

EXHIBIT 2

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

IN RE:

22-MD-3050 (KPF)

CHANTIX (VARENICLINE)
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION
(NO. II)

This Document Relates to All Actions

**DECLARATION OF CHARLES E. SCHAFER IN SUPPORT OF CLASS COUNSEL’S
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS’ FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES, AND
SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Charles E. Schaffer , pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare:

1. I am partner at the law firm of Levin Sedran & Berman LLC (“LSB”), counsel for Plaintiff County of Monmouth (“Monmouth”) and the proposed Settlement Class. I submit this Declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Service Awards filed concurrently herewith. I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and, if called upon as a witness, could and would testify competently to them.

2. My firm and I served as co-lead counsel for TPP and Consumer Plaintiffs and the proposed Settlement Class in this action (the “Action”). Unless otherwise defined, capitalized terms have the meaning assigned in the Class Action Settlement Agreement between Plaintiffs and Defendant Pfizer, Inc. See ECF No. 131-1.

3. My firm as well as Class Counsel undertook and litigated this case on a fully contingent basis. We assumed a very real risk in taking on this contingent fee class action and have demonstrated that we were prepared to invest time, effort, and money over a period of years with absolutely no guarantee of any recovery. If this action had continued to be litigated and Plaintiffs

were ultimately unsuccessful in the claims, my firm and Class Counsel firms would not be entitled to recover any attorneys' fees.

4. From the inception of this case to the present, my firm vigorously pursued this litigation, committing their services and resources and advancing funds out-of-pocket to prosecute it for the Plaintiffs and the Class. We provided these services and advanced necessary litigation expenses with no assurance of compensation or repayment and have received no compensation or reimbursement of their expenses. My firm's compensation and expense reimbursement has at all times in this litigation been entirely contingent upon successfully obtaining relief

5. I along with Class Counsel have contributed substantial time, expense, and effort pursuing this matter on behalf of Plaintiffs and the Class.

6. **Exhibit A** summarizes and identifies the attorneys who have worked on this litigation, the number of hours those individuals worked, their regularly hourly billing rates, and their respective lodestar values from inception of this Action through August 1, 2026. The detailed descriptions of the time spent by the attorneys and other professionals of my firm in this litigation was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records prepared and maintained by my firm. The lodestar figure is based on the ordinary professional billing rates that my law office charges clients in class action litigation. The firm reviewed its time records for accuracy, necessity, and reasonableness, and in the exercise of billing judgment and consistent with its standard practices, reduced certain time entries and the resulting lodestar. Expenses are accounted for and billed separately, without markup, and are not duplicated in the professional billing rates. Further details regarding the litigation and trial experience of each professional can be found, to the extent available, in the firm resume attached as **Exhibit C**.

7. The firm requires regular and contemporaneous recording of time records, which occurred in this case. I oversaw the day-to-day activities in the litigation and reviewed these

printouts and backup documentation when necessary. The purpose of the reviews were to confirm both the accuracy of the entries on the records as well as the necessity for, and reasonableness of the time and expenses that my firm committed to the litigation. I believe that the time reflected in the firm's lodestar calculation and the expense for which payment is sought are reasonable in amount and were necessary for the effective and efficient prosecution and resolution of this litigation.

8. The lodestar summary reflects LSB's experience in the field, the complexity of the matters involved in this litigation, and the prevailing rate for providing such services.

9. The number of hours that LSB has devoted to pursuing this litigation is reasonable and appropriate, considering, among other factors: (a) the scope and high stake's nature of this proceeding; and (b) the novelty and complexity of the claims asserted in the litigation.

10. This time was kept contemporaneously with billable work as it was performed on the case. Based on our experience in similar cases, I, as Class Counsel, am of the opinion that this time was reasonable and necessary to the prosecution and resolution of a case of this type.

11. The hourly rates shown in the Summary Chart in **Exhibit A** are the usual and customary lodestar rates charged in Philadelphia, and the national venues in which the firm typically handles cases for each individual doing the type of work performed in this litigation. These rates were not adjusted, notwithstanding the complexity of this litigation, the skill and tenacity of the opposition, the preclusion of other employment, the delay in payment, or any other factors that could be used to justify higher hourly compensation. The rates reflect LSB's experience in the field; the complexity of the matters involved in this litigation and have not been adjusted.

12. The hours reported in this Declaration do not include time spent after August 1, 2026, including any work preparing this declaration or effectuating the Settlement after that date,

preparing for, or attending the Final Approval Hearing, or administering the Settlement, if approved by the Court.

13. LSB primarily represents clients on a contingency-fee basis. The billing rates listed in **Exhibit A** are consistent with the rates the firm has submitted, and courts have approved in other class action cases, including lodestar cross-checks using the firm's then-prevailing rates. *See, e.g., In re: Vioxx Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1657 (E.D. La. 2011); *In re: Propulsid Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1355 (E.D. La.); *In re: CertainTeed Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litig.*, No. 07-MDL-1817 (E.D. Pa. 2010); *In re: Davis v. SOH Distribution Company, Inc.*, No. 09-CV-237 (M.D. Pa.); *In re: Wellbutrin SR Antitrust Litigation*, No. 04-5525 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Gwaizdowski v. County of Chester*, No. 08-CV-4463 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Meneghin v. The Exxon Mobile Corporation*, No. OCN-002697-07 (Superior Court, Ocean County, NJ 2012); *In re: Melillo v. Building Products of Canada Corp.*, No. 1:12-CV-00016-JGM (D. Vt. 2012); *In re: Vought v. Bank of America*, No. 10-CV-2052 (C.D. Ill. 2013); *In re: Eliason v. Gentek Building Products, Inc.*, No. 10-2093 (N.D. Ohio. 2013); *In re: Navistar Diesel Engine Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2223 (N.D. Ill. 2013); *Smith v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-370 (S.D. Ill. 2014); *In re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation*, MDL No. 2270 (E.D. Pa. 2014); *In re: JP Morgan Chase Mortgage Modification Litigation*, No. 11-md-2290 (D. Mass. 2014); *United Desert Charities v. Sloan Valve Company*, No. 12-6878 (C.D. Cal. 2014); *Gulbankian v. MW Manufacturers, Inc.*, No. 10-10392 (D. Mass.); *Pollard v. Remington Arms Company, LLC*, No. 4:13-cv-00086-ODS (W.D. Mo. 2017); *Leach v. Honeywell International, Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-12245-LTS (D. Mass.); *In Re IKO Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2104 (C.D. Ill.); *Newman v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Company*, No. 1:11-cv-03530 (N.D. Ill. 2019); *In re Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, MDL 2827 (N.D. Cal. 2020); *Hill v. Canidae Corporation*, No. 20-1374 (C.D. Cal. 2021); *Herrera v. Wells*

Fargo Bank, N.A., No. 8:18-cv-00332(C.D. Cal 2021); *Erby v. Allstate Fire and Casualty Ins. Co.*, No. 2:18-cv 04944 (ECF No. 63) (approving the hourly rates ranging from \$450 - \$975 and the number of hours worked as reasonable); *Segebarth v. CertainTeed LLC*, No. 2:19 – CV – 05500 (E.D. Pa. 2023) (ECF No. 79) (approving hourly rates ranging from \$500 to \$1,250 per hour for attorneys and \$110 to \$475 per hour for paralegals); *Bangoura v. Beiersdorf, Inc.*, Case No. 1:22-cv-291 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 10, 2023) (ECF No. 39) (approving hourly rates ranging from \$550 to \$975 per hour for attorneys and the number of hours worked as reasonable); *Goldstein v. Henkel Corp.*, Case No. 3:22-cv-164 (D. Conn. Dec. 13, 2023) (ECF No. 96) (approving hourly rates ranging from \$500 to \$1,025 per hour for attorneys, \$500 per hour for IT specialist and the number of hours worked as reasonable); *Catalano v. Lyons Magnus, LLC and TRU Aspectics, LLC*, Case No. 3:22-cv-164 (S.D.N.Y. Apr 10, 2024) (ECF No. 52) (approving hourly rates ranging from \$650 to \$1,025 per hour for attorneys, \$475 per hour for paralegal and the number of hours worked as reasonable); *Swetz v. The Clorox Company*, Case No. 7:22-cv-9374 (S.D.N.Y. May 24, 2024) (ECF No. 57) (approving hourly rates ranging from \$750 to \$1,025 per hour for attorneys, \$500 per hour for IT specialist and the number of hours worked as reasonable); *Patora v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.*, Case No. 7:23-cv-01118 (S.D.N.Y April 25, 2024) (ECF No. 42) (approving hourly rate of \$1,025 per hour for attorneys and the number of hours worked as reasonable); and *Barnes v. Unilever United States Incorporated*, 1:21-cv-06191 (N.D. Ill. September 16, 2024) (ECF No. 137) (approving hourly rates ranging from \$650 to \$1025 per hour for attorneys and the number of hours worked as reasonable). Recently, in *Barnes*, the United States District court for the Northern District of Illinois approved the 2024 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$1,025.00), David Magagna (\$750), and Nicholas Elia (\$650), in *Patora*, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York approved the 2024 rate of Charles E. Schaffer (\$1,025.00), in *Catalano*, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York approved the

2024 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$1,025.00), David Magagna (\$750), Nicholas Elia (\$650), and paralegal Victoria Jennings (\$475), in *Swetz*, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York approved the 2023 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$1,025.00), David Magagna (\$750), Nicholas Elia (\$650), and paralegal Victoria Jennings (\$475), in *Goldstein*, the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut approved the 2023 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$1,025.00), David Magagna (\$750), Nicholas Elia (\$650), Zachary Winkler (\$500) and IT specialist Thomas Shrack (\$500), in *Bangoura*, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York approved the 2022 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00) and David Magagna (\$550), in *Segebarth*, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania approved the 2022 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00), David Magagna (\$550), Nicholas Elia (\$500) and Thomas Shrack (\$475), *and* in *Erby*, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania approved the 2022 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00), Daniel C. Levin (\$975.00), David Magagna (\$550), and Nicholas Elia (\$500) finding that “Class Counsel have years of experience and are highly skilled in complex litigations such as this. And their hourly rates fall well within the range of rates charged by other attorneys practicing complex litigation in Philadelphia. *See Whiteley*, 2021 WL4206696, at *14 (finding that hourly rates ranging from \$110 to \$1,100 “well within the range of what is reasonable and appropriate in this market”). See ECF No. 79.

14. LSB’s customary rates have also been approved by courts in prior years. In *Segebarth*, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania approved the 2022 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00), David Magagna (\$550), Nicholas Elia (\$500) and Thomas Shrack (\$475). In *Erby*, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania approved the 2022 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00), Daniel C. Levin (\$975.00), David Magagna (\$550), and Nicholas Elia (\$500). In *In re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding*

Litigation, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, approved the entire requested fee of \$18.5 million dollars, including the 2014 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$950.00). In *Pollard v. Remington Arms Company*, the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri approved the entire requested fee of \$12.5 million dollars, including the 2017 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00), and Sammi McCurtain (document reviewer) (\$450.00), and in *Leach v. Honeywell International, Inc.*, the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts approved the entire requested fee award of \$1.15 million dollars, including the 2017 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00) and Michael MacBride (attorney) (\$475.00). More recently in *In Re IKO Roofing Shingle Products Liability Litigation*, the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois approved the entire requested fee award of \$7.5 million dollars, including the 2019 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00) and Michael MacBride (attorney) (\$475). In *Newman v. Metropolitan Life Insurance Company*, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois approved the entire requested fee award of \$5 million dollars, including the 2019 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00); and in *In re Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, the United States District Court for the Northern District of California approved the fee award of \$80.6 million dollars, including the submitted rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$950), other members of the firm and paralegals. ECF No. 609 at 15. In 2021, the United States District Court for the Central District of California in *Hill v. Canidae Corporation*, No. 20-1374 (C.D. Cal. 2021) approved the submitted rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975) and associate David Magagna (\$550). See ECF No. 79 at 16. (Plaintiffs also submit Class Counsel's billing rates that other courts have approved, which show that one of the partners who is counsel for Plaintiffs has consistently been approved at an hourly rate of \$950.00 to \$975.00 per hour, while a non-partner attorney was consistently approved at an hourly rate of \$450.00 to \$475.00. (Schaffer Decl. ¶ 28.) Accordingly, the Court determines that the hourly rates used to calculate the

lodestar are reasonable.). In November of 2021, the United States District Court for Central District of California in *Herrera v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 8:18-cv-00332 (C.D. 2021), approved the entire requested fee award of \$23.1 million dollars, including the 2021 rates of Charles E. Schaffer (\$975.00), associate David Magagna (\$550) and IT specialist Thomas Shrack (\$475). See ECF No. 208 adopting the Tentative Order Regarding Final Approval of Class Settlement and Final Approval of Attorneys' Fees at 21-22. For personnel no longer employed by LSB, the lodestar calculation is based on the billing rates for such personnel in his or her final year of employment.

15. The services LSB performed on behalf of the putative class include, among other things:

- Researching and investigating the underlying factual background regarding the contamination of the products with nitrosamine including sources, how to manufacture the products without the contamination including good manufacturing standards and principles, harm and damages to TPP plaintiffs and legal theories;
- Researching and investigating the applicable legal standards and regulations for manufacturing pharmaceutical products and adulterated pharmaceutical products;
- Researching and investigating legal theories, claims and damage models for TPP plaintiffs;
- Analyzing the legal landscape and evaluating the risks and benefits of prosecuting this Action, researching potential claims, state consumer protection laws, and available remedies, and evaluating class certification issues;
- Assessing and analyzing the formulation of the recalled products, supply chain for product ingredients and the manufacturing methods and processes for the recalled products
- Drafting and revising the complaint;

- Drafting the Multidistrict Motion to Transfer all actions to the SDNY;
- Arguing the Multidistrict Motion to Transfer all actions to SDNY;
- Preparing portions of Plaintiffs' opposition to Pfizer's motions to dismiss;
- Researching Pfizer's operations to identify discovery custodians;
- Drafting and revising written discovery requests;
- Drafting third party discovery including subpoenas;
- Conducting meet-and-confer conferences and related correspondence regarding the scope of Pfizer's and non-parties' discovery;
- Reviewing and analyzing discovery produced by Pfizer;
- Conducting meet-and-confer conferences and related correspondence regarding the scope of Plaintiffs' discovery;
- Assisting in preparing for and conducting depositions of Defendants witnesses;
- Preparing objections and responses to discovery requests served upon TPP plaintiffs;
- Reviewing for relevance and privilege TPP Plaintiff County of Monmouth's documents and records and then producing documents on behalf of TPP plaintiff County of Monmouth;
- Preparing Initial Disclosures for TPP plaintiffs;
- Meeting and conferring with TPP Plaintiff County of Monmouth and its employees in preparation of the complaint, initial disclosures, answers to discovery , reviewing documents responsive to discovery and in preparation of depositions;

- Vetting, investigating, retaining and consulting with experts in the field of the manufacturing of pharmaceutical products including good manufacturing standards and protocols to be used to prevent the contamination and adulteration of products;
- Vetting and investigating, retaining and consulting with experts in the fields of economics and conjoint survey/analysis to determine economic loss on a class-wide basis for TPP and consumers;
- Conducting informal (*i.e.* settlement) discovery pre- and post-mediation;
- Participating in case strategy decisions and discussions with other counsel;
- Engaging in meet-and-confer conferences with defense counsel regarding discovery, mediation and settlement-related issues;
- Conducting numerous arms-length, independent settlement negotiations with the mediator,
- Drafting the settlement agreement along with the requisite exhibits, including claim forms, content of settlement webpage, opt out forms, long and short form notice forms, and other related documents;
- Researching and selecting the claims administrator (AB Data);
- Developing and implementing the notice plan with claims administrator/notice provider AB Data;
- working with AB Data to prepare and send notice of the Settlement to putative Settlement Class Members, respond to inquiries from Settlement Class Members and others, and supervise the claims administration process;
- developing and implementing the claims process with the administrator/notice provider AB Data;

- troubleshooting the claims process in conjunction with defendant's counsel and claims administrator/notice provider AB Data;
- speaking with class members who contacted class counsel regarding filing of claim forms; and
- preparing and drafting the motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement.

16. LSB devoted 2,298.90 hours to this Action. The resulting lodestar is \$2,122,851.25.

17. Further, our work on this litigation has not ended and will not end until the last settlement distribution payment is made to eligible settlement class members. We expect to expend additional hours going forward, which of course are not included in the firm's lodestar reported below, concerning the settlement approval and administration processes, preparing for the Final Approval Hearing, responding to settlement class members and other inquiries and, if the Court grants final approval, overseeing Settlement administration

18. **Exhibit B** is a schedule of LSB's expenses reasonably incurred in this Action and for which it seeks reimbursement. These expenses are billed separately and are not included in the firm's hourly rates. They do not include general overhead, and the firm has not added any surcharge to the amounts paid to the underlying vendors.

19. The firm believes the Court should approve the requested litigation expenses because the firm reasonably and necessarily incurred them in prosecuting this Action.

20. As reflected in **Exhibit B**, LSB incurred a total of \$24,084.42 in expenses from the inception of this Action through August 1, 2026. These expenses were reasonably and necessarily incurred in connection with the prosecution of this litigation. The schedule is drawn from the firm's books and records, which are maintained in the ordinary course of business and supported by expense vouchers, check records, receipts, and other source documents.

21. The summary of expenses above does not include LSB's contribution to the litigation fund established for this case and held by Scott + Scott Attorneys at Law LLP. The details of the expenses paid from the litigation fund are described in the Scott Declaration.

22. LSB has extensive experience prosecuting consumer litigation and other complex class actions. LSB's resume is attached as **Exhibit C**.

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

Executed this 28th day of August 2026, in Philadelphia, PA.

/s/Charles E. Schaffer
Charles E. Schaffer

EXHIBIT A***IN RE: CHANTIX (VARENICLINE) MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION (NO. II) – Case No. 22-MD-3050 (KPF)***

Levin Sedran & Berman LLP
Inception through August 1, 2026

<i>NAME</i>		<i>HOURS</i>	<i>RATE</i>	<i>LODESTAR</i>
Frederick S. Longer	(P)	287.80	\$1350	\$388,530.00
Charles E. Schaffer	(P)	1108.65	\$1,025	\$1,136,366.25
Zanetta Moore-Driggers	(A)	94.40	\$850	\$80,240.00
David Magagna	(A)	131.85	\$750	\$98,887.50
Nicholas Elia	(A)	239.50	\$650	\$155,675.00
Alicia Armstrong	(A)	21.80	\$500	\$10,900.00
David McLafferty	(A)	14.90	\$850	\$12,665.00
Candice Aiken	(A)	396.50	\$600	\$237,900.00
Victoria Jennings	(PL)	2.50	\$475	\$1,187.50
Thomas Shrack	(PL)	1.00	\$500	\$500.00
<i>TOTAL</i>		<i>2298.90</i>		<i>\$2,122,851.25</i>

(P) Partner

(A) Associate

(PL) Paralegal

EXHIBIT B***IN RE: CHANTIX (VARENICLINE) MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES
AND PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION (NO. II) – Case No. 22-MD-3050 (KPF)***

Levin Sedran & Berman LLP
Inception through August 1, 2026

<i>CATEGORY</i>	<i>AMOUNT</i>
Airfare, Transportation, Hotels & Meals	\$6,241.38
Telephone, Facsimile	\$19.83
Postage	\$143.91
Filing Fees	\$870.20
Wifi Charges	\$12.00
Notary Public	\$10.00
Process Server	\$327.50
Photocopies	\$1,501.25
Online Legal and Financial Research	\$14,958.35
<i>TOTAL</i>	<i>\$24,084.42</i>

EXHIBIT C

LEVIN SEDRAN & BERMAN
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Levin Sedran & Berman LLP is a Philadelphia law firm with a national reputation for superior client service and results representing clients in cases pending both in the Philadelphia area and across the nation. Through almost 40 years of serving our clients, our attorneys have gained national recognition for their experience and skill and are frequently called upon to lead some of the largest class actions, mass torts, complex litigation and antitrust cases in the nation. Our stock-and-trade is the litigation of technically complex cases, usually pending before an assigned MDL court. We have been appointed lead counsel or to other leadership positions in hundreds of cases, including more than forty MDLs, and are presently serving or have served in such positions in several of the largest and technically complex class actions nationwide. We regularly appear in federal courts throughout the country. *See, e.g., In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liab. Litig.*, MDL No. 2047 (E.D. La.) (Lead Counsel); *In re: Nat'l Football League Players' Concussion Injury Litig.*, MDL No. 2323 (E.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs Steering Committee and Subclass Counsel for Settlement); *In re: Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010*, MDL 2179 (E.D. La.) (Special Counsel to the Plaintiffs' Fee and Cost Committee as well as having been on a discovery team); *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Servs. Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1775 (E.D.N.Y.) (Co-Lead Counsel); *In re: Wells Fargo Insurance Marketing Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2797 (C.D. Cal.) (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, MDL 2827 (N.D. Cal.) (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); and *In re: Intel Corp. CPU Marketing Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2828 (D. Or.) (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee to represent the interests of governmental entities). Our firm's philosophy from leading and prosecuting complex class actions for over three decades is to efficiently, vigorously and zealously prosecute the action on behalf of our clients and the class. We become experts in the facts of the case, law, and science and assemble a team committed to doing the same.

Our firm has earned rankings published in the U. S. News and World Report for Best Law Firms, as a Tier I law firm for class-actions, personal injury and mass tort cases. The firm was also named to THE NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL's insurance list of *America's Elite Trial Lawyers* in 2014. Members of the firm are listed in the LEGAL 500, LAW DRAGON 500, Martindale Hubbell's *Directory of Preeminent Attorneys*, "Best Lawyers in America", and the National Trial Lawyers Top 100 Trial Lawyers.

We have pioneered the use of class actions and mass actions in the United States with our work resulting not only in numerous record-breaking recoveries but also pioneering novel results over the nearly four decades we have been specializing in this practice area of the law. A few examples include:

- *In re: Asbestos School Litigation*, No. 83-0263 (E.D. Pa.) (Levin Sedran & Berman as member of Executive Committee and Lead Trial Counsel obtained a certification of a nationwide class and

settlement on behalf of school districts that included pioneering the 50-state analysis of the law to meet class certification requirements);

- *In re: Three Mile Island Litigation*, No. 79-0432 (M.D. Pa.) (Levin Sedran & Berman as a member of Executive Committee that obtained a settlement that included the establishment of a medical monitoring fund);
- *In re: Diet Drug Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1203 (E.D. Pa.) (Levin Sedran & Berman as Liaison and Co-Lead Counsel obtained a \$6.75 billion-dollar settlement on behalf of consumers who ingested Fen-Phen);¹
- *In re: The Exxon Valdez*, No. 89-00095 (D. Alaska) (Levin Sedran & Berman as a member of the Trial and Discovery Committee and represented fishermen, native corporations, native villages, native claims and business claims in this mass tort involving the massive oil spill in Alaska. The firm's assistance in the litigation helped the Plaintiffs obtain a judgment of \$5 billion in punitive damages - at the time the largest punitive damage verdict in U.S. history. (Later reduced to \$507.5 million by the U.S. Supreme Court);
- *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2047 (E.D. La.) (Levin Sedran & Berman as Lead Counsel obtained inter-related settlements involving various suppliers, builders, installers, insurers and manufacturers of Chinese drywall with a value that exceeds \$1 billion dollars);
- *In re: The Vioxx Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1657 (E.D. La.) (As a member of the PSC and Plaintiffs' Negotiating Committee, Levin Sedran & Berman was instrumental in achieving a \$4.85 billion-dollar settlement on behalf of consumers who ingested Vioxx);
- *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Servs. Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1775 (E.D.N.Y.) (As Co-Lead Counsel in the decade long air cargo antitrust litigation Levin Sedran & Berman obtained 28 inter-related settlements against air cargo service providers totaling \$1.2 billion dollars);
- *Galanti v. The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. ("Entran II")*, No. 03-209 (D.N.J.) (As a member of the Executive Committee Levin

¹ That prolix settlement has received favorable comments by academia. See Nagareda, R., "Autonomy, Peace, and 'Put' Options in the Mass Tort Class Action," 115 Harv. L. Rev. 747, 756 (2002).

Sedran & Berman was instrumental in negotiating and achieving the creation of a common fund in the amount of \$344 million); and

- *In re: National Football League Players' Concussion Injury Litigation*, MDL No. 2323 (E.D. Pa.) (Levin Sedran & Berman as Subclass Counsel working along with Lead Counsel obtained an uncapped settlement having a value that exceeds \$1 billion dollars on behalf of NFL football players).

Frequently, the firm was specifically recognized by a court that is presiding over a matter for its work product and success in handling technical complex class-action cases. Examples of courts favorably commenting on the quality of the firm's work include:

- In *In re: Three Mile Island Litigation*, 557 F. Supp. 96 (M.D. Pa. 1982) Judge Rambo favorably acknowledged the quality of the work of Levin Sedran & Berman in her opinion.
- In the *Lazy Oil Co. v. Witco Corp.*, No. 94-110E (W.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel) ("[t]he Court notes that the class was represented by very competent attorneys of national repute as specialists in the area of complex litigation. As such, Class Counsel brought considerable resources to the Plaintiffs' cause. The Court has had the opportunity to observe Class Counsel first-hand during the course of this litigation and finds that these attorneys provided excellent representation to the Class. The Court specifically notes that, at every phase of the litigation, Class Counsel demonstrated professionalism, preparedness and diligence in pursuing their cause.")
- In *In re: Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1014 (E.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel) ("the Court also finds that the standing and expertise of counsel for [plaintiffs] is noteworthy. First class counsel is of high caliber and most PLC members have extensive national experience and similar class-action litigation.")
- In *In re: Consumer Bags Antitrust Litigation*, No. 77-1516 (E.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel) ("Each of the firms and the individual lawyers in this case have extensive experience in large, complex antitrust and securities litigation." Furthermore, the Court notes that the quality of the legal services rendered was of the highest caliber.)
- In *In re: Diet Drugs Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1203 (E.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel) (Court recognized "the 'remarkable contribution' from Levin Sedran & Berman in the

creation of the largest nationwide personal injury settlement to date”)

- In *In re: Summers v. Abraham Lincoln Savings and Loan Association*, 66 F.R.D. 581, 589 (E.D. Pa.) (“There is no question that Plaintiff’s counsel is experienced in the conduct of the class action”)

We regularly prosecute multi-state consumer class actions involving technically complex issues in representing victims of defective products, unfair trade practices, data breaches, privacy security breaches and other complex cases involving computers, phones, devices and source code. Aside from the cases cited above, reference is made to: *In re: CertainTeed Corporation Roofing Shingles Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1817 (E.D. Pa.), *In re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation*, MDL No. 2270 (E.D. Pa.), *Pollard v. Remington Arms Company*, No. 4:13-CV-00086-ODS (W.D. Mo.), *In re: Intel Corp. CPU Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2828 (D. Or.). and *In re: Wells Fargo Insurance Marketing Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2797 (C.D. Cal.).

Relating to data breach and privacy cases, the firm has served as a member of the Executive Committee in *In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 2522 (D. Minn.) (\$39 million settlement value for plaintiff financial institutions), where they were instrumental in working with experts and discovery including establishing the proper standard of care and calculation of damages to all victims (consumer and financial institutions) and serve as Co-Lead Counsel in *Green v. Accolade, Inc.*, 2:18-cv-00274 (E.D. Pa.) (where an employer breached its employees’ PII information). The firm’s data breach litigation experience also includes its leadership roles in: *Kuss v. American Home Patient, Inc. et. al.*, 8:18 -cv-0248 (M.D. Fl.) (where laptops were stolen and patient’s medical information breached); *Abdelmessih v. Five Below, Inc.*, 2:19-cv-01487 (E.D. Pa.) (where retailer breached customers’ PII information stored electronically); *Bryd v. Aaron’s Inc.*, No. 11-101 (W.D. Pa.) (where defendant placed spyware on rental computers); *Peterson v. Aaron’s Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-1919 (N.D. Ga.) (where defendant placed spyware on rental computers) and on the Executive Committee in *Harris, et. al. v. Lord and Taylor, LLC*, 18-cv-00521 (D.Del.) (where retailer breached customers’ PII information stored electronically); *Kyler v Saks Incorporated*, 18-cv-00360 (M.D. Tn.) (where retailer breached customers’ PII information stored electronically) and *In re: Carrier IQ, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litigation*, No. 12-md-1330 (N.D. Cal.) (where defendant placed software on mobile devices).

More recently the firm obtained certification of cases *inter alia* in *Helmer v. The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. (“Entran III”)*, No. 12-00685 (D. Colo.) (certification of a liability only class on behalf of purchasers of radiant floor heating and then tried the issue of liability to a jury); *In re: Dial Complete Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2263 (D.N.H.) (certification of multi state class action on behalf of purchasers of Dial Complete Anti-Bacterial Soap); *In re: Emerson Electric Co. Wet/Dry Vac Marketing and Sales Litigation*, MDL No. 2382 (E.D. MS.) (certification of a national class action on behalf of purchasers of wet/dry vacs) and *Gold v. Lumber Liquidators, Inc.*, No. 3:14-cv-05373-TEH (N.D. Cal.) (certification of a multi-state class action including California on behalf of purchasers of bamboo flooring)

The firm willingly takes cases through years of discovery and motion practice and settles only if the case is positioned for consumers to obtain real and meaningful benefits and relief. And, unlike many class action firms, Levin Sedran & Berman also takes cases to trial. In lead roles and as members of litigation teams, Levin Sedran & Berman did so in *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liability Litigation*, *In re: The Exxon Valdez, Entan III and MDL - 2592 Xarelto Products Liability Litigation* (part of trial team of coordinated cases in the Philadelphia Mass Tort Program).

More specifics about many of the accomplishments of the attorneys of Levin Sedran & Berman are set forth below in the biographies of the individual attorneys of the firm.

THE FIRM'S PRINCIPAL LAWYERS**ARNOLD LEVIN***Founding Member, In Memoriam (1939 – 2024)*

ARNOLD LEVIN graduated from Temple University, B.S., in 1961, with Honors and Temple Law School, LLB, in 1964. He was Articles Editor of the Temple Law Quarterly. He served as a Captain in the United States Army (MPC). He was a member of the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, American and International Bar Associations. He was a member of the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers Association, Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Association and the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. He was admitted to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, the Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Tenth and Eleventh Circuit Courts of Appeals and the United States Supreme Court. He has

appeared pro hac vice in various federal and state courts throughout the United States. He has lectured on class actions, environmental, antitrust and tort litigation for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute, the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers Association, the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Association, The Association of Trial Lawyers of America, The Belli Seminars, the Philadelphia Bar Association, American Bar Association, the New York Law Journal Press, and the ABA-ALI London Presentations.

Mr. Levin was a past Chairman of the Commercial Litigation Section of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America and was co-chairman of the Antitrust Section of the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Association. He was a member of the Pennsylvania Trial Lawyers Consultation Committee, Class Action Section, a fellow of the Roscoe Pound Foundation and past Vice-Chairman of the Maritime Insurance Law Committee of the American Bar Association. He was also a fellow of the International Society of Barristers and chosen by his peers to be listed in Best Lawyers of America. He has been recognized as one of 500 leading lawyers in America by Law Dragon and The Legal 500 USA. U.S. News and World Report has designated Levin Sedran & Berman as one of the top 22 national plaintiffs' firms in mass torts and complex litigation. In addition, he has been further recognized as one of the top 100 trial lawyers by The National Trial Lawyers Association. He was also named to the National Law Journal's Inaugural List of America's Elite Trial Lawyers. He also had an "av" rating in Martindale-Hubbell and was listed in Martindale-Hubbell's Register of Preeminent Lawyers.

Mr. Levin was on the Executive Committee as well as various other committees and Lead Trial Counsel in the case of *In re: Asbestos School Litigation*, No. 83-0268 (E.D. Pa.), which was certified as a nationwide class action on behalf of all school districts. Mr. Levin was also on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re: Copley Pharmaceutical, Inc., "Albuterol" Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1013 (D. Wyoming); *In re: Norplant Contraceptive Products Liability*

Litigation, MDL 1038 (E.D. Tex.); and *In re: Telectronics Pacing Systems, Inc., Accufix Atrial “J” Lead Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1057 (S.D. Ohio).

Mr. Levin was appointed by the Honorable Sam J. Pointer as a member of the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee in the *Silicone Gel Breast Implants Products Liability Litigation*, No. CV-92-P-10000-S, MDL 926 (N.D. Ala.). The Honorable Louis L. Bechtle appointed Mr. Levin as Co-Lead Counsel of the Plaintiffs’ Legal Committee and Liaison Counsel in *In re: Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1014 (E.D. Pa.). Mr. Levin also served as Co-Chair of the Plaintiffs’ Management Committee, Liaison Counsel, and Class Counsel in *In re: Diet Drugs Litigation*, MDL 1203 (E.D. Pa.). He was also a member of a four lawyer Executive Committee in *In re: Rezulin Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1348 (S.D.N.Y.) and was a member of a seven-person Steering Committee in *In re: Propulsid Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1355 (E.D. La.). He was Chair of the State Liaison Committee in *In re: Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1407 (W.D. Wash.); and was a member of the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee and Plaintiffs’ Negotiating Committee in *In re: Vioxx Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1657 (E.D. La.) and the Court approved Medical Monitoring Committee in *In re: Human Tissue Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1763 (D.N.J.). He was Plaintiffs’ Lead Counsel, Class Counsel and Co-Chair of the Fee Committee in *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2047 (E.D. La.). He was Plaintiffs’ Liaison Counsel in *In re: CertainTeed Corp. Roofing Shingles Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1817 (E.D. Pa.). He was a member of the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee in *In re: National Football League Players’ Concussion Litigation*, MDL No. 2323 (E.D. Pa.) and was appointed as Subclass Counsel for Subclass 1 in the NFL Concussion Class Action Settlement. Mr. Levin was a member of the Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee in *In re: Pool Products Distribution Market Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 2328 (E.D. La.); *In re: Testosterone Replacement Therapy Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2545 (N.D. Ill.); *In re: Zoloft (Sertraline Hydrochloride) Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2342 (E.D. Pa.); and *In re: Yasmin and Yaz Marketing, Sales Practices and Relevant Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2100 (S.D. Ill.). He was a member of Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee in *In re: Fresenius Granuflo/Naturalyte Dialysate Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2428 (D. Mass.). Mr. Levin was appointed by the Honorable Carl J. Barbier to serve as Special Counsel to the Plaintiffs’ Fee and Cost Committee in the BP Oil Spill Litigation, *In re: Oil Spill by the Oil Rig “Deepwater Horizon” in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010*, MDL 2179 (E.D. La.).

Mr. Levin was also a member of the Trial and Discovery Committees in the *Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Litigation*, No. 89-095 (D. Alaska) In addition, Mr. Levin was Lead Counsel in the prosecution of individual fishing permit holders, native corporations, native villages, native claims and business claims.

HOWARD J. SEDRAN*Founding Member (1982 through 2017)*

HOWARD J. SEDRAN was a founding member of the firm from 1982 through December, 2017. Effective January, 2018, Mr. Sedran became Of-Counsel to the firm. Mr. Sedran graduated cum laude from the University of Miami School of Law in 1976. He was a law clerk to United States District Court Judge, C. Clyde Atkins, of the Southern District of Florida from 1976-1977. He is a member of the Florida, District of Columbia and Pennsylvania bars and is admitted to practice in various federal district and appellate courts. From 1977 to 1981, he was an associate at the Washington, D.C. firm of Howrey & Simon which specializes in antitrust and complex litigation. During that period he worked on the following antitrust class actions: *In re: Uranium Antitrust Litigation*; *In re: Fine Paper Antitrust Litigation*;

Bogosian v. Gulf Oil Corporation; *FTC v. Exxon*; and *In re: Petroleum Products Antitrust Litigation*.

In 1982, Mr. Sedran joined the firm and has continued to practice in the areas of environmental, securities, antitrust and other complex litigation. Mr. Sedran also has extensive trial experience. In the area of environmental law, Mr. Sedran was responsible for the first certified “Superfund” class action.

As a result of his work in an environmental case in Missouri, Mr. Sedran was nominated to receive the Missouri Bar Foundation’s outstanding young trial lawyer’s award, the Lon Hocker Award.

Mr. Sedran has also actively participated in the following actions: *In re: Dun & Bradstreet Credit Services Customer Litigation*, Civil Action Nos. C-1-89-026, C-1-89-051, 89-2245, 89-3994, 89-408 (S.D. Ohio); *Raymond F. Wehner v. Syntex Corporation and Syntex (U.S.A.) Inc.*, No. C-85-20383(SW) (N.D. Cal.); *Harold A. Andre v. Syntex Agribusiness, Inc.*, Cause No. 832-05432 (Cir. Ct. of St. Louis, Mo.); *In re: Petro-Lewis Securities Litigation*, No. 84-C-326 (D. Colo.); *In re: North Atlantic Air Travel Antitrust Litigation*, No. 84-1013 (D.D.C.); *Jaroslawicz v. Engelhard Corp.*, No. 84-3641 (D.N.J.); *Gentry v. C & D Oil Co.*, 102 F.R.D. 490 (W.D. Ark. 1984); *In re: EPIC Limited Partnership Securities Litigation*, Nos. 85-5036, 85-5059 (E.D. Pa.); *Rowther v. Merrill Lynch*, No. 85-Civ-3146 (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Hops Antitrust Litigation*, No. 84-4112 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Rope Antitrust Litigation*, No. 85-0218 (M.D. Pa.); *In re: Asbestos School Litigation*, No. 83-0268 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Catfish Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 928 (Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee); *In re: Carbon Dioxide Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 940 (N.D. Miss.) (Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee); *In re: Alcolac, Inc. Litigation*, No. CV490-261 (Marshall, Mo.); *In re: Clozapine Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 874 (N.D. Ill.) (Co-Lead Counsel); *In re: Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 878 (N.D. Fla.); *Cumberland Farms, Inc. v. Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc.*, No. 87-3713 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Airlines Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 861 (N.D. Ga.); *Lazy Oil, Inc. v. Witco Corporation*, No. 94-110E (W.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs’ Co-Lead Counsel); *In re:*

Nasdaq Market-Makers Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1023 (S.D.N.Y.) (Co-Chair Discovery); and *In re: Travel Agency Commission Antitrust Litigation*, No. 4-95-107 (D. Minn.) (Co-Chair Discovery); *Erie Forge and Steel, Inc. v. Cyprus Minerals Co.*, No. 94-0404 (W.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Commercial Explosives Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1093 (Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *In re: Brand Name Prescription Drug Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 997; *In re: High Fructose Corn Syrup Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1087; *In re: Carpet Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1075; *In re: Graphite Electrodes Antitrust Litigation*, C.A. No 97-CV-4182 (E.D. Pa.) (Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *In re: Flat Glass Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1200 (Discovery Co-Chair); *In re: Commercial Tissue Products Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1189; *In re: Thermal Fax Antitrust Litigation*, No. 96-C-0959 (E.D. Wisc.); *In re: Lysine Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, (D. Minn.); *In re: Citric Acid Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, No. 96-CV-009729 (Cir. Ct. Wisc.). Most recently, Mr. Sedran serves as one of the court-appointed Co-Lead Counsel in *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1775 (E.D.N.Y.).

In *Lazy Oil Co. v. Witco Corp.*, *supra*, the District Court made the following comments concerning the work of Co-Lead Counsel:

[t]he Court notes that the class was represented by very competent attorneys of national repute as specialists in the area of complex litigation. As such Class Counsel brought considerable resources to the Plaintiffs' cause. The Court has had the opportunity to observe Class counsel first-hand during the course of this litigation and finds that these attorneys provided excellent representation to the Class. The Court specifically notes that, at every phase of this litigation, Class Counsel demonstrated professionalism, preparedness and diligence in pursuing their cause.

LAURENCE S. BERMAN
Founding Member



LAURENCE S. BERMAN, a founding member of the firm, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on January 17, 1953. He was admitted to the bar in 1977. He is admitted to practice before the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Third, Fourth and Seventh Circuits; the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania; and the Bar of Pennsylvania. He is a graduate of Temple University (B.B.A., magna cum laude, 1974, J.D. 1977). He is a member of the Beta Gamma Sigma Honor Society. Mr. Berman was the law clerk to the Honorable Charles R. Weiner, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania 1978-1980. Member: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and American Bar Associations. In 1982, Mr. Berman joined the law firm of Levin & Fishbein as an associate and became a partner in 1985 when the firm name was changed to Levin, Fishbein, Sedran & Berman.

Mr. Berman has had extensive experience in litigating and managing complex litigation. In the early 1980's he became a member of the discovery, law and trial committees of *In re: Asbestos School Litigation*, No. 83-0268 (E.D. Pa.). As a member of those committees, he drafted discovery and legal briefs that lead to the successful resolution of the case on behalf of a nationwide class of schools seeking recovery of damages for the costs and expenses they were required to expend to assess the presence of asbestos in school buildings and to remediate under newly enacted rules and regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency, promulgated in the 1970's. In connection with that litigation, he was one of the architects of approaching class certification issues for a nationwide class by the use of a "50" state analysis of the law, in order to demonstrate the similarity of laws and therefore the manageability of a nationwide class action. The "50" state approach has been followed in other cases.

During the early stages of his career, he litigated numerous environmental class/mass tort cases to successful conclusions. He successfully litigated a lead contamination case for the residents of a community in the Port Richmond area of Philadelphia, where he drafted the legal briefs and presented the oral argument to obtain class certification of a property damage and medical monitoring class against NL Industries and Anzon. That litigation produced a multi-million-dollar recovery for the residents in the class area. *Ursula Stiglich Wagner v. Anzon, Inc.*, No. 4420, June Term, 1987 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.)

Similarly, he represented homeowners located near Ashland, Kentucky for environmental pollution damage. This case involved representing approximately 700 individual clients for personal injury and medical monitoring relief that also resulted in a multi-million-dollar recovery for his clients.

Beginning in the 1990's Mr. Berman began his representation of victims of the Three Mile Island accident. The firm represented approximately 2,000 plaintiffs in that matter, and Mr.

Berman was responsible for the legal briefing and experts in the case, along with addressing *Daubert* issues. The presiding Court (Middle District of Pennsylvania) determined to conduct extensive *Daubert* hearings in Three Mile Island, resulting in approximately ten full weeks of in court live hearings, and thousands of pages of legal briefing. Ultimately the trial court determined that several of the expert witnesses offered by the plaintiffs did not meet the *Daubert* requirements, and an appeal was taken to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, where Mr. Berman both briefed and argued the issues. The Third Circuit affirmed parts of the decision and remanded for further proceedings by the trial court. His representation of clients in the Three Mile Island litigation spanned well over a decade.

In 1989, Mr. Berman represented approximately 1,000 plaintiffs who suffered damages as a result of the Exxon Valdez oil spill. In that role, he managed the claims of each of his firm's clients and worked in the development of their expert evidence and claim materials. As a subset of that litigation, he handled the claims of the Native Opt-Out Settlement Class. This representation also spanned well over a decade.

Mr. Berman began his role in litigating *In re: Diet Drugs*, MDL 1203 (E.D. Pa.) in 1997 at the outset of that litigation. The *Diet Drugs* case is still active to this date. Mr. Berman's firm was appointed as Co-Lead Counsel, Co-Class Counsel and Liaison Counsel. The massive size of the *Diet Drugs* case required the commitment of three of the named partners to the case, Arnold Levin, Michael Fishbein and Mr. Berman, as well as a substantial commitment by partner Fred Longer. While Messrs. Levin and Fishbein were formally named as Co-Class counsel to the case, Mr. Berman had a *de facto* role as Co-Class Counsel and Co-Lead counsel for the case. Mr. Berman briefed many legal issues, argued issues in court, participated in discovery, appeared frequently before the Special Discovery Master, helped negotiate the settlement(s) and helped in the management of the oversight of both the AHP Settlement Trust that was created to oversee the Settlement and the Seventh Amendment Fund Administrator that was created to oversee the Seventh Amendment aspect of the Settlement. He also managed the claims of the firm's individual clients.

Although the *Diet Drugs* case remains active today, and still occupies some of Mr. Berman's time, over the recent years he became active in various other pharmaceutical cases. In particular, beginning in about 2010, he became active in *In re: Yaz/Yasmin/Ocella*, MDL 2100 (S.D. Ill.) where he was appointed as a member of the discovery and legal briefing committees. Mr. Berman worked with his partner Michael Weinkowitz as Co-Liaison Counsel in the parallel state court litigation pending in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia.

As the *Yaz* case began to wind down, Mr. Berman became active in litigation Tylenol cases where he was appointed and remains currently Plaintiffs' Co-Lead and Liaison Counsel. *In re: Tylenol*, MDL 2436 (E.D. Pa.). As Plaintiffs' Co-Lead and Liaison Counsel, Mr. Berman has appeared in Court for the Plaintiffs at virtually all of the monthly status conferences, drafted numerous briefs, engaged in discovery, drafted numerous case management orders that were entered by the Court, argued motions and otherwise managed the case on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

Mr. Berman is also a *de facto* member of the executive committee of *In re: Granuflo*, MDL 2428 (D. Mass.). Mr. Berman's partner Arnold Levin was formally appointed to that case's Executive Committee for the Plaintiffs and Mr. Berman was appointed as a Co-Chair of the law and briefing committee. He has acted as a *de facto* member of the Executive Committee for the firm. In his role on the Law and Briefing Committee, he drafted numerous briefs for the case, including *Daubert* briefs, drafted various case management orders that were entered by the Court, and assisted in the negotiation of the global settlement including the drafting of the settlement documents and the allocation plan.

In *In re: Fosamax*, MDL 2243 (D.N.J.), Mr. Berman spearheaded the plaintiffs' position relating to privilege log issues as well as preemption and *in limine* issues raised in the bellwether case. Most recently, Mr. Berman was appointed to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee by the Honorable Freda L. Wolfson in *In re: Johnson & Johnson Talcum Powder Products*, MDL 2738 (D.N.J.).

Mr. Berman has lectured about mass tort matters. He lectured about the Tylenol case at several seminars and is a member of the American Association of Justice (AAJ) litigation group for the case. He is also a member of various other AAJ litigation groups involving pharmaceutical products. Mr. Berman has been a frequent speaker for the Pennsylvania Bar Institute, Mealy's Publications and Harris Martin. His lectures have been accredited for providing CLE credit to the attendees. Mr. Berman has an A.V. Peer Review rating by Martindale-Hubbell and is an AAJ National College of Advocacy Advocate. He is also a member of The National Trial Lawyers, as well as a member of the American, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia Bar Associations and has been recognized as a Super Lawyer. His published works include "Class Actions in State and Federal Courts," Pennsylvania Bar Institute (Continuing Legal Education), November 1997; "New Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 207.1," Pennsylvania Bar Institute (Continuing Legal Education), November, 2001, and membership on the Board of Editors, "Fen-Phen Litigation Strategist," Leader Publications (1998).

FREDERICK S. LONGER*Member*

FREDERICK S. LONGER, a member of the firm, specializes in representing individuals who have been harmed by dangerous drugs, medical devices, other defective products and antitrust violations. Mr. Longer has extensive experience in prosecuting individual, complex and class action litigations in both state and federal courts across the country. Mr. Longer has been involved in the resolution of several of the largest settlements involving personal injuries including the \$6.75 billion settlement involving Diet Drugs and the \$4.85 billion settlement involving Vioxx. Mr. Longer was a member of the negotiating counsel responsible for the settlements in the *Chinese Drywall* litigation involving various suppliers and manufacturers of Chinese Drywall valued in excess of \$1 billion. Mr. Longer has a wealth of experience in mass torts and has frequently been the chairman or member of the

Law and Briefing Committee in numerous multi-district litigations:

- *In re Zantac Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2924 (S.D. Fla.);
- *In re Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Prod. Liab. Litigation*, MDL No. 2873 (D.S.C.);
- *In re Xarelto Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2592 (E.D. La.);
- *In re: Propulsid Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1355 (E.D. La.);
- *In re: Rezulin Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1348 (S.D.N.Y.);
- *In re: Vioxx Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1657 (E.D. La.);
- *In re: Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1014 (E.D. Pa.); and
- *In re: Diet Drug Litigation*, MDL 1203 (E.D. Pa.).

He is a court-appointed member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re: Mirena Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2434 (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Xarelto Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2592 (E.D. La.); and *In re Zantac Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2924 (S.D. Fla.). Mr. Longer also assisted Co-Lead Counsel and Subclass Counsel with negotiating the class settlement in *In re: National Football League Players' Concussion Litigation*, MDL No. 2323 (E.D. Pa.).

Mr. Longer has substantial trial experience and is one of the few lawyers in the country to have tried to verdict a client's claim involving Baycol in Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas.


Mr. Longer, originally from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, completed his undergraduate work at Carnegie Mellon University. He then attended the University Pittsburgh School of Law and was a Notes and Comments Editor for the University of Pittsburgh Law Review. Mr. Longer practiced for 3 years in Allegheny County with the law firm of Berger, Kapetan, Malakoff & Myers

on complex litigation and civil rights matters, including *Kelly v. County of Allegheny*, No. 6D 84-17962 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Allegheny Cty.). Thereafter, Mr. Longer joined the firm and is now a member in the firm.

Mr. Longer is a frequent lecturer and has presented numerous seminars on various legal topics for professional groups. Some of Mr. Longer's speaking engagements include: *COVID-19 Business Interruption Litigation - MDL and Outside Influences*, Harris Martin (May 14, 2020); *Impact of Ascertainability Consideration son Rule 23(b)(3)*, American Association for Justice (December 6, 2018); *Plaintiff Only Consumer Warranty Class Action Litigation Seminar*, American Association for Justice Education and the National Association of Consumer Advocate (June 3-4, 2014); *"No Injury" and "Overbroad" Class Actions After Comcast*, Glazer and Butler: *Implications for Certification-Navigating Complex Issues of Overbreadth and Damages in Consumer Product Cases*, Strafford Webinar (April 1, 2014); *Service of Process in China*, ABA Annual Conference (April 18-20, 2012); *Chinese Drywall Litigation Conference*, Harris Martin (October 20-21, 2011); *Current Issues in Multi-district Litigation Practice*, Harris Martin (September 26, 2011); *FDA Preemption: Is this the end?*, Mass Torts Made Perfect (May 2008). He has authored several articles including, *The Federal Judiciary's Super Magnet*, TRIAL (July 2009). He also contributed to Herbert J. Stern & Stephen A. Saltzburg, *TRYING CASES TO WIN: ANATOMY OF A TRIAL* (Aspen 1999).

Mr. Longer is a member of the American Bar Association, American Association for Justice, Pennsylvania and Philadelphia Association for Justice, the Pennsylvania Bar Association and the Philadelphia Bar Association. He is an active member of the Historical Society for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. He is admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the Supreme Court of New Jersey, the United States Supreme Court; the United States Courts of Appeals for the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Seventh and Ninth Circuits, and the United States District Courts for the Western and Eastern Districts of Pennsylvania, United States District Court Northern District of New York; United States District Court for the Western District of New York; United States District Court of New Jersey; United States District Court for District of Arizona; and the United States District Court District of Nebraska.

Mr. Longer has received Martindale-Hubbell's highest rating (AV) as a pre-eminent lawyer for his legal ability and ethical standards. He has also been recognized by his peers as a Super Lawyer since 2008.

DANIEL C. LEVIN*Member*

DANIEL C. LEVIN is a Philadelphia native who practices in the areas of Medical Malpractice, Personal Injury, Class Actions, Products Liability, Environmental Liability and Mass Torts.

Daniel Levin is a member of the firm of Levin Sedran & Berman. He is a graduate of University of Pittsburgh (B.A. 1994) and Oklahoma City University School of Law (J.D. 1997). He is admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania and the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He is a member of the American, Pennsylvania and

Philadelphia County Bar Associations, as well as the American and Pennsylvania Association for Justice. Past President of the Philadelphia Trial Lawyers Association. Mr. Levin holds an AV rating from Martindale Hubbell and his peers recognize him as a Super Lawyer.

Daniel Levin is appointed to the Steering Committee in *Troyan v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.*, No. 5:17-cv-01096 (W.D. Okla.) and *In Re: Valsartan Losartan And Irbesartan Products Liability Litigation*; 1:19-md-02875-RBK-JS (D.N.J.).

Daniel Levin has been part of the litigation team in *In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1014 (E.D. Pa.); *In re Diet Drug Litigation*, MDL No. 1203 (E.D. Pa.); *Galanti v. The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co.*, Civil Action No. 03-209 (D.N.J.); *In re Vioxx Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1657 (E.D. La. 2011); *Cobb v. BSH Home Appliance Corporation*, C.D.Ca. No. SACV10-711 DOC (C.D. Cal.); *In Re Human Tissue Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1763 (D.N.J.); *In Re: Chinese Drywall Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2047 (E.D. La.); *National Football League Players' Concussion Injury Litigation*, No. 2:12-md-02323-AB (E.D. Pa.); *In Re: Rezulin Products Liability Litigation*, No. 00 Civ. 2843 (S.D.N.Y.); *In Re: Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, No. 5:18-md-02827 (N.D. Cal.); *In Re: Intel Corp. CPU Marketing, Sales Practices And Products Liability Litigation*, No. 3:18-md-2828 (D. Or.); and *In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams (AFFF) Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2:18-mn-2873-RMG.

Daniel Levin has served as Class Counsel in the following automobile defect cases: *Henderson v. Volvo Cars of North America, LLC*, No. 09-cv-4146 (D.N.J.) (class action brought on behalf of individuals who purchased Volvo vehicles with defective transmissions) and *Grant v. Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. and Ford Motor Company*, September Term, 2000, No. 003668 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.) (involving the Ford Explorer debate). Mr. Levin has also served as class counsel in the following cases: *Kowa v. The Auto Club Group*, No. 11-7476 (N.D. Ill.); *Kurian v. County of Lancaster*, 2:07-cv-03482 (E.D. Pa.); *Gwaizdowski v. County of Chester*, No. 08-CV-4463 (E.D. Pa. 2012); *Meneghin, The Exxon Mobile Corporation*, No. OCN-002697-07 (Superior

Court, Ocean County, NJ 2012); *Johnson v. Walsh*, April Term 2008, No. 2012 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.); *Muscara v. Nationwide*, October Term 2000, No. 001557 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.); and *Wong v. First Union*, May Term 2003, No. 001173 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.); *Harry Delandro v. County of Allegheny*, No. 2:06-CV-927 (W.D. Pa.); *Nakisha Boone v. City of Philadelphia*, No. 05-CV-1851 (E.D. Pa.); *Helmer v. the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, D.Co. No. 1:12-00685-RBJ (D. Colo.); *Schappell v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company*, No. 1331 S2001 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Dauphin Cty.); *Ortiz v. Complete Healthcare Resources, Inc.*, Montgomery CCP No. 12-12609; *Butterline v. the Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association*, No. 15-01429 (E.D. Pa.); *Martinez v. Capstone Restaurant Group, LLC*, No. 1:20-cv-01017 (D. Colo.); *Mullins v. Kroger*, No. 1:19-cv-00964 (S.D. Ohio); *Gallagher v. Charter Foods, Inc.*, No. 2:20-cv-00049 (W.D. Pa.); and *McGhee v. Toms King, LLC*, No. 2:19-cv-01470 (W.D. Pa.).

Along with Daniel Levin's class action and mass tort experience, Mr. Levin also has extensive experience in individual litigation where he handles and prosecutes claims on behalf of railroad workers involved in workplace accidents ("FELA"). Daniel Levin has also successfully prosecuted complex individual actions on behalf of individuals involved in products liability, medical malpractice, automobile accidents, drug and medical device actions.

CHARLES E. SCHAFFER*Member*

CHARLES E. SCHAFFER, a member of the firm, born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is a graduate of Villanova University, (B.S., *Magna Cum Laude*, 1989) and Widener University School of Law (J.D. 1995) and Temple University School of Law (LL.M. in Trial Advocacy, 1998). Mr. Schaffer served as a Corporal in the United States Marine Corps (USMC). He is admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, the Supreme Court of New Jersey, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania; Western District of Pennsylvania; Middle District of Pennsylvania; Northern District of Illinois; Central District of Illinois; Northern District of New York; District of Colorado; Third Circuit Court of Appeals; and the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. He is also a member of the American Bar Association, Association of Trial Attorneys of America,

Pennsylvania Association for Justice, Philadelphia Trial Lawyers Association, and the National Trial Lawyers Association.

With over 28 years of experience Mr. Schaffer is a nationally-recognized leader in complex litigation, having been appointed as Lead or Co-Lead counsel or as a PSC member on a regular basis by federal courts across the country. He is widely recognized for his ability to lead very complex litigation and his expertise in dealing with discovery, experts, damage models, and national and multi-state classes.

Mr. Schaffer's appointments in MDL litigation include *inter alia*: *In re Moveit Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 3083 (D. Mass.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *In re AT&T Inc., Customer Data Breach Security Litigation*, MDL No. 3114 (N.D. Tex.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re Change Healthcare, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 3108 (D. Minn.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re Overby-Seawell Company Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 3056 (N.D. Ga.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Chantix (Varenicline) Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation (No. II)* MDL No. 3050 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *In re Phillips Recalled CPAP, BI-Level PAP, Mechanical Ventilator Products Liability Litigation (Phillips)*, MDL 3014 (W.D. Pa.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Discovery Liaison Counsel for Phillips and SoClean MDLs), *In re Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2873 (D.S.C) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re Hill's Pet Nutrition, Inc. Dog Food Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2887 (D. Kan.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Intel Corp. CPU Marketing Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2828 (D. Or.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee to represent the interests of governmental entities); *In re: Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, MDL No. 2827 (N.D. Cal.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Wells Fargo Insurance Marketing Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL 2797 (C.D. Cal.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: JP Morgan Modification Litigation* MDL No. 2290 (D. Mass.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *In re: IKO Roofing Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2104

(C.D. Ill.) (appointed Co-lead Counsel); *In re: HardiePlank Fiber Cement Siding Litigation*, MDL No. 2359 (D. Minn.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Navistar Diesel Engine Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2223 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Azek Decking Sales Practice Litigation*, MDL No. 2506 (D.N.J.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Pella Corporation Architect and Designer Series Windows Marketing Sales Practices and Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2514 (D.S.C.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Navistar Diesel Engine Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2223 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re: CitiMortgage, Inc. Home Affordable Modification Program ("HAMP")*, MDL No. 2274 (C.D. Cal.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Carrier IQ Consumer Privacy Litigation*, MDL No. 2330 (N.D. Cal.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Dial Complete Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2263 (D.N.H.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: Emerson Electric Co. Wet/Dry Vac Marketing and Sales Litigation*, MDL No. 2382 (E.D. Mo.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); and *In re: Colgate-Palmolive Soft Soap Antibacterial Hand Soap Marketing and Sales Practice Litigation*, MDL No. 2320 (D.N.H.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee).

Mr. Schaffer has also served in leadership positions in class actions which were not consolidated in an MDL. *E.g.*, *Volio v. Sugarhouse HSP Gaming, L.P. d/b/a Rivers Casino Philadelphia et. al.*, No. 2:25-cv-0039-JDW (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *Dimoff v. Allegheny Health Network*, No. 2:25-cv-00125 (W.D. Pa.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Brooks v. MRO Corporation et. al.*, 2:26-cv-01838 (E.D. Pa.) (Appointed Liasson Counsel); *In re Cargurus Data Security Litigation*, No.1;26-cv-10996 (D. Mass) (appointed to Executive Committee); *Ding v. New York University*, No. 1;25-cv-02416 (S.D.N.Y.) appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In Re: Columbia University Data Breach Litigation*, No.-cv-05541 (S.D. N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *Hall v. Healthcare Services Group Inc.*, No. 2:25-cv-04908 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *In re Anna Jaques Hospital Data Security Incident Litigation*, No. 1:24-cv-10792 (D. Mass) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *In Re: Bank of America Unauthorized Account Opening Litigation*, No. 3:23-cv-422 (W.D.N.C.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *Reichbart v. Financial Business and Consumer Solutions, Inc.*, No. 24-1876 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Co- Lead Counsel); *Pompilio v. Boar's Head Provisions Co. Inc.*, No. 7:24-cv-08220 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Kessler v. The Quaker Oats Company*, No. 7:24-cv-00526 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Hulewat v. Medical Management Resource Group LLC*, No. 2:24-cv-00377 (D. Ariz) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Hasson v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC*, No. 2:23-cv-05039 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee and Liaison counsel); *Gambino v. Berry, Dunn, McNeil & Parker, LLC*, No. 2:24-cv-00146 (D. Maine) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re: NCB Mgmt. Serv., Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, No. 2:23-cv-01236 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Liaison counsel); *Holden v. Guardian Analytics, Inc.. et. al*, No. 2;23-cv-02156 (D. N.J.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *Nadeau v. Onsite Mammography, LLC d/b/a Onsite Womens Health*, No. 3:25-cv-11123 (D. Mass) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re Advance Auto Stores company, Incorporated, Data Breach Litigation*, No. 5:24-cv-00352 (E.D.N.C.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Flores v. South Texas Oncology and Hematology, PLLC*, No 2024C113299 (Tex. Dist. Ct. Bexar Cty.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *Covey v. Texas Retina Associates*, Cause No. DC-24-09642 (Tex. Dist. Ct. Dallas Cty.)

(appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *Hulse v. Acadian Ambulance Service, Inc.*, No. 6:24-cv-01011(W.D. La.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *McNally v. Infosys McCamish Systems, LLC*, No. 1:24-cv-00995 (N.D. Ga.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *C.K., et al., v. Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago*, No. 1:24-cv-05503 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re Save RX Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:24-cv-00204 (D. Neb.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *Pannozzi v. Deloitte Consulting, LLP*, No. 1:24-00524 (D.R.I.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Batista v. Richmond University Medical Center*, Index No. 152916/2024 (N.Y.S.C. Richmond Cty.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *In re Deva Concepts Products Liability Litigation*, No. 1:20-CV-01234 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *Armando Herrera, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, et al.*, No. 8:18-cv-00332 (C.D. Cal.) (court appointed Co-Lead- Co-Class Counsel); *Declid v. Tco Hot Acquisition LLC et al.*, No. 1:21-cv-09569 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Segebarth v. CertainTeed LLC*, No. 19-5500 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Goldstein v. Henkel Corporation et al.*, No. 3:22 – CV – 00164 (D. Conn) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Bangoura v. Beiersdorf, Inc. and Bayer Healthcare, LLC*, No. 1:22-cv-00291-BMC (E.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Catalano v. Lyons Magnus, LLC et al.*, No. 7:22- cv- 06867 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Swetz v. The Clorox Company*, No. 7:22-cv-09374 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Barnes v. Unilever United States Incorporated*, No. 1:21-cv-06191 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *Patora v. Colgate-Palmolive Co.*, No. 7:23-cv-01118 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co Class Counsel); *In re Midwestern Pet Foods Marketing Sales Practice and Product Liability Litigation*, No. 3:21-cv-00007 (S.D. Ind.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Zicarello v. Sanyo Energy (USA) et al.*, No. 2:19-cv-16623 (D.N.Y.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Rojas v. Bosh Solar Energy Corp.*, No. 5:18-cv-5841 (N.D. Cal.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Culbertson v. Deloitte Consulting*, No. 1:20-cv-3962 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed to Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Green v. Accolade, Inc.*, 2:18-cv-00274 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Kuss v. American Home Patient, Inc. et al.*, No. 8:18 -cv-0248 (M.D. Fla) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Abdelmessih v. Five Below, Inc.*, No. 2:19-cv-01487 (E.D. Pa.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *In re Hudson's Bay Company Data Security Incident Consumer Litigation*, No. 18-cv-8472 (S.D.N.Y.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Hashemi, et al. v. Bosley, Inc.*, No. 2:21-cv-00946 (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Morrison v. Ross Stores, Inc.*, No. 4:18-cv-02671 (N.D. Cal.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Hawes v. Macys West Stores, Inc.*, No. 1:17-cv-00754(W.D. OH.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Forth, et al. v. Walgreens Co.*, No. 1:17-cv-02246 (N.D. Ill.) (serving as member of Plaintiffs Executive Committee); *County of Monmouth, et al. Rite Aid Corporation et al.*, No. 2:20-cv-02024 (E.D. Pa.) (serving as Plaintiff s' Co-Lead Counsel); *Pollard v. Remington Arms Company*, No. 4:13-cv-00086-ODS (W.D. Mo.) (appointed Co-Lead Counsel); *Davis v. SOH Distribution Company, Inc.*, No. 09-CV-237 (M.D. Pa.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel); *Gwaizdowski v. County of Chester*, No. 08-CV-4463 (E.D. Pa.) (member of discovery and trial committees); *Meneghin, v. The Exxon Mobile Corporation, et al.*, No. OCN-002697-07 (N.J. Super. Ct., Ocean County) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Johnson, et al. v. Walsh, et al.*, PCCP April Term, 2008, No. 2012 (Phila. Com. Pl. 2008) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Leach v. Honeywell International, Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-12245-LTS (D. Mass) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *Gulbankian et*

al. v. MW Manufacturers, Inc., No. 1:10-cv-10392-RWZ (D. Mass.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *Eliason, et al. v. Gentek Building Products, Inc., et al.*, No. 1:10-cv-2093 (N.D. Ohio) (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Smith, et al. v. Volkswagen Group of America, Inc.*, No. 3:13-cv-00370-SMY-PMF (S.D. Ill.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *Melillo, et al. v. Building Products of Canada Corp.*, No. 1:12-CV-00016-JGM (D. Vt.) (appointed Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Vought, et al., v. Bank of America, et al.*, No. 10-CV-2052 (C.D. Ill.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *United Desert Charities, et al. v. Sloan Valve, et al.*, No. 12-cv-06878 (C.D. Cal.) (Plaintiffs' Executive Committee); *Kowa, et. el. v. The Auto Club Group AKA AAA Chicago*, No. 1:11-cv-07476 (N.D. Ill.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Weller v. HSBC Mortgage Services, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-00185 (D. Colo.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *Gilmour v. HSBC Bank, N.A.*, No. 13-cv-05896 (S.D.N.Y.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *Smith v. SunTrust Mortgage, Inc.*, No. SACH3-739-AG (C.D. Cal.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *George v. Uponor, Inc.*, No. 12-249 ADM/JJK (D. Minn.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *Yarbrough v. Martin's Famous Pastry Shoppe, Inc.*, No. 11-cv-02144-JEJ (M.D. Pa.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); *Minor v. Congoleum Corporation*, No. 3:13-cv-07727-JAP-LHG (D.N.J.) (appointed Plaintiffs' Co-Lead/Co-Class Counsel); and *In re: MF Global Holdings, Ltd. Investment Litigation*, No. 12-MD-2338 (S.D.N.Y.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees).

In addition, Mr. Schaffer has served as member of litigation teams where Levin Sedran & Berman was appointed to leadership positions in, *inter alia*. *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2047 (E.D. La.); *In re Pergerine Financial Group Customer Litigation*, MDL No.12-5546 (N.D. Ill.) (Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees); *In re: Vioxx Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1657 (E.D. La.); *In re: Orthopedic Bone Screw Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1014 (E.D. Pa.); and *In re: Diet Drug Litigation*, MDL No. 1203 (E.D. Pa.).

Currently, Mr. Schaffer is serving as Co-Lead counsel *In re Moveit Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 2082 (D. Mass.), Co-Lead counsel *In re: Chantix (Varenicline) Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation (No. II)* MDL3050 (S.D.N.Y.); Co-Lead counsel *In Re: Bank of America Unauthorized Account Opening Litigation*, No. 3:23-cv-422 (W.D.N.C.); Co-Lead counsel in *In Re: Columbia University Data Breach Litigation*, No.-cv-05541 (S.D. N.Y.); Co-Lead counsel *Hall v. Healthcare Services Group Inc.*, No. 2:25-cv-04908 (E.D. Pa.); Co-Lead Counsel *In re Anna Jaques Hospital Data Security Incident Litigation*, No. 1:24-cv-10792 (D. Mass); discovery liaison counsel in *In re Phillips Recalled CPAP, BI-Level PAP, Mechanical Ventilator Products Liability Litigation (Phillips)*, MDL No. 3014 (W.D. Pa.), a member of Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2873 (D.S.C), a member of Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re AT&T Inc., Customer Data Breach Security Litigation*, MDL No, 3114 (N.D. Tex.), a member of Plaintiffs' Steering committee in *In re Change Healthcare, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 3108 (D. Minn.), and a member of Third Party Payor Discovery and Trial Committee *In Re: Valsartan Losartan and Irbesartan Products Liability Litigation*, No. 1:19-md-02875-RBK-JS (D.N.J.) and is actively participating in a number of other class actions and mass tort actions across the United States in leadership positions.

Mr. Schaffer regularly prosecutes multi-state consumer class actions involving technically complex issues and has one of the best track records in the country when it comes to developing practical damages methodologies, obtaining prompt relief for consumers victimized by defective products and unfair or deceptive practices, as well as working cooperatively with others. Through smart, efficient, strategy and tailored creative problem-solving Mr. Schaffer and Levin Sedran & Berman have recovered billions of dollars for victims of defective products, environmental disasters and unfair or deceptive practices.

In this regard, Mr. Schaffer and his firm served as liaison counsel in *In re: CertainTeed Corporation Roofing Shingle Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1817 (E.D. Pa.). That case involved claims on behalf of \$1.8 million homeowners who unknowingly purchased roofing shingles that were defectively designed and manufactured thereby causing premature and unreasonable deterioration, cracking, blistering, crumbling and leaking. Mr. Schaffer was instrumental in bringing about a settlement which was approved by the court and valued at between \$687 to \$815 million dollars. To date over \$200 million dollar of benefits have been paid out and the claims period is still open. In addition, Mr. Schaffer served as Plaintiffs' Discovery and Settlement Committees in *In re: CertainTeed Siding Litigation*, MDL No. 2270 (E.D. Pa.). That case involved claims on behalf of tens of thousands of homeowners who unknowingly purchased fiber cement siding that was defectively designed, manufactured thereby causing premature and unreasonable deterioration, cracking and water protrusion. Mr. Schaffer was instrumental in bringing about a common fund settlement in the amount of \$103.9 million dollars which was approved by the court. Recently, Mr. Schaffer was appointed and served as Co-Lead and Co-Class Counsel in *Segebarth v. CertainTeed LLC*, No. 19-5500 (E.D. Pa.), obtaining a national settlement on behalf of consumers with defective roofing products. The total value of the settlement benefits available to Class Members is valued at \$900 million and the value of the enhanced warranty benefits to be paid out over the seven-year claims period is \$99,138,852.

Mr. Schaffer also served as lead counsel in *In re: JP Morgan Modification Litigation*, MDL No. 2290 (D. Mass.). This MDL involved a class action filed across the United States all of which arose out of JP Morgan Chase's implementation of the Home Affordable Modification Program, one of the main programs designed to assist struggling homeowners in the economic downturn. In exchange for receiving billions of dollars in funds, JP Morgan Chase and many other big banks agreed to offer homeowners loan modifications pursuant to the Federal Guidelines. Numerous individuals sued JP Morgan Chase and certain other related companies claiming that Chase failed to offer them a timely and proper permanent mortgage modification after they completed trial period plans under HAMP or Chase's home own equivalent programs. Mr. Schaffer was instrumental in every phase of the litigation including settlement which culminated in a nationwide settlement under a consolidated litigation which provided a broad range of benefits to tens of thousands of homeowners. The overall value of the settlement to class members which was determined to be \$506 million dollars by a former treasury department official who worked on the initial management of the Government's program.

More recently, Mr. Schaffer served as a member of the Executive Committee and Co-Chair of Third Party Discovery Committee in *In re Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, MDL No. 2827 (N.D. Cal.) and was instrumental in obtaining evidence to establish Apple's liability for the

throttling or slowing down consumers phones to hide performance defects and performance issues. These efforts were instrumental in achieving a nationwide common fund settlement of \$310 million dollars. In *In re Wells Fargo Insurance Marketing Sales Practice Litigation*, MDL No. 2797 (C.D. Cal.) Mr. Schaffer served as a member of the Plaintiffs Executive Committee and instrumental in obtaining evidence to establish Wells Fargo unlawfully placing duplicative, unnecessary, and overpriced collateral protection policies on their customer's automobile loan accounts. A nationwide settlement in the amount of \$423.5 million dollars was achieved along with business practice changes. This lawsuit alleged that Defendants unlawfully placed duplicative, unnecessary, and overpriced collateral protection insurance policies on Wells Fargo customer's automobile loan accounts. Plaintiffs alleged that as a result of Defendants' CPI placements, borrowers suffered financial harm, including wrongful charges, fees, costs, and credit damage. The settlement allowed borrowers to recoup these overpayments. Mr. Schaffer was appointed and served as Co-lead and Co-Class Counsel in *Armando Herrera, et al. v. Wells Fargo Bank, et al.*, No. 8:18-cv-00332 (C.D. Cal.) and was instrumental in obtaining evidence to establish Wells Fargo unlawfully failed to repay borrowers for prepaid GAP insurance when they satisfied or paid off the auto loan prior to maturity, as required by the terms of the agreement, and charged unwarranted fees. A nationwide settlement in excess of \$300 million dollars was achieved along with business practice changes.

Mr. Schaffer also served as lead counsel in *Pollard v. Remington Pollard v. Remington Arms Company*, No. 4:13-cv-00086-ODS (W.D. Mo.). That case involved claims on behalf of over one million consumers who purchased firearms equipped with a defective fire control mechanism which would allow the firearm to discharge without pulling the trigger and placing the user of the firearm as well as bystanders at a grave risk of injury and even death. Mr. Schaffer was instrumental in negotiating a nation-wide class action settlement which was approved by the district court and affirmed by the Eight Circuit Court of Appeals. The settlement allowed owners of the firearms with the defective triggers to have their trigger mechanisms retrofitted with a non-defective trigger. The district court valued the settlement to be at least \$97,000,000. This settlement not only allowed the firearm owners to get the benefit of their bargain by having their guns repaired, but, it also resulted in dangerous firearms being fixed and thereby preventing accidental discharges which could injure or kill the user and/or innocent bystander.

Mr. Schaffer and Levin Sedran & Berman has also handled technically and technologically complex issues representing victims harmed by drugs, defective products, unfair trade practices, data breaches, privacy security breaches and other complex cases involving computers, phones, devices and source code. *See, e.g., In re: Diet Drug Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1203 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2047 (E.D. La.); *In re: The Vioxx Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1657 (E.D. La.); *In re: CertainTeed Corporation Roofing Shingles Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 1817 (E.D. Pa.), *In re: CertainTeed Fiber Cement Siding Litigation*, MDL No. 2270 (E.D. Pa.), *Pollard v. Remington Arms Company*, No. 4:13-CV-00086-ODS (W.D. Mo.), *In re: Carrier IQ, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litigation*, No. 12-md-1330-EMC (N.D. Cal.); *Byrd v. Aaron's Inc.*, No. 11-101 (W.D. Pa.); *In re: Apple Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, MDL 2827 (N.D. Cal.) and *In re: Intel Corp. CPU Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 2828 (D. Or.).

Levin Sedran & Berman is Lead Counsel in *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Product Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2047 (E.D. La.). Against tremendous odds and at great effort and expense, Levin Sedran along with Liaison Counsel and members of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee, dedicated themselves for over ten years to prosecuting claims on behalf of class(es) of thousands of homeowners who had defective Chinese Drywall installed in their homes. Levin Sedran's leadership in developing innovative pleadings involving "Omni Complaints", strategic discovery, and rapid bellwether trials led to a series of inter-related settlements involving various suppliers, builders, installers, insurers, and manufacturers of Chinese Drywall valued at more than \$1 Billion. Mr. Schaffer worked in conjunction with the Plaintiffs' Expert Committee to develop experts to provide the requisite foundation for their defect, causation and damages opinions. This evidence was instrumental in bringing about plaintiff verdicts in the "bellwether" trial (*Hernandez v. Knauf*, 2010 WL 1710434 (E.D. La. April 27, 2010)) which contributed to the foundation for the inter-related settlements described above. In addition, Mr. Schaffer oversaw the inspection of plaintiffs' homes in Virginia by the defendants' experts and worked with plaintiffs' experts to challenge defendants' experts' opinion that Chinese Drywall could be detected with the use of an XRF handheld measuring device. As a result, plaintiffs filed a Daubert motion and were able to preclude defendant's experts from offering such an opinion. Though the inter-related settlements described above culminated with Knauf, a German company with Chinese manufacturing subsidiaries, the remaining Chinese manufacturing defendants continue to dispute personal jurisdiction and raise other defenses to liability and damages. However, Levin Sedran, continues to spearhead the prosecution of plaintiffs' claims by overseeing the litigation as plaintiffs begin to prepare to try the individual cases which were remanded back to their home districts. These tireless efforts reflect the dedication Levin Sedran & Berman attorneys, like Mr. Schaffer apply to every case.

Mr. Schaffer has extensive experience in data breach and privacy cases, including serving as a member of leadership in *In re Movelt Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 3083 (D. Mass) (one of the largest data breach to date with over 100 million victims' PII and PHI compromised and impacting over 2000 entities. Mr. Schaffer was selected as one of five lead counsel after the court reviewed applications and conducted interviews of over 50 applicants); *In re AT&T Inc., Customer Data Breach Security Litigation*, MDL No, 3114 (N.D. Tex.) (data breaching involving 73 million customers PII); *In re Change Healthcare, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 3108 (D. Minn.) (financial, health and personal data; one of the largest data breach to date with over 100 million victims' PII and PHI compromised); *In re Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 2522 (D. Minn.) (retailer compromised consumer data requiring financial institutions to issue new credit cards, settlement value \$39 million settlement for plaintiff financial institutions), *Green v. Accolade, Inc.*, No. 2:18-cv-00274 (E.D. Pa.) (employer data breach resulting in compromised employee PII); *Kuss v. American Home Patient, Inc.*, No. 8:18-cv-0248 (M.D. Fla.) (stolen laptops from medical provider compromised patient's medical information); *Abdelmessih v. Five Below, Inc.*, No. 2:19-cv-01487 (E.D. Pa.) (retailer data breach compromising customers' PII); *In re Hudson's Bay Company Data Security Incident Consumer Litigation*, No. 18-cv-8472 (S.D.N.Y.) (retailer data breach compromised customers' electronically-stored PII); *Hasehemi v. Bosley, Inc.*, No. 2:21-cv-00946 (C.D. Cal.) (hair restoration company compromised customers' electronically stored PII and medical and/or health information); *Culbertson v. Deloitte Consulting LLP*, No 1:20-cv-3962

(S.D.N.Y.) (accounting firm as part of the Pandemic Unemployment Assistance program compromised applicants electronically stored PII); *St. James v. Partnership HealthPlan of California*, No. FCS058720 (Cal. Super. Ct.) (hospital compromised PII and medical information); *In re Overby-Seawell Company Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, No. 1:23-md-03056 (N.D. Ga.) (bank customers' PII compromised); *Holden v. Guardian Analytics, Inc.. et. al*, No. 2:23-cv-02156 (D. N.J.) (bank customers' PII compromised); *In re: NCB Mgmt. Serv., Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, No. 2:23-cv-01236 (E.D. Pa.) (bank customers' PII compromised) and *Hasson v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC*, No. 2:23-cv-05039 (E.D. Pa.) (cable provider compromised customers' PII); *Reichbart v. Financial Business and Consumer Solutions, Inc.*, No. 24-1876 (E.D. Pa.) (collection agency compromised consumers' PII and financial data); *Hulewat v. Medical Management Resource Group LLC*, No. 2:24-cv-00377 (D. Ariz) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); *Gambino v. Berry, Dunn, McNeil & Parker, LLC*, No. 2:24-cv-00146 (D. Maine) (accounting firm compromised customers' PII and financial data); *In re Advance Auto Stores company, Incorporated, Data Breach Litigation*, No. 5:24-cv-00352 (E.D.N.C.) (retailer compromised customers PII and financial data); *Flores v. South Texas Oncology and Hematology, PLLC*, No 2024C113299 (Tex. Dist. Ct. Bexar Cty.) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); *Covey v. Texas Retina Associates*, Cause No. DC-24-09642 (Tex. Dist. Ct. Dallas Cty.) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); *Hulse v. Acadian Ambulance Service, Inc*, No. 6:24-cv-01011(W.D. La.) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); *McNally v. Infosys McCamish Systems, LLC*, No. No. 1:24-cv-00995 (N.D. Ga.); *C.K., et al., v. Ann & Robert H. Lurie Children's Hospital of Chicago*, No. 1:24-cv-05503 (N.D. Ill.); *In re Save RX Data Breach Litigation*, No. 8:24-cv-00204 (D. Neb.) (pharmacy benefits manager compromised insurers' PII and PHI); *Pannozzi v. Deloitte Consulting, LLP*, No. 1:24-00524 (D.R.I.) (accounting firm compromised customers' PII and financial data); *Batista v. Richmond University Medical Center*, Index No. 152916/2024 (N.Y.S.C. Richmond Cty.) (medical provider compromised consumers' PII and PHI); *Volio v. Rush Street gaming LLC et. al.*, No. 2:25-cv-00039 (E.D. Pa.) (casino operator compromised customers PII and financial data); *Dimoff v. Allegheny Health Network*, No. 2:25-cv-00125 (W.D. Pa.) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI) ; *In re Anna Jaques Hospital Data Security Incident Litigation*, No. 1:24-cv-10792 (D. Mass) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); and *Nadeau v. Onsite Mammography, LLC d/b/a Onsite Womens Health* ,No. 3:25-cv-11123 (D. Mass) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); *In Re: Columbia University Data Breach Litigation*, No.-cv-05541 (S.D. N.Y.) (university compromised students, faculty and donors PII and PHI); *Hall v. Healthcare Services Group Inc.*, No. 2:25-cv-04908 (E.D. Pa.) (medical provider comprised consumers' PII and PHI); *Ding v. New York University*, No. 1;25-cv-02416 (S.D.N.Y.) (university compromised students, faculty and donors PII and PHI). *Volio v. Sugarhouse HSP Gaming, L.P. d/b/a Rivers Casino Philadelphia et. al.*, No. 2:25-cv-0039-JDW (E.D. Pa.) (casino compromised consumers' PII)); *Dimoff v. Allegheny Health Network*, No. 2:25-cv-00125 (W.D. Pa.) (healthcare provider compromised patients' PII and PHI); *Brooks v. MRO Corporation et. al.*, 2:26-cv-01838 (E.D. Pa.) (healthcare provider compromised patients' PII and PHI); *In re Cargurus Data Security Litigation*, No.1;26-cv-10996) (D. Mass) (auto company compromised consumers' PII);

In addition, Mr. Schaffer has served in many other data breaches as a member of a litigation team assisting leadership in the prosecution of the class actions. E.g., *In re Wawa, Inc., Data*

Breach Litigation, No. 19-6019 (E.D. Pa.) (convenience store conglomerate compromised consumer credit card information requiring financial institutions to issue new credit cards, served as co-chair of third-party discovery committee for financial track); *Smallman v. MGM Resorts International*, No. 2:20-cv-00376 (D. Nev.) (casino compromised customers PII, serving on third party discovery and deposition committee); *In re Tenet Healthcare Corporation Data Breach Litigation*, No. DC-22-07513 (Tex. Cty. Ct.) (hospital compromised patients' PII and medical information, serving as member of discovery and law and briefing committees); *Christiansen v. Parker Hanifin Corporation*, No. 1:22-cv-835 (N.D. Ohio) (engineering company compromised employees' and job applicants' PII, serving as member of discovery and law and briefing committees); *Masters v. Gateway Rehabilitation Center, Inc.*, No. 22-14713 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl.) (medical provider compromised patients' PII and medical information, serving as member of discovery and law and briefing committees); *In Re: Goodman Campbell Brain and Spine Data Incident Litig.*, No. 49D01-2207-PL-024807 (Ind. Super. Ct.) (medical provider compromised patients' PII and medical information, serving as member of discovery and law and briefing committees); *In re MCG Health Data Security Issue Litigation*, No. 2:22-CV-849 (W.D. Wash.) (medical provider compromised patients' PII and medical information, serving as member of discovery and law and briefing committees); *In re Marriot International Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 2879 (D. Mass.) (hotel conglomerate compromised consumers PII, served as member of plaintiffs' screening or vetting committee and assisted leadership in vetting plaintiffs for inclusion in the consolidated amended complaint as well as assisting with discovery); *In re Capital One Consumer Data Security Data Breach*, MDL No. 2915 (E.D. Va.) (credit card company compromised consumer PII, served as member of discovery committee); *In re Rutters Data Security Breach Litigation*, No. 1:20-cv-00382 (M.D. Pa.) (convenience store conglomerate compromised consumer PII, assisted lead counsel with law and briefing and discovery). Levin Sedran also has experience in other privacy cases, including serving as Co-lead counsel in *Bryd v. Aaron's Inc.*, No. 11-101 (W.D. Pa.), and *Peterson v. Aaron's Inc.*, No. 1-14-cv-1919 (N.D. Ga.) (where defendant placed spyware on rental computers), and on the Executive Committee in *In re Carrier IQ, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litigation*, No. 12-md-1330 (N.D. Cal.) (where defendant placed software on mobile devices). Mr. Schaffer is actively participating in a number of other data breach class actions across the United States in leadership positions and or as a member of litigation team assisting leadership in the prosecution of the class actions.

In addition to representing consumers, Mr. Schaffer has also represented victims of pollution, contamination and other toxic exposures. *In Re Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Products Liability Litigation*, MDL No. 2873 (D.S.C.) (executive committee) (settlements valued in excess of \$12 billion); *In re East Palestine, Train Derailment, Meneghin*, No. 4:23-cv-00242 (N.D.OH.) (executive committee); *Meneghin v. The Exxon Mobile Corporation, et al.*, No. OCN-002697-07 (N.J. Super. Ct., Ocean County) (Plaintiffs' Co-lead Counsel); *Johnson, et al. v. Walsh, et al.*, PCCP April Term, 2008, No. 2012 (Phila. Com. Pl.) (Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel). As lead counsel in *Meneghin v. Exxon Mobil Corporation, et al.*, Mr. Schaffer successfully opposed Exxon Mobil's *Daubert* challenges to Plaintiffs' liability and damage experts and obtained certification of a class of property owners whose properties were contaminated with constituents from gasoline (benzene). The contamination was a result of a discharge of gasoline from underground storage tanks which led to ground water contamination and contamination of the properties. Thereafter, Mr. Schaffer negotiated a multi-million-dollar class action settlement on behalf of all property

owners in the vicinity of the Exxon Mobil gas station. This was the first class-action settlement for property contamination entered into by Exxon Mobil.

These cases are just a few examples of the complex class-action cases that Mr. Schaffer along with Levin Sedran & Berman led to a successful outcome.

Along with his class action and mass tort experience, Mr. Schaffer has a LLM in Trial Advocacy and has extensive experience prosecuting complex individual actions on behalf of injured individuals in products liability, medical negligence and drug and medical device actions. He has served as Lead Counsel in these matters and successfully tried cases to jury verdicts.

In recognition of his accomplishments, Mr. Schaffer has achieved and maintained an AV Martindale-Hubbell rating and is recognized by his peers as a Super Lawyer. Mr. Schaffer speaks nationally on a multitude of topics relating to class actions and complex litigation.

AUSTIN B. COHEN*Member*

AUSTIN B. COHEN, a native of West Islip, New York, received a BA in Economics and History from the University of Pennsylvania in 1990. He received a JD, cum laude, from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law in 1996. During law school, he interned for the Honorable Lowell Reed (E.D. Pa.) June – August, 1995. He also served as an Executive Editor and Associate Editor for the University of Pittsburgh Journal of Law and Commerce and was a finalist in the Murray S. Love Trial Moot Court Competition.

On April 12, 2019, Mr. Cohen was appointed Co-Lead Counsel in *Sutton v. Hoffman La Roche, Inc.*, ES-L-008724-14 (N.J. Super.), representing a class of homeowners adjacent to Roche's former New Jersey manufacturing facilities in an environmental claim seeking to recover diminished property values as a result of pollution emanating from Roche's property. Mr. Cohen successfully argued for class certification before the trial court and, on interlocutory appeal, before the appellate court. The New Jersey Supreme Court recently rejected defendants' motion for interlocutory review.

Mr. Cohen is presently representing several large ethanol producers asserting, among other things, a Sherman Act Section 2 damages claim due to a cross-market manipulation scheme implemented by defendant Archer Daniels Midland Company involving the U.S. market for ethanol and ethanol derivatives. previously Mr. Cohen served as counsel for a New England electricity wholesaler who brought a Section 2 market manipulation claim against two New England energy companies.

Mr. Cohen's work has focused on all aspects of class litigation. Cases he has worked on include:

- *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1775 (E.D.N.Y.) (representing class of shippers alleging international air cargo carriers conspired to fix prices and surcharges. Levin Sedran & Berman served as Co-Lead Counsel. Settlements exceeded \$1.25 billion);
- *In re: Electrical Carbon Products Antitrust Litigation*, MDL (D.N.J.) (representing class of purchasers alleging electrical carbon products manufacturers agreed to horizontal price fixing and customer allocation. Levin Sedran & Berman served as Co-Lead Counsel);
- *In re: Graphite Electrodes Litigation*, MDL No. 1244 (E.D. Pa.) (representing class of purchasers alleging manufacturers of graphite components used for steel

manufacturing agreed to horizontal price fixing. Levin Sedran & Berman served as Co-Lead Counsel. Settlements totaled \$133.5 million, representing 100% of actual damages);

- *In re: Potash Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 1996 (N.D. Ill. and 7th Cir.) (representing class of potash customers alleging horizontal conspiracy among mining companies to fix prices and restrict output. Levin Sedran & Berman worked with lead counsel and focused on obtaining jurisdiction over foreign entities and interpretation of the Foreign Trade Antitrust Improvement Act);
- *In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL 2522 (D. Minn.) (representing class of financial institutions seeking to recover costs due to Target Corporation's failure to implement proper data security protocols. Levin Sedran & Berman worked with lead counsel and focused on establishing proper standard of care and calculation of appropriate damages).

Mr. Cohen has written published articles regarding the admissibility of subsequent remedial modifications in products liability litigation (68 Pa. B.A.Q. 93), the enforceability of litigation confidentiality agreements (71 Pa. B.A.Q. 93), and federal tax issues related to the tax-exempt financing of University sponsored research facilities (23 The Exempt Organization Tax Review 445).

Mr. Cohen has been rated as a Pennsylvania antitrust "Super Lawyer" and is AV Peer Review rated by Martindale Hubble.

Mr. Cohen is admitted to practice in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, as well as the U.S. District Courts for the Eastern and Western Districts of Pennsylvania and the Central District of Illinois.

KEITH J. VERRIER*Member*

KEITH J. VERRIER concentrates his practice on complex class action litigation with a focus on antitrust, consumer fraud, environmental contamination and data security breach cases. His clients include large and small businesses as well as individuals seeking compensation for price-fixing, monopolization, and other wrongdoing. He has experience in all aspects of litigation and has assisted in obtaining significant recoveries in courts throughout the United States. For his work, Mr. Verrier was named a “Rising Star” in 2008 and 2010 and recognized by Super Lawyers as a top attorney in antitrust in 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Verrier graduated *magna cum laude* from Temple University School of Law where he was a member of the Law Review. Following law school, he served as a judicial clerk for the Honorable Herbert J. Hutton on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Earlier in his career, Mr. Verrier practiced at a large national law firm where he represented clients in a variety of complex commercial litigation matters and at a nationally-recognized boutique law firm specializing in antitrust class actions.

Throughout his career, Mr. Verrier has been involved in a wide range of diverse and complex litigation. The following are representative of the types of matters in which he has been involved:

- *United Wisconsin Grain Producers LLC v. Archer Daniels Midland*, No. 20-cv-2314 (C.D. Ill.) - Representing a group of large ethanol producers asserting claims for damages arising from an alleged cross-market manipulation scheme implemented by defendant Archer Daniels Midland Company involving the U.S. market for ethanol and ethanol derivatives in violation of, among other things, Section 2 of the Sherman Act.
- *In re: Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation* – Represented a class of shippers alleging international air cargo carriers conspired to fix prices and surcharges. Levin Sedran & Berman served as Co-Lead Counsel. (Over \$1.25 billion in settlements).
- *In re Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Products Liability Litigation* – Prosecuted class action and mass tort on behalf of homeowners whose homes contain defective drywall. Levin Sedran & Berman served as Lead Counsel. A settlement with the German defendant provided full remediation for affected homeowners (valued at over \$1.1 billion) and settlement with the Chinese defendant provided \$248 million to members of the settlement class.

- *In re: Target Corporation Customer Data Security Breach Litigation* – Represented a class of financial institutions seeking to recover costs due to Target Corporation’s failure to implement proper data security protocols. Levin Sedran & Berman worked with lead counsel and focused on establishing proper standard of care and calculation of appropriate damages. (\$39 million settlement).
- *In re: Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation* – Representing a class of car purchasers seeking damages arising from alleged price-fixing conspiracies as to various automotive parts that are components of new motor vehicles. Levin Sedran & Berman worked with co-lead counsel on briefing and discovery matters. (Over \$200 million in settlements to date).
- *In re: Mushroom Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* – Defended a cooperative of mushroom growers against allegations of, *inter alia*, price fixing, supply control and monopolization brought under Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act.
- *Johnson Matthey, Inc. v. Research Corp.* – Represented one of the world’s largest fabricators and distributors of platinum group metals involving complex pharmaceutical development and licensing issues.
- *Chester County Hospital v. Independence Blue Cross* – Represented a community hospital in an antitrust matter involving the largest health maintenance organization (HMO) in the country.

Mr. Verrier is admitted to practice in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey; in the U.S. District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, the District of New Jersey, and the Central District of Illinois; and in the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

NICHOLAS J. ELIA

Associate




NICHOLAS J. ELIA graduated from The Pennsylvania State University (B.S. Finance and Economics, 2014) and Temple University James E. Beasley School of Law (J.D., 2018). In law school, Mr. Elia was a member of the Temple International and Comparative Law Journal, he focused his coursework on complex civil litigation and antitrust law, and he interned with the Federal Labor Relations Authority, Securities and Exchange Commission, and the American Antitrust Institute.

Mr. Elia is admitted to practice in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

ZANETTA MOORE-DRIGGERS

Associate



ZANETTA MOORE-DRIGGERS concentrates her practice on class action litigation with a focus on consumer fraud and products liability. She graduated from Howard University School of Law, where she was a member of the Howard Law Journal. Following law school, she practiced at a large regional law firm in Philadelphia and worked in the Third Circuit Staff Attorney's Office.

Zanetta is licensed to practice in Pennsylvania. She is admitted to the United States District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

SANDRA L. DUGGAN
Of Counsel



SANDRA L. DUGGAN is a native of St. Louis and she graduated from Washington University with Phi Beta Kappa. Having earned a J.D. degree from Columbia University School of Law, Ms. Duggan was admitted to the bar in 1986. Since moving to Philadelphia in 1989, Ms. Duggan has focused her practice on class action and multi-district litigation.

She has served as a member of the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in the national asbestos property damage class action, *Prince George Center, Inc. v. U.S. Gypsum* (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.), and she is counsel for class plaintiffs in the Title IX discrimination suit, *Cohen v. Brown University*, (D.R.I.). Ms. Duggan has worked on *In re: School Asbestos Litig.*, (E.D. Pa.); Asbestos Claimants Committees in Celotex and National Gypsum Chapter 11 bankruptcies; *In re: Orthopedic Bone Screw Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL 1014 (E.D. Pa.); *Diet Drugs Litigation*, MDL 1203 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: EXXON VALDEZ*; *In re: Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL 2047 (E.D. La.); *In re: VIOXX Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL 1657 (E.D. La.), and other securities fraud, shareholder and property damage class actions in federal and state courts. She assisted Co-Lead Counsel and Subclass Counsel with negotiating the class settlement in *In re National Football League Players' Concussion Litig.*, MDL No. 2323 (E.D. Pa.).

In 2022, Ms. Duggan was appointed by the Honorable Joy Flowers Conti to serve as Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Counsel in *In re Philips Recalled CPAP, Bi-Level PAP, and Mechanical Ventilator Prod. Litig.*, MDL 3014 (W.D. Pa.). On October 10, 2023, a class settlement of economic loss claims was preliminarily approved.

In 2019, Ms. Duggan negotiated a global class settlement with the Chinese manufacturers in the *Chinese Drywall Litigation*. See *In re Chinese-Manufactured Drywall Prods. Liab. Litig.*, MDL 2047, 424 F. Supp. 3d 456 (E.D. La. 2020). She was appointed by the Honorable Eldon E. Fallon to serve as Class Counsel for Plaintiffs in the Global Settlement and she also served as Chair of the Fee Allocation Committee in that case.

In 2015, Ms. Duggan was appointed by the Honorable Carl J. Barbier to serve as Special Counsel to the Plaintiffs' Fee and Cost Committee in the BP Oil Spill Litigation, *In re Oil Spill by the Oil Rig "Deepwater Horizon" in the Gulf of Mexico, on April 20, 2010*, MDL 2179 (E.D. La.).

Ms. Duggan served as a class action expert in *In re "Non-Filing" Insurance Fee Litig.*, MDL 1130 (M.D. Ala.). She was a contributing author and editor of the Third Edition of Herbert Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* (3d ed. 1992), and she earned a Public Justice Achievement Award in July 1999 from Public Justice for her work on the Brown University Title IX Litigation.

Ms. Duggan is admitted to practice in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the U.S. District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and the United States Supreme Court.

Ms. Duggan is Mexican American. She is fluent in Spanish.

TOM SHRACK

Information Technology Manager

Tom Shrack has been managing information technology and litigation technology projects for over thirty years. He has been the IT Manager at Levin Sedran & Berman LLP since 2003 and has assisted the firm's attorneys with many large litigation projects. He frequently works with the attorneys and staff at other firms to facilitate collaboration on projects and has extensive experience with the litigation-specific platforms and most other tools used in case preparation. Mr. Shrack often assists with document management, data analysis and presentation, court filing preparation, exhibit creation and management, and various other needs that arise in litigation.

SUCCESSFULLY LITIGATED CLASS CASES

Examples of the firm successfully litigated class action cases include the following: *James J. and Linda J. Holmes v. Penn Security Bank and Trust Co.*, U.S.D.C., Middle District of Pennsylvania No. 80-0747; *In re: Glassine & Greaseproof Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 475, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: First Pennsylvania Securities Litigation*, No. 80-1643, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: Caesars World Shareholder Litigation*, No. MDL 496 (J.P. MDL); *In re: Standard Screws Antitrust Litigation*, No. MDL 443, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: Electric Weld Steel Tubing Antitrust Litigation - II*, No. 83-0163, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *Leroy G. Meshel v. Nutri-Systems, Inc.*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 83-1440; *In re: Corrugated Container Antitrust Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, MDL 310; *In re: Three Mile Island Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Middle District of Pennsylvania, No. 79-0432; *Township of Susquehanna v. GPU*, U.S.D.C., Middle District of Pennsylvania, No. 81-0437 (a Three Mile Island case); *Donald A. Stibitz v. General Public Utilities Corporation*, No. 654 S 1985 (C.P. Dauphin County, Pa.) (a Three Mile Island case); *Raymond F. Wehner v. Syntex Corporation and Syntex (U.S.A.) Inc.*, No. C-85-20383(SW) (N.D. Cal.) (first Superfund Class Action ever certified); *In re: Dun & Bradstreet Credit Services Customer Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Southern District of Ohio, Civil Action Nos. C-1-89-026, 89-051, 89-2245, 89-3994, 89-408; *Malcolm Weiss v. York Hospital*, U.S.D.C., Middle District of Pennsylvania, No. 80-0134; *In re: Ramada Inns Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., District of Delaware, No. 81-456; *In re: Playboy Securities Litigation*, Court of Chancery, State of Delaware, New Castle County, No. 6806 and 6872; *In re: Oak Industries Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Southern District of California, No. 83-0537-G(M); *Dixie Brewing Co., Inc. v. John Barth*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 84-4112; *In re: Warner Communications Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Southern District of New York, No. 82-CV-8288; *In re: Baldwin United Corporation Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Southern District of New York, MDL No. 581; *Zucker Associates, Inc. v. William C. Tallman and Public Service Company of New Hampshire*, U.S.D.C., District of New Hampshire, No. C86-52-D; *In re: Shopping Carts Antitrust Litigation*, MDL 451, Southern District of New York; *Charal v. Andes*, No. 77-1725; *Hubner v. Andes*, No. 78-1610 U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: PetroLewis Securities Litigation*, 84-C-326, U.S.D.C., District of Colorado; *Gentry v. C & D Oil Co.*, 102 F.R.D. 490 (W.D. Ark. 1984); *In re: Hops Antitrust Litigation*, No. 84-4112, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: North Atlantic Air Travel Antitrust Litigation*, No. 84-1013, U.S.D.C., District of Columbia; *Continental/Midlantic Securities Litigation*, No. 86-6872, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: Fiddler's Woods Bondholders Litigation*, No. 83-2340 (E.D. Pa.) (Newcomer, J.); *Fisher Brothers v. Cambridge-Lee Industries, Inc.*, No. 82-4941, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *Silver Diversified Ventures Limited Money Purchase Pension Plan v. Barrow*, No. B-86-1520-CA (E.D. Tex.) (*Gulf States Utilities Securities Litigation*); *In re: First Jersey Securities Litigation*, No. 85-6059 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Crocker Shareholder Litigation*, Cons. No. 7405, Court of Chancery, State of Delaware, New Castle County; *Mario Zacharjasz v. The Lomas and Nettleton Co.*, No. 87-4303, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *In re: People Express Securities Litigation*, No. 86-2497, U.S.D.C., District of New Jersey; *In re: Duquesne Light Shareholder Litigation*, No. 86-1046 U.S.D.C., Western District of Pennsylvania (Ziegler, J.); *In re: Western Union Securities Litigation*, No. 84-5092 (JFG), U.S.D.C., District of New Jersey; *In re: TSO Financial Litigation*, No. 87-7903,

U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania; *Kallus v. General Host*, No. B-87-160, U.S.D.C., District of Connecticut; *Staub v. Outdoor World Corp.*, C.P. Lancaster County, No. 2872-1984; *Jaroslavic v. Englehard Corp.*, U.S.D.C., District of New Jersey, No. 84-3641F; *In re: Boardwalk Marketplace Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., District of Connecticut, MDL 712 (WWE); *In re: Goldome Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Southern District of New York, No. 88-Civ-4765; *In re: Ashland Oil Spill Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Western District of Pennsylvania, No. M-14670; *Rosenfeld v. Collins & Aikman Corp.*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 87-2529; *Gross v. The Hertz Corporation*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Master File, No. 88-661; *In re: Collision Near Chase, Maryland on January 4, 1987 Litigation*, U.S.D.C., District of Maryland, MDL 728; *In re: Texas International Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Western District of Oklahoma, MDL No. 604, 84 Civ. 366-R; *In re: Chain Link Fence Antitrust Litigation*, U.S.D.C., District of Maryland, No. CLF-1; *In re: Winchell's Donut House, L.P. Securities Litigation*, Court of Chancery of the State of Delaware, New Castle County, Consolidated No. 9478; *Bruce D. Desfor v. National Housing Ministries*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 84-1562; *Cumberland Farms, Inc. v. Browning-Ferris Industries, Inc.*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 87-3717; *In re: SmithKline Beckman Corp. Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 88-7474; *In re: SmithKline Beecham Shareholders Litigation*, Court of Common Pleas, Phila. County, No. 2303; *In re: First Fidelity Bancorporation Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., District of New Jersey, No. 88-5297 (HLS); *In re: Qintex Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Central District of California, No. CV-89-6182; *In re: Sunrise Securities Litigation*, U.S.D.C., Eastern District of Pennsylvania, MDL 655; *David Stein v. James C. Marshall*, U.S.D.C., District of Arizona, No. Civ. 89-66 (PHX-CAM); *Residential Resources Securities Litigation*, No. 89-0066 (D. Ariz.); *In re: Home Shopping Network Securities Litigation -- Action I (Consolidated Actions)*, No. 87-428-CIV-T-13A (M.D. Fla.); *In re: Kay Jewelers Securities Litigation*, Civ. Action Nos. 90-1663-A through 90-1667A (E.D. Va.); *In re: Rohm & Haas Litigation*, Master File No. 89-2724 (Coordinated) (E.D. Pa.); *In re: O'Brien Energy Securities Litigation*, No. 89-8089 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Richard J. Dennis & Co. Litigation*, No. 88-Civ-8928 (MP) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Mack Trucks Securities Litigation*, Consolidated No. 90-4467 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Digital Sound Corp., Securities Litigation*, No. 90-3533-MRP (BX) (C.D. Cal.); *In re: Philips N.V. Securities Litigation*, No. 90-Civ.-3044 (RPP) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Frank B. Hall & Co., Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 86-Civ.-2698 (CLB) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Genentech, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. C-88-4038-DLJ (N.D. Cal.); *Richard Friedman v. Northville Industries Corp.*, Supreme Court of New York, Suffolk County, No. 88-2085; *Benjamin Fishbein v. Resorts International, Inc.*, No. 89 Civ.6043(MGC) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Avon Products, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 89 Civ. 6216 (MEL) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Chase Manhattan Securities Litigation*, No. 90 Civ. 6092 (LJF) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: FPL Group Consolidated Litigation*, No. 90-8461 Civ. Nesbitt (S.D. Fla.); *Daniel Hwang v. Smith Corona Corp.*, Consolidated No. B89-450 (TFGD) (D. Ct.); *In re: Lomas Financial Corp. Securities Litigation*, No. CA-3-89-1962-G (N.D. Tex.); *In re: Tonka Corp. Securities Litigation*, Consolidated No. 4-90-2 (D. Minn.); *In re: Unisys Securities Litigation*, No. 89-1179 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Alcolac Inc. Litigation*, No. CV490-261 (Cir. Ct. Saline Cty. Marshall, Missouri); *In re: Clozapine Antitrust Litigation*, No. MDL874 (N.D. Ill.); *In re: Jiffy Lube Securities Litigation*, No. JHY-89-1939 (D. Md.); *In re: Beverly Enterprises Securities Litigation*, No. CV-88-01189 RSWL (Tex.) [Central District CA]; *In re: Kenbee Limited Partnerships Litigation*, CV-91-2174 (GEB)

(D.N.J.); *Greentree v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, No. 6309, April Term 1991 (Pa. Ct. Com. Pl., Phila. Cty.); *Moise Katz v. Donald A. Pels and Lin Broadcasting Corp.*, No. 90 Civ. 7787 (KTD) (S.D.N.Y.); *In re: Airlines Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 861 (N.D. GA.); *Fulton, Mehring & Hauser Co., Inc. v. The Stanley Works*, No. 90-0987-C(5) (E.D. Mo.); *In re: Mortgage Realty Trust Securities Litigation*, No. 90-1848 (E.D. Pa.); *Benjamin and Colby v. Bankeast Corp.*, No. C-90-38-D (D.N.H.); *In re: Royce Laboratories, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 920923-Civ-Moore (S.D. Fla.); *In re: United Telecommunications, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 90-2251-0 (D. Kan.); *In re: U.S. Bioscience Securities Litigation*, No. 92-678 (E.D. Pa.); *In re: Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 89 Civ. 17 (E.D.N.Y.); *In re: PNC Securities Litigation*, No. 90-592 (W.D. Pa.); *Raymond Snyder v. Oneok, Inc.*, No. 88-C-1500-E (N.D. Okla.); *In re: Public Service Company of New Mexico*, No. 91-0536M (S.D. Cal.); *In re: First Republic Bank Securities Litigation*, No. CA3-88-0641-H (N.D. Tex, Dallas Division); and *In re: First Executive Corp. Securities Litigation*, No. CV-89-7135 DT (C.D. Cal.).