denying defendants' motion for summary judgment in certified class action involving the sale of ultrasonic pest repellents.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 2018 WL 3471813 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2018), denying defendants' motion to exclude plaintiffs' expert in certified class action involving the sale of ultrasonic pest repellents.

Penrose v. Buffalo Trace Distillery, Inc., 2018 WL 2334983 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 5, 2018), denying bourbon producers' motion to dismiss fraud and consumer protection claims in putative class action.

West v. California Service Bureau, Inc., 323 F.R.D. 295 (N.D. Cal. 2017), certifying a nationwide class of "wrong-number" robocall recipients.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 2017 WL 2912519 (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2017), certifying nationwide class of purchasers of ultrasonic pest repellents.

Browning v. Unilever United States, Inc., 2017 WL 7660643 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2017), denying motion to dismiss fraud and warranty claims in putative class action concerning facial scrub product.

Brenner v. Procter & Gamble Co., 2016 WL 8192946 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2016), denying motion to dismiss warranty and consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning baby wipes.

Hewlett v. Consolidated World Travel, Inc., 2016 WL 4466536 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2016), denying telemarketer's motion to dismiss TCPA claims in putative class action.

Bailey v. KIND, LLC, 2016 WL 3456981 (C.D. Cal. June 16, 2016), denying motion to dismiss fraud and warranty claims in putative class action concerning snack bars.

Hart v. BHH, LLC, 2016 WL 2642228 (S.D.N.Y. May 5, 2016) denying motion to dismiss warranty and consumer protection claims in putative class action concerning ultrasonic pest repellents.

Marchuk v. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, et al., 100 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting clients' motion for judgment as a matter of law on claims for retaliation and defamation in employment action.

In re Scotts EZ Seed Litigation, 304 F.R.D. 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2015), granting class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by New York and California purchasers of grass seed product.

Brady v. Basic Research, L.L.C., 101 F. Supp. 3d 217 (E.D.N.Y. 2015), denying diet pill manufacturers' motion to dismiss its purchasers' allegations for breach of express warranty in putative class action.

Ward v. TheLadders.com, Inc., 3 F. Supp. 3d 151 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), denying online job board's motion to dismiss its subscribers' allegations of consumer protection law violations in putative class action.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 297 F.R.D. 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2014), granting nationwide class certification of false advertising and other claims brought by purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

Ebin v. Kangadis Food Inc., 2014 WL 737878 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 25, 2014), denying distributor's motion for summary judgment against nationwide class of purchasers of purported "100% Pure Olive Oil" product.

Selected Class Settlements:

Hart v. BHH, LLC, Case No. 1:15-cv-04804 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 22, 2020), resolving class action claims regarding ultrasonic pest repellers.

In re: Kangadis Food Inc., Case No. 8-14-72649 (Bankr. E.D.N.Y. Dec. 17, 2014), resolving class action claims for \$2 million as part of a Chapter 11 plan of reorganization, after a corporate defendant filed for bankruptcy following the certification of nationwide claims alleging that its olive oil was sold with false and misleading representations.

West v. California Service Bureau, Case No. 4:16-cv-03124-YGR (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2019), resolving class action claims against debt-collector for wrong-number robocalls for \$4.1 million.

ALEC M. LESLIE

Alec Leslie is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. He focuses his practice on consumer class actions, employment law disputes, and complex business litigation.

Alec is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bar of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York. Alec was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Alec received his Juris Doctor from Brooklyn Law School in 2016, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Alec served as an Articles Editor for Brooklyn Law Review. In addition, Alec served as an intern to the Honorable James C. Francis for the Southern District of New York and the Honorable Vincent Del Giudice, Supreme Court, Kings County. Alec graduated from the University of Colorado with a B.A. in Philosophy in 2012.

Selected Class Settlements:

Gregorio v. Premier Nutrition Corp., Case No. 17-cv-05987-AT (S.D.N.Y. 2019) – final

approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims of protein shake purchasers for alleged false advertising.

Wright v. Southern New Hampshire Univ., Case No. 1:20-cv-00609-LM (D.N.H. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 tuition and fee refunds to students.

Mendoza et al. v. United Industries Corp., Case No. 21PH-CV00670 (Phelps Cnty. Mo. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve false advertising claims on insect repellent products.

Kaupelis v. Harbor Freight Tools USA, Inc., Case No. 8:19-cv-01203-JVS-DFM (C.D. Cal. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly defective and dangerous chainsaws.

Rocchio v. Rutgers Univ., Case No. MID-L-003039-20 (Middlesex Cnty. N.J. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

Malone v. Western Digital Corporation, Case No. 5:20-cv-03584-NC (N.D. Cal.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve false advertising claims on hard drive products.

Frederick et al. v. ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc., Case No. 2021L001116 (DuPage Cnty. Ill. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over alleged BIPA violations with respect to exam proctoring software.

D'Amario et al. v. Univ. of Tampa, Case No. 7:20-cv-07344 (S.D.N.Y. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

Olin et al. v. Meta Platforms, Inc., Case No. 3:18-cv-01881-RS (N.D. Cal. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement involving invasion of privacy claims.

Croft v. SpinX Games et al., Case No. 2:20-cv-01310-RSM (W.D. Wash. 2022) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al., Case No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cnty. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Barbieri v. Tailored Brands, Inc., Index No. 616696/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Metzner et al. v. Quinnipiac Univ., Case No. 3:20-cv-00784 (D. Conn.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve claims over COVID-19 fee refunds to students.

In re GE/Canon Data Breach, Case No. 1:20-cv-02903 (S.D.N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement to resolve data breach claims.

Davis v. Urban Outfitters, Inc., Index No. 612162/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Armstead v. VGW Malta LTD et al., Civil Action No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Casler et al. v. Mclane Company, Inc. et al., Index No. 616432/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Wyland v. Woopla, Inc., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00356 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Graziano et al. v. Lego Systems, Inc., Index No. 611615/2022 (Nassau Cnty. N.Y.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving untimely wage payments to employees.

Lipsky et al. v. American Behavioral Research Institute, LLC, Case No. 50-2023-CA-011526-XXXX-MB (Palm Beach Cnty. Fl.) – final approval granted to resolve allegedly deceptive automatic renewal and product efficacy claims.

Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00358 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky.) – final approval granted for class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

STEPHEN BECK

Stephen is a Partner with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Stephen focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Stephen is admitted to the State Bar of Florida and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern and Middle Districts of Florida, the Eastern District of Missouri, and the Northern District of Illinois.

Stephen received his Juris Doctor from the University of Miami School of Law in 2018. During law school, Stephen received an Honors distinction in the Litigation Skills Program and was awarded the Honorable Theodore Klein Memorial Scholarship for excellence in written and oral advocacy. Stephen also received the CALI Award in Legislation for earning the highest grade on the final examination. Stephen graduated from the University of North Florida with a B.A. in Philosophy in 2015.

MAX S. ROBERTS

Max Roberts is a Partner in Bursor & Fisher's New York office. Max focuses his practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection. Max was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Since 2023, Max has been named “Rising Star” in the New York Metro Area by Super Lawyers®.

Max received his Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law in 2019, graduating *cum laude*. During law school, Max was a member of Fordham’s Moot Court Board, the Brennan Moore Trial Advocates, and the Fordham Urban Law Journal, for which he published a note entitled [*Weaning Drug Manufacturers Off Their Painkiller: Creating an Exception to the Learned Intermediary Doctrine in Light of the Opioid Crisis*](#). In addition, Max served as an intern to the Honorable Vincent L. Briccetti of the Southern District of New York and worked as an intern in the Fordham Criminal Defense Clinic. Max graduated from Johns Hopkins University in 2015 with a B.A. in Political Science.

Outside of the law, Max is an avid triathlete.

Selected Published Decisions:

Huertas v. Bayer US LLC, 120 F.4th 1169 (3d Cir. 2024), reversing district court and holding plaintiffs had alleged an injury-in-fact sufficient for Article III standing. Max personally argued the appeal before the Third Circuit, which can be listened to [here](#).

Jackson v. Amazon.com, Inc., 65 F.4th 1093 (9th Cir. 2023), affirming district court’s denial of motion to compel arbitration. Max personally argued the appeal before the Ninth Circuit, which can be viewed [here](#).

Javier v. Assurance IQ, LLC, 2022 WL 1744107 (9th Cir. May 31, 2022), reversing district court and holding that Section 631 of the California Invasion of Privacy Act requires prior consent to wiretapping. Max personally argued the appeal before the Ninth Circuit, which can be viewed [here](#).

Mora v. J&M Plating, Inc., 213 N.E.3d 942 (Ill. App. Ct. 2d Dist. 2022), reversing circuit court and holding that Section 15(a) of Illinois’ Biometric Information Privacy Act requires an entity to establish a retention and deletion schedule for biometric data at the first moment of possession. Max personally argued the appeal before the Second District, which can be listened to [here](#).

Newman v. Bayer Corp., 348 F.R.D. 567 (S.D.N.Y. 2025), certifying class of New York purchases of “One A Day” gummy multivitamins.

Deivaprakash v. Condé Nast Digital, 798 F. Supp. 3d 1100 (N.D. Cal. 2025), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of California pen register statute.

Shah v. Fandom, Inc., 754 F. Supp. 3d 924 (N.D. Cal. 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of California pen register statute.

Yockey v. Salesforce, Inc., 745 F. Supp. 3d 945 (N.D. Cal. 2024), denying motion dismiss alleged violations of California and Pennsylvania wiretapping statutes.

Rancourt v. Meredith Corp., 2024 WL 381344 (D. Mass. Jan. 11, 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of federal Video Privacy Protection Act, and finding personal jurisdiction over operator of mobile application.

Saunders v. Hearst Television, Inc., 711 F. Supp. 3d 24 (D. Mass. 2024), denying motion to dismiss alleged violations of federal Video Privacy Protection Act.

Cristostomo v. New Balance Athletics, Inc., 647 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D. Mass. 2022), denying motion to dismiss and motion to strike class allegations in case involving sneakers marketed as “Made in the USA.”

Selected Class Settlements:

Sholopa v. Turk Hava Yollari A.O. (d/b/a Turkish Airlines), Case No. 1:20-cv-3294-ALC (S.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$14.1 million class settlement to resolve claims of passengers whose flights with Turkish Airlines were cancelled due to COVID-19 and who did not receive refunds.

Payero v. Mattress Firm, Inc., Case No. 7:21-cv-3061-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$4.9 million class settlement to resolve claims of consumers who purchased allegedly defective bed frames.

Miranda v. Golden Entertainment (NV), Inc., Case No. 2:20-cv-534-AT (D. Nev. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement valued at over \$4.5 million to resolve claims of customers and employees of casino company stemming from data breach.

Malone v. Western Digital Corp., Case No. 5:20-cv-3584-NC (N.D. Cal. 2021) – final approval granted for class settlement valued at \$5.7 million to resolve claims of hard drive purchasers for alleged false advertised.

Frederick v. ExamSoft Worldwide, Inc., Case No. 2021-L-001116 (18th Judicial Circuit Court DuPage County, Illinois 2021) – final approval granted for \$2.25 million class settlement to resolve claims of Illinois students for alleged violations of the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.

Bar Admissions

- New York State
- California
- Massachusetts
- Southern District of New York
- Eastern District of New York
- Northern District of New York
- Northern District of California
- Central District of California
- Eastern District of California
- Southern District of California
- District of Massachusetts
- Northern District of Illinois
- Central District of Illinois
- Eastern District of Michigan
- District of Colorado
- First Circuit Court of Appeals
- Second Circuit Court of Appeals
- Third Circuit Court of Appeals
- Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals
- Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals

ANDREW J. OBERGFELL

Andrew Obergfell is Counsel with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Andrew focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Andrew graduated from Drew University with *summa cum laude* distinction. While at Drew University, Andrew was captain of the varsity baseball team. Andrew was inducted into the Phi Beta Kappa honor society and was President of the college's chapter of the Pi Sigma Alpha political science honor society.

Andrew attended Seton Hall University School of Law, where he obtained his law degree with *magna cum laude* distinction, and was inducted into the prestigious Order of the Coif honor society. While in law school, Andrew was an editor and published author for the Seton Hall Law Review, participated in the Impact Litigation Clinic, and was a member of the Interscholastic Moot Court Board. As part of the Interscholastic Moot Court Board, Andrew received the national best-brief award in the 2015 ABA National Appellate Advocacy Competition, as well as the 2015 best student-written brief of the year award as recognized by Scribes, the American Society of Legal Writers.

Prior to joining the firm, Andrew practiced at an AmLaw 100 law firm. He also clerked for The Honorable Douglas M. Fasciale in the New Jersey Superior Court, Appellate Division, in Newark, New Jersey.

Selected Published Decisions:

Kirkbride, et al. v. The Kroger Co., 349 F.R.D. 160 (S.D. Ohio April 9, 2025), granting class certification of three consumer classes of insured purchasers of prescription drugs at Kroger who allegedly overpaid for prescription drugs due to Kroger's usual and customary price reporting practices, and denying Defendant's *Daubert* motions directed at certain of Plaintiffs' experts.

DANIEL GUERRA

Daniel Guerra is Counsel with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Dan focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions.

Prior to working at Bursor & Fisher, Dan practiced at a national law firm in San Francisco. He helped represent various companies during internal investigations and in complex civil litigation, including product liability litigation and commercial disputes. He also advised clients on a range of matters including regulatory compliance, litigation risk assessment, and product counseling.

Dan is admitted to the State Bar of California, all California Federal District Courts, and the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas.

Dan received his Juris Doctor from the University of California Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings College of the Law) in 2009.

STEFAN BOGDANOVICH

Stefan Bogdanovich is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Stefan litigates complex civil and class actions typically involving privacy, intellectual property, entertainment, and false advertising law.

Prior to working at Bursor & Fisher, Stefan practiced at two national law firms in Los Angeles. He helped represent various companies in false advertising and IP infringement cases, media companies in defamation cases, and motion picture producers in royalty disputes. He also advised corporations and public figures on complying with various privacy and advertising laws and regulations.

Stefan is admitted to the State Bar of California and all of the California Federal District Courts. He is also a Certified Information Privacy Professional.

Stefan received his Juris Doctor from the University of Southern California Gould School of Law in 2018, where he was a member of the Hale Moot Court Honors Program and the Trial Team. He received the highest grade in his class in three subjects, including First Amendment Law.

SPENCER N. MIGOTSKY

Spencer Migotsky is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Spencer focuses his practice on data privacy, complex commercial litigation, and consumer class actions. He has experience litigating data privacy class actions under the California Invasion of Privacy Act, the federal Video Privacy Protection Act, and the Arizona Telephone, Utility, and Communication Service Records Act.

Prior to joining Bursor & Fisher, Spencer practiced at a national law firm in New York City. He is admitted to the State Bar of New York and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of New York. Spencer received his J.D. from Harvard Law School in 2019. In 2014, Spencer graduated magna cum laude from New York University with a B.A. in Economics.

JULIA K. VENDITTI

Julia K. Venditti is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Julia focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions. Julia was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Julia is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Julia received her Juris Doctor in 2020 from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law, where she graduated *cum laude* with two CALI Awards for the highest grade in her Evidence and California Community Property classes. During law school, Julia was a member of the UC Hastings Moot Court team and competed at the Evans Constitutional Law

Moot Court Competition, where she finished as a national quarterfinalist and received a best brief award. Julia was also inducted into the UC Hastings Honors Society and was awarded Best Brief and an Honorable Mention for Best Oral Argument in her First-Year Moot Court section. In addition, Julia served as a Research Assistant for her Constitutional Law professor, as a Teaching Assistant for Legal Writing & Research, and as a Law Clerk at the San Francisco Public Defender's Office. In 2017, Julia graduated *magna cum laude* from Baruch College/CUNY, Weissman School of Arts and Sciences, with a B.A. in Political Science.

JULIAN DIAMOND

Julian Diamond is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Julian focuses his practice on privacy law and class actions. Julian was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Julian received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Julian was Articles Editor for the Columbia Journal of Environmental Law. Prior to law school, Julian worked in education. Julian graduated from California State University, Fullerton with a B.A. in History and a single subject social science teaching credential.

MATTHEW GIRARDI

Matt Girardi is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Matt focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions, and has focused specifically on consumer class actions involving privacy violations, illegal gambling, financial misconduct, and false advertising. Matt was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Matt is admitted to the State Bar of New York, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York, the Eastern District of New York, the Eastern District of Michigan, the Western District of Michigan, the First Circuit Court of Appeals, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Matt received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School in 2020, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Matt was the Commentary Editor for the Columbia Journal of Tax Law, and represented fledgling businesses for Columbia's Entrepreneurship and Community Development Clinic. In addition, Matt worked as an Honors Intern in the Division of Enforcement at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Matt graduated from Brown University in 2016 with a B.A. in Economics, and worked as a Paralegal Specialist at the U.S. Department of Justice in the Antitrust Division prior to law school.

Selected Class Settlements:

Armstead v. VGW Malta Ltd. et al., Case No. 22-CI-00553 (Henderson Cnty. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$11.75 million class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Edwards v. Mid-Hudson Valley Federal Credit Union, Case No. 22-cv-00562-TJM-CFH (N.D.N.Y. 2023) – final approval granted for \$2.2 million class settlement to resolve claims that an upstate New York credit union was unlawfully charging overdraft fees on accounts with sufficient funds.

Fischer, et al. v. Instant Checkmate LLC, et al., No. 19-cv-04892 (N.D. Ill. 2024) – final approval granted for state-by-state non-reversionary cash settlements involving alleged violations of right of publicity statutes totaling in excess of \$10.1 million.

Wyland v. Woopla, Inc., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00356 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$835,000 class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

Whiting v. Yellow Social Interactive Ltd., Civil Action No. 2023-CI-00358 (Henderson Cir. Ct. Ky. 2023) – final approval granted for \$1.32 million class settlement involving allegedly deceptive and/or illegal gambling practices.

KAILI LYNN

Kaili Lynn is an Associate in Bursor & Fisher’s Walnut Creek office, where she focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions involving data privacy and consumer protection. She is admitted to the State Bars of California and Kentucky.

Kaili earned her Juris Doctor from the University of Southern California, Gould School of Law in 2020. During law school, she was a member of the Hale Moot Court Honors Program and the International Human Rights Clinic. In 2016, Kaili graduated from the Georgia Institute of Technology with highest honors earning a Bachelor of Science in International Affairs and Modern Languages.

Prior to joining Bursor & Fisher, Kaili served as a trial attorney for the Kentucky Department of Public Advocacy, where she litigated cases involving indigent juveniles and adults charged with misdemeanor and felony offenses. Kaili also worked for two law firms in Southern California, gaining experience in appellate practice and class action litigation.

JENNA GAVENMAN

Jenna Gavenman is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Jenna focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Jenna was a Summer Associate and a part-time intern with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full-time Associate in September 2022.

Jenna is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Jenna received her Juris Doctor in 2022 from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law (now named UC Law SF). During law school, she was awarded an Honorable Mention for Best Oral Argument in her First-Year Moot Court section. Jenna also

participated in both the Medical Legal Partnership for Seniors (MLPS) and the Lawyering for Children Practicum at Legal Services for Children—two of UC Hastings’s nationally renowned clinical programs. Jenna was awarded the Clinic Award for Outstanding Performance in MLPS for her contributions to the clinic. In addition, Jenna volunteered with her law school’s Legal Advice and Referral Clinic and as a LevelBar Mentor.

In 2018, Jenna graduated *cum laude* from Villanova University with a B.A. in Sociology and Spanish (double major). Jenna was a Division I athlete, competing on the Villanova Women’s Water Polo varsity team for four consecutive years.

IRA ROSENBERG

Ira Rosenberg is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ira focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Ira received his Juris Doctor in 2022 from Columbia Law School. During law school, Ira served as a Student Honors Legal Intern with Division of Enforcement at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Ira also interned during law school in the Criminal Division at the United States Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York and with the Investor Protection Bureau at the Office of the New York State Attorney General. Ira graduated in 2018 from Beth Medrash Govoha with a B.A. in Talmudic Studies.

LUKE SIRONSKI-WHITE

Luke Sironski-White is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A., focusing on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Luke joined the firm as a full-time Associate in August 2022.

Luke is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Luke received his Juris Doctor in 2022 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Luke was on the board of the Consumer Advocacy and Protection Society (CAPS), edited for the Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, and volunteered with the Prisoner Advocacy Network.

In 2017, Luke graduated from the University of Chicago with a B.A. in Anthropology. Before entering the field of law Luke was a professional photographer and filmmaker.

INES DIAZ

Ines Diaz is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ines focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions.

Ines is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Ines received her Juris Doctor in 2023 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Ines served as an Executive Editor of the California Law Review. She also served as an intern with the East Bay Community Law Center's Immigration Clinic and as a Fellow of the Berkeley Law Academic Skills Program. Additionally, Ines served as an instructor with the University of California, Berkeley Extension, Legal Studies Global Access Program where she taught legal writing to international law students. In 2021, Ines was selected for a summer externship at the California Supreme Court where she served as a judicial extern for the Honorable Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar.

CAROLINE C. DONOVAN

Caroline C. Donovan is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Caroline focuses her practice on complex civil litigation, data protection, mass arbitration, and class actions. Caroline interned with Bursor & Fisher during her third year of law school before joining full time in Fall 2023.

Caroline is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Caroline received her Juris Doctor in 2023 from Brooklyn Law School. During law school, Caroline was a member of the Moot Court Honor Society Trial Division, where she was chosen to serve as a National Team Member. Caroline competed and coached in numerous competitions across the country, and placed second at regionals in AAJ's national competition in both her second and third year of law school. Caroline was also the President of the Art Law Association, and the Treasurer of the Labor and Employment Law Association.

During law school, Caroline was a judicial intern for Judge Kenneth W. Chu of the National Labor Relations Board. She also interned at the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of New York, as well as a securities class action firm.

JOSHUA B. GLATT

Joshua Glatt is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joshua focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. Joshua was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as an Associate.

Joshua is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Joshua earned his Juris Doctor from the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings). While there, he received a CALI Award for earning the highest grade in Constitutional Law II and served on the executive boards of the Jewish Law Students Association and the American Constitution Society. Prior to law school, Joshua graduated *summa cum laude* from the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Arizona State University in 2016 and earned a master's degree from the University of Southern California in 2018.

JOSHUA R. WILNER

Joshua Wilner is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Joshua focuses his practice on complex civil litigation, data privacy, consumer protection, and class actions. Joshua was a Summer Associate at Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm full time in Fall 2023.

Joshua is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Joshua received his Juris Doctor in 2023 from Berkeley Law. During law school, he received the American Jurisprudence Award for Constitutional Law.

During law school, Joshua served on the board of the Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law. Joshua also interned at Disability Rights California, Legal Aid at Work, and a private firm that worked closely with the ACLU of Northern California to enforce the California Racial Justice Act. In 2022 and 2023, Joshua worked as a research assistant for Professor Abbye Atkinson.

VICTORIA ZHOU

Victoria Zhou is an Associate in Bursor & Fisher's New York office. Victoria focuses her practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection.

Victoria is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Victoria received her Juris Doctor from Fordham Law School in 2023. During law school, Victoria served as an Associate Editor of the Moot Court Board and competed in multiple mock trial competitions as a member of the Brendan Moore Trial Advocates. In addition, Victoria served as a judicial extern to Chief Judge Mark A. Barnett of the United States Court of International Trade. In 2019, Victoria graduated *magna cum laude* from Fei Tian College with a B.F.A. in Classical Dance.

KYLE D. GORDON

Kyle Gordon is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Kyle focuses his practice on class actions concerning data privacy and consumer protection. Kyle was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm.

Kyle is admitted to the State Bar of New York.

Kyle received his Juris Doctor from Columbia Law School in 2023, where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone Scholar. During law school, Kyle was a Staff Editor for the Columbia Science and Technology Law Review. In 2020, Kyle graduated *summa cum laude* from New York University with a B.A. in Politics and became a member of Phi Beta Kappa. Prior to law school, Kyle interned in the Clerk's Office of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

ELEANOR R. GRASSO

Eleanor Grasso is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Eleanor focuses her practice on complex civil litigation, including data privacy and consumer protection class actions.

Eleanor is admitted to the State Bars of New York and Florida, and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Southern District of New York and Eastern District of New York.

Eleanor earned her Juris Doctor from Fordham University School of Law. During law school, Eleanor was a member of the Fordham Journal of Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law, serving as Symposium Editor for Volume XXXIV. Eleanor was also a member of the Brendan Moore Trial Advocacy Team, served as a Research Assistant, and was a member of the Board of Student Advisors.

Throughout her time in law school, Eleanor interned for the Office of the Public Defender for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida in the Misdemeanor Unit, the Office of the Federal Public Defender for the Middle District of Tennessee in the Capital Habeas Unit, the ACLU of Florida, and for the Honorable Kiyo A. Matsumoto in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Eleanor was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher and also interned part-time during her third year of law school.

Eleanor earned her Bachelors from the University of Florida, with a double-major in Criminology & Law and Political Science and a minor in French & Francophone studies.

RYAN B. MARTIN

Ryan Martin is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Ryan focuses his practice on complex civil litigation and consumer class actions. He was a Summer Associate and part-time law clerk with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full time Associate in August 2024.

Ryan is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

He earned his Juris Doctor from the University of California College of the Law, San Francisco (formerly U.C. Hastings), graduating *Cum Laude* with a Concentration in Environmental Law and as a member of the Honors Society. While there, he was a Senior Production Editor of the *U.C. Law Journal*, was President of the Hastings Environmental Law Association, and was a Torts Teaching Fellow.

Prior to law school, Ryan graduated from the W.A. Franke College of Business at Northern Arizona University with a Bachelors of Science in Hotel and Restaurant Management and a minor in Business. Ryan also studied Sustainable Business and Hotel Management at the Internationale Hochschule of Applied Sciences in Bad Honnef Germany and is a certified yoga instructor.

LOGAN HAGERTY

Logan Hagerty is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Logan is admitted to the State Bar of New York and the Southern District of New York.

Logan received his Juris Doctor from Boston College Law School in 2024, where he received a certificate in Land & Environmental Law.

During law school, Logan was President of the Environmental Law Society. In addition, Logan worked for a class action firm, a general practice firm, and interned at a Massachusetts state agency.

Logan earned his Bachelors from St. Lawrence University, where he graduated magna cum laude with a double major in History and Environmental Studies and a minor in African Studies. He is also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

KAREN VALENZUELA

Karen Valenzuela is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Karen focuses her practice on complex civil litigation and class actions. Karen was a Summer Associate and a part-time intern with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full-time Associate.

Karen is admitted to the State Bar of California and is a member of the bars of the United States District Courts for the Northern, Eastern, Central, and Southern Districts of California.

Karen received her Juris Doctor in 2024 from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law. During law school, Karen was part of the Consumer Protection Public Policy Order, and interned for the Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office. Karen also participated in the International Human Rights Law Clinic, La Alianza Workers' and Tenants' Rights Clinic, and the Death Penalty Clinic.

Prior to law school, Karen graduated from the University of California, Berkeley with a B.A. in Gender and Women's Studies and a minor in Global Poverty and Practice.

KEVIN A. KAPRAL

Kevin A. Kapral is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Kevin focuses his practice on complex civil litigation, including data privacy and consumer protection class actions.

Kevin is admitted to the State Bar of Florida.

Kevin received his Juris Doctor in 2025 from the University of Florida Levin College of Law, where he was enrolled as a Governor's Scholar. During law school, Kevin was a Forum Editor for the Florida Law Review and served as a research assistant for Professor Lynn LoPucki. Kevin was a Summer Associate with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm full time.

Kevin earned his B.A. in 2021 from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he graduated with a double major in Political Science and Philosophy.

LAUREN A. VANHEMEL

Lauren A. VanHemel is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Lauren focuses her practice on complex civil litigation, data privacy, and class actions. She was a Summer Associate and part-time law clerk with Bursor & Fisher before joining the firm full time in Fall 2025.

Lauren is admitted to the State Bar of Florida. She received her Juris Doctor in 2025 from the University of Florida Levin College of Law. During law school, Lauren served as internal vice president of the Florida Moot Court Team and notes & comments editor of the UF Journal of Law and Public Policy. Lauren competed and coached numerous moot court competitions, winning best brief and second overall at the 2023-2024 McGee National Civil Rights Moot Court Competition and second-best brief at the 2024-2025 NAAC ABA Philadelphia Regional Competition.

Prior to law school, Lauren graduated cum laude from the University of Florida with a B.A. in Criminology in 2022.

ZACHARY J. BRAVERMAN

Zachary J. Braverman is an Associate with Bursor & Fisher, P.A. Zach focuses his practice on complex civil litigation, labor and employment, consumer protection, and class actions. Zach was a Summer Associate and part-time law clerk with Bursor & Fisher prior to joining the firm as a full-time associate.

Zach is admitted to the State Bar of New York. He earned his Juris Doctor from Brooklyn Law School. During law school, Zach was a member of The Brooklyn Sports and Entertainment Law Society and The Brooklyn Journal of Corporate, Financial and Commercial Law, serving as an Articles Editor and publishing a note. Zach also studied international law at The University of Amsterdam.

Prior to law school, Zach graduated from Binghamton University with a B.S. in Financial Economics and B.A. in Philosophy, Politics, and Law.