

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JEFFREY LEONARD, IN HIS CAPACITY AS
TRUSTEE OF THE POPLAWSKI 2008 INSURANCE
TRUST; PHYLLIS POPLAWSKI; PBR PARTNERS;
BRIGHTON TRUSTEES, LLC, on behalf of and as trustee
for COOK STREET MASTER TRUST III, et.al.,

Plaintiffs,

- against -

JOHN HANCOCK LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF
NEW YORK and JOHN HANCOCK LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY (U.S.A.),

Defendants.

Case No. 18-CV-04994

**DECLARATION OF GINA
M. INTREPIDO-BOWDEN
ON PROPOSED
SETTLEMENT NOTICE
PLAN**

Judge Alvin K. Hellerstein

I, GINA M. INTREPIDO-BOWDEN, declare and state as follows:

1. I am a Vice President at JND Legal Administration LLC (“JND”). I am a judicially recognized legal notice expert with more than 20 years of experience designing and implementing class action legal notice programs. I have been involved in many of the largest and most complex class action notice programs, including all aspects of notice dissemination. A comprehensive description of my experience is attached as Exhibit A.

2. I submit this Declaration, based on my personal knowledge and information provided to me by Class Counsel, Defense Counsel and experienced JND employees to describe the proposed Notice Plan and address why it is consistent with other class notice plans that courts have determined satisfy the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Rule 23”), the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, and the Federal

Judicial Center's ("FJC") guidelines for best practicable due process notice. If called upon to do so, I could and would testify competently thereto.

RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

3. JND is a leading legal administration services provider with offices throughout the United States and its headquarters in Seattle, Washington. JND's class action division provides all services necessary for the effective implementation of class actions, including: (1) all facets of providing legal notice to potential class members, such as developing the final class member list and addresses for them, outbound mailing, email notification, and the design and implementation of media programs; (2) website design and deployment; (3) call center and other contact support; (4) secure class member data management; (5) paper and electronic claims processing; (6) lien verification, negotiation, and resolution; (7) calculation design and programming; (8) payment disbursements through check, wire, PayPal, merchandise credits, and other means; (9) qualified settlement fund management and tax reporting; (10) banking services and reporting; and (11) all other functions related to the secure and accurate administration of class actions.

4. JND is an approved vendor for the United States Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), as well as for the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC"). In addition, we have been working with a number of other United States government agencies, including: the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency ("OCC"), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ("CFPB"), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation ("FDIC"), the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), the Department of Justice ("DOJ"), and the Department of Labor ("DOL"). We also have Master Services Agreements with various law firms, corporations, banks, and other government agencies, which were only

awarded after JND underwent rigorous reviews of our systems, privacy policies, and procedures. JND has also been certified as SOC 2 Compliant by noted accounting firm Moss Adams.¹ Finally, JND has been recognized by various publications, including the *National Law Journal*, the *Legal Times*, and the *New York Law Journal*, for excellence in class action administration.

5. The principals of JND collectively have over 80 years of experience in class action legal and administrative fields and have overseen claims processes for some of the largest legal claims administration matters in the country's history. JND was appointed the notice and claims administrator in the \$2.67 billion proposed Blue Cross Blue Shield class action settlement. We have also been handling the settlement administration of the \$1.3 billion Equifax Data Breach class action settlement, the largest class action ever in terms of the number of claims received; a voluntary remediation program in Canada on behalf of over 30 million people; the \$1.5 billion Mercedes-Benz Emissions class action settlement; the \$120 million GM Ignition class action economic settlement, where we sent notice to nearly 30 million class members; and the \$215 million USC Student Health Center class action settlement on behalf of women who were sexually abused by a doctor at USC, as well as hundreds of other matters. Our notice campaigns are regularly approved by courts throughout the United States.

6. As a member of JND's Legal Notice Team, I research, design, develop, and implement a wide array of legal notice programs to meet the requirements of Rule 23 and relevant state court rules. During my career, I have submitted declarations to courts throughout the country attesting to the creation and launch of various notice programs.

¹ As a SOC 2 Compliant organization, JND has passed an audit under AICPA (American Institute of Certified Public Accountants) criteria for providing data security.

NOTICE PLAN OVERVIEW

7. We have been asked by Counsel to prepare a Notice Plan to reach potential class members and inform them about the action, as well as their rights and options.

8. The objective of the proposed Notice Plan is to provide the best notice practicable, consistent with the methods and tools employed in other court-approved notice programs. The FJC's *Judges' Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide* considers a Notice Plan with a high reach (above 70%) effective.

9. The proposed Settlement Class consists of current and former owners of universal life insurance policy issued by John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York and John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.) ("Defendants"), or its predecessors, that were subjected to the 2018/2019 Performance UL COI rate increase, excluding the Excluded Policies ("Settlement Class Members").

10. The proposed Notice Plan consists of a direct mailed notice effort to Settlement Class Members as identified by Defendants, publication notice in *USA Today*, *The New York Times*, and *The Financial Times*, and a press release distributed over the *PR Newswire* internet wire service.

11. JND will also establish, maintain, and update a Class Website, where information about the Settlement, as well as copies of relevant case documentation, including but not limited to the Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Motion, the Class Notice, any potential Preliminary Approval Order, any proposed Final Approval Order and Judgment, and related documents will be accessible to Settlement Class Members; a toll-free telephone line with an interactive voice response (IVR) that Settlement Class Members may call to obtain more

information; and a post office box to which Settlement Class Members may send their exclusion requests.

12. It is my understanding that the direct notice effort will provide notice to the vast majority of Settlement Class Members and the supplemental publication effort will extend notice further.

13. Based on my experience in developing and implementing class notice programs, I believe the proposed Notice Plan will provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY

14. JND is well versed in the handling and management of sensitive information and has in place the technical, administrative, and physical controls necessary to ensure the ongoing confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data.

15. JND's security and privacy controls have been vetted and approved for use by a number of large banks, federal agencies including the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).

16. JND has adopted a NIST-based information security program, risk management framework, and SP 800 series of controls to ensure all safeguards are appropriately selected, implemented, and reviewed. Specific individuals have been assigned the responsibility for information security and data privacy throughout our organization. JND submits itself and its systems no less than annually to several independent assessments, such as, the AICPA's SOC II certification and External Penetration Testing performed by a reputable cybersecurity consulting firm. JND also maintains Business Continuity and Incident Response programs and performs no less than monthly vulnerability scanning and system patching.

17. JND performs background checks on all personnel at onboarding and requires each individual to enter into a non-disclosure and confidentiality agreement. Additionally, everyone must successfully complete cybersecurity, privacy, and HIPAA training during the onboarding process, which educates all staff on the proper use of sensitive data. Refresher training is required of all employees each year and JND periodically disseminates security and privacy awareness messages to all staff.

18. To help ensure the proper use of data, JND's systems have been designed with privacy in mind and utilize a role-based access control methodology to ensure access is granted in accordance with principle of least privilege. Access to the data is provided via a separate dedicated application for each class action ensuring data that has been collected for different purposes can be processed separately. Additionally, JND only collects the minimum amount of data necessary to administer the class action at hand, stores data for each class action in a dedicated database to prevent comingling of data, utilizes that data only for purposes specified in the class action, and only retains data for the minimum amount of time required.

19. Industry standard logical access controls are in place to prevent unauthorized access to JND's network and systems. Access is only provided after proper approval is acquired, tracked in the ticketing system and information system audit logs, and all access and access levels are reviewed no less than quarterly. JND provides unique identifiers to each employee and requires complex, 14 character, passwords which expire every 90 days, and also requires multifactor authentication for all remote access. All sessions occur via encrypted channels to ensure the confidentiality and integrity of the data being transmitted.

20. JND's defense-in-depth approach to security includes a myriad of tools and solutions to ensure its environment remains protected. Next Generation Firewalls are deployed at all perimeter

points and provide intrusion detection and prevention protection (IDS/IPS) to proactively block suspicious and malicious traffic without the need for human intervention. Similarly, Web Application Firewalls (WAF) are positioned in front of public facing web applications which are designed in adherence to standard 3-Tier (Web/App/Data) architecture. Security event and audit log data is transmitted to JND's Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) solution which aggregates data from across the enterprise to deliver analytics and threat intelligence. This is coupled with Microsoft's Defender Advanced Threat Protection (ATP) endpoint protection which is deployed on all endpoints to perform real-time and scheduled scanning along with behavioral analysis to ensure all systems are free from malicious software and activity. Encryption is also in use throughout JND's systems and services. Access to JND's information processing system is provided via a Microsoft IIS web application configured to be only accessible via Transport Layer Security (TLS) web traffic. Transmission of data outside on JND's environment also occurs via TLS encrypted web traffic, via SFTP, or similarly protected secure and encrypted protocols. Data is stored in Microsoft SQL databases and protected with full database SQL TDE encryption and field/column level encryption to ensure the utmost security of data. Furthermore, the physical disks of all servers and workstations are protected with encryption, as well.

21. JND's Disaster Recovery solution performs backups of production systems by securely transmitting data at scheduled intervals to both a local and geographically separate offsite storage system. Not only is backup data encrypted in transit but also on the offsite storage itself. JND's backup system is highly configurable, scalable, and robust enough to accommodate any requirements.

22. JND facilities used to process or store data have in place adequate physical controls to prevent unauthorized access to, or dissemination of, sensitive information. Access to,

and within, facilities is controlled by key cards assigned only to authorized personnel and only at the level required to perform job duties. Access to highly sensitive areas, such as datacenters, server rooms, mailrooms, etc., while also controlled by key cards, are controlled by restricted levels of access. Access to JND's facilities is reviewed periodically, as well. Facilities are also protected by alarm systems and employ CCTV monitoring and recording systems. JND educates staff on maintaining a clean desk and securely storing and disposing of sensitive documentation, and also prohibits by default access to removeable media devices. Disposal of media, whether physical or electronic, is done so securely and in accordance with NIST 800-88 guidelines to ensure the data cannot be reconstituted.

23. All data provided to JND in connection with this case will be handled according to JND's security protocols and applicable law.

DIRECT NOTICE

24. For this Settlement, JND will send a Class Notice by first-class mail to the addresses in the Class List that will be provided by Defendants.

25. Upon receipt of Class List, JND will promptly load the information into a secure case-specific database for this action. JND employs appropriate administrative, technical, and physical controls designed to ensure the confidentiality and protection of Settlement Class Member data, as well as to reduce the risk of loss, misuse, or unauthorized access, disclosure, or modification of Settlement Class Member data.

26. Prior to mailing the Class Notice, JND will run the mailing addresses through the United States Postal Service ("USPS") National Change of Address ("NCOA") database to update

the addresses.² JND will track all notices returned undeliverable by the USPS and will promptly re-mail notices that are returned with a forwarding address. In addition, JND will also take reasonable efforts to locate a mailing address for any Settlement Class Member for whom a notice is returned without a forwarding address.

27. A copy of the proposed Class Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

PUBLICATION NOTICE

28. To supplement the direct notice effort, JND will cause the Short-Form (Publication) Notice to be published once in each of *USA Today*, *The New York Times*, and *The Financial Times*, on different dates, and be transmitted electronically over the PR Newswire Internet wire service.

29. A copy of the proposed Short-Form (Publication) Notice is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

CLASS WEBSITE

30. JND will develop, maintain, and update a Class Website that will allow Settlement Class Members to obtain more information about the Settlement. The website will have an easy-to-navigate design and will be formatted to emphasize important information regarding Settlement Class Members' rights, as well as the exclusion and objection deadlines. It will provide a link to download the Class Notice, Settlement Agreement, Preliminary Approval Order, and other important court documents.

31. The Class Website will be optimized for mobile visitors so that information loads quickly on mobile devices and will also be designed to maximize search engine optimization

² The NCOA database is the official USPS technology product which makes change of address information available to mailers to help reduce undeliverable mail pieces before mail enters the mail stream. This product is an effective tool to update address changes when a person has completed a change of address form with the USPS. The address information is maintained on the database for 48 months.

through Google and other search engines. Keywords and natural language search terms will be included in the site's metadata to maximize search engine rankings.

TOLL-FREE NUMBER AND POST OFFICE BOX

32. JND will establish and maintain a dedicated toll-free telephone line for Settlement Class Members to call for information related to the action. The telephone line will be available 24 hours day, seven (7) days a week.

33. JND will also maintain a dedicated post office box where Settlement Class Members may send their exclusion requests.

NOTICE DESIGN AND CONTENT

34. JND designed the proposed notice documents so that they are written in plain language and comply with Rule 23's guidelines for class notice and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, as well as the FJC's *Class Action Notice and Plain Language Guide*.

REACH

35. The direct mailed notice effort alone is expected to reach the vast majority of Settlement Class Members. The publication notice effort and press release extend that reach further. As a result, the anticipated reach meets that of other court approved programs, and exceeds the 70% or above reach standard set forth by the FJC.

CONCLUSION

36. In my opinion, the proposed Notice Plan as described herein provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances, is consistent with the requirements of Rule 23, and is consistent with other similar court-approved notice programs.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 30, 2021, at Philadelphia, PA.



GINA M. INTREPIDO-BOWDEN

- EXHIBIT A -

GINA INTREPIDO-BOWDEN

VICE PRESIDENT



I.

INTRODUCTION

Gina Intrepido-Bowden is a Vice President at JND Legal Administration (“JND”). She is a court recognized legal notice expert who has been involved in the design and implementation of hundreds of legal notice programs reaching class members/claimants throughout the U.S., Canada, and the world, with notice in over 35 languages. Some notable cases in which Gina has been involved include:

- *Flaum v Doctor’s Assoc., Inc.*, a \$30 million FACTA settlement
- *FTC v. Reckitt Benckiser Grp. PLC*, the \$50 million Suboxone branded drug antitrust settlement
- *In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litig.*, a \$2.67 billion antitrust settlement
- *In re General Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig.*, the \$120 million GM Ignition Switch economic settlement
- *In re Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, a security breach impacting over 40 million consumers who made credit/debit card purchases in a Home Depot store
- *In re Monitronics Int’l, Inc.*, a \$28 million TCPA settlement
- *In re Residential Schools Litig.*, a complex Canadian class action incorporating a groundbreaking notice program to remote aboriginal persons qualified to receive benefits in the multi-billion-dollar settlement

- *In re Royal Ahold Sec. and "ERISA"*, a \$1.1 billion securities settlement involving a comprehensive international notice effort
- *In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig.*, a prescription antitrust involving notice to both third party payor and consumer purchasers
- *In re TJX Cos., Inc. Retail Sec. Breach Litig.*, this \$200 million settlement impacted 45 million credit/debit cards in the U.S. and Canada making it the then-largest theft of consumer data
- *In re Trans Union Corp. Privacy Litig.*, a \$75 million data breach settlement involving persons with a credit history
- *Thompson v Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, a large race-based pricing settlement involving 25 million policyholders
- *USC Student Health Ctr. Settlement*, a \$215 million settlement providing compensation to women who were sexually assaulted, harassed and otherwise abused by Dr. George M. Tyndall
- *Williams v. Weyerhaeuser Co.*, a consumer fraud litigation involving exterior hardboard siding on homes and other structures

With more than 25 years of advertising research, planning and buying experience, Gina began her career working for one of New York's largest advertising agency media departments (BBDO), where she designed multi-million-dollar media campaigns for clients such as Gillette, GE, Dupont, and HBO. Since 2000, she has applied her media skills to the legal notification industry, working for several large legal notification firms. Gina is an accomplished author and speaker on class notice issues including effective reach, notice dissemination as well as noticing trends and innovations. She earned a Bachelor of Arts in Advertising from Penn State University, graduating *summa cum laude*.



JUDICIAL RECOGNITION

Courts have favorably recognized Ms. Intrepido-Bowden’s work as outlined by the sampling of Judicial comments below:

1. Judge Vernon S. Broderick, Jr.

In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig., (June 7, 2021)
No. 14-md-02542 (S.D.N.Y.):

The Notice Plan provided for notice through a nationwide press release, print notice in the national edition of People magazine, and electronic media—Google Display Network, Facebook, and LinkedIn—using a digital advertising campaign with links to a settlement website. Proof that Plaintiffs have complied with the Notice Plan has been filed with the Court. The Notice Plan met the requirements of due process and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23; constituted the most effective and best notice of the Agreement and fairness hearing practicable under the circumstances; and constituted due and sufficient notice for all other purposes to all other persons and entities entitled to receive notice.

2. Honorable Louis L. Stanton

Rick Nelson Co. v. Sony Music Ent., (May 25, 2021)
No. 18-cv-08791 (S.D.N.Y.):

Notice of the pendency of this Action as a class action and of the proposed Settlement was given to all Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort. The form and method of notifying the Class of the pendency of the action as a class action and of the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement met the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, due process, and any other applicable law, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

3. Honorable Daniel D. Domenico

Advance Trust & Life Escrow Serv., LTA v. Sec. Life of Denver Ins. Co., (January 29, 2021)
No. 18-cv-01897-DDD-NYW (D. Colo.):

The proposed form and content of the Notices meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(B)...The court approves the retention of JND Legal Administration LLC as the Notice Administrator.

4. Honorable Virginia A. Phillips

Sonner v. Schwabe North America, Inc., (January 25, 2021)
No. 15-cv-01358 VAP (SPx) (C.D. Cal.):

Following preliminary approval of the settlement by the Court, the settlement administrator provided notice to the Settlement Class through a digital media campaign. (Dkt. 203-5). The Notice explains in plain language what the case is about, what the recipient is entitled to, and the options available to the recipient in connection with this case, as well as the consequences of each option. (Id., Ex. E). During the allotted response period, the settlement administrator received no requests for exclusion and just one objection, which was later withdrawn. (Dkt. 203-1, at 11).

Given the low number of objections and the absence of any requests for exclusion, the Class response is favorable overall. Accordingly, this factor also weighs in favor of approval.

5. Honorable R. Gary Klausner

A.B. v. Regents of the Univ. of California, (January 8, 2021)
No. 20-cv-09555-RGK-E (C.D. Cal.):

The parties intend to notify class members through mail using UCLA's patient records. And they intend to supplement the mail notices using Google banners and Facebook ads, publications in the LA times and People magazine, and a national press release. Accordingly, the Court finds that the proposed notice and method of delivery sufficient and approves the notice.

6. Judge Jesse M. Furman

In re General Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig., economic settlement, (December 18, 2020)
No. 2543 (MDL) (S.D.N.Y.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice and Class Notice Plan satisfied and continue to satisfy the applicable requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2)(b) and 23(e), and fully comply with all laws, including the Class Action Fairness Act (28 U.S.C. § 1711 et seq.), and the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution (U.S. Const., amend. V), constituting the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances of this litigation.

7. Judge Vernon S. Broderick, Jr.

In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig., (December 16, 2020)
No. 14-md-02542 (S.D.N.Y.):

I further appoint JND as Claims Administrator. JND's principals have more than 75 years-worth of combined class action legal administration experience, and JND has handled some of the largest recent settlement administration issues, including the Equifax Data Breach Settlement. (Doc. 1115 ¶ 5.) JND also has extensive experience in handling claims administration in the antitrust context. (Id. ¶ 6.) Accordingly, I appoint JND as Claims Administrator.

8. Judge R. David Proctor

In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litig., (November 30, 2020)
Master File No. 13-CV-20000-RDP (N.D. Ala.):

After a competitive bidding process, Settlement Class Counsel retained JND Legal Administration LLC ("JND") to serve as Notice and Claims Administrator for the settlement. JND has a proven track record and extensive experience in large, complex matters... JND has prepared a customized Notice Plan in this case. The Notice Plan was designed to provide the best notice practicable, consistent with the latest methods and tools employed in the industry and approved by other courts...The court finds that the proposed Notice Plan is appropriate in both form and content and is due to be approved.

9. Honorable Laurel Beeler

Sidibe v. Sutter Health, (November 5, 2020)

No. 12-cv-4854-LB (N.D. Cal.):

Class Counsel has retained JND Legal Administration (“JND”), an experienced class notice administration firm, to administer notice to the Class. The Court appoints JND as the Class Notice Administrator.

10. Judge Carolyn B. Kuhl

Sandoval v. Merlex Stucco Inc., (October 30, 2020)

No. BC619322 (Cal. Super. Ct.):

Additional Class Member class members, and because their names and addresses have not yet been confirmed, will be notified of the pendency of this settlement via the digital media campaign... the Court approves the Parties selection of JND Legal as the third-party Claims Administrator.

11. Honorable Louis L. Stanton

Rick Nelson Co. v. Sony Music Ent., (September 16, 2020)

No. 18-cv-08791 (S.D.N.Y.):

The parties have designated JND Legal Administration (“JND”) as the Settlement Administrator. Having found it qualified, the Court appoints JND as the Settlement Administrator and it shall perform all the duties of the Settlement Administrator as set forth in the Stipulation...The form and content of the Notice, Publication Notice and Email Notice, and the method set forth herein of notifying the Class of the Settlement and its terms and conditions, meet the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process. and any other applicable law, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.

12. Honorable Jesse M. Furman

In re General Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig., economic settlement, (April 27, 2020)
No. 2543 (MDL) (S.D.N.Y.):

The Court further finds that the Class Notice informs Class Members of the Settlement in a reasonable manner under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(1)(B) because it fairly apprises the prospective Class Members of the terms of the proposed Settlement and of the options that are open to them in connection with the proceedings.

The Court therefore approves the proposed Class Notice plan, and hereby directs that such notice be disseminated to Class Members in the manner set forth in the Settlement Agreement and described in the Declaration of the Class Action Settlement Administrator...

13. Honorable Virginia A. Phillips

Sonner v. Schwabe North America, Inc., (April 7, 2020)
No. 15-cv-01358 VAP (SPx) (C.D. Cal.):

The Court orders the appointment of JND Legal Administration to implement and administrate the dissemination of class notice and administer opt-out requests pursuant to the proposed notice dissemination plan attached as Exhibit D to the Stipulation.

14. Judge Fernando M. Olguin

Ahmed v. HSBC Bank USA, NA, (December 30, 2019)
No. 15-cv-2057-FMO-SPx (N.D. Ill.):

On June 21, 2019, the court granted preliminary approval of the settlement, appointed JND Legal Administration (“JND”) as settlement administrator... the court finds that the class notice and the notice process fairly and adequately informed the class members of the nature of the action, the terms of the proposed settlement, the effect of the action and release of claims, the class members’ right to exclude themselves from the action, and their right to object to the proposed settlement...the reaction of the class has been very positive.

15. Judge Cormac J. Carney

In re ConAgra Foods Inc., (October 8, 2019)

No. 11-cv-05379-CJC-AGR (C.D. Cal.):

Following the Court's preliminary approval, JND used a multi-pronged notice campaign to reach people who purchased Wesson Oils...As of September 19, 2019, only one class member requested to opt out of the settlement class, with another class member objecting to the settlement. The reaction of the class has thus been overwhelmingly positive, and this factor favors final approval.

16. Honorable Stephen V. Wilson

USC Student Health Ctr. Settlement, (June 12, 2019)

No. 18-cv-04258-SVW (C.D. Cal.):

The Court hereby designates JND Legal Administration ("JND") as Claims Administrator. The Court finds that giving Class Members notice of the Settlement is justified under Rule 23(e)(1) because, as described above, the Court will likely be able to: approve the Settlement under Rule 23(e)(2); and certify the Settlement Class for purposes of judgment. The Court finds that the proposed Notice satisfies the requirements of due process and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

17. Judge J. Walton McLeod

Boskie v. Backgroundchecks.com, (May 17, 2019)

No. 2019CP3200824 (S.C. C.P.):

The Court appoints JND Legal Administration as Settlement Administrator...The Court approves the notice plans for the HomeAdvisor Class and the Injunctive Relief Class as set forth in the declaration of JND Legal Administration. The Court finds the class notice fully satisfies the requirements of due process, the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. The notice plan for the HomeAdvisor Class and Injunctive Relief Class constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances of each Class.

18. Judge Cormac J. Carney

In re ConAgra Foods Inc., (April 4, 2019)

No. 11-cv-05379-CJC-AGR (C.D. Cal.):

The bids were submitted to Judge McCormick, who ultimately chose JND Legal Administration to propose to the Court to serve as the settlement administrator. (Id. ¶ 65.) In addition to being selected by a neutral third party, JND Legal Administration appears to be well qualified to administer the claims in this case...The Court appoints JND Legal Administration as Settlement Administrator... JND Legal Administration will reach class members through a consumer media campaign, including a national print effort in People magazine, a digital effort targeting consumers in the relevant states through Google Display Network and Facebook, newspaper notice placements in the Los Angeles Daily News, and an internet search effort on Google. (Keough Decl. ¶ 14.) JND Legal Administration will also distribute press releases to media outlets nationwide and establish a settlement website and toll-free phone number. (Id.) The print and digital media effort is designed to reach 70% of the potential class members. (Id.) The newspaper notice placements, internet search effort, and press release distribution are intended to enhance the notice's reach beyond the estimated 70%. (Id.)

19. Judge Kathleen M. Daily

Podawiltz v. Swisher Int'l, Inc., (February 7, 2019)

No. 16CV27621 (Or. Cir. Ct.):

The Court appoints JND Legal Administration as settlement administrator...The Court finds that the notice plan is reasonable, that it constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and that it meets the requirements of due process, ORCP 32, and any other applicable laws.

20. Honorable Kenneth J. Medel

Huntzinger v. Suunto Oy, (December 14, 2018)

No. 37-2018-27159 (CU) (BT) (CTL) (Cal. Super. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Class Notice and the Notice Program implemented pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all persons within the definition of the Class and fully complied with the due process requirement under all applicable statutes and laws and with the California Rules of Court.

21. Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig., (November 16, 2018)

No. 16-cv-8637 (N.D. Ill.):

The notice given to the Class, including individual notice to all members of the Class who could be identified through reasonable efforts, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Said notice provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rules 23(c)(2) and 23(e)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the requirements of due process.

22. Honorable Kenneth J. Medel

Huntzinger v. Suunto Oy, (August 10, 2018)

No. 37-2018-27159 (CU) (BT) (CTL) (Cal. Super. Ct.):

The Court finds that the notice to the Class Members regarding settlement of this Action, including the content of the notices and method of dissemination to the Class Members in accordance with the terms of Settlement Agreement, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constitute valid, due and sufficient notice to all Class Members, complying fully with the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, California Civil Code § 1781, California Rules of Court Rules 3.766 and 3.769(f), the California and United States Constitutions, and any other applicable law.

23. Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig., (June 22, 2018)

No. 16-cv-8637 (N.D. Ill.):

The proposed notice plan set forth in the Motion and the supporting declarations comply with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) and due process as it constitutes the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice via mail and email to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort. The direct mail and email notice will be supported by reasonable publication notice to reach class members who could not be individually identified.

24. Judge John Bailey

In re Monitronics Int'l, Inc. TCPA Litig., (September 28, 2017)

No. 11-cv-00090 (N.D. W.Va.):

The Court carefully considered the Notice Plan set forth in the Settlement Agreement and plaintiffs' motion for preliminary approval. The Court finds that the Notice Plan constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and satisfies fully the requirements of Rule 23, the requirements of due process and any other applicable law, such that the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the releases provided therein, and this Court's final judgment will be binding on all Settlement Class Members.

25. Honorable Ann I. Jones

Eck v. City of Los Angeles, (September 15, 2017)

No. BC577028 (Cal. Super. Cal.):

The form, manner, and content of the Class Notice, attached to the Settlement Agreement as Exhibits B, E, F and G, will provide the best notice practicable to the Class under the circumstances, constitutes valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members, and fully complies with California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Code of Civil Procedure section 1781, the Constitution of the State of California, the Constitution of the United States, and other applicable law.

26. Honorable James Ashford

Nishimura v. Gentry Homes, LTD., (September 14, 2017)

No. 11-11-1-1522-07-RAN (Haw. Cir. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan and Class Notices will fully and accurately inform the potential Class Members of all material elements of the proposed Settlement and of each Class Member's right and opportunity to object to the proposed Settlement. The Court further finds that the mailing and distribution of the Class Notice and the publication of the Class Notices substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Notice Plan and Settlement Agreement meets the requirements of the laws of the State of Hawai'i (including Hawai'i Rule of Civil Procedure 23), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Rules of the Court, and any other applicable law, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitutes due and sufficient notice to all potential Class Members.

27. Judge Cecilia M. Altonaga

Flaum v. Doctor's Assoc., Inc., (March 22, 2017)

No. 16-cv-61198 (S.D. Fla.):

...the forms, content, and manner of notice proposed by the Parties and approved herein meet the requirements of due process and FED. R. CIV. P. 23(c) and (e), are the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constitute sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice, and satisfy the Constitutional requirements of notice. The Court approves the notice program in all respects (including the proposed forms of notice, Summary Notice, Full Notice for the Settlement Website, Publication Notice, Press Release and Settlement Claim Forms, and orders that notice be given in substantial conformity therewith.

28. Judge Manish S. Shah

Johnson v. Yahoo! Inc., (December 12, 2016)

No. 14-cv-02028 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court approves the notice plan set forth in Plaintiff's Amended Motion to Approve Class Notice (Doc. 252) (the "Notice Plan"). The Notice Plan, in form, method, and content, complies with the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

29. Judge Joan A. Leonard

Barba v. Shire U.S., Inc., (December 2, 2016)

No. 13-cv-21158 (S.D. Fla.):

The notice of settlement (in the form presented to this Court as Exhibits E, F, and G, attached to the Settlement Agreement [D.E. 423-1] (collectively, "the Notice") directed to the Settlement Class members, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. In making this determination, the Court finds that the Notice was given to potential Settlement Class members who were identified through reasonable efforts, published using several publication dates in Better Homes and Gardens, National Geographic, and People magazines; placed on targeted website and portal banner advertisements on general Run of Network sites; included in e-newsletter placements with ADDitude, a magazine dedicated to helping children and adults with attention deficit disorder and learning disabilities lead successful lives, and posted on the Settlement Website which included additional access to Settlement information and a toll-free number. Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the Court hereby finds that the Notice provided Settlement Class members with due and adequate notice of the Settlement, the Settlement Agreement, these proceedings, and the rights of Settlement Class members to make a claim, object to the Settlement or exclude themselves from the Settlement.

30. Judge Marco A. Hernandez

Kearney v. Equilon Enter. LLC, (October 25, 2016)

No. 14-cv-00254 (D. Ore.):

The papers supporting the Final Approval Motion, including, but not limited to, the Declaration of Robert A. Curtis and the two Declarations filed by Gina Intrepido-Bowden, describe the Parties' provision of Notice of the Settlement. Notice was directed to all members of the Settlement Classes defined in paragraph 2, above. No objections to the method or contents of the Notice have been received. Based on the above-mentioned declarations, inter alia, the Court finds that the Parties have fully and adequately effectuated the Notice Plan, as required by the Preliminary Approval Order, and, in fact, have achieved better results than anticipated or required by the Preliminary Approval Order.

31. Honorable Amy J. St. Eve

In re Rust-Oleum Restore Mktg, Sales Practices & Prod. Liab. Litig., (October 20, 2016)

No. 15-cv-01364 (N.D. Ill.):

The Notices of Class Action and Proposed Settlement (Exhibits A and B to the Settlement Agreement) and the method of providing such Notices to the proposed Settlement Class...comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) and due process, constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and provide due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice of the settlement of this Action.

32. Honorable R. Gary Klausner

Russell v. Kohl's Dep't Stores, Inc., (October 20, 2016)

No. 15-cv-01143 (C.D. Cal.):

Notice of the settlement was provided to the Settlement Class in a reasonable manner, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including through individual notice to all members who could be reasonably identified through reasonable effort.

33. Judge Fernando M. Olguin

Chambers v. Whirlpool Corp., (October 11, 2016)

No. 11-cv-01733 (C.D. Cal.):

Accordingly, based on its prior findings and the record before it, the court finds that the Class Notice and the notice process fairly and adequately informed the class members of the nature of the action, the terms of the proposed settlement, the effect of the action and release of claims, their right to exclude themselves from the action, and their right to object to the proposed settlement.

34. Honourable Justice Stack

Anderson v. Canada, (September 28, 2016)

No. 2007 01T4955CP (NL Sup. Ct.):

The Phase 2 Notice Plan satisfies the requirements of the Class Actions Act and shall constitute good and sufficient service upon class members of the notice of this Order, approval of the Settlement and discontinuance of these actions.

35. Judge Mary M. Rowland

In re Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig., (August 23, 2016)

No. 14-md-02583 (N.D. Ga.):

The Court finds that the Notice Program has been implemented by the Settlement Administrator and the parties in accordance with the requirements of the Settlement Agreement, and that such Notice Program, including the utilized forms of Notice, constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and satisfies due process and the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

36. Honorable Manish S. Shah

Campos v. Calumet Transload R.R., LLC, (August 3, 2016)

No. 13-cv-08376 (N.D. Ill.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to the Settlement Class were adequate, reasonable, and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the

Settlements, the terms and conditions set forth therein, and these proceedings to all Persons entitled to such notice. The notice satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Rule 23”) and due process.

37. Honorable Lynn Adelman

Fond Du Lac Bumper Exch., Inc. v. Jui Li Enter. Co., Ltd., (Indirect Purchaser), (July 7, 2016)
No. 09-cv-00852 (E.D. Wis.):

The Court further finds that the mailing and publication of Notice in the manner set forth in the Notice Program is the best notice practicable under the circumstances; is valid, due and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class members; and complies fully with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the due process requirements of the Constitution of the United States. The Court further finds that the forms of Notice are written in plain language, use simple terminology, and are designed to be readily understandable by Settlement Class members.

38. Judge Marco A. Hernandez

Kearney v. Equilon Enter. LLC, (June 6, 2016)
No. 14-cv-00254 (Ore. Dist. Ct.):

The Court finds that the Parties’ plan for providing Notice to the Settlement Classes as described in paragraphs 35-42 of the Settlement Agreement and as detailed in the Settlement Notice Plan attached to the Declaration of Gina Intrepido-Bowden: (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances of this Action; (b) constitutes due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Classes of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Settlement Classes, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing; and (c) complies fully with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law. The Court further finds that the Parties’ plan for providing Notice to the Settlement Classes, as described in paragraphs 35-42 of the Settlement Agreement and as detailed in the Settlement Notice Plan attached to the Declaration of Gina Intrepido-Bowden, will adequately inform members of the Settlement Classes of their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Classes so as not to be bound by the Settlement Agreement.

39. Judge Joan A. Leonard

Barba v. Shire U.S., Inc., (April 11, 2016)

No. 13-cv-21158 (S.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that the proposed methods for giving notice of the Settlement to members of the Settlement Class, as set forth in this Order and in the Settlement Agreement, meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23 and requirements of state and federal due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

40. Honorable Manish S. Shah

Campos v. Calumet Transload R.R., LLC, (March 10, 2016 and April 18, 2016)

No. 13-cv-08376 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court further finds that the mailing and publication of Notice in the manner set forth in the Notice Program is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, constitutes due and sufficient notice of the Settlement and this Order to all persons entitled thereto, and is in full compliance with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, applicable law, and due process.

41. Judge Thomas W. Thrash Jr.

In re Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig., (March 8, 2016)

No. 14-md-02583 (N.D. Ga.):

The Court finds that the form, content and method of giving notice to the Class as described in Paragraph 7 of this Order and the Settlement Agreement (including the exhibits thereto): (a) will constitute the best practicable notice to the Settlement Class; (b) are reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the action, the terms of the proposed settlement, and their rights under the proposed settlement, including but not limited to their rights to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed settlement and other rights under the terms of the Settlement Agreement; (c) are reasonable and constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all Class Members and other persons entitled

to receive notice; and (d) meet all applicable requirements of law, including Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c) and (e), and the Due Process Clause(s) of the United States Constitution. The Court further finds that the Notice is written in plain language, uses simple terminology, and is designed to be readily understandable by Class Members.

42. Judge Mary M. Rowland

In re Sears, Roebuck and Co. Front-Loader Washer Prod. Liab. Litig., (February 29, 2016)
No. 06-cv-07023 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court concludes that, under the circumstances of this case, the Settlement Administrator's notice program was the "best notice that is practicable," Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B), and was "reasonably calculated to reach interested parties," *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 318 (1950).

43. Honorable Lynn Adelman

Fond Du Lac Bumper Exch., Inc. v. Jui Li Enter. Ins. Co., (Indirect Purchaser–Tong Yang & Gordon Settlements), (January 14, 2016)
No. 09-CV-00852 (E.D. Wis.):

The form, content, and methods of dissemination of Notice of the Settlements to the Settlement Class were reasonable, adequate, and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the Settlements, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlements, and these proceedings to all persons and entities entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process requirements.

44. Judge Curtis L. Collier

In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig., (December 22, 2015)
No. 12-md-2343 (E.D. Tenn.):

The Class Notice met statutory requirements of notice under the circumstances, and fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the requirement process.

45. Honorable Mitchell D. Dembin

Lerma v. Schiff Nutrition Int'l, Inc., (November 3, 2015)

No. 11-CV-01056 (S.D. Cal.):

According to Ms. Intrepido-Bowden, between June 29, 2015, and August 2, 2015, consumer publications are estimated to have reached 53.9% of likely Class Members and internet publications are estimated to have reached 58.9% of likely Class Members...The Court finds this notice (i) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the putative Class Members of the pendency of the action, and of their right to object and to appear at the Final Approval Hearing or to exclude themselves from the Settlement, (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice, and (iv) fully complied with due process principles and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.

46. Honorable Lynn Adelman

Fond Du Lac Bumper Exch., Inc. v. Jui Li Enter. Ins. Co.,

(Indirect Purchaser–Gordon Settlement), (August 4, 2015)

No. 09-CV-00852 (E.D. Wis.):

The Court further finds that the mailing and publication of Notice in the manner set forth in the Notice Program is the best notice practicable under the circumstances; is valid, due and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class members; and complies fully with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the due process requirements of the Constitution of the United States. The Court further finds that the forms of Notice are written in plain language, use simple terminology, and are designed to be readily understandable by Settlement Class members.

47. Honorable Sara I. Ellis

Thomas v. Lennox Indus. Inc., (July 9, 2015)

No. 13-CV-07747 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court approves the form and content of the Long-Form Notice, Summary Notice, Postcard Notice, Dealer Notice, and Internet Banners (the “Notices”) attached as

Exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4 and A-5 respectively to the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that the Notice Plan, included in the Settlement Agreement and the Declaration of Gina M. Intrepido-Bowden on Settlement Notice Plan and Notice Documents, constitutes the best practicable notice under the circumstances as well as valid, due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto, and that the Notice Plan complies fully with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and provides Settlement Class Members due process under the United States Constitution.

48. Honorable Lynn Adelman

Fond du Lac Bumper Exch., Inc. v. Jui Li Enter.Co., Ltd.

(Indirect Purchaser–Tong Yang Settlement), (May 29, 2015)

No. 09-CV-00852 (E.D. Wis.):

The Court further finds that the mailing and publication of Notice in the manner set forth in the Notice Program is the best notice practicable under the circumstances; is valid, due and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class members; and complies fully with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and the due process requirements of the Constitution of the United States. The Court further finds that the forms of Notice are written in plain language, use simple terminology, and are designed to be readily understandable by Settlement Class members.

49. Honorable Mitchell D. Dembin

Lerma v. Schiff Nutrition Int'l, Inc., (May 25, 2015)

No. 11-CV-01056 (S.D. Cal.):

The parties are to notify the Settlement Class in accordance with the Notice Program outlined in the Second Supplemental Declaration of Gina M. Intrepido-Bowden on Settlement Notice Program.

50. Honorable Lynn Adelman

Fond du Lac Bumper Exch., Inc. v. Jui Li Enter. Co., Ltd.
(Direct Purchaser–Gordon Settlement), (May 5, 2015)
No. 09-CV-00852 (E.D. Wis.):

The Notice Program set forth herein is substantially similar to the one set forth in the Court’s April 24, 2015 Order regarding notice of the Tong Yang Settlement (ECF. No. 619) and combines the Notice for the Tong Yang Settlement with that of the Gordon Settlement into a comprehensive Notice Program. To the extent differences exist between the two, the Notice Program set forth and approved herein shall prevail over that found in the April 24, 2015 Order.

51. Honorable José L. Linares

Demmick v. Cellco P’ship, (May 1, 2015)
No. 06-CV-2163 (D.N.J.):

The Notice Plan, which this Court has already approved, was timely and properly executed and that it provided the best notice practicable, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and met the “desire to actually inform” due process communications standard of Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306 (1950) The Court thus affirms its finding and conclusion in the November 19, 2014 Preliminary Approval Order that the notice in this case meets the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Due Process Clause of the United States and/or any other applicable law. All objections submitted which make mention of notice have been considered and, in light of the above, overruled.

52. Honorable David O. Carter

Cobb v. BSH Home Appliances Corp., (December 29, 2014)
No. 10-CV-0711 (C.D. Cal.):

The Notice Program complies with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) because it constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, provides individual notice to all Class Members who can be identified through reasonable effort, and is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Class Members of the nature of the action,

the claims it asserts, the Class definition, the Settlement terms, the right to appear through an attorney, the right to opt out of the Class or to comment on or object to the Settlement (and how to do so), and the binding effect of a final judgment upon Class Members who do not opt out.

53. Honorable José L. Linares

Demmick v. Cellco P'ship, (November 19, 2014)

No. 06-CV-2163 (D.N.J.):

The Court finds that the Parties' plan for providing Notice to the Settlement Classes as described in Article V of the Settlement Agreement and as detailed in the Settlement Notice Plan attached to the Declaration of Gina M. Intrepido-Bowden: (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances of this Action; (b) constitutes due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Classes of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Settlement Classes, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the Final Approval Hearing; and (c) complies fully with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and any other applicable law.

The Court further finds that the Parties' plan for providing Notice to the Settlement Classes as described in Article V of the Settlement Agreement and as detailed in the Settlement Notice Plan attached to the Declaration of Gina M. Intrepido-Bowden, will adequately inform members of the Settlement Classes of their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Classes so as to not be bound by the Settlement Agreement.

54. Honorable Christina A. Snyder

Roberts v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc., (September 11, 2014)

No. 12-CV-01644 (C.D. Cal.):

Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and concludes that members of the Settlement Class have been provided the best notice practicable of the Settlement and that such notice satisfies all requirements of federal and California laws and due process. The Court finally approves the Notice Plan in all respects...Any objections to the notice provided to the Class are hereby overruled.

55. Judge Gregory A. Presnell

Poertner v. Gillette Co., (August 21, 2014)

No. 12-CV-00803 (M.D. Fla.):

This Court has again reviewed the Notice and the accompanying documents and finds that the “best practicable” notice was given to the Class and that the Notice was “reasonably calculated” to (a) describe the Action and the Plaintiff’s and Class Members’ rights in it; and (b) apprise interested parties of the pendency of the Action and of their right to have their objections to the Settlement heard. See Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts, 472 U.S. 797, 810 (1985). This Court further finds that Class Members were given a reasonable opportunity to opt out of the Action and that they were adequately represented by Plaintiff Joshua D. Poertner. See Id. The Court thus reaffirms its findings that the Notice given to the Class satisfies the requirements of due process and holds that it has personal jurisdiction over all Class Members.

56. Honorable Christina A. Snyder

Roberts v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc., (May 5, 2014)

No. 12-CV-01644 (C.D. Cal.):

The Court finds that the Notice Plan set forth in the Settlement Agreement (§ V. of that Agreement) is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Court further preliminarily finds that the Notice itself IS appropriate, and complies with Rules 23(b)(3), 23(c)(2)(B), and 23(e) because it describes in plain language (1) the nature of the action, (2) the definition of the Settlement Class and Subclasses, (3) the class claims, issues or defenses, (4) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires, (5) that the Court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion, (6) the time and manner for requesting exclusion, and (7) the binding effect of a judgment on Settlement Class Members under Rule 23(c)(3) and the terms of the releases. Accordingly, the Court approves the Notice Plan in all respects...

57. Honorable William E. Smith

Cappalli v. BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc., (December 12, 2013)

No. 10-CV-00407 (D.R.I.):

The Court finds that the form, content, and method of dissemination of the notice given to the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of these proceedings of the proposed Settlement, and of the terms set forth in the Stipulation and first Joint Addendum, and the notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Constitutional due process, and all other applicable laws.

58. Judge Gregory A. Presnell

Poertner v. Gillette Co., (November 5, 2013)

No. 12-CV-00803 (M.D. Fla.):

The Court finds that compliance with the Notice Plan is the best practicable notice under the circumstances and constitutes due and sufficient notice of this Order to all persons entitled thereto and is in full compliance with the requirements of Rule 23, applicable law, and due process.

59. Judge Marilyn L. Huff

Beck-Ellman v. Kaz USA, Inc., (June 11, 2013)

No. 10-cv-02134 (S.D. Cal.):

The Notice Plan has now been implemented in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order...The Notice Plan was specially developed to cause class members to see the Publication Notice or see an advertisement that directed them to the Settlement Website...The Court concludes that the Class Notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and all due process requirements.

60. Judge Tom A. Lucas

Stroud v. eMachines, Inc., (March 27, 2013)

No. CJ-2003-968 L (W.D. Okla.):

The Notices met the requirements of Okla. Stat. tit. 12 section 2023(C), due process, and any other applicable law; constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and constituted due and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto. All objections are stricken. Alternatively, considered on their merits, all objections are overruled.

61. Judge Marilyn L. Huff

Beck-Ellman v. Kaz USA, Inc., (January 7, 2013)

No. 10-cv-02134 (S.D. Cal.):

The proposed Class Notice, Publication Notice, and Settlement Website are reasonably calculated to inform potential Class members of the Settlement, and are the best practicable methods under the circumstances... Notice is written in easy and clear language, and provides all needed information, including: (1) basic information about the lawsuit; (2) a description of the benefits provided by the settlement; (3) an explanation of how Class members can obtain Settlement benefits; (4) an explanation of how Class members can exercise their rights to opt-out or object; (5) an explanation that any claims against Kaz that could have been litigated in this action will be released if the Class member does not opt out; (6) the names of Class Counsel and information regarding attorneys' fees; (7) the fairness hearing date and procedure for appearing; and (8) the Settlement Website and a toll free number where additional information, including Spanish translations of all forms, can be obtained. After review of the proposed notice and Settlement Agreement, the Court concludes that the Publication Notice and Settlement Website are adequate and sufficient to inform the class members of their rights. Accordingly, the Court approves the form and manner of giving notice of the proposed settlement.

62. Judge Tom A. Lucas

Stroud v. eMachines, Inc., (December 21, 2012)

No. CJ-2003-968 L (W.D. Okla.):

The Plan of Notice in the Settlement Agreement as well as the content of the Claim Form, Class Notice, Post-Card Notice, and Summary Notice of Settlement is hereby approved in all respects. The Court finds that the Plan of Notice and the contents of the Class Notice, Post-Card Notice and Summary Notice of Settlement and the manner of their dissemination described in the Settlement Agreement is the best practicable notice under the circumstances and is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Putative Class Members of the pendency of this action, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and their right to object to the Settlement Agreement or exclude themselves from the Certified Settlement Class and, therefore, the Plan of Notice, the Class Notice, Post-Card Notice and Summary Notice of Settlement are approved in all respects. The Court further finds that the Class Notice, Post-Card Notice and Summary Notice of Settlement are reasonable, that they constitute due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and that they meet the requirements of due process.

63. Honorable Michael M. Anello

Shames v. Hertz Corp., (November 5, 2012)

No. 07-cv-02174 (S.D. Cal.):

...the Court is satisfied that the parties and the class administrator made reasonable efforts to reach class members. Class members who did not receive individualized notice still had opportunity for notice by publication, email, or both...The Court is satisfied that the redundancies in the parties' class notice procedure—mailing, e-mailing, and publication—reasonably ensured the widest possible dissemination of the notice...The Court OVERRULES all objections to the class settlement...

64. Judge Ann D. Montgomery

In re Uponsor, Inc., F1807 Plumbing Fittings Prod. Liab. Litig., (July 9, 2012)
No. 11-MD-2247 (D. Minn.):

The objections filed by class members are overruled; The notice provided to the class was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise class members of the pendency of this action, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and their right to object, opt out, and appear at the final fairness hearing;...

65. Judge Ann D. Montgomery

In re Uponsor, Inc., F1807 Plumbing Fittings Prod. Liab. Litig., (June 29, 2012)
No. 11-MD-2247 (D. Minn.):

After the preliminary approval of the Settlement, the parties carried out the notice program, hiring an experienced consulting firm to design and implement the plan. The plan consisted of direct mail notices to known owners and warranty claimants of the RTI F1807 system, direct mail notices to potential holders of subrogation interests through insurance company mailings, notice publications in leading consumer magazines which target home and property owners, and earned media efforts through national press releases and the Settlement website. The plan was intended to, and did in fact, reach a minimum of 70% of potential class members, on average more than two notices each...The California Objectors also take umbrage with the notice provided the class. Specifically, they argue that the class notice fails to advise class members of the true nature of the aforementioned release. This argument does not float, given that the release is clearly set forth in the Settlement and the published notices satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2)(B) by providing information regarding: (1) the nature of the action class membership; (2) class claims, issues, and defenses; (3) the ability to enter an appearance through an attorney; (4) the procedure and ability to opt-out or object; (5) the process and instructions to make a claim; (6) the binding effect of the class judgment; and (7) the specifics of the final fairness hearing.

66. Honorable Michael M. Anello

Shames v. Hertz Corp., (May 22, 2012)

No. 07-cv-02174 (S.D. Cal.):

The Court approves, as to form and content, the Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action, substantially in the forms of Exhibits A-1 through A-6, as appropriate, (individually or collectively, the “Notice”), and finds that the e-mailing or mailing and distribution of the Notice and publishing of the Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in ¶ 7 of this Order meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and due process, and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled thereto.

67. Judge Ann D. Montgomery

In re Uponor, Inc., F1807 Plumbing Fittings Prod. Liab. Litig., (January 18, 2012)

No. 11-MD-2247 (D. Minn.):

The Notice Plan detailed in the Affidavit of Gina M. Intrepido-Bowden provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances and constitutes due and sufficient notice of the Settlement Agreement and the Final Fairness Hearing to the Classes and all persons entitled to receive such notice as potential members of the Class... The Notice Plan’s multi-faceted approach to providing notice to Class Members whose identity is not known to the Settling Parties constitutes ‘the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances’ consistent with Rule 23(c)(2)(B)... Notice to Class members must clearly and concisely state the nature of the lawsuit and its claims and defenses, the Class certified, the Class member’s right to appear through an attorney or opt out of the Class, the time and manner for opting out, and the binding effect of a class judgment on members of the Class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). Compliance with Rule 23’s notice requirements also complies with Due Process requirements. ‘The combination of reasonable notice, the opportunity to be heard, and the opportunity to withdraw from the class satisfy due process requirements of the Fifth Amendment.’ Prudential, 148 F.3d at 306. The proposed notices in the present case meet those requirements.

68. Judge Jeffrey Goering

Molina v. Intrust Bank, N.A., (January 17, 2012)

No. 10-CV-3686 (Ks. 18th J.D. Ct.):

The Court approved the form and content of the Class Notice, and finds that transmission of the Notice as proposed by the Parties meets the requirements of due process and Kansas law, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitutes due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

69. Judge Charles E. Atwell

Allen v. UMB Bank, N.A., (October 31, 2011)

No. 1016-CV34791 (Mo. Cir. Ct.):

The form, content, and method of dissemination of Class Notice given to the Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all persons entitled to such notice, and said notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 52.08 of the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure and due process.

70. Judge Charles E. Atwell

Allen v. UMB Bank, N.A., (June 27, 2011)

No. 1016-CV34791 (Mo. Cir. Ct.):

The Court approves the form and content of the Class Notice, and finds that transmission of the Notice as proposed by the Parties meets the requirements of due process and Missouri law, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitutes due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

71. Judge Jeremy Fogel

Ko v. Natura Pet Prod., Inc., (June 24, 2011)

No. 09cv2619 (N.D. Cal.):

The Court approves, as to form and content, the Long Form Notice of Pendency and Settlement of Class Action (“Long Form Notice”), and the Summary Notice attached as Exhibits to the Settlement Agreement, and finds that the e-mailing of the Summary Notice, and posting on the dedicated internet website of the Long Form Notice, mailing of the Summary Notice post-card, and newspaper and magazine publication of the Summary Notice substantially in the manner as set forth in this Order meets the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and due process, and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice.

72. Judge M. Joseph Tiemann

Billieson v. City of New Orleans, (May 27, 2011)

No. 94-19231 (La. Civ. Dist. Ct.):

The plan to disseminate notice for the Insurance Settlements (the “Insurance Settlements Notice Plan”) which was designed at the request of Class Counsel by experienced Notice Professionals Gina Intrepido-Bowden... IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 1. The Insurance Settlements Notice Plan is hereby approved and shall be executed by the Notice Administrator;*
- 2. The Insurance Settlements Notice Documents, substantially in the form included in the Insurance Settlements Notice Plan, are hereby approved.*

73. Judge James Robertson

In re Dep’t of Veterans Affairs (VA) Data Theft Litig., (February 11, 2009)

MDL No. 1796 (D.D.C.):

The Court approves the proposed method of dissemination of notice set forth in the Notice Plan, Exhibit 1 to the Settlement Agreement. The Notice Plan meets the requirements of due process and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances. This method of Class Action Settlement notice dissemination is hereby approved by the Court.

74. Judge Louis J. Farina

Soders v. Gen. Motors Corp., (December 19, 2008)

No. CI-00-04255 (C.P. Pa.):

The Court has considered the proposed forms of Notice to Class members of the settlement and the plan for disseminating Notice, and finds that the form and manner of notice proposed by the parties and approved herein meet the requirements of due process, are the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constitute sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice.

75. Judge Robert W. Gettleman

In re Trans Union Corp., (September 17, 2008)

MDL No. 1350 (N.D. Ill.):

The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice under the terms and in the format provided for in its Preliminary Approval Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, is due and sufficient notice for all purposes to all persons entitled to such notice, and fully satisfies the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the requirements of due process under the Constitution of the United States, and any other applicable law...Accordingly, all objections are hereby OVERRULED.

76. Judge William G. Young

In re TJX Cos. Retail Security Breach Litig., (September 2, 2008)

MDL No. 1838 (D. Mass.):

...as attested in the Affidavit of Gina M. Intrepido...The form, content, and method of dissemination of notice provided to the Settlement Class were adequate and reasonable, and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Notice, as given, provided valid, due, and sufficient notice of the proposed settlement, the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and these proceedings to all Persons entitled to such notice, and said Notice fully satisfied the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process.

77. Judge David De Alba

Ford Explorer Cases, (May 29, 2008)

JCCP Nos. 4226 & 4270 (Cal. Super. Ct.):

[T]he Court is satisfied that the notice plan, design, implementation, costs, reach, were all reasonable, and has no reservations about the notice to those in this state and those in other states as well, including Texas, Connecticut, and Illinois; that the plan that was approved -- submitted and approved, comports with the fundamentals of due process as described in the case law that was offered by counsel.

III.

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

1. **'Marching to Their Own Drumbeat.' What Lawyers Don't Understand About Notice and Claims Administration**, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, American Bar Association's (ABA) 23rd Annual National Institute on Class Actions, panelist (October 2019).
2. **Rule 23 Amendments and Digital Notice Ethics, accredited CLE Program**, presenter at Terrell Marshall Law Group PLLC, Seattle, WA (June 2019); Severson & Werson, San Francisco, CA and broadcast to office in Irvine (June 2019); Greenberg Traurig, LLP, Los Angeles, CA (May 2019); Chicago Bar Association, Chicago, IL (January 2019); Sidley Austin LLP, Century City, CA and broadcast to offices in Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York, Chicago, Washington D.C. (January 2019); Burns Charest LLP, Dallas, TX (November 2018); Lockridge Grindal Nauen P.L.L.P., Minneapolis, MN (October 2018); Zimmerman Reed LLP, Minneapolis, MN (October 2018); Gustafson Gluek PLLC, Minneapolis, MN (October 2018).
3. **Ethics in Legal Notification, accredited CLE Program**, presenter at Kessler Topaz Meltzer & Check LLP, Radnor, PA (September 2015); The St. Regis Resort, Deer Valley, UT (March 2014); and Morgan Lewis & Bockius, New York, NY (December 2012).
4. **Pitfalls of Class Action Notice and Settlement Administration, accredited CLE Program**, PRACTISING LAW INSTITUTE (PLI), Class Action Litigation 2013, presenter/panelist (July 2013).
5. **The Fundamentals of Settlement Administration, accredited CLE Program**, presenter at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, Chicago, IL (January 2013); Wexler Wallace LLP, Chicago, IL (January 2013); Hinshaw & Culbertson LLP, Chicago, IL (October 2012); and Spector Roseman Kodroff & Willis, P.C., Philadelphia, PA (December 2011).
6. **Class Action Settlement Administration Tips & Pitfalls on the Path to Approval, accredited CLE Program**, presenter at Jenner & Block, Chicago, IL and broadcast to offices in Washington DC, New York and California (October 2012).
7. **Reaching Class Members & Driving Take Rates**, CONSUMER ATTORNEYS OF SAN DIEGO, 4th Annual Class Action Symposium, presenter/panelist (October 2011).

8. **Legal Notice Ethics, accredited CLE Program**, presenter at Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C., Minneapolis, MN (January 2011); Lockridge Grindal Nauen P.L.L.P., Minneapolis, MN (January 2011); Chestnut Cambronne, Minneapolis, MN (January 2011); Berger & Montague, P.C., Anapol Schwartz, Philadelphia, PA (October 2010); Lundy Law, Philadelphia, PA (October 2010); Dechert LLP, Philadelphia, PA and broadcast to offices in California, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Texas, Washington D.C., and London and sent via video to their office in China (October 2010); Miller Law LLC, Chicago, IL (May 2010); Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC, New York, NY (May 2010); and Milberg LLP, New York, NY (May 2010).
9. **Class Actions 101: Best Practices and Potential Pitfalls in Providing Class Notice, accredited CLE Program**, presenter, Kansas Bar Association (March 2009).

IV.

ARTICLES

1. Gina M. Intrepido-Bowden, *Time to Allow More Streamlined Class Action Notice Formats - Adapting Short Form Notice Requirements to Accommodate Today's Fast Paced Society*, LAW360 (2021).
2. Todd B. Hilsee, Gina M. Intrepido & Shannon R. Wheatman, *Hurricanes, Mobility and Due Process: The "Desire-to-Inform" Requirement for Effective Class Action Notice Is Highlighted by Katrina*, 80 TULANE LAW REV. 1771 (2006); reprinted in course materials for: CENTER FOR LEGAL EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL, *Class Actions: Prosecuting and Defending Complex Litigation* (2007); AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, *10th Annual National Institute on Class Actions* (2006); NATIONAL BUSINESS INSTITUTE, *Class Action Update: Today's Trends & Strategies for Success* (2006).
3. Gina M. Intrepido, *Notice Experts May Help Resolve CAFA Removal Issues, Notification to Officials*, 6 CLASS ACTION LITIG. REP. 759 (2005).
4. Todd B. Hilsee, Shannon R. Wheatman, & Gina M. Intrepido, *Do You Really Want Me to Know My Rights? The Ethics Behind Due Process in Class Action Notice Is More Than Just Plain Language: A Desire to Actually Inform*, 18 GEORGETOWN JOURNAL LEGAL ETHICS 1359 (2005).

V

CASE EXPERIENCE

Ms. Intrepido-Bowden has been involved in the design and implementation of hundreds of notice programs throughout her career. A partial listing of her case work is provided below.

CASE NAME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION
<i>A.B. v. Regents of the Univ. of California</i>	20-cv-09555-RGK-E	C.D. Cal.
<i>Abante Rooter & Plumbing, Inc. v. New York Life Ins. Co.</i>	16-cv-03588	S.D.N.Y.
<i>Advance Trust & Life Escrow Serv., LTA v. Sec. Life of Denver Ins. Co.</i>	18-cv-01897-DDD-NYW	D. Colo.
<i>Ahmed v. HSBC Bank USA, NA</i>	15-cv-2057-FMO-SPx	N.D. Ill.
<i>Allen v. UMB Bank, N.A.</i>	1016-CV34791	Mo. Cir. Ct.
<i>Anderson v. Canada (Phase I)</i>	2008NLTD166	NL Sup. Ct.
<i>Anderson v. Canada (Phase II)</i>	2007 01T4955CP	NL Sup. Ct.
<i>Angel v. U.S. Tire Recovery</i>	06-C-855	W. Va. Cir. Ct.
<i>Baiz v. Mountain View Cemetery</i>	809869-2	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Baker v. Jewel Food Stores, Inc. & Dominick's Finer Foods, Inc.</i>	00-L-9664	Ill. Cir. Ct.
<i>Barba v. Shire U.S., Inc.</i>	13-cv-21158	S.D. Fla.
<i>Beck-Ellman v. Kaz USA Inc.</i>	10-cv-2134	S.D. Cal.
<i>Beringer v. Certegy Check Serv., Inc.</i>	07-cv-1657-T-23TGW	M.D. Fla.
<i>Bibb v. Monsanto Co. (Nitro)</i>	041465	W. Va. Cir. Ct.
<i>Billieson v. City of New Orleans</i>	94-19231	La. Civ. Dist. Ct.
<i>Bland v. Premier Nutrition Corp.</i>	RG19-002714	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Boskie v. Backgroundchecks.com</i>	2019CP3200824	S.C. C.P.
<i>Brookshire Bros. v. Chiquita</i>	05-CIV-21962	S.D. Fla.
<i>Brown v. Am. Tobacco</i>	J.C.C.P. 4042 No. 711400	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Campos v. Calumet Transload R.R., LLC</i>	13-cv-08376	N.D. Ill.
<i>Cappalli v. BJ's Wholesale Club, Inc.</i>	10-cv-00407	D.R.I.
<i>Carter v. Monsanto Co. (Nitro)</i>	00-C-300	W. Va. Cir. Ct.
<i>Chambers v. Whirlpool Corp.</i>	11-cv-01733	C.D. Cal.

CASE NAME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION
<i>Cobb v. BSH Home Appliances Corp.</i>	10-cv-00711	C.D. Cal.
<i>Davis v. Am. Home Prods. Corp.</i>	94-11684	La. Civ. Dist. Ct., Div. K
<i>Defrates v. Hollywood Ent. Corp.</i>	02L707	Ill. Cir. Ct.
<i>Demereckis v. BSH Home Appliances Corp.</i>	8:10-cv-00711	C.D. Cal.
<i>Demmick v. Cellco P'ship</i>	06-cv-2163	D.N.J.
<i>Desportes v. Am. Gen. Assurance Co.</i>	SU-04-CV-3637	Ga. Super. Ct.
<i>Dolen v. ABN AMRO Bank N.V.</i>	01-L-454 & 01-L-493	Ill. Cir. Ct.
<i>Donnelly v. United Tech. Corp.</i>	06-CV-320045CP	Ont. S.C.J.
<i>Eck v. City of Los Angeles</i>	BC577028	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Engquist v. City of Los Angeles</i>	BC591331	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Ervin v. Movie Gallery Inc.</i>	CV-13007	Tenn. Ch. Fayette Co.
<i>First State Orthopaedics v. Concentra, Inc.</i>	05-CV-04951-AB	E.D. Pa.
<i>Fisher v. Virginia Electric & Power Co.</i>	02-CV-431	E.D. Va.
<i>Flaum v. Doctor's Assoc., Inc. (d/b/a Subway)</i>	16-cv-61198	S.D. Fla.
<i>Fond du Lac Bumper Exch. Inc. v. Jui Li Enter. Co. Ltd. (Direct & Indirect Purchasers Classes)</i>	09-cv-00852	E.D. Wis.
<i>Ford Explorer Cases</i>	JCCP Nos. 4226 & 4270	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Friedman v. Microsoft Corp.</i>	2000-000722	Ariz. Super. Ct.
<i>FTC v. Reckitt Benckiser Grp. PLC</i>	19CV00028	W.D. Va.
<i>Gardner v. Stimson Lumber Co.</i>	00-2-17633-3SEA	Wash. Super. Ct.
<i>Gordon v. Microsoft Corp.</i>	00-5994	D. Minn.
<i>Grays Harbor v. Carrier Corp.</i>	05-05437-RBL	W.D. Wash.
<i>Griffin v. Dell Canada Inc.</i>	07-CV-325223D2	Ont. Super. Ct.
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assoc., Inc. (AIG)</i>	2004-2417-D	La. 14 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assoc., Inc. (FARA)</i>	2004-2417-D	La. 14 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assoc., Inc. (Focus)</i>	2004-2417-D	La. 14 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assoc., Inc. (Wal-Mart)</i>	2004-2417-D	La. 14 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Gunderson v. F.A. Richard & Assoc., Inc. (Amerisafe)</i>	2004-002417	La. 14 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Huntzinger v. Suunto Oy</i>	37-2018-00027159-CU-BT-CTL	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i>	15-md-02617	N.D. Cal.
<i>In re Babcock & Wilcox Co.</i>	00-10992	E.D. La.

CASE NAME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION
<i>In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litig.</i>	13-CV-20000-RDP	N.D. Ala.
<i>In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig.</i>	16-cv-08637	N.D. Ill.
<i>In re ConAgra Foods Inc.</i>	11-cv-05379-CJC-AGR	C.D. Cal.
<i>In re Countrywide Fin. Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach</i>	MDL 08-md-1998	W.D. Ky.
<i>In re General Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig. (economic settlement)</i>	2543 (MDL)	S.D.N.Y.
<i>In re High Sulfur Content Gasoline Prod. Liab.</i>	MDL No. 1632	E.D. La.
<i>In re Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i>	14-md-02583	N.D. Ga.
<i>In re Hypodermic Prod. Antitrust Litig.</i>	05-cv-01602	D.N.J.
<i>In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig. (Indirect-Purchasers)</i>	14-md-02542	S.D.N.Y.
<i>In re Lidoderm Antitrust Litig.</i>	14-md-02521	N.D. Cal.
<i>In re Lupron Mktg. & Sales Practices</i>	MDL No.1430	D. Mass.
<i>In re Mercedes-Benz Emissions Litig.</i>	16-cv-881 (KM) (ESK)	D.N.J.
<i>In re Monitronics Int'l, Inc., TCPA Litig.</i>	11-cv-00090	N.D. W.Va.
<i>In re Parmalat Sec.</i>	04-md-01653 (LAK)	S.D.N.Y.
<i>In re Residential Schools Litig.</i>	00-CV-192059 CPA	Ont. Super. Ct.
<i>In re Resistors Antitrust Litig.</i>	15-cv-03820-JD	N.D. Cal.
<i>In re Royal Ahold Sec. & "ERISA"</i>	03-md-01539	D. Md.
<i>In re Rust-Oleum Restore Mktg. Sales Practices & Prod. Liab. Litig.</i>	15-cv01364	N.D. Ill.
<i>In re Sears, Roebuck & Co. Front-Loading Washer Prod. Liab. Litig.</i>	06-cv-07023	N.D. Ill.
<i>In re Serzone Prod. Liab.</i>	02-md-1477	S.D. W. Va.
<i>In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig.</i>	12-cv-194	E.D. Ten.
<i>In re Solodyn (Minocycline Hydrochloride) Antitrust Litig. (Direct Purchaser Class)</i>	14-md-2503	D. Mass.
<i>In re TJX Cos. Retail Sec. Breach Litig.</i>	MDL No. 1838	D. Mass.
<i>In re Trans Union Corp. Privacy Litig.</i>	MDL No. 1350	N.D. Ill.
<i>In re Uponor, Inc., F1807 Prod. Liab. Litig.</i>	2247	D. Minn.
<i>In re U.S. Dep't of Veterans Affairs Data Theft Litig.</i>	MDL 1796	D.D.C.

CASE NAME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION
<i>In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Prod. Liab. Litig.</i>	MDL 08-1958	D. Minn.
<i>Johnson v. Yahoo! Inc.</i>	14-cv02028	N.D. Ill.
<i>Kearney v. Equilon Enter. LLC</i>	14-cv-00254	D. Ore.
<i>Ko v. Natura Pet Prod., Inc.</i>	09cv02619	N.D. Cal.
<i>Langan v. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Co.</i>	13-cv-01471	D. Conn.
<i>Lavinsky v. City of Los Angeles</i>	BC542245	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Lee v. Stonebridge Life Ins. Co.</i>	11-cv-00043	N.D. Cal.
<i>Lerma v. Schiff Nutrition Int'l, Inc.</i>	11-cv-01056	S.D. Cal.
<i>Lockwood v. Certegy Check Serv., Inc.</i>	07-CV-587-FtM-29-DNF	M.D. Fla.
<i>Luster v. Wells Fargo Dealer Serv., Inc.</i>	15-cv-01058	N.D. Ga.
<i>McCrary v. Elations Co., LLC</i>	13-cv-00242	C.D. Cal.
<i>Microsoft I-V Cases</i>	J.C.C.P. No. 4106	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Molina v. Intrust Bank, N.A.</i>	10-cv-3686	Ks. 18 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Morrow v. Conoco Inc.</i>	2002-3860	La. Dist. Ct.
<i>Mullins v. Direct Digital LLC.</i>	13-cv-01829	N.D. Ill.
<i>Myers v. Rite Aid of PA, Inc.</i>	01-2771	Pa. C.P.
<i>Naef v. Masonite Corp.</i>	CV-94-4033	Ala. Cir. Ct.
<i>Nature Guard Cement Roofing Shingles Cases</i>	J.C.C.P. No. 4215	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Nichols v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.</i>	00-6222	E.D. Pa.
<i>Nishimura v Gentry Homes, LTD.</i>	11-11-1-1522-07-RAN	Haw. Cir. Ct.
<i>Novoa v. The GEO Grp., Inc.</i>	17-cv-02514-JGB-SHK	C.D. Cal.
<i>Nwauzor v. GEO Grp., Inc.</i>	17-cv-05769	W.D. Wash.
<i>Palace v. DaimlerChrysler</i>	01-CH-13168	Ill. Cir. Ct.
<i>Peek v. Microsoft Corp.</i>	CV-2006-2612	Ark. Cir. Ct.
<i>Plubell v. Merck & Co., Inc.</i>	04CV235817-01	Mo. Cir. Ct.
<i>Podawiltz v. Swisher Int'l, Inc.</i>	16CV27621	Or. Cir. Ct.
<i>Poertner v. Gillette Co.</i>	12-cv-00803	M.D. Fla.
<i>Prather v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i>	15-cv-04231	N.D. Ga.
<i>Q+ Food, LLC v. Mitsubishi Fuso Truck of Am., Inc.</i>	14-cv-06046	D.N.J.
<i>Richison v. Am. Cemwood Corp.</i>	005532	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Rick Nelson Co. v. Sony Music Ent.</i>	18-cv-08791	S.D.N.Y.

CASE NAME	CASE NUMBER	LOCATION
<i>Roberts v. Electrolux Home Prod., Inc.</i>	12-cv-01644	C.D. Cal.
<i>Russell v. Kohl's Dep't Stores, Inc.</i>	15-cv-01143	C.D. Cal.
<i>Sandoval v. Merlex Stucco Inc.</i>	BC619322	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Scott v. Blockbuster, Inc.</i>	D 162-535	136 th Tex. Jud. Dist.
<i>Senne v Office of the Comm'r of Baseball</i>	14-cv-00608-JCS	N.D. Cal.
<i>Shames v. Hertz Corp.</i>	07cv2174-MMA	S.D. Cal.
<i>Sidibe v. Sutter Health</i>	12-cv-4854-LB	N.D. Cal.
<i>Soders v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i>	CI-00-04255	Pa. C.P.
<i>Sonner v. Schwabe North America, Inc.</i>	15-cv-01358 VAP (SPx)	C.D. Cal.
<i>Stroud v. eMachines, Inc.</i>	CJ-2003-968-L	W.D. Okla.
<i>Talalai v. Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.</i>	MID-L-8839-00 MT	N.J. Super. Ct.
<i>Tech. Training Assoc. v. Buccaneers Ltd. P'ship</i>	16-cv-01622	M.D. Fla.
<i>Thibodeaux v. Conoco Philips Co.</i>	2003-481	La. 4 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Thomas v. Lennox Indus. Inc.</i>	13-cv-07747	N.D. Ill.
<i>Thompson v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.</i>	00-CIV-5071 HB	S.D. N.Y.
<i>Turner v. Murphy Oil USA, Inc.</i>	05-CV-04206-EEF-JCW	E.D. La.
<i>USC Student Health Ctr. Settlement</i>	18-cv-04258-SVW	C.D. Cal.
<i>Walker v. Rite Aid of PA, Inc.</i>	99-6210	Pa. C.P.
<i>Wells v. Abbott Lab., Inc. (AdvantEdge/ Myoplex nutrition bars)</i>	BC389753	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Wener v. United Tech. Corp.</i>	500-06-000425-088	QC. Super. Ct.
<i>West v. G&H Seed Co.</i>	99-C-4984-A	La. 27 th Jud. Dist. Ct.
<i>Williams v. Weyerhaeuser Co.</i>	CV-995787	Cal. Super. Ct.
<i>Yamagata v. Reckitt Benckiser, LLC</i>	17-cv-03529-CV	N.D.Cal.
<i>Zarebski v. Hartford Ins. Co. of the Midwest</i>	CV-2006-409-3	Ark. Cir. Ct.

- EXHIBIT B -

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

If you are the current or former owner of a Performance Universal life insurance policy issued by John Hancock that was subject to a cost of insurance rate increase, your rights may be affected by a class action settlement

A New York Federal Court authorized this Notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

- A proposed settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit called *Jeffrey Leonard et. al. v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York et. al.*, Case No. 18-CV-4994 (AKH) (the “Settlement”).
- The lawsuit alleges that Defendants, John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York and John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.) (collectively, “John Hancock”) increased cost of insurance (“COI”) rates on certain Performance Universal Life policies (“Class Policies”) beginning in 2018 and 2019 unlawfully and in violation of the terms of the policies (the “COI Increase”). The lawsuit further alleges that John Hancock violated certain state statutes for issuing false and misleading illustrations regarding the policies. John Hancock denies these claims; however, both sides have agreed to the Settlement to avoid the cost of further litigation.
- If the Court approves the Settlement, John Hancock will fund a cash settlement fund up to \$123,074,128.32, which is estimated to be approximately 91.25% of the incremental COI charges that John Hancock collected from the Class Policies through August 31, 2021. Class members will be eligible to receive payment from that cash fund, as further detailed in Questions 8-11.
- As part of the Settlement, John Hancock has agreed to a “COI Rate Freeze,” under which it will not raise COI rate scales on policies covered by the Settlement for a period of five years. In addition, John Hancock has agreed to extend the COI Rate Freeze if it agrees to a longer freeze for any member of the Settlement Class that opts out of the Settlement, or for any owner of a policy that was subject to the COI Increase.
- As part of the Settlement, John Hancock has also agreed not to challenge the validity of the Class Policies based on certain grounds, as further detailed in Question 8.
- You may be a part of the Settlement if you are the current or former owner of a Class Policy. Your legal rights are affected whether or not you act. ***Please read this notice carefully.***

YOUR LEGAL RIGHTS AND OPTIONS		
DO NOTHING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get certain benefits from the Settlement • Be bound by the Settlement • Give up your right to sue or continue to sue John Hancock for the claims in this case 	
ASK TO BE EXCLUDED (“OPT OUT”)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove yourself from the Class • Get no benefits from the Settlement • Keep your right to sue or continue to sue John Hancock, at your own expense, for the claims in this case 	Postmarked by Month x, 2022
OBJECT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tell the Court what you do not like about the Settlement — You will still be bound by the Settlement and you will receive a payment and other non-cash relief if you are entitled to it 	Filed and served by Month x, 2022

- These rights and options—**and the deadlines to exercise them**—are explained in this notice. The deadlines may be moved, cancelled, or otherwise modified, so please check the Class Website, www.HancockCOISettlement.com, regularly for updates and further details.
- The Court in charge of this case still has to decide whether to approve the Settlement. Payments will be made if the Court approves the Settlement and after any appeals are resolved. Please be patient.

QUESTIONS? Visit www.HancockCOISettlement.com or call toll-free at 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx

WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS

Basic Information.....4

 1. Why is there a notice?.....4

 2. What is this lawsuit about?4

 3. Why is this a class action?4

 4. Why is there a Settlement?4

Who is in the Settlement?5

 5. Am I part of the Settlement?.....5

 6. How do I know if I am the Owner of a Class Policy?5

 7. What if I am still not sure if I am included in the Settlement?5

Settlement Benefits – What Settlement Class Members Get6

 8. What does the Settlement provide?.....6

How to Get a Payment.....7

 9. How can I get a payment?.....7

 10. When would I get my payment?7

 11. What am I giving up to get a payment or stay in the Settlement?7

Excluding Yourself from the Settlement.....7

 12. How do I get out of the Settlement?7

 13. If I don’t exclude myself, can I sue the Defendants for the same thing later?.....8

 14. If I exclude myself, can I still get a Settlement payment?8

The Lawyers Representing You8

 15. Do I need to hire my own lawyer?.....8

 16. How will the lawyers be paid?.....8

Objecting to the Settlement.....9

 17. How do I tell the Court if I do not like the Settlement?.....9

 18. What is the difference between objecting and excluding?.....11

The Court’s Fairness Hearing11

 19. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the Settlement?11

 20. Do I have to come to the hearing?11

 21. May I speak at the hearing?11

If You Do Nothing.....11

 22. What happens if I do nothing at all?11

Getting More Information12

 23. How do I get more information?.....12

BASIC INFORMATION

1. Why is there a notice?

You have a right to know about a proposed settlement of a class action lawsuit, and about your rights and options, before the Court decides whether to approve the Settlement.

The Court in charge of this case is the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (the “Court”), and the case is called *Jeffrey Leonard et. al. v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York et. al.*, Case No. 18-CV-4994 (AKH) (the “Action”). The individuals who sued on behalf of the Class include Plaintiffs Jeffrey Leonard, in his capacity as trustee of The Poplawski 2008 Insurance Trust; Phyllis Poplawski; PBR Partners; Brighton Trustees, LLC, on behalf of and as trustee for Cook Street Master Trust III; Bank of Utah, solely as securities intermediary to Cook Street Master Trust III; Peak Trust Company, AK, on behalf of and as trustee for the Susan L. Ciciora Trust and the Stewart West Indies Trust; and Advance Trust & Life Escrow Services, LTA, as securities intermediary for Life Partners Position Holder Trust. The companies they sued, John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York and John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.), and any of their predecessor and successor entities, are called the Defendants.

2. What is this lawsuit about?

This lawsuit alleges that John Hancock increased COI rates on certain Performance Universal life insurance policies beginning in 2018 and 2019 unlawfully and in violation of the terms of the policies. The lawsuit further alleges that John Hancock violated certain state statutes for issuing false and misleading illustrations regarding the policies. John Hancock denies these claims; however, both sides have agreed to the Settlement to avoid the cost of further litigation.

3. Why is this a class action?

In a class action, one or more people called Class Representatives sue on behalf of people who have similar claims. All these people are a class or class members. Bringing a case, such as this one, as a class action allows resolution of many similar claims of persons and entities that might be economically too small to bring in individual actions. One court resolves the issues for all class members, except for those who exclude themselves from the class.

4. Why is there a Settlement?

John Hancock denies that it did anything wrong. However, both sides, with the assistance of an experienced mediator, former Judge James “Jay” C. Francis IV, have agreed to the Settlement. Both sides want to avoid the cost and risk of further litigation. The Court has not decided in favor of the Plaintiffs or John Hancock. Plaintiffs and their attorneys think the Settlement is in the best interests of the Settlement Class and is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

WHO IS IN THE SETTLEMENT?

5. Am I part of the Settlement?

The Settlement Class consists of current and former owners of any universal life insurance policy issued by John Hancock, or its predecessors, that were subjected to the COI Increase, excluding the Excluded Policies.

Excluded Policies include:

- (1) the policies at issue in the following cases: (i) *Davydov v. JHNY and JHUSA*, 18-cv-09825 (S.D.N.Y.); (ii) *Twin Lakes and Lakewood Holdings v. JHNY and JHUSA*, 655429/2018 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.); (iii) *LSH and Wells Fargo v. JHNY and JHUSA*, 19-cv-1009 (S.D.N.Y.); (iv) *Lipschitz et al. v. JHNY*, 655579/2019 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.); (v) *VICOF II Trust et al. v. JHNY*, 19-cv-11093 (S.D.N.Y.); (vi) *Wells Fargo v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.)*, 20-cv-5032 (S.D.N.Y.); (vii) *Kolel Beth Yechiel Mechil of Tartikov, Inc. v. JHNY and JHUSA*, 650452/2021 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.); and (viii) all actions consolidated with (v) pursuant to the Court's Oct. 14, 2021 Order (19-cv-11093, Dkt. 99).
- (2) the following policies, which have previously reached settlements with John Hancock: 94656436, 93706844, 93717346, 93717353, 93717361, 93717379, 93752541, 94265337, 94472578, 93970200, 94270709, 93509370, and 93787802.

If an individual or entity is the owner of *both* an Excluded Policy and a Class Policy, the owner is included in the Settlement Class with respect to the Class Policy but not with respect to any Excluded Policy. If an owner (such as a securities intermediary or trustee) owns multiple policies on behalf of different principals, that owner may stay in or opt-out of the Settlement Class separately for each principal.

6. How do I know if I am the Owner of a Class Policy?

You are the Owner of a Class Policy if you currently have or previously held a direct or indirect ownership interest in any Class Policy.

7. What if I am still not sure if I am included in the Settlement?

If you are not sure whether you are a Settlement Class Member, or have any other questions about the Settlement, you should visit the Class Website, www.HancockCOISettlement.com, or call the Settlement Administrator toll-free at 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx.

SETTLEMENT BENEFITS – WHAT SETTLEMENT CLASS MEMBERS GET

8. What does the Settlement provide?

The Settlement provides both cash and non-cash relief.

Cash Relief: John Hancock will fund up to \$123,074,128.32, which is estimated to be approximately 91.25% of the total incremental COI charges collected by John Hancock from Class Policies through August 31, 2021 (the “Settlement Fund”).

Each Final Settlement Class Member will be issued a check for their pro-rata share of the Settlement Fund, after certain expenses have been deducted. At a minimum, the check will be for \$100, but in most cases, it will be for a much greater amount.

Specifically, each of the Class Policies has been assigned a dollar amount that is estimated to be approximately 91.25% of the incremental COI charges collected by John Hancock from the specific Class Policy through August 31, 2021 (the “Policy Settlement Amount”). For each Class Policy that validly opts out of this Settlement, the Settlement Fund will be reduced by the Policy Settlement Amount for that Class Policy, resulting in what is called the “Final Settlement Fund.” The Final Settlement Fund will first be used to pay: (1) all settlement administration expenses (excluding certain publication notice expenses); (2) any “Incentive Awards,” which are awards to compensate the named Plaintiffs for efforts they took on behalf of the entire Settlement Class in the litigation, and which are capped at \$25,000 per Plaintiff; and (3) any Class Counsel’s Fees and Expenses (which will not exceed one-third of the value of all benefits provided by the Settlement to the Final Settlement Class Members). The remainder of the Final Settlement Fund will be used to pay the Final Settlement Class Members on a pro-rata basis, based on each Class Policy’s share of the total Settlement Fund.

Non-Cash Relief: John Hancock has also agreed not to:

- Raise COI rates on policies covered by the Settlement for a period of five years (the “COI Rate Freeze”) following final approval of this Settlement. In addition, John Hancock has agreed to extend the COI Rate Freeze if it agrees to a longer freeze for an Excluded Policy or for a policy subjected to the COI Increase owned by any member of the Settlement Class that opts out of the Settlement. John Hancock has agreed to extend the COI Rate Freeze so that it is as long as any freeze it agrees to with an opt-out or other policyholder subjected to the COI Increase.
- Seek to cancel, void, rescind, or deny a death claim submitted under the Class Members’ policies or contest the validity of a policy based on:
 - An alleged lack of valid insurable interest under any applicable law or equitable principles;
or
 - Any misrepresentation allegedly made on or related to the application for, or otherwise made in applying for the Policy.

More details are in a document called the Settlement Agreement, which is available at www.HancockCOISettlement.com.

HOW TO GET A PAYMENT

9. How can I get a payment?

You will automatically receive a payment in the mail if you are entitled to one. The payments will be mailed to the last known address based on John Hancock's administrative system, after they are run through the National Change of Address database. If you would like your payment to be mailed to a different address, please contact the Settlement Administrator.

10. When would I get my payment?

Payments will be mailed to Settlement Class Members after the Court grants "final approval" to the Settlement and after all appeals are resolved. If the Court approves the Settlement, there may be appeals. It's always uncertain whether these appeals can be resolved and resolving them can take time. Please be patient.

11. What am I giving up to get a payment and the other non-cash relief in the Settlement?

If you are a Settlement Class Member, unless you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you cannot sue John Hancock, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against John Hancock about the claims released in this Settlement. It also means that all the decisions by the Court will bind you. The Released Claims and Released Parties are defined in the Settlement Agreement. They describe the legal claims that you give up if you stay in the Settlement. The Settlement Agreement is available at www.HancockCOISettlement.com.

EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT

If you don't want a payment and the other non-cash relief from the Settlement or you want to keep the right to sue or continue to sue the John Hancock on your own about the claims released in this Settlement, then you must take steps to get out. This is called excluding yourself—or it is sometimes referred to as "opting out" of the Settlement.

12. How do I get out of the Settlement?

To exclude yourself (or "opt out") of the Settlement, you must complete and mail to the Settlement Administrator a written request for exclusion. The exclusion request must include the following:

- Your full name, address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
- A statement saying that you want to be excluded from the Settlement Class;
- The case name and case number (*Jeffrey Leonard v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York*, Case No. 18-CV-4994 (AKH));
- The policy(ies) number(s) to be excluded; and
- Your signature.

If you request to be excluded, but you are not listed as the last known owner of the policy in John Hancock's administrative system, the Settlement Administrator will reach out to you and ask you to provide proof that you own the policy in question.

QUESTIONS? Visit www.HancockCOISettlement.com or call toll-free at 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx

You must mail your exclusion request, postmarked by **Month x, 2022** to:

xxx Settlement - Exclusions
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box xxxxx
Seattle, WA 98111

If you are excluded, you will not get any Settlement payment or any other non-cash relief, and you cannot object to the Settlement. You will not be legally bound by anything that happens in this lawsuit, and you may be able to sue (or continue to sue) John Hancock about the claims in this lawsuit.

If you don't include the required information or timely submit your request for exclusion, you will remain a Settlement Class Member and will not be able to sue John Hancock about the claims in this lawsuit.

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

No. Unless you exclude yourself, you give up any right to sue John Hancock for the claims that this Settlement resolves. If you have a pending lawsuit, speak to your lawyer in that lawsuit immediately. You must exclude yourself from this Settlement to continue your own lawsuit, except for claims premised on Excluded Policies, which are already excluded. If you properly exclude yourself from the Settlement, you will not be bound by any orders or judgments entered in the Action relating to the Settlement.

14. If I exclude myself, can I still get a Settlement payment?

No. You will not get any money from the Settlement if you exclude yourself.

THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

15. Do I need to hire my own lawyer?

No. The Court has appointed Susman Godfrey L.L.P as Class Counsel. You will not be charged for Class Counsel. If you want to be represented by your own lawyer, you may hire one at your own expense.

16. How will the lawyers be paid?

Class Counsel will file a motion seeking a fee award not to exceed one-third of the value of all benefits provided by the Settlement to the Final Settlement Class Members, and reimbursement for all of the expenses they incurred or will incur. Class Counsel will also seek an Incentive Award of up to \$25,000 for each of the named Plaintiffs, to compensate them for efforts they took on behalf of the entire Settlement Class in the litigation.

OBJECTING TO THE SETTLEMENT

17. **How do I tell the Court if I do not like the Settlement?**

Any Settlement Class Member who does not properly opt out of the Settlement on time may object to the fairness, reasonableness, or adequacy of the proposed Settlement. Settlement Class Members who wish to object to any term of the Settlement must do so, in writing, by filing a written objection with the Court, and serving copies on Class Counsel and Counsel for Defendants.

The written objection must include:

- Your full name, address, telephone number, and email address (if any);
- The policy(ies) number(s);
- A written statement of all grounds for the objection accompanied by any legal support for the objection (if any);
- Copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based;
- A list of all persons who will be called to testify in support of the objection (if any);
- A statement of whether you intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing;
- A list of any objections by you and/or your counsel in any class action settlement submitted to any state or federal court in the United States in the previous five years; and
- Your or your counsel's signature.

If you intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing through counsel, the written objection must also state the identity of all attorneys representing you who will appear at the Fairness Hearing.

Your objection, along with any supporting material you wish to submit, must be filed with the Office of the Court, with a copy served on Class Counsel and Counsel for Defendants by **Month x, 2022** at the following addresses:

Clerk of the Court	Class Counsel
<p>Office of the Clerk Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse 500 Pearl St. New York, NY 10007-1312</p>	<p>Steven G. Sklaver Seth Ard Ryan Kirkpatrick Glenn Bridgman Zachary B. Savage Ari Ruben Amy Gregory Susman Godfrey LLP 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor New York, NY 10019 ssklaver@susmangodfrey.com sard@susmangodfrey.com rkirkpatrick@susmangodfrey.com gbridgman@susmangodfrey.com zsavage@susmangodfrey.com aruben@susmangodfrey.com agregory@susmangodfrey.com</p>
	Counsel for Defendants
	<p>Motty Shulman FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON LLP One New York Plaza New York, NY 10004 Phone: 212-859-8839 Fax: 212-859-4000 motty.shulman@friedfrank.com</p> <p>Andrea J. Robinson Robert K. Smith Timothy J. Perla WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109 Phone: 617-526-6000 Fax: 617-526-5000 andrea.robinson@wilmerhale.com robert.smith@wilmerhale.com timothy.perla@wilmerhale.com</p>

QUESTIONS? Visit www.HancockCOISettlement.com or call toll-free at 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx

18. What is the difference between objecting and excluding?

Objecting is simply telling the Court that you don't like something about the Settlement. You can object to the Settlement only if you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement. Excluding yourself from the Settlement is telling the Court that you don't want to be part of the Settlement. If you exclude yourself from the Settlement, you have no basis to object to the Settlement because it no longer affects you.

THE COURT'S FAIRNESS HEARING

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

The Court will hold a Fairness Hearing on Month x, 2022 at x:00 x.m. ET, in Courtroom x of the Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, New York, NY 10007-1312.

At the Fairness Hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court will also consider the application by Class Counsel for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses and reasonable Incentive Award payments for Plaintiffs. If there are objections, the Court will consider them at this time. After the hearing, the Court will decide whether to approve the Settlement. We do not know how long these decisions will take.

20. Do I have to come to the hearing?

No. Class Counsel will answer any questions that the Court may have, but you may come at your own expense. If you submit an objection, you don't have to come to Court to talk about it. As long as you filed and served your written objection on time to the proper addresses, the Court will consider it. You may also pay your own lawyer to attend, but it's not necessary.

21. May I speak at the hearing?

Yes. You may ask the Court for permission to speak at the Fairness Hearing. To do so, you must send a letter saying that it is your "Notice of Intent to Appear." Your request must state your name, address, and telephone number, as well as the name, address, and telephone number of the person that will appear on your behalf. Your request must be filed with the Clerk of the Court and served on Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel no later than Month x, 2022.

Only the Parties, Settlement Class Members, or their counsel may request to appear and be heard at the Fairness Hearing. Persons or entities that opt out may not request to appear and be heard at the Fairness Hearing.

IF YOU DO NOTHING

22. What happens if I do nothing at all?

If you do nothing, you will automatically receive a payment and the other non-cash relief from the Settlement. Unless you exclude yourself, you won't be able to start a lawsuit, continue with a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against John Hancock about the legal issues in this case, ever again.

GETTING MORE INFORMATION

23. How do I get more information?

This notice summarizes the proposed Settlement. More details are in the Settlement Agreement, available at the Class Website, www.HancockCOISettlement.com. If you have additional questions, you can visit the Class Website or contact the Settlement Administrator:

Hancock COI Settlement
c/o JND Legal Administration
P.O. Box xxxxx
Seattle, WA xxxxx
info@xxxx.com
1-xxx-xxx-xxxx

PLEASE DO NOT CONTACT THE COURT OR THE COURT CLERK'S OFFICE

- EXHIBIT C -

LEGAL NOTICE

If you are the current or former owner of a Performance Universal life insurance policy issued by John Hancock that was subject to a cost of insurance rate increase, your rights may be affected by a class action settlement

A proposed settlement has been reached in a class action lawsuit called *Jeffrey Leonard et. al. v. John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York et. al.*, Case No. 18-CV-4994 (AKH) (the “Settlement”). This notice provides a summary of your rights and options. More details are available at www.HancockCOISettlement.com.

What is this about? The lawsuit alleges that Defendants, John Hancock Life Insurance Company of New York and John Hancock Life Insurance Company (U.S.A.) (collectively, “John Hancock”) increased cost of insurance (“COI”) rates on certain Performance Universal Life policies beginning in 2018 and 2019 unlawfully and in violation of the terms of the policies (the “COI Increase”). The lawsuit further alleges that John Hancock violated certain state statutes for issuing false and misleading illustrations regarding the policies. John Hancock denies these claims; however, both sides have agreed to the Settlement to avoid the cost of further litigation.

Who is affected? You are potentially a member of the Settlement class whose rights may be affected if you are a current or former owner of one or more of the universal life insurance policies subjected to the COI Increase (a “Class Policy” or “Class Policies”). To learn which policies are excluded go to www.HancockCOISettlement.com.

How do I know if I am an owner of a Class Policy? You are the owner of a Class Policy if you currently have or previously held a direct or indirect ownership interest in any Class Policy. If you have any questions regarding ownership, please visit the Settlement website or contact the Settlement Administrator.

What does the Settlement provide? The Settlement provides for cash payments that will be distributed on a *pro rata* basis from a fund of up to \$123,074,128.32. In addition, John Hancock has agreed not to increase COI rate scales on Class Policies for a period of five years or more, and has agreed not to challenge the validity of the Class Policies on various grounds. For more details, visit www.HancockCOISettlement.com.

What are my options? You can do nothing, exclude yourself, or object to the Settlement.

Do nothing. You will automatically receive payment in the mail and the other non-cash benefits if you are entitled to them. You will give up your right to sue or continue to sue John Hancock for the claims in this lawsuit.

Exclude yourself. You will not receive a payment or any other benefits of the Settlement. You will keep your right to sue John Hancock at your own expense and with your own attorney for the claims in this lawsuit. Your exclusion request must follow the specific format required by the Court. For more information on how to exclude yourself from the Settlement please visit the Settlement website or contact the Settlement Administrator.

Object. If you do not exclude yourself from the Settlement Class, you may object or tell the Court what you don’t like about the Settlement.

Exclusion requests and objections must be sent to Hancock COI Settlement, c/o JND Legal Administration, P.O. Box xxxxx, Seattle, WA 98111, **postmarked by Month x, 2022**. For more details about your rights and options and how to exclude yourself or object, go to www.HancockCOISettlement.com.

What happens next? The Court will hold a Fairness Hearing on [MONTH, DAY, 2022] at [00:00 a/p.m] at the [ADDRESS], to consider whether to approve the Settlement, Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees and expenses (not to exceed 33% of the value of the benefits provided by the Settlement), and incentive awards (up to \$25,000 per Plaintiff). The Court has appointed Susman Godfrey L.L.P. as Class Counsel. Class Counsel will answer any questions that the Court may have. You or your attorney may ask to speak at the hearing at your own expense, but you don’t have to.

How do I get more information? For more information and to view the full notice, go to www.HancockCOISettlement.com, or contact the Settlement Administrator by writing Hancock COI Settlement, c/o JND Legal Administration, P.O. Box xxxxx, Seattle, WA 98111, or calling 1-xxx-xxx-xxxx.

Please do not contact the Court.