**BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.** 1 L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626) 2 Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 272996) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295032) 3 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 4 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 5 E-Mail: ltfisher@bursor.com 6 apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 8 9 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 Case No. 2:15-cy-01801-PSG-AJW 13 JONATHAN RETTA, KIRSTEN SCHOFIELD, and JESSICA MANIRE 14 PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION on Behalf of Themselves and all Others AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY Similarly Situated, 15 APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, PROVISIONAL 16 Plaintiffs, **CERTIFICATION OF** v. NATIONWIDE SETTLEMENT 17 CLASS, AND APPROVAL OF 18 PROCEDURE FOR AND FORM OF MILLENNIUM PRODUCTS, INC., and **NOTICE** WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC., 19 Date: January 30, 2017 20 Defendants. Time: 1:30 p.m. 21 Courtroom 880 22 Judge: Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez 23 24 25 26 27 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF 28 **CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT** 

CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01801-PSG-AJW

### TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on January 30, 2017 at 1:30 p.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard by the above-captioned Court, located at 255 East Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 in the courtroom of Judge Philip S. Gutierrez, Plaintiffs Jonathan Retta, Kirsten Schofield, and Jessica Manire ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their undersigned counsel of record, will move, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), for the Court to: (i) grant preliminary approval of the proposed Stipulation of Class Action Settlement ("Settlement Agreement"), (ii) provisionally certify the Class for the purposes of preliminary approval, designate Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives, and appoint Bursor & Fisher, P.A. as Class Counsel for the Class, (iii) establish procedures for giving notice to members of the Class, (iv) approve forms of notice to Class Members, (v) mandate procedures and deadlines for exclusion requests and objections, and (vi) set a date, time and place for a final approval hearing.

This motion is made on the grounds that preliminary approval of the proposed class action settlement is proper, given that each requirement of Rule 23(e) has been met.

This motion is based on Plaintiff's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Provisional Certification of Nationwide Settlement Class, and Approval of Procedure for and Form of Notice, the accompanying Declarations of L. Timothy Fisher, Steven Weisbrot, and GT Dave and attachments thereto, including the Settlement Agreement, the pleadings and papers on file herein, and any other written and oral arguments that may be presented to the Court.

1	Datada Navambar 19, 2016	Dean estfully submitted
2	Dated: November 18, 2016	Respectfully submitted,
3		BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
4		By: /s/L. Timothy Fisher L. Timothy Fisher
5		L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626)
6		Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 272996) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No.295032)
7		1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940
8		Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455
9		Facsimile: (925) 407-2700
10		Email: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com
11		ykrivoshey@bursor.com
12		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01801-PSG-AJW

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	BURSOR & FISHER, P.A. L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626) Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 27299) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295) 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 E-Mail: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com	96)
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
9		
10	LINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
11		CT OF CALIFORNIA
12		
13	JONATHAN RETTA, KIRSTEN	Case No. 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW
14	SCHOFIELD, and JESSICA MANIRE on Behalf of Themselves and all Others	PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
15	Similarly Situated,	SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
16	Plaintiffs,	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT,
17	V.	PROVISIONAL CERTIFICATION OF NATIONWIDE SETTLEMENT
18	MILLENNIUM PRODUCTS, INC., and	CLASS, AND APPROVAL OF PROCEDURE FOR AND FORM OF
19	WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC.,	NOTICE
20	Defendants.	Date: January 30, 2017
22		Time: 1:30 p.m. Courtroom 880
23		Judge: Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND .	ALITHORITIES IN SLIPPORT

OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01801-PSG-AJW

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS PAGE(S) 2 INTRODUCTION......1 3 I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND......4 II. 4 III. 5 IV. Α. 6 В. 7 C. 8 D. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE PRELIMINARILY 9 V. APPROVED......9 10 Α. 11 В. 12 C. 13 D. Ε. 14 15 THIS COURT SHOULD PROVISIONALLY CERTIFY THE VI. CLASS AND ENTER THE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL 16 17 Α. 18 a. 19 b. 20 d. 21 2. 22 Common Questions of Law and Fact a. Predominate 21 23 A Class Action Is the Superior Mechanism for b. 24 25 THE PROPOSED NOTICE PROGRAM CONSTITUTES ADEQUATE NOTICE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED ...... 24 VII. 26 27

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	DA CE(C)
2		PAGE(S)
3	CASES	
4	Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor, 521 U.S. 591 (1997)	17, 21, 22
5	Arnold v. United Artists Theatre Circuit, Inc., 158 F.R.D. 439 (N.D. Cal. 1994)	19
7	Balderas v. Massage Envy Franchising, LLC, 2014 WL 3610945 (N.D. Cal. July 21, 2014)	13
8	Boyd v. Bechtel Corp., 485 F. Supp. 610 (N.D. Cal. 1979)	
9	Churchill Village, L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec., 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004)	
11	Curtis-Bauer v. Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc., 2008 WL 4667090 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2008)	
12 13	Downey Surgical Clinic, Inc. v. Optuminsight, Inc., 2016 WL 5938722 (C.D. Cal. May 16, 2016)	
14 15	Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp., 657 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 2011)	
16	Garner v. State Farm. Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 2010 WL 1687832 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010)	
17 18	Gen. Tel. Co. of the Southwest v. Falcon, 457 U.S. 147 (1982)	
19	Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	passim
20 21	Hendricks v. Starkist Co., 2016 WL 5462423 n. 3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016)	12, 13, 14
22	Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., 2015 WL 9664959 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2015)	14
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>	In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig., 213 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 2000)	16
25	In re Netflix Privacy Litig., 2013 WL 1120801 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2013)	16
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	In re Omnivision Techs., Inc., 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036 (N.D. Cal. 2008)	17
28	PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT	
	PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT	ii

# Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-1 Filed 11/18/16 Page 4 of 31 Page ID #:1841

In re POM Wonderful LLC, 2014 WL 1225184 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2014)
In re Syncor ERISA Litig., 516 F.3d 1095 (9th Cir. 2008)
In re Tableware Antitrust Litig., 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2007)6
Khasin v. R. C. Bigelow, Inc., 2016 WL 1213767 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2016)
Khasin v. R. C. Bigelow, Inc., 2016 WL 4504500 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2016)
Lanovaz v. Twinings N. Am., Inc., 2014 WL 1652338 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2014)
Lilly v. Jamba Juice Co., 2015 WL 1248027 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2015)22
Nur v. Tatitlek Support Services, Inc., 2016 WL 3039573 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2016)
Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n, 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)
Protective Committee for Independent Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson, 390 U.S. 414 (1968)
Red v. Kraft Foods, Inc., 2012 WL 8019257 (C.D. Cal. Apr.12, 2012)
Rodriguez v. West Publ'g Corp., 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009)
Slaven v. BP Am., Inc., 190 F.R.D. 649 (C.D. Cal. 2000)
Staton v. Boeing Co., 327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003)20
Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc., 2015 WL 3776765 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2015)
Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, 131 S. Ct. 2541 (2011)
Zinser v. Accufix Research Inst., Inc., 253 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2001)21

### Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-1 Filed 11/18/16 Page 5 of 31 Page ID #:1842

1	SIAIUIES
2	NY GBL § 3494, 21
3	RULES
4	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1)
5	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2)
6	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)
7	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)20
8	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)(D)22
9	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B)
10	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1)24
11	REGULATIONS
12	21 C.F.R. § 101.54(g)
13	OTHER AUTHORITIES
14	H. Newberg & Conte, 1 Newberg on Class Actions § 3.10 (1992)
15	Manual for Complex Litigation, § 21.312 (4th ed. 2004)5
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	PLAINTIEFS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT

### I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this memorandum in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

Plaintiffs' operative complaint, the Fifth Amended Class Action Complaint, alleges three bases for relief, including: (1) that continued fermentation of Millennium's Enlightened kombucha beverages causes an increase in the alcohol concentration in the beverages to broach allowable legal limits and, accordingly, causes any alcohol warnings (or lack thereof) on the beverages' labels to be misleading and insufficient as a matter of law; (2) that the antioxidant representations on the labels of Enlightened kombucha beverages are misleading because the beverages do not contain any antioxidant nutrients as required for such statements by 21 C.F.R. § 101.54(g) and corresponding state laws; and (3) that the labels of Millennium's Enlightened and Classic kombucha beverages are misleading for the additional reason that they understate the amount of sugar in the beverages.

After *three* mediations before Jill R. Sperber, Esq. of Judicate West, investigations spanning roughly two years, motion practice, protracted discovery, and ongoing laboratory testing, the parties have reached a settlement that provides substantial monetary benefit to the class and significant injunctive relief. Defendants have agreed to provide up to \$8,250,000 to pay claims for those who purchased one or more flavors of the Subject Products on a claims-made basis. <sup>1</sup> Class Members can receive a \$3.50 cash payment for each bottle of every Subject Product purchased up to 10 bottles (\$35) without Proof of Purchase. Alternatively, Class Members can choose a product voucher redeemable for a free Millennium product for each bottle of every Subject Product purchased up to 10 bottles without Proof of Purchase. For claims administration purposes, these vouchers will be assigned a value of \$3.50,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same definitions as set out in the Settlement. *See* Fisher Decl. Ex. 1.

although their value may be higher or lower depending on the point of sale at issue.<sup>2</sup> Product Vouchers will have no expiration date and will be redeemable for any Subject Product at no cost. Class Members with Proof of Purchase can receive up to \$60 in cash or \$60 in product vouchers at the actual retail price they paid.

The Settlement also provides expansive injunctive relief. Millennium has agreed to (1) cease ordering and printing labels bearing the term "antioxidant"; (2) include a warning on its labels that "the products contain naturally occurring alcohol and should not be consumed by individuals seeking to avoid alcohol due to pregnancy, allergies, sensitivities or religious beliefs"; (3) regularly test samples of its products (at the time of bottling and the time of expiration) using a third-party laboratory to ensure compliance with federal and state labeling standards and to ensure the accuracy of the representations regarding the sugar content of its products; and (4) include a warning on its labels that the products may be under pressure and that the failure to refrigerate the products may result in leaking or gushing. Further, should a new, industrywide standard for testing the alcohol content of kombucha be developed, Millennium will adopt that testing methodology.

In its Order denying Plaintiff's prior motion for preliminary approval, the Court expressed a few concerns about the prior settlement. Dkt. 95. Specifically, the Court was concerned that (a) Plaintiffs' prior motion did not provide sufficient explanation of how the amount of relief offered related to the harm suffered by Class Members; (b) that Plaintiffs did not provide sufficient information for the Court to evaluate the true value of the voucher option as compared to the cash option; and (c) that the product giveaway option did not provide a sufficient benefit to the Class.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Millennium does not provide MSRP amounts for the Subject Products to its various distributors, and, accordingly, there is no uniform retail price. Millennium estimates that the average retail price of the Subject Products is between \$2.99 to \$3.99. See Decl. of GT Dave at ¶ 4-6. Thus, \$3.50 was chosen as the closest approximation of the average retail price. This figure comports with Plaintiffs' personal experiences in purchasing the Subject Products.

On October 7, 2016, the parties participated in a third mediation with Ms. Sperber and reached an agreement that addresses each of the Court's concerns. Notably, the value of the cash and voucher claims under the current Settlement is identical. Class Members can receive either up to \$35 in cash or up to \$35 in vouchers for the same number (ten) of Subject Products purchased.<sup>3</sup> The value of voucher claims for settlement purposes is set at \$3.50, the estimated average retail price of the Subject Products. *See* Dave Decl. at ¶¶ 4-6. Cash claims are likewise valued at \$3.50 per bottle purchased, a 40 percent increase from the prior settlement. The Settlement increases the fund available to pay all claims by \$750,000. It also increases the budget for notice and claims administration by \$125,000, and increases the mandatory reach of the notice program from 70% to 80%. The Settlement eliminates the Product Giveaway provision entirely. Further, Plaintiffs' motion provides the Court with an extensive evaluation of the risks Plaintiffs faced in continuing to litigate their claims, the relationship between the relief provided and Plaintiffs' claims, and the fairness and adequacy of the Settlement overall.

As in any class action, the Settlement is subject initially to preliminary approval and then to final approval by the Court after notice to the class and a hearing. Plaintiffs now request this Court to (1) grant preliminary approval of Settlement; (2) conditionally certify the Class, designate Plaintiffs as Class Representatives, and appoint Bursor & Fisher, P.A. as Class Counsel; (3) appoint Angeion Group as the Settlement Administrator and establish procedures for giving notice to members of the Class; (4) approve forms of notice to Class Members; (5) mandate procedures and deadlines for exclusion requests and objections; and (6) set a date, time and place for a final approval hearing. *See* Proposed Preliminary Approval Order, Ex. D to Settlement.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The prior settlement provided up to \$20 in cash for 8 purchases or up to \$30 in vouchers for 8 purchases. Thus, Class Members can receive up to \$15 more in cash or \$5 more in vouchers under the current settlement.

### II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On March 11, 2015, Plaintiffs filed this case in this Court alleging that Millennium made false or misleading representations regarding the antioxidant content of its kombucha beverages. Dkt. No. 1. Millennium moved to dismiss the complaint and to strike Plaintiffs' class action allegations. Dkt. 13. In response, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint. Dkt. 14. Millennium again moved to dismiss the complaint and to strike Plaintiffs' class allegations. Dkt. 17. The Court denied Millennium's motion to dismiss as to Plaintiffs' claims under the CLRA, UCL, FAL and NY GBL § 349 and denied Millennium's motion to strike, but granted the motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' request for injunctive relief without prejudice. Dkt. No. 25. Plaintiffs subsequently amended the Complaint to allege additional facts in support of their claims for injunctive relief. Dkt. No. 68 at ¶¶ 6-8.

On October 8, 2015, after commissioning two independent laboratories to test the alcohol content of Millennium's Enlightened Kombucha and Synergy beverages and several months of ongoing investigation, Plaintiffs filed a Third Amended Complaint adding claims regarding the purportedly high alcohol content of the products and Millennium's failure to provide federal alcohol warnings regarding the same. Dkt. No. 30. On February 11, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a Fourth Amended Complaint adding Whole Foods as a Defendant. Dkt. No. 53. Millennium answered on February 29, 2016 and Whole Foods moved to dismiss on April 7, 2016.

On June 22, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a Fifth Amended Complaint pleading additional claims regarding Millennium's alleged failure to correctly state the sugar content of its products on the labels after the discovery of a recent study concerning the sugar content of Millennium's products and further investigations. Dkt. 68. Millennium answered the Fifth Amended Complaint on July 6, 2016 and Whole Foods moved to dismiss on July 11, 2016.

After two mediations before Jill R. Sperber, Esq. of Judicate West, Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement on August 11,

2016. Dkt. 77. The Court vacated all then-scheduled pretrial deadlines on August 18, 2016 pursuant to the parties' stipulation. Dkt. 80. On September 21, 2016, the Court denied the motion for preliminary approval.

The parties participated in a third mediation with Ms. Sperber on October 7, 2016, where they reached an agreement in principle as to all claims for monetary relief set forth in Section IV(A) of the Settlement, and all injunctive relief concerning the Plaintiffs' antioxidant, alcohol, and sugar labeling claims set forth in Section IV(B)(a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Settlement. After reaching the new agreement in principle, the parties conferred with opposing counsel in *Pedro et al. v. Millennium Products, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-03780-PSG-AJW (C.D. Cal 2016). During these negotiations, the parties stated their position that the claims asserted in *Pedro* are subsumed within the *Retta* matter, and *Pedro* plaintiffs stated their position that the *Retta* action, although addressing the bulk of their claims, did not address a remaining claim for injunctive relief with respect to their allegations that the bottles of Millennium's products leak, fizz, or spill due to potential pressure buildup. As a result of these negotiations, the *Retta* Plaintiffs and Defendants agreed that additional injunctive relief set out in Section IV(B)(f) of the Settlement would be provided by the *Retta* settlement to address the *Pedro* Plaintiffs' remaining claim.

Counsel for Plaintiffs and counsel for Defendants have engaged in substantial arm's-length negotiations in an effort to resolve this action over a period of roughly eight months, including participating in *three* mediations. The parties have considered the risks and potential costs of continued litigation of this action, on the one hand, and the benefits of the proposed settlement, on the other hand, and desire to settle the action upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement.

### III. THE STANDARD FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

Approval of class action settlements involves a two-step process. First, the Court must make a preliminary determination whether the proposed settlement

appears to be fair and is "within the range of possible approval." *In re Syncor ERISA Litig.*, 516 F.3d 1095, 1100 (9th Cir. 2008); *In re Tableware Antitrust Litig.*, 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078, 1079 (N.D. Cal. 2007). If so, notice can be sent to class members and the Court can schedule a final approval hearing. *See Manual for Complex Litigation*, § 21.312 at 293-96 (4th ed. 2004) (hereinafter "*Manual*").

The purpose of a preliminary approval hearing is to ascertain whether to send out notice to putative class members and proceed with a fairness hearing. *See In re Tableware Antitrust Litig.*, 484 F. Supp. 2d at 1079. Notice should be disseminated where "the proposed settlement appears to be the product of serious, informed, non-collusive negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, does not improperly grant preferential treatment to class representatives or segments of the class, and falls within the range of possible approval." *Id.* Preliminary approval does not require an answer to the ultimate question of whether the proposed settlement is fair and adequate, for that determination occurs only after notice of the settlement has been given to the members of the settlement class. *See In re Tableware Antitrust Litig.*, 484 F. Supp. 2d at 1079 (finding that "[t]he question currently before the court is whether this settlement should be preliminarily approved" for the purposes of notifying the putative class members of the proposed settlement and proceeding with a fairness hearing, which requires the court to consider whether the settlement appears to be fair and "falls within the range of possible approval").

While the district court has discretion regarding the approval of a proposed settlement, it should give "proper deference to the private consensual decision of the parties." *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1027 (9th Cir. 1998). Here, the negotiations were conducted at arm's length, were non-collusive and were well informed, with an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims on both sides, were conducted between counsel with decades of class action experience, and utilized at the appropriate time the assistance of a well-respected mediator. Under

such circumstances, the Court is entitled to rely upon the opinions and assessments of counsel that the settlement is fair and reasonable. *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.*, 485 F. Supp. 610, 622-23 (N.D. Cal. 1979).

Beyond the public policy favoring settlements, the principal consideration in evaluating the fairness and adequacy of a proposed settlement is the likelihood of recovery balanced against the benefits of settlement. "[B]asic to this process in every instance, of course, is the need to compare the terms of the compromise with the likely rewards of litigation." *Protective Committee for Independent Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson*, 390 U.S. 414, 424-25 (1968). That said, "the court's intrusion upon what is otherwise a private consensual agreement negotiated between the parties to a lawsuit must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned." *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982).

### IV. TERMS OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

The proposed Class consists of "all persons in the United States and United States Territories who purchased at retail one or more of the Subject Products during the Class Period." Settlement ¶ 7. Excluded from the Class are (a) Defendants and their employees, principals, officers, directors, agents, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (b) the judges to whom the Action has been or is assigned and any members of their immediate families; (c) those who purchased the Subject Products for the purpose of re-sale; and (d) all persons who have filed a timely Request for Exclusion from the Class. *See id*.

## A. Monetary Relief for Class Members

Defendants have agreed to pay up to \$8,250,000 to cover all claims filed by Class Members as well as the costs of settlement administration, incentive awards,

and attorneys' fees, costs and expenses. Class Members can receive a cash payment of \$3.50 for each Subject Product purchased during the Class Period up to \$35 (10 purchases) without proof of purchase. Alternatively, Class Members can receive a product voucher redeemable for a free Millennium product for each Subject Product purchased during the Class Period up to \$35 worth of product vouchers. For claims administration purposes, these vouchers will be assigned a value of \$3.50. Thus, cash and voucher claims are equally valuable to putative class members (although the value of vouchers may be higher or lower than \$3.50 depending on the point of sale at issue). Class Members with proof of purchase can receive a cash payment up to \$60 or a product voucher up to \$60 at the retail price they paid for each purchase of the Subject Products during the Class Period. If the aggregate value of the cash and voucher awards claimed exceeds the Net Cash Amount, then the cash and voucher awards will be reduced on a pro rata basis, such that the aggregate value of the awards does not exceed the Net Cash Amount. Settlement ¶ 46.4

## **B.** Injunctive Relief

Pursuant to the Settlement, Millennium will cease ordering and printing labels bearing the term "antioxidant." Millennium will also include warnings on its labels that "the products contain naturally occurring alcohol and should not be consumed by individuals seeking to avoid alcohol due to pregnancy, allergies, sensitivities or religious beliefs" and that "Contents are under pressure. Failure to refrigerate may increase pressure, causing product to leak or gush." Millennium will also regularly test samples of its products (at the time of bottling and the time of expiration) using a third-party laboratory to ensure compliance with federal and state alcohol labeling standards and to ensure the accuracy of the representations regarding the sugar content of its products. Should a new, industrywide standard for testing the alcohol

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The Net Cash Amount is defined as the value derived by subtracting the value of any attorneys' fees, expenses, incentives awards, and any settlement administration expenses from \$8,250,000. *Id.* at ¶ 18.

content of kombucha be developed, Millennium will adopt that testing methodology.

## C. Incentive Awards and Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Expenses

Subject to the Court's approval, Defendants have agreed to pay incentive awards to Plaintiffs and the Related Plaintiffs in the amount of \$2,000. In addition, Class Counsel will make an application to the Court for an award of attorneys' fees, costs and expenses. Defendants have the right to challenge the amount of Plaintiffs' fees, costs and expenses and there is no formal agreement as to the amount of attorneys' fees, costs and expenses that will be sought by Class Counsel.

### D. Notice and Administrative Fees

The parties propose that Angeion Group act as the Settlement Administrator. Angeion will develop a notice and claims administration program designed to achieve at least 80% reach. Defendants shall pay all Settlement Administration Expenses up to \$400,000. Any reasonable Settlement Administration Expenses above \$400,000 shall be deducted on a pro rata basis from the cash rewards and product vouchers claimed by Authorized Claimants, regardless of whether the entire \$8,250,000 fund is fully exhausted. Notice and claims administration costs will be paid from the Settlement Fund.

# V. THE SETTLEMENT IS FAIR, ADEQUATE, AND REASONABLE AND SHOULD BE PRELIMINARILY APPROVED

Rule 23(e)(2) provides that "the court may approve [a proposed class action settlement] only after a hearing and on finding that it is fair, reasonable, and adequate." When making this determination, the Ninth Circuit has instructed district courts to balance several factors: (1) the strength of plaintiffs' case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial; (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings;

and (6) the experience and views of counsel. *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026;<sup>5</sup> *Churchill Village, L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004). Here, the balance of these factors readily establishes that the Settlement should be preliminarily approved.

## A. Strength of Plaintiffs' Case

In determining the likelihood of a plaintiff's success on the merits of a class action, "the district court's determination is nothing more than an amalgam of delicate balancing, gross approximations and rough justice." *Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 625 (internal quotations omitted). The court may "presume that through negotiation, the Parties, counsel, and mediator arrived at a reasonable range of settlement by considering Plaintiff's likelihood of recovery." *Garner v. State Farm. Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 2010 WL 1687832, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010) (citing *Rodriguez v. West Publ'g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 965 (9th Cir. 2009)). Here, the settlement negotiations were hard-fought, requiring multiple mediation sessions over several months, with both Parties and their counsel thoroughly familiar with the applicable facts, legal theories, and defenses on both sides. Plaintiffs believe that the Settlement is an outstanding result considering the issues addressed below.

In false or misleading advertising cases concerning beverages or foods, plaintiffs are typically foreclosed from full-refund theories of damages at class certification. *See, e.g., In re POM Wonderful LLC*, 2014 WL 1225184, at \*2-\*3 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2014) (explaining that a full refund damages model is unavailable where the beverage at issue provided class members with benefits in the form of calories, hydration, vitamins, and minerals); *Red v. Kraft Foods, Inc.*, 2012 WL 8019257, at \*11 (C.D. Cal. Apr.12, 2012). Here, the Subject Products contain multiple vitamins, enzymes and probiotics, and provide hydration and calories.

<sup>5</sup> In *Hanlon*, the Ninth Circuit also instructed district courts to consider "the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement." *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026. This

consideration is more germane to final approval, and will be addressed at the

appropriate time.

Defendants would have strong arguments against a full damages model for relief.

Although Plaintiffs believe that proving price premium damages would be possible here, there is no guarantee that the ultimate price premium proved would justify the risk of further litigation. As to the alcohol claims, it would be difficult to establish a price premium because Millennium's alcoholic kombucha beverages (the "Classic" line) and the purported non-alcoholic beverages (the "Enlightened" line) retail for the exact same price at the same retail locations. Even if Plaintiffs were to establish a alcohol labeling problem, the alcohol levels of kombucha products necessarily vary over time due to an ongoing fermentation process. Thus, the amount of alcohol in the accused products varies greatly between purchases, with some class members potentially receiving Enlightened products below and above the 0.5% alcohol by volume threshold. Further, the alcohol labeling claims would likely devolve into an uncertain "battle of the experts." Millennium produced 1,394 tests of the alcohol concentration of Enlightened kombucha beverages spanning several years within the Class Period. Every single test showed that the beverages were below the federally mandated 0.5% threshold set for non-alcoholic beverages.

With regards to *Plaintiffs' claims concerning antiox*idants, Plaintiffs would face a strong hurdle at class certification and summary judgment to establish damages considering that some antioxidants (*e.g.*, catechins) are actually present in the Subject Products, just not the antioxidant "nutrients" mandated by federal and state law. *See, e.g., Khasin v. R. C. Bigelow*, 2016 WL 4504500, at \*3-\*6 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2016) (granting summary judgment in favor of defendant in antioxidant labeling case where it was undisputed that the tea beverage contained *some* antioxidants). Nonetheless, Plaintiffs' review of the literature regarding consumer willingness to pay for labeling statements touting a product's antioxidant content shows that class members likely paid a roughly <u>four percent</u> premium based on the antioxidant representations at issue here. *See* Armenak Markosyan, *et al.*, *Consumer* 

Response to Information about a Functional Food Product: Apples Enriched with Antioxidants, Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics, 325, 337 (2009) (concluding that customers are willing to pay a 4 percent price premium for a product advertised as being enriched with antioxidants).

Defendants vigorously deny Plaintiffs' allegations and assert that neither Plaintiffs nor the Class suffered any harm or damages. In addition, Defendants would no doubt present a vigorous defense at trial, and there is no assurance that the Class would prevail – or even if they did, that they would be able to obtain an award of damages significantly higher than achieved here absent such risks. Thus, in the eyes of Class Counsel, the proposed Settlement provides the Class with an outstanding opportunity to obtain significant relief at this stage in the litigation. The Settlement also abrogates the risks that might prevent them from obtaining *any* relief.

#### **B.** The Amount Offered in Settlement

As discussed *supra*, it would be difficult for Plaintiffs to establish price premium damages above four percent of the purchase price. Assuming that Plaintiffs were to prevail at trial and prove damages at four percent of the \$3.50 retail price, damages would be set at 14 cents per Subject Product purchased during the Class Period. The Settlement, however, provides up to \$35 in cash or vouchers<sup>6</sup> without proof of purchase. Class members can thus potentially receive full recovery for the price premium attributable to the purchase of up to 250 Subject Products within the Class Period without providing proof of purchase. Indeed, even if a class member were to make a claim for a single cash award of \$3.50, that class member would recover the price premium attributable to the purchase of 25 products. The

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> The voucher option is valued at "100 cents on the dollar" here because class members are given a choice between choosing cash or vouchers, and because the vouchers have no expiration date, are freely transferrable, and are redeemable at any retailer that sells the Subject Products. *Hendricks v. Starkist Co.*, 2016 WL 5462423, at \*7, \*10 n. 3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016) (finding that "vouchers are valued at 100 cents on the dollar" where the vouchers have no expiration date, are freely transferrable, and are redeemable at any retailer that sells the products).

significant relief provided here clearly favors settlement approval. *See, e.g., Hendricks v. Starkist Co.*, 2016 WL 5462423, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2016) ("Testing showed that there was an average underfill between 4.5% and 16.7%, resulting in damages between 3.87 cents and 14.3 cents per can. A \$1.97 cash payment would provide full recovery for 13 to 50 cans and a voucher of \$4.43 would provide full recovery for 30 to 114 cans. Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of settlement as well.") (citations omitted).

Considering Plaintiffs' damages theories and real risks inherent in continued litigation, the total fund available to pay all claims—\$8,250,000—fits squarely within the "range of reasonableness." See id. The Settlement aims to settle all claims "from March 11, 2011 up to and including the Notice Date." Settlement ¶ 10. From March of 2011 through the end of October of 2016, Millennium sold approximately 274,715,000 bottles of the Subject Products to its distributors. Although the precise amount of bottles sold at retail locations during this time period is not known, it is presumably smaller than the 274 million unit figure due to unsold inventory at retail locations. However, even assuming that all 274 million bottles were sold at retail, and assuming that Plaintiffs could prevail in showing damages at 14 cents per bottle as discussed above, the total maximum recovery available at trial would be roughly \$38 million. Thus, the total fund made available by the Settlement represents more than 21 percent of potentially recovery at trial. This result is certainly "within the range of reasonableness in light of the risks and costs of litigation." See id. ("The \$12,000,000 settlement amount, while consisting only a single-digit percentage of the maximum potential exposure, is reasonable given the stage of the proceedings and the defenses asserted in this action."); Stovall-Gusman v. W.W. Granger, Inc., 2015 WL 3776765, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2015) (granting final approval of a net settlement amount representing 7.3 % of the plaintiffs' potential recovery at trial); Balderas v. Massage Envy Franchising, LLC, 2014 WL

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3610945, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. July 21, 2014) (granting preliminary approval of a net settlement amount representing 5 % of the projected maximum recovery at trial); *Ma v. Covidien Holding, Inc.*, 2914 WL 360196, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2014) (finding a settlement worth 9.1 % of the total value of the action "within the range of reasonableness"). *See also Downey Surgical Clinic, Inc. v. Optuminsight, Inc.*, 2016 WL 5938722 at \*5 (C.D. Cal. May 16, 2016) (*this* Court granting final approval where recovery was as low as 3.21 % of potential recovery at trial).

Further, "claims-made settlements ... are routinely approved by the Ninth Circuit and Courts in California." See Nur v. Tatitlek Support Services, Inc., 2016 WL 3039573, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2016) (characterizing a string-cite of 16 cases as "only a small sample of those cases"). Indeed, this Court granted final approval to a class action settlement with a reversion clause just last year. See Hightower v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., 2015 WL 9664959, at \*7 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 4, 2015). Although the \$8,250,000 fund here is to be distributed on a "claims-made" basis, the Settlement sets aside \$400,000 for notice and claims administration purposes and mandates a minimum 80 percent reach for the notice program. See Settlement ¶ 48. The notice program anticipates email and U.S. mail service, the creation of a settlement website, a toll-free number, an expansive internet banner ad campaign, publication notice, and notice through Millennium's popular social media accounts. See gen. Weisbrot Decl. As in Hightower, Plaintiffs would "not have been able to negotiate a maximum amount of even [\$8,250,000]" if not for the claims-made structure of the Settlement "and have taken methods to increase participation in the Settlement." Hightower, 2015 WL 9664959, at \*7. While there can be no guarantee the entire \$8,250,000 will be depleted, Plaintiffs have structured the Settlement to maximize the chance that every cent of the fund is exhausted.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Class Counsel was also counsel for the settlement class in *Hendricks*, where a substantially similar notice program resulted in over 2.5 million claims. *See Hendricks*, 2016 WL 5462423, at \*3.

### C. Risk of Continuing Litigation

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

As referenced above, proceeding in this litigation in the absence of settlement poses various risks such as failing to certify a class, having summary judgment granted against Plaintiffs, or losing at trial. Such considerations have been found to weigh heavily in favor of settlement. See Rodriguez, 563 F.3d at 966; Curtis-Bauer v. Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc., 2008 WL 4667090, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2008) ("Settlement avoids the complexity, delay, risk and expense of continuing with the litigation and will produce a prompt, certain, and substantial recovery for the Plaintiff class."). Even assuming that Plaintiffs were to survive summary judgment, they would face the risk of establishing liability at trial in light of conflicting expert testimony between their own expert witnesses and Defendants' expert witnesses. In this "battle of experts," it is virtually impossible to predict with any certainty which testimony would be credited, and ultimately, which expert version would be accepted by the jury. The experience of Class Counsel has taught them that these considerations can make the ultimate outcome of a trial highly uncertain. Moreover, even if Plaintiffs prevailed at trial, in light of the possible damage theories that could be presented by both sides, there is a substantial likelihood based on the above analysis that Class Members may be awarded significantly less than is offered to them under this Settlement on an individual basis. By settling, Plaintiffs and the Class avoid these risks, as well as the delays and risks of the appellate process.

## D. Risk of Maintaining Class Action Status

In addition to the risks of continuing the litigation, Plaintiffs would also face risks in certifying a class and maintaining class status through trial. For instance, plaintiffs in other antioxidant labeling cases have never obtained class certification of a damages class. *See, e.g., Lanovaz v. Twinings N. Am., Inc.*, 2014 WL 1652338 at \*1, \*4-\*7 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2014); *Khasin v. R. C. Bigelow, Inc.*, 2016 WL 1213767, at \*1-\*5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2016). Further, Plaintiffs are not aware of a single case where a damages class was certified due to a product's allegedly high

alcohol content. Even assuming that the Court were to grant a motion for class certification, the class could still be decertified at any time. *See In re Netflix Privacy Litig.*, 2013 WL 1120801, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2013) ("The notion that a district court could decertify a class at any time is one that weighs in favor of settlement.") (internal citations omitted). The Settlement eliminates these risks by ensuring Class Members a recovery that is "certain and immediate, eliminating the risk that class members would be left without any recovery ... at all." *Fulford v. Logitech, Inc.*, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29042, at \*8 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2010).

### E. The Extent of Discovery and Status of Proceedings

Under this factor, courts evaluate whether class counsel had sufficient information to make an informed decision about the merits of the case. See In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig., 213 F.3d 454, 459 (9th Cir. 2000). Beginning in June of 2015, Plaintiffs have conducted extensive research, discovery, and investigation, including, without limitation: (i) the review of Defendants' production, including more than a thousand of Millennium's alcohol and antioxidant testing results throughout the Class Period, sales information, distributor information, internal communications, communications with potential customers, and information regarding current and former labeling of the Subject Products; (ii) the review of testing results and other documents produced by the American Herbal Products Association, Inc. and Kombucha Brewers International in response to Plaintiffs' subpoenas; (iii) the review of product tests initiated and paid for by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel; (iv) an in-person inspection of the facilities and equipment of Brewing & Distilling Analytical Services, LLC, one of the laboratories commissioned by Plaintiffs to conduct testing of the Subject Products; (v) the review of other publicly available reports and tests concerning Defendants' products; and (vi) the review of publicly available information regarding Defendants, their business practices and prior litigation. The parties also held numerous telephonic and written

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

discussions regarding Plaintiffs' allegations, discovery and settlement as well as three mediations with Ms. Sperber, with subsequent follow on negotiations after those mediations during which the terms of an agreement were extensively debated and negotiated. The Settlement is thus the result of fully-informed negotiations.

### F. Experience and Views of Counsel

"The recommendations of plaintiffs' counsel should be given a presumption of reasonableness." *In re Omnivision Techs., Inc.*, 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036, 1043 (N.D. Cal. 2008). Deference to Class Counsel's evaluation of the Settlement is appropriate because "[p]arties represented by competent counsel are better positioned than courts to produce a settlement that fairly reflects each party's expected outcome in litigation." *Rodriguez*, 563 F.3d at 967. Here, the Settlement was negotiated by counsel with extensive experience in consumer class action litigation. *See* Fisher Decl. Ex. 2 (firm resume of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.). Based on their experience, Class Counsel concluded that the Settlement provides exceptional results for the class while sparing the class from the uncertainties of continued and protracted litigation.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and should be preliminarily approved.

## VI. THIS COURT SHOULD PROVISIONALLY CERTIFY THE CLASS AND ENTER THE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER

## A. The Proposed Settlement Class Should Be Certified

The Ninth Circuit has recognized that certifying a settlement class to resolve consumer lawsuits is a common occurrence. *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1019. When presented with a proposed settlement, a court must first determine whether the proposed settlement class satisfies the requirements for class certification under Rule 23. In assessing those class certification requirements, a court may properly consider that there will be no trial. *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 620 (1997) ("Confronted with a request for settlement-only class certification, a district court need not inquire whether the case, if tried, would present intractable

CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01801-PSG-AJW

management problems . . . for the proposal is that there be no trial."). For the reasons below, the Class meets the requirements of Rule 23(a) and (b).

### 1. The Class Satisfies Rule 23(a)

### a. <u>Numerosity</u>

Rule 23(a)(1) requires that "the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable." *See* Rule 23(a)(1). "As a general matter, courts have found that numerosity is satisfied when class size exceeds 40 members, but not satisfied when membership dips below 21." *Slaven v. BP Am., Inc.*, 190 F.R.D. 649, 654 (C.D. Cal. 2000). Here, the proposed Class is comprised of millions of consumers who purchased the Subject Products – a number that obviously satisfies the numerosity requirement. Accordingly, the proposed Class is so numerous that joinder of their claims is impracticable.

### b. <u>Commonality</u>

Rule 23(a)(2) requires the existence of "questions of law or fact common to the class." *See* Rule 23(a)(2). Commonality is established if plaintiffs and class members' claims "depend on a common contention," "capable of class-wide resolution ... meaning that determination of its truth or falsity will resolve an issue that is central to the validity of each one of the claims in one stroke." *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 131 S. Ct. 2541, 2551 (2011). Because the commonality requirement may be satisfied by a single common issue, it is easily met. H. Newberg & Conte, 1 Newberg on Class Actions § 3.10, at 3-50 (1992).

There are ample issues of both law and fact here that are common to the members of the Class. All of the Class Members' claims arise from a common nucleus of facts and are based on the same legal theories. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants mislabeled the Subject Products by (1) using the term "antioxidant" on the labels when the products allegedly do not contain antioxidant nutrients, (2) labeling the products as non-alcoholic when in fact they allegedly contain two to

seven times the amount of alcohol permitted for non-alcoholic beverages, and (3) allegedly understating the sugar content of the products. Accordingly, commonality is satisfied by the existence of these common factual issues. *See Arnold v. United Artists Theatre Circuit, Inc.*, 158 F.R.D. 439, 448 (N.D. Cal. 1994) (commonality requirement met by "the alleged existence of common discriminatory practices").

Second, Plaintiffs' claims are brought under legal theories common to the Class as a whole. Alleging a common legal theory alone is enough to establish commonality. *See Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1019 ("All questions of fact and law need not be common to satisfy the rule. The existence of shared legal issues with divergent factual predicates is sufficient, as is a common core of salient facts coupled with disparate legal remedies within the class."). Here, all of the legal theories asserted by Plaintiffs are common to all Class Members. Given that there are virtually no issues of law which affect only individual members of the Class, common issues of law clearly predominate over individual ones. Thus, commonality is satisfied.

## c. <u>Typicality</u>

Rule 23(a)(3) requires that the claims of the representative plaintiffs be "typical of the claims ... of the class." *See* Rule 23(a)(3). "Under the rule's permissive standards, representative claims are 'typical' if they are reasonably coextensive with those of absent class members; they need not be substantially identical." *See Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1020. In short, to meet the typicality requirement, the representative plaintiffs simply must demonstrate that the members of the settlement class have the same or similar grievances. *Gen. Tel. Co. of the Southwest v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 161 (1982).

The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of those of the Class. Like those of the Class, their claims arise out of the purchase of Millennium's kombucha beverages and the alleged mislabeling of those products. Each named Plaintiff purchased several of Millennium's kombucha products and was exposed to the

allegedly false or misleading labels. The named Plaintiffs have precisely the same claims as the Class, and must satisfy the same elements of each of their claims, as must other Class Members. Supported by the same legal theories, the named Plaintiffs and all Class Members share claims based on the same alleged course of conduct. The named Plaintiffs and all Class Members have been injured in the same manner by this conduct. Therefore, Plaintiffs satisfy the typicality requirement.

## d. Adequacy

The final requirement of Rule 23(a) is set forth in subsection (a)(4) which requires that the representative parties "fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class." *See* Rule 23(a)(4). A plaintiff will adequately represent the class where: (1) plaintiffs and their counsel do not have conflicts of interests with other class members; and (2) where plaintiffs and their counsel prosecute the action vigorously on behalf of the class. *See Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 958 (9th Cir. 2003). Moreover, adequacy is presumed where a fair settlement was negotiated at arm'slength. 2 *Newberg on Class Actions, supra*, §11.28, at 11-59.

Class Counsel have vigorously and competently pursued the Class Members' claims. The arm's-length settlement negotiations that took place and the investigation they undertook demonstrate that Class Counsel adequately represent the Class. Moreover, the named Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have no conflicts of interests with the Class. Rather, the named Plaintiffs, like each absent Class Member, have a strong interest in proving Defendants' common course of conduct, and obtaining redress. In pursing this litigation, Class Counsel, as well as the named Plaintiffs, have advanced and will continue to advance and fully protect the common interests of all members of the Class. Class Counsel have extensive experience and expertise in prosecuting complex class actions. Class Counsel are active practitioners who are highly experienced in class action, product liability, and

consumer fraud litigation. *See* Fisher Decl. Ex. 2 (firm resume of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.). Accordingly, Rule 23(a)(4) is satisfied.

### 2. The Class Satisfies Rule 23(b)(3)

In addition to meeting the prerequisites of Rule 23(a), Plaintiffs must also meet one of the three requirements of Rule 23(b) to certify the proposed class. *See Zinser v. Accufix Research Inst., Inc.*, 253 F.3d 1180, 1186 (9th Cir. 2001). Under Rule 23(b)(3), a class action may be maintained if "the court finds that the questions of law or fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy." *See* Rule 23(b)(3). Certification under Rule 23(b)(3) is appropriate and encouraged "whenever the actual interests of the parties can be served best by settling their differences in a single action." *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1022.

### a. <u>Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate</u>

The proposed Class is well-suited for certification under Rule 23(b)(3) because questions common to the Class Members predominate over questions affecting only individual Class Members. Predominance exists "[w]hen common questions present a significant aspect of the case and they can be resolved for all members of the class in a single adjudication." *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1022. As the U.S. Supreme Court has explained, when addressing the propriety of certification of a settlement class, courts take into account the fact that a trial will be unnecessary and that manageability, therefore, is not an issue. *Amchem*, 521 U.S. at 620.

In this case, common questions of law and fact exist and predominate over any individual questions, including in addition to whether this settlement is reasonable (*see Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026-27), *inter alia*: (1) whether Defendants' representations regarding the Subject Products were false and misleading or reasonably likely to deceive consumers; (2) whether the Subject Products are

misbranded; (3) whether Defendants violated the CLRA, UCL, FAL and NY GBL §349; (4) whether Defendants breached an express or implied warranty; (5) whether Defendants had defrauded Plaintiff and the Class Members; and (6) whether the Class has been injured by the wrongs complained of, and if so, whether Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to damages, injunctive and/or other equitable relief, including restitution or disgorgement, and if so, the nature and amount of such relief.

### b. <u>A Class Action Is the Superior Mechanism for</u> Adjudicating This Dispute

The class mechanism is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of the Class Members. Each individual Class Member may lack the resources to undergo the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessary to establish Defendants' liability. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and multiplies the burden on the judicial system presented by the complex legal and factual issues of this case. Individualized litigation also presents a potential for inconsistent or contradictory judgments. In contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

Moreover, since this action will now settle, the Court need not consider issues of manageability relating to trial. *See Amchem*, 521 U.S. at 620 ("Confronted with a request for settlement-only class certification, a district court need not inquire whether the case, if tried, would present intractable management problems, see Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 23(b)(3)(D), for the proposal is that there be no trial."). Accordingly, common questions predominate and a class action is the superior method of adjudicating this controversy.

## 3. The Class Also Satisfies Rule 23(b)(2)

The proposed class is also well suited for certification under Rule 23(b)(2). *See gen. Lilly v. Jamba Juice Co.*, 2015 WL 1248027 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2015)

# Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-1 Filed 11/18/16 Page 28 of 31 Page ID #:1865

## VII. THE PROPOSED NOTICE PROGRAM CONSTITUTES ADEQUATE NOTICE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

Once preliminary approval of a class action settlement is granted, notice must be directed to class members. For class actions certified under Rule 23(b)(3), "the court must direct to class members the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort." Rule 23(c)(2)(B). In addition, Rule 23(e)(1) applies to any class settlement and requires the Court to "direct notice in a reasonable manner to all class members who would be bound by a proposal." Rule 23(e)(1).

When a court is presented with class notice pursuant to a settlement, both the class certification notice and notice of settlement may be combined in the same notice. *Manual*, § 21.633 at 321-22 ("For economy, the notice under Rule 23(c)(2) and the Rule 23(e) notice are sometimes combined."). This notice allows Class Members to decide whether to opt out of or participate in the class and/or to object to the Settlement and argue against final approval by the Court. *Id*. The proposed notice program here, which is described in detail in the Fisher and Weisbrot Declarations, informs the Class of their rights and includes a comprehensive plan for delivery of notice by e-mail, U.S. Mail, a settlement website, publication in the California edition of USA Today, and Internet banner ads and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances of this case.

The Notices accurately inform Class Members of the salient terms of the Settlement, the Class to be certified, the final approval hearing and the rights of all parties, including the rights to file objections and to opt out of the class. The Parties in this case have created and agreed to perform the following forms of notice, which will satisfy both the substantive and manner of distribution requirements of Rule 23 and due process. *See* Exs. E and F to the Settlement, at Fisher Decl. Ex. 1:

**Email and U.S. Mail Notice:** A notice substantially in the form attached as Exhibit E to the Settlement shall be e-mailed or mailed to the last known e-mail address or U.S. mailing address of any Class Member whose contact

information is reasonably available to Millennium. E-Mail Notice will be followed by U.S. Mail Notice to any recipient for whom E-Mail Notice is unsuccessful.

**Settlement Website:** The parties will post a copy of the Long Form Notice (Ex. 3) on a website to be maintained by the Administrator, which will additionally contain the settlement documents, an online claim form, a list of important dates, and any other information to which the parties may agree. The website shall also contain a Settlement Email Address and Settlement Telephone Number, where Class Members can submit questions and receive further information and assistance.

Internet Banner Ad Campaign: The Administrator will implement an Internet banner ad campaign that contains an embedded link to the Settlement Website, which will be designed to reach at least 85% of the Class Members, without even taking account of other forms of notice contemplated by the notice program. The internet banner ad campaign is estimated to result in more than 12,900,000 impressions. Weisbrot Decl. ¶¶ 10, 18.

**Publication Notice:** The parties shall supplement direct notice by publishing the Summary Notice, attached as Exhibit F to the Settlement, for four consecutive weeks in the California edition of USA Today. The Summary Notice shall not be less than 1/4 of a page in size.

**Millennium's Social Media Accounts:** Millennium has also agreed to post a link to the Settlement website on its company website and on its Facebook, Instagram and Twitter pages. *Id.* ¶ 22.

**CAFA Notice:** The parties shall also cause to be disseminated the notice to public officials required by the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA") in accordance with the provisions of that Act. Id.  $\P$  8.

This proposed notice program provides a fair opportunity for Class Members to obtain full disclosure of the conditions of the Settlement and to make an informed decision regarding the Settlement. This notice program is designed to reach at least 85 percent of the Class Members. Weisbrot Decl. ¶ 22. Thus, the notices and notice procedures amply satisfy the requirements of due process.

### VIII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel respectfully request that the Court grant preliminary approval, provisionally certify the Class, approve the proposed notice plan, and enter the Proposed Preliminary Approval Order.

# Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-1 Filed 11/18/16 Page 31 of 31 Page ID #:1868

BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.  By:	1	Dated: November 18, 2016	Respectfully submitted,
By:	2		
L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626) Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 272996) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295032 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 Email: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com  4ttorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	3		, , ,
L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626) Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 272996) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295032 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 Email: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com  4ttorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	4		By: <u>/s/L. Timothy Fisher</u> L. Timothy Fisher
Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 272996) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295032 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 Email: Itfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  4 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	5		·
1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 Email: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	6		Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 272996)
Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 Email: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	7		1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940
Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 Email: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com ykrivoshey@bursor.com  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	8		
10	9		Facsimile: (925) 407-2700
11 12	10		apersinger@bursor.com
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	11		, , , ,
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	12		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	13		
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	14		
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	15		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	16		
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	17		
<ul> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ul>	18		
<ul> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ul>	19		
22 23 24 25	20		
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	21		
24 25	22		
25	23		
	24		
26	25		
II	26		
27	27		
PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDIIM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT 2	28		S AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT 26

Case	2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW [	Document 103-2 #:1869	Filed 11/18/16	Page 1 of 3 Page ID
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	SCOTT M. VOELZ (S.B svoelz@omm.com DANIEL J. FARIA (S.B. dfaria@omm.com O'MELVENY & MYER 400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, California Telephone: (213) 430-66 Facsimile: (213) 430-64 Attorneys for Defendants Millennium Products, Inc.	#285158) S LLP 90071-2899 900 407		
9	UNI	TED STATES	DISTRICT CO	DÚRT
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
12	IONA THAN DETTA		C N 15 C	NA 1001 DGC A INV
13	JONATHAN RETTA, et			V-1801-PSG-AJW
14 15	Plaint v.	iffs,	SUPPORT OF PRELIMINA	ON OF GT DAVE IN F MOTION FOR RY APPROVAL OF ON SETTLEMENT
16	MILLENNIUM PRODU	CTS, INC.,		hilip S. Gutierrez
17	Defen	dants.	FAC Filed: Ju	
18			Trial Date: No	ot Set
19 20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
20			DAVE	DECLARATION ISO MOT. FOR

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

## DECLARATION OF GT DAVE

- I, George Thomas "GT" Dave, hereby declare and state as follows:
- I am the founder of Millennium Products, Inc. ("Millennium") and have been its Chief Executive Officer since 1994. I submit this declaration in support of preliminary approval of the Stipulation of Class Action Settlement in the above-captioned action. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein and could testify to them if called upon to do so.
- Millennium is the manufacturer of the "GT's Classic Kombucha" and "GT's Enlightened Kombucha" products at issue in this action ("Products").
- Millennium is a manufacturer of kombucha beverages and, with few 3. exceptions, does not ship and/or distribute such beverages for resale directly to retailers. Instead, Millennium ships and/or distributes products to third-party distributors, who in turn receive and process purchase orders and ship Millennium products to retailers. These third-party distributors ship products to many different combinations of states and do not provide Millennium with records sufficient to show to what states Millennium products were shipped and when. As a result, Millennium does not have business records sufficient to show which specific Products were sold in any particular state at any given time.
- 4. As a manufacturer and not a retailer, Millennium does not set the retail price for the Products. Within the exception of a few local stores who receive shipments of the Products directly from Millennium, Millennium sells the Products to distribution companies who subsequently ship them to downstream retailers nationwide. These downstream retailers set the retail price for the Products.
- Based on my observation of sales trends for the Products, in my 5. capacity of the Chief Executive Officer of Millennium, the retail price of the Products has varied significantly over time and between states, and even within stores in the same market due to varying promotions offered by retailers.

-	[2] 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12					
Case	2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-2 Filed 11/18/16 Page 3 of 3 Page ID #:1871					
1	6. Based on my observation of sales trends for the Products, in my					
2	capacity of the Chief Executive Officer of Millennium, the retail price of the					
3	Products has generally varied between \$2.99 and \$3.99 throughout the class period					
4	for this action (which I am informed is March 2011 through present).					
5	7. Based on my review of Millennium's records, including sales records					
6	produced to Plaintiffs in discovery, Millennium has sold approximately					
7	274,715,600 units of the Products at issue in this Action since March 2011.					
8	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the					
9	best of my knowledge, information, and belief.					
10	Executed this Ath day of November, 2016 at Vernon, California.					
11						
12	CT Davis					
13	GT Dave					
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27 28						
20	DAVE DECLARATION ISO MOT. FO					

1 2 3 4 5 6	BURSOR & FISHER, P.A. L. Timothy Fisher (State Bar No. 191626) Annick M. Persinger (State Bar No. 27299) Yeremey O. Krivoshey (State Bar No. 295) 1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 300-4455 Facsimile: (925) 407-2700 E-Mail: ltfisher@bursor.com apersinger@bursor.com	96)					
7	ykrivoshey@bursor.com						
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs						
9							
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
11							
12							
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JONATHAN RETTA, KIRSTEN SCHOFIELD, and JESSICA MANIRE on Behalf of Themselves and all Others Similarly Situated,  Plaintiffs, v.  MILLENNIUM PRODUCTS, INC., and WHOLE FOODS MARKET, INC.,  Defendants.	Case No. 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW  DECLARATION OF L. TIMOTHY FISHER IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT  Date: January 30, 2017 Time: 1:30 p.m. Courtroom 880  Judge: Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez					
223 224 225 226 227 228							

DECLARATION OF L. TIMOTHY FISHER CASE NO. 2:15-CV-01801-PSG-AJW

# 2

4

67

8

1011

1213

1415

16

1718

19

2021

2223

24

2526

2728

#### **DECLARATION OF L. TIMOTHY FISHER**

- I, L. Timothy Fisher, declare as follows:
- 1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of California. I am a member of the bar of this Court, and I am a partner at Bursor & Fisher, P.A., counsel for Plaintiffs in this action. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Provisional Certification of Nationwide Settlement Class, and Approval of Procedure for and Form of Notice. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, and, if called as a witness, could and would competently testify thereto under oath.
- Bursor & Fisher, P.A. ("Class Counsel"), working in tandem with 2. attorneys at Lehrman Beverage Law, PLLC, conducted extensive research, discovery, and investigation during the prosecution of this Action, including, without limitation: (i) the review of Defendants' production, including more than a thousand of Millennium's alcohol and antioxidant testing results throughout the Class Period, sales information, distributor information, internal communications, communications with potential customers, and information regarding current and former labeling of the Subject Products; (ii) the review of testing results and other documents produced by the American Herbal Products Association, Inc. and Kombucha Brewers International in response to Plaintiffs' subpoenas; (iii) the review of product tests initiated and paid for by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel; (iv) an in-person inspection of the facilities and equipment of Brewing & Distilling Analytical Services, LLC, one of the laboratories commissioned by Plaintiffs to conduct testing of the Subject Products; (v) the review of other publicly available reports and tests concerning Defendants' products; and (vi) the review of publicly available information regarding Defendants, their business practices and prior litigation.
- 3. Class Counsel and counsel for Defendants have engaged in substantial arm's length negotiations in an effort to resolve the Action over a period of roughly

eight months, including conducting numerous telephone conferences, and three mediations before Jill Sperber, Esq. of Judicate West with subsequent follow-up negotiations, during which the terms of an agreement were extensively discussed and debated.

- 4. This Settlement constitutes an excellent recovery for Class members, and is within the reasonable range of probable recoveries. Defendants have agreed to provide up to \$8,250,000 to pay claims for those who purchased one or more flavors of the Subject Products on a claims-made basis. <sup>1</sup> Class Members can receive a \$3.50 cash payment for each bottle of every Subject Product purchased up to 10 bottles (\$35) without Proof of Purchase. Alternatively, Class Members can choose a product voucher redeemable for a free Millennium product for each bottle of every Subject Product purchased up to 10 bottles without Proof of Purchase. For claims administration purposes, these vouchers will be assigned a value of \$3.50, although their value may be higher or lower depending on the point of sale at issue. <sup>2</sup> Product Vouchers will have no expiration date and will be redeemable for any Subject Product at no cost. Class Members with Proof of Purchase can receive up to \$60 in cash or \$60 in product vouchers at the actual retail price they paid.
- 5. The Parties propose that Angeion Group shall serve as the Settlement Administrator. The Parties will work with the Settlement Administer to develop a notice program designed to achieve at least 80% reach. As discussed in detail in the Weisbrot Declaration, the Parties expect that the notice program will in fact achieve at least an 85% reach. The notice program will consist of a Summary Notice to be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same definitions as set out in the Settlement. *See* Fisher Decl. Ex. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> According to information and belief, Millennium does not provide MSRP amounts for the Subject Products to its various distributors, and, accordingly, there is no uniform retail price. Millennium estimates that the average retail price of the Subject Products is between \$2.99 to \$3.99. See Decl. of GT Dave at ¶ 4-6. Thus, \$3.50 was chosen as the closest approximation of the average retail price. This figure comports with Plaintiffs' personal experiences in purchasing the Subject Products.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

published on the Settlement Website and once a week, for four successive weeks, in the California edition of USA Today. The notice program will also have an expansive internet advertising component, consisting of both digital banner ads and links to the Settlement Website on Millennium's website and on its Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter accounts. The Settlement Administrator will also establish a Settlement Website where Class Members will be able to submit claims and receive notice regarding all applicable deadlines, the Agreement, Class Notice, all papers filed by the Parties in support of the settlement, orders pertaining to the settlement, and contact information for reaching the Settlement Administrator via a toll-free telephone number, e-mail, and U.S. mail. Further, the Settlement Agreement mandates that Millennium provide direct notice to all Class Members that can be identified through reasonable effort. The Parties and the Claims Administrator will also cause to be disseminated the notice to public officials required by the Class Action Fairness Act ("CAFA") in accordance with the provisions of that Act. 6. Class Counsel have vigorously and competently pursued the Class Members' claims. The arm's-length settlement negotiations that took place and the

6. Class Counsel have vigorously and competently pursued the Class Members' claims. The arm's-length settlement negotiations that took place and the investigation they undertook demonstrate that Class Counsel adequately represent the Class. Moreover, the named Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have no conflicts of interests with the Class. Rather, the named Plaintiffs, like each absent Class Member, have a strong interest in proving Defendants' common course of conduct, and obtaining redress. In pursing this litigation, Class Counsel, as well as the named Plaintiffs, have advanced and will continue to advance and fully protect the common interests of all members of the Class. Class Counsel have extensive experience and expertise in prosecuting complex class actions. Class Counsel are active practitioners who are highly experienced in class action, product liability, and consumer fraud litigation.

- 7. Although Plaintiffs and Class Counsel had confidence in their claims, a favorable outcome was not assured. They also recognize that they will face risks at class certification, summary judgment, and trial. Defendants vigorously deny Plaintiffs' allegations and assert that neither Plaintiffs nor the Class suffered any harm or damages. In addition, Defendants would no doubt present a vigorous defense at trial, and there is no assurance that the Class would prevail or even if they did, that they would not be able to obtain an award of damages significantly more than achieved here absent such risks. Thus, in the eyes of Class Counsel, the proposed Settlement provides the Class with an outstanding opportunity to obtain significant relief at this stage in the litigation. The Settlement Agreement also abrogates the risks that might prevent them from obtaining relief.
- 8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 1** is a true and correct copy of the Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and exhibits thereto (the "Settlement Agreement").
- 9. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 2** is a true and correct copy of the firm resume of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on November 18, 2016 at Walnut Creek, California.

/s/ L. Timothy Fisher
L. Timothy Fisher

Ca	se 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW	Document 103-3 #:1878	Filed 11/18/16	Page 7 of 139	Page ID			
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11		UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
12	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA							
13 14								
15	JONATHAN RETTA et al	<i>l.</i> ,	Case No. 2:15-C	V-01801-PSG-	AJW			
16	Plaintif	ffs,	STIPULATION ACTION SETT	OF CLASS LEMENT				
17	V.		Judge: Hon. Phi	lip S. Gutierrez				
18	MILLENNIUM PRODUCT	eTS, Inc., et	5AC Filed: June	27, 2016				
19	Defendants							
20								
21								
22								
23								
<ul><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>								
26								
27								
28								

STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Subject to Court approval pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs Jonathan Retta, Kirsten Schofield, and Jessica Manire ("Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and each of the Class Members, and Defendants Millennium Products, Inc. ("Millennium") and Whole Foods Market, Inc. ("Whole Foods") ("Defendants") (collectively, the "Parties"), by and through their respective counsel, authorized to settle this Action on their behalf, in consideration for and subject to the promises, terms, and conditions contained in this Stipulation of Class Action Settlement ("Agreement"), hereby stipulate and agree, as follows:

### I. <u>RECITALS</u>

- A. On March 11, 2015, Plaintiffs filed a proposed nationwide (or, in the alternative, California and New York) class action lawsuit against Millennium in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, Case No. 15-CV-1801-PSG-AJW, which asserted claims for violations of the California Consumers Legal Remedies Act (Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1750, et seq.) ("CLRA"), California's Unfair Competition Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200, et seq.) (the "UCL"), California's False Advertising Law (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17500, et seq.) (the "FAL"), New York's Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act, and the New York General Business Law § 349 ("NYGBL"), that related to the advertising, labeling, and marketing of the antioxidant content of the Subject Products.
- B. On April 28, 2015, Millennium filed a motion to dismiss or strike the above-referenced complaint. In response, on May 19, 2015 Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint asserting additional facts regarding their claims for injunctive relief, standing, and clarifying the details regarding their purchases of Millennium's products.
- C. On June 19, 2015, Millennium filed a motion to dismiss or strike Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, which the Court granted in part (as to claims for injunctive relief) and denied in part (as to the remainder of the claims at issue). In response, on October 2, 2015, Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint pleading

additional facts in support of their claims for injunctive relief.

- D. After commissioning two independent laboratories to test the alcohol content of Millennium products and several months of ongoing investigation, Plaintiffs filed a Third Amended Complaint adding claims regarding the purported alcohol content of Millennium products and Millennium's alleged failure to provide federal alcohol warnings regarding the same on October 8, 2015. Millennium answered the Third Amended Complaint on November 3, 2015.
- E. On February 11, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a Fourth Amended Complaint adding Whole Foods as a Defendant. Millennium answered the Fourth Amended Complaint on February 29, 2016 and Whole Foods moved to dismiss the Fourth Amended Complaint on April 7, 2016.
- F. After discovery of a recent study concerning the sugar content of Millennium products and further investigation, Plaintiffs filed a Fifth Amended Complaint on June 22, 2016 adding additional claims for damages and injunctive relief and pleading additional causes of action regarding Millennium's alleged failure to correctly state the sugar content of its products on the labels of the products. The Fifth Amended Complaint asserted claims for violations of the CLRA, UCL, FAL, and NYGBL, and for breach of express warranty, breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, negligent misrepresentation, fraud, and unjust enrichment. Millennium answered the Fifth Amended Complaint on July 6, 2016 and Whole Foods moved to dismiss the Fifth Amended Complaint on July 11, 2016.
- G. Before entering into this Agreement, the Parties exchanged and met and conferred concerning several sets of discovery requests, including interrogatories and requests for production. In response, Millennium produced thousands of pages of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Whole Foods Market, Inc. moved to dismiss, in part, on the grounds that as a Texas holding company with no business operations, employees or any other contact with the state of California, it is not subject to the jurisdiction of the courts in California. This stipulation shall in no way be interpreted to waive future challenges Whole Foods Market, Inc. has to jurisdiction in California.

documents to Plaintiffs, including Millennium's test results, sales information, distributor information, internal communications, communications with potential customers, and information regarding current and former labeling of its products. Plaintiffs also produced documents to Millennium, including their test results, consumer surveys, consumer research, and other materials. Plaintiffs also served subpoenas pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 45 on American Herbal Products Association, Inc. and Kombucha Brewers International. After an extensive meet and confer process, the American Herbal Products, Inc. and Kombucha Brewers International produced testing results concerning Millennium's products and other information. Plaintiffs reviewed all of the documents produced by Millennium, American Herbal Products Association, Inc. and Kombucha Brewers International as well as documents and information obtained through their own research and investigation.

- H. Before entering into this Agreement, the Parties, by and through their respective counsel, conducted a thorough examination, investigation, and evaluation of the relevant law, facts, and allegations to assess the merits of the claims and potential claims to determine the strength of liability, potential remedies, and all defenses thereto, including an extensive investigation into the facts and law relating to (i) label design and product formulation; (ii) the marketing and advertising of the products; (iii) sales, pricing, and financial data; and (iv) the sufficiency of the claims and appropriateness of class certification.
- I. This Agreement was reached as a result of extensive arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and their counsel. The Parties have engaged in extensive settlement discussions to determine if the Parties could reach a resolution short of protracted litigation. This included a full day of mediation before Jill R. Sperber, Esq. of Judicate West on March 25, 2016, several weeks of follow-on settlement discussions amongst counsel, and a further half day of mediation with Ms. Sperber via telephone on May 20, 2016 before a settlement in principle was reached.
  - J. On August 11, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Preliminary Approval

4 5

6

7 8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

> 25 26

27 28 of Class Action Settlement. On September 21, 2016, the Court denied the motion for preliminary approval.

- K. After the Court's order, the Parties renewed their settlement negotiations to address the Court's concerns stated in the September 21, 2016 Order. On October 7, 2016, Plaintiffs and Millennium participated in another mediation with Jill R. Sperber, Esq. of Judicate West, where the Plaintiffs and Millennium were able to reach another settlement agreement in principle.
- After the Parties reached another settlement in principle as to all claims L. for monetary relief set forth in Section IV(A) of this agreement, and all injunctive relief concerning Plaintiffs' antioxidant, alcohol, and sugar labeling claims set forth in Section IV(B)(a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this agreement, the Parties met and conferred with opposing counsel in Pedro et al. v. Millennium Products, Inc., Case No. 16-cv-03780-PSG-AJW (C.D. Cal 2016). During these negotiations, the Parties stated their position that the claims asserted in *Pedro* are subsumed within the *Retta* matter, and *Pedro* plaintiffs stated their position that the *Retta* action, although addressing the bulk of their claims, did not address a remaining claim for injunctive relief with respect to their allegations that the bottles of Millennium's products leak, fizz, or spill due to potential pressure buildup. As a result of these negotiations, the Parties agreed that additional injunctive relief set out in Section IV(B)(f) of this agreement would be provided by the *Retta* settlement to address the *Pedro* plaintiffs' remaining claim. Before and during these settlement negotiations, the Parties had an arm's-length exchange of sufficient information to permit Plaintiffs and their counsel to evaluate the claims and potential defenses and to meaningfully conduct informed settlement discussions.
- Based upon their review, investigation, and evaluation of the facts and N. law relating to the matters alleged in the pleadings, Plaintiffs, as settlement class representatives, believe that the claims settled herein have merit. However, they and their counsel recognize and acknowledge the expense and length of continued

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- O. Defendants deny and continue to deny all charges of wrongdoing or liability against them arising out of any of the conduct, statements, acts or omissions alleged, or that could have been alleged, in the Action. Defendants specifically deny all allegations that the Subject Products (i) did not contain antioxidants as labeled at any time; (ii) owing to their specific alcohol content, failed to bear alcohol warnings required by any applicable laws; (iii) failed to accurately state their sugar content; or (iv) caused spillage, leakage, spoilage, or other product loss owing to the secondary fermentation of the Subject Products. Whole Foods further denies that Whole Foods' retail locations (which are wholly owned and operated by subsidiaries of Whole Foods Market, Inc.) can be held liable, in whole or in part, for the acts and omissions alleged in the Action, as these retail locations merely sell the Subject Products, and do not manufacture or label them. As a result, Defendants believe they cannot be held liable for any of the alleged conduct, statements, acts, or omissions at issue in the Action.
  - P. Defendants also denied and continue to deny, amongst other things,

16 17 18

19

20 21 22

25

23

24

26 27

28

allegations that Plaintiffs, the Class, or any member of the Class have suffered damage or harm by reason of any alleged conduct, statement, act, or omission of Defendants, or that Plaintiffs could establish damages or entitlement to injunctive relief on a classwide basis. Defendants further have denied and continue to deny that the Action meets the requisites for certification as a class action under federal, California, or New York law, except for purposes of settlement, or that the evidence is sufficient to support a finding of liability on an individual or classwide basis. Nonetheless, Defendants have concluded that further defense of the Action would be protracted and expensive, and that it is desirable that the Action be fully and finally settled in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement. Defendants also have taken into account the uncertainty and risks inherent in any litigation. Defendants, therefore, have determined that it is desirable and beneficial to it that the Action be settled in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement.

Q. This Agreement, and the proposed certification, for settlement purposes only, of the Class, effectuates the resolution of disputed claims and is for settlement purposes only.

NOW THEREFORE, it is hereby STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between the Parties, through their respective counsel, that: (a) the Action and all Released Claims be fully and finally compromised, settled, and released upon final settlement approval by the Court after the hearings as provided for in this Agreement; and (b) upon such approval by the Court, a Final Order and Final Judgment, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, respectively, be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice upon the following terms and conditions:

#### **DEFINITIONS** II.

As used in this Agreement and the attached exhibits, the following terms have the following meanings, unless this Agreement specifically provides otherwise. Other capitalized terms used in this Agreement but not defined below shall have the

3 4

5 6 7

8

9

10 11

13

14

15

12

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

21

24 25

26

27 28 meaning ascribed to them in this Agreement and the exhibits attached hereto:

- 1. "Action" shall mean the proposed class action lawsuit entitled *Retta et* al. v. Millennium Products, Inc., Case No. 15-CV-1801-PSG-AJW pending in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.
- "Agreement" means this Stipulation of Settlement and its exhibits, 2. attached hereto and incorporated herein, including all subsequent amendments agreed to in writing by the Parties and any exhibits to such amendments.
- 3. "Attorneys' Fees and Expenses" means such funds as may be awarded by the Court to Plaintiffs' Counsel to compensate Plaintiffs' Counsel for their fees and expenses in connection with the Action and the Settlement, as described more particularly in Section VI of this Agreement.
- "Authorized Claimant" means a member of the Class who timely 4. submits a valid Claim Form in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.
- 5. "Claim Deadline," means the final time and date by which a valid Claim Form must be postmarked or received by the Settlement Administrator for a Class Member to be eligible for any of the settlement consideration contemplated in this Agreement. The Claim Deadline shall be clearly set forth in the Court orders granting preliminary and final approval of the Settlement, the Long Form Notice and Summary Notice, on the Settlement Website, and on the front page of the Claim Form.
- 6. "Claim Form" means the proof of claim and release form(s), substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C, the format of which may be modified to meet the requirements of the Settlement Administrator, to be submitted by Class Members seeking to recover settlement consideration pursuant to this Agreement.
- 7. "Class" means all persons in the United States and United States Territories who purchased at retail one or more of the Subject Products during the Class Period. Specifically excluded from the Class are: (a) Defendants and their

employees, principals, officers, directors, agents, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (b) the judges to whom the Action has been or is assigned and any members of their immediate families; (c) those who purchased the Subject Products for the purpose of re-sale; and (d) all persons who have filed a timely Request for Exclusion from the Class.

- 8. "Class Member(s)" means any member of the Class.
- 9. "Class Notice" means, collectively, the Long Form Notice and Summary Notice provided to the Class as provided herein and directed by the Court, and the Internet advertising to be facilitated by the Settlement Administrator.
- 10. "Class Period" means the period from March 11, 2011 up to and including the Notice Date.
- 11. "Court" means the United States District Court for the Central District of California and all judges assigned to the Action.
- 12. "Defense Counsel" means the law firms of O'Melveny & Myers LLP as to Millennium and LTL Attorneys LLP as to Whole Foods.
- 13. "Effective Date" means the first date after which all of the following events and conditions have been met or have occurred:
  - (a) The Court has entered the Preliminary Approval Order;
  - (b) The Court has entered the Final Order and Final Judgment;
- (c) Unless the Parties otherwise agree in writing to waive all or any portions of the following provision, there has occurred: (i) in the event there is a properly and timely filed objection to entry of the Final Order and Final Judgment, the expiration (without the filing or noticing of an appeal) of the time to appeal from the Final Order and Final Judgment; (ii) if the Final Order and Final Judgment is appealed, the final dismissal of an appeal from the Final Order and Final Judgment or the affirmance on appeal of the Final Order and Final Judgment in its entirety; (iii) if a ruling or decision is entered by an appellate court affirming the Final Order and Final Judgment, the time to petition for a writ of certiorari with respect to such ruling

- or decision has expired; or (iv) if a petition for a writ of certiorari with respect to the Final Order and Final Judgment is filed, the petition has been denied or dismissed or, if granted, has resulted in affirmance of the Final Order and Final Judgment in substantial form.
- 14. "Fairness Hearing" means the hearing that is to take place after the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order and after the Notice Date for purposes of: (a) determining the fairness, adequacy and reasonableness of the Agreement in accordance with applicable jurisprudence; (b) if the Court so decides, entering the Final Order and Final Judgment and dismissing the Action with prejudice; (c) ruling upon an application by Class Counsel for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Plaintiffs' incentive awards. The Parties shall request that the Court schedule the Fairness Hearing for a date that is in compliance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1715(d).
- 15. "Final Order and Final Judgment" means the Court's order and judgment fully and finally approving the Settlement and dismissing the Action with prejudice, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibits A and B.
- 16. "Long Form Notice" means the long form notice of settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit E.
- 17. "Millennium" means Millennium Products, Inc., and includes, without limitation all related entities, including but not limited to parents, subsidiaries, agents, employees and assigns, predecessors, successors and affiliates of Millennium Products, Inc., and their related entities and owners, including George Thomas Dave.
- 18. "Net Cash Amount" means the value derived by subtracting the value of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses to be awarded to Plaintiffs' Counsel, any incentive awards to be awarded to any Plaintiffs or Related Plaintiffs, and any Settlement Administration Expenses from eight million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$8,250,000).
  - 19. "Notice Date" means the first date upon which the Class Notice is

- 20. "Objection Deadline" means the date, to be set by the Court, by which Class Members must file objections, if any, to the Agreement in accordance with Section IX of this Agreement. The Parties shall request that the Court set an Objection Deadline coinciding with the Opt Out Date.
- 21. "Opt Out Date" means the date, to be set by the Court, by which a Request For Exclusion must be sent to Settlement Administrator for a Class Member to be excluded from the Settlement Class. The Parties shall request that the Court set an Opt Out Date coinciding with the Objection Deadline.
- 22. "Parties" means Plaintiffs, Millennium, and Whole Foods collectively, as each of those terms are defined in this Agreement.
- 23. "Plaintiffs" means Jonathan Retta, Kirsten Schofield, and Jessica Manire.
- 24. "Plaintiffs' Counsel" and/or "Class Counsel" means the law firm of Bursor & Fisher, P.A.
- 25. "Preliminary Approval Order" means the order, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit D, conditionally certifying, for settlement purposes only, the Class; appointing Plaintiffs' Counsel as counsel for the Class; setting the date of the Fairness Hearing; preliminarily approving this Agreement; approving the Class Notice program and Claim Form; and setting dates for the Claim Deadline, Opt Out Date, Objection Deadline, and Notice Date.
- 26. "Proof of Purchase" means receipts, Millennium packaging, or other documentation from a third-party commercial source reasonably establishing the purchase during the Class Period of one or more of the Subject Products. Packaging, including bar codes or UPCs, shall constitute Proof of Purchase only if the Subject Product(s) claimed to have been purchased by the Class Member can be identified from the packaging submitted.
  - 27. "Related Actions" means Samet v. Millennium Products, Inc., No. 1-15-

9

12 13

15

16

14

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

- CV-286908 (Santa Clara Sup. Ct. 2015), Pedro et al. v. Millennium Products, Inc., Case No. 16-cv-03780-PSG-AJW (C.D. Cal 2016), and Hood v. Millennium Products, Inc., No. 1-15-CV-286910 (Santa Clara Sup. Ct. 2015).
- 28. "Related Plaintiffs" means Janet Hood, Rosalind Lewis, Nina Pedro, and Sarah Samet.
- 29. "Released Claims" means and includes any and all claims, (a) demands, rights, damages, obligations, suits, debts, liens, and causes of action under common law or statutory law (federal, state, or local) of every nature and description whatsoever, monetary, injunctive, or equitable, ascertained or unascertained, suspected or unsuspected, existing or claimed to exist, including Unknown Claims as of the Notice Date by Plaintiffs and all Class Members (and Plaintiffs' and Class Members' respective heirs, guardians, executors, administrators, representatives, agents, attorneys, partners, successors, predecessors-in-interest, and assigns) that:
  - (i) were asserted or that could have been reasonably asserted in the Action against the Released Parties (as hereinafter defined), or any of them, and that arise out of or are related in any way to any or all of the acts, omissions, facts, matters, transactions, or occurrences that were or could have been directly or indirectly alleged or referred to in the Action (including, but not limited to, alleged violations of the CLRA, UCL, FAL, NYGBL or similar laws of any state or United States territory, and alleged claims for injunctive relief, breach of warranty, breach of the implied warranty of merchantability, negligent misrepresentation, fraud, and unjust enrichment); or
  - were asserted or that could have been reasonably asserted by any Class (ii) Member against the Released Parties (as hereinafter defined), or any of them, and that arise out of or are related in any way to any or all of the acts, omissions, facts, matters, transactions, or occurrences that were or could have been directly or indirectly alleged or referred to, including all claims for monetary, injunctive, or equitable relief that relate in any way to

- communications, disclosures, representations, statements, claims, nondisclosures and/or omissions, packaging, advertising, labeling, and/or marketing of or concerning the Subject Products, in the Related Actions; or (iii) relate in any way to communications, disclosures, representations, statements, claims, nondisclosures and/or omissions, packaging, advertising, labeling, and/or marketing of or concerning the Subject Products related to the nutritional value and/or content, including but not limited to the antioxidant content, of the Subject Products, including, but not limited to statements that the Subject Products contain "antioxidants," "powerful antioxidants," or "more antioxidants than blueberries," made through any medium; or
- (iv) relate in any way to communications, disclosures, representations, statements, claims, nondisclosures and/or omissions, packaging, advertising, labeling, testing, and/or marketing of or concerning the Subject Products related to the alleged alcohol content of the products; or
- (v) relate in any way to communications, disclosures, representations, statements, claims, nondisclosures and/or omissions, packaging, advertising, labeling, testing, and/or marketing of or concerning the Subject Products related to the consequences of continued fermentation of the products, including but not limited to the consequences of continued fermentation of the products, including but not limited to the consequences of excessive carbonation, bottle pressure, or product spillage, leakage, or spoilage; or
- (vi) relate in any way to communications, disclosures, representations, statements, claims, nondisclosures and/or omissions, packaging, advertising, labeling, testing, and/or marketing of or concerning the Subject Products related to the alleged sugar content of the products.
- (b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, "Released Claims" do not include claims for personal injuries. Plaintiffs and Class Members are not releasing any claims, demands, rights, damages, obligations, suits, debts, liens,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 30. "Released Parties" shall be defined and construed broadly to effectuate a complete and comprehensive release, and means Millennium and any entity that made, manufactured, tested, inspected, audited, certified, purchased, distributed, supplied, licensed, transported, donated, marketed, advertised, promoted, sold or offered for sale any Subject Product, including but not limited to Whole Foods, Target Corporation, Costco Wholesale Corporation, Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., the Kroger Company, Safeway, Inc., and Albertsons, Inc., other distributors or retailers, or any entity that contributed to any labeling, sale, distribution, supply, advertising, marketing, or packaging of any Product, including all of their respective predecessors, successors, assigns, parents, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, and affiliates, and any and all of their past, present and future officers, directors, employees, shareholders, partners, principals, agents, servants, successors, attorneys, insurers, representatives, licensees, licensors, customers, subrogees and assigns. It is expressly understood that, to the extent a Released Party is not a Party to this Agreement, all such Released Parties are intended third party beneficiaries of this Agreement.
- 31. "Releasing Parties" means Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' Counsel, and all Class Members, and any person claiming by or through each Class Member, including but not limited to spouses, children, wards, heirs, devisees, legatees, invitees, employees, associates, co-owners, attorneys, agents, administrators, predecessors, successors, assignees, representatives of any kind, shareholders, partners, directors, or affiliates.
- 32. "Request For Exclusion" means the written communication that must be sent to the Settlement Administrator and postmarked on or before the Opt Out Date by a Class Member who wishes to be excluded from the Class.
- 33. "Settlement" means the settlement embodied in this Agreement, including all attached exhibits (which are an integral part of this Agreement and are incorporated in their entirety by reference).

1

2

- 5 6
- 7 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20 21
- 22

- 24 25
- 26 27
- 28

- "Settlement Administration Expenses" means the expenses incurred by 35. the Settlement Administrator assisting with the implementation of this Agreement, which shall primarily result from administering the notice program and processing all claims made by Class Members. "Subject Products" means all products sold by Defendants during the
- Class Period under Millennium's Enlightened Kombucha, Enlightened Synergy, Classic Kombucha, and Classic Synergy product lines: Classic Kombucha Original, Classic Kombucha Citrus, Classic Kombucha Gingerade, Classic Kombucha Multi-Green, Classic Kombucha Third Eye Chai, Classic Synergy Cosmic Cranberry, Classic Synergy Maqui Berry Mint, Classic Synergy Divine Grape, Classic Synergy Gingerberry, Classic Synergy Raspberry Rush, Classic Synergy Strawberry Serenity, Classic Synergy Superfruits, Classic Synergy Trilogy, Enlightened Kombucha Botanic No. 3, Enlightened Kombucha Botanic No. 7, Enlightened Kombucha Botanic No. 9, Enlightened Kombucha Citrus, Enlightened Kombucha Gingerade, Enlightened Kombucha Multi-Green, Enlightened Kombucha Original, Enlightened Synergy Black Chia, Enlightened Synergy Cosmic Cranberry, Enlightened Synergy Cherry Chia, Enlightened Synergy Gingerberry, Enlightened Synergy Grape Chia, Enlightened Synergy Green Chia, Enlightened Synergy Guava Goddess, Enlightened Synergy Mystic Mango, Enlightened Synergy Passionberry Bliss, Enlightened Synergy Raspberry Chia, Enlightened Synergy Strawberry Serenity, and Enlightened Synergy Trilogy.
- "Summary Notice" means the summary notice of the proposed 37. Settlement, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit F.
- "Unknown Claims" means any and all Released Claims that a Class 38. Member, or anyone acting on behalf of or in the Class Member's interest, does not know or suspect to exist against any of the Released Parties relating to any Subject Product, which, if known, might have affected his or her decision to enter into or to

be bound by the terms of this Agreement. The Plaintiffs and Class Members acknowledge that they may hereafter discover facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true concerning the subject matter of this Agreement, but nevertheless fully, finally, and forever settle and release any and all Released Claims, monetary, injunctive, or equitable, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, contingent or non-contingent, which now exist, may hereafter exist, or heretofore have existed which arise from, or in any way relate to, the labeling, packaging, sale, distribution, supply, marketing, testing, or advertising, regardless of medium, of any Subject Product, without regard to subsequent discovery or existence of such different or additional facts concerning each of the Released Parties.

Notwithstanding this paragraph or any other paragraph herein, this Agreement shall not be deemed to release any individual, class, representative, group or collective claim, liability, right, demand, suit, matter, obligation, damage, loss, action or cause of action, of any kind or description that a Releasing Party has or may have for personal injuries.

39. "Whole Foods" means Whole Foods Market, Inc., and includes, without

39. "Whole Foods" means Whole Foods Market, Inc., and includes, without limitation all related entities, including but not limited to parents, subsidiaries, agents, employees and assigns, predecessors, successors and affiliates of Whole Foods Market, Inc., and its related entities.

# III. SUBMISSION OF THE SETTLEMENT TO THE COURT FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL

- 40. As soon as is practicable following the signing of this Agreement, Class Counsel shall apply to the Court for entry of the Preliminary Approval Order (substantially in the form attached as Exhibit D), for the purpose of, among other things:
- (a) Approving the Class Notice, including the Long Form Notice and Summary Notice, substantially in the form set forth at Exhibits E and F;

- (b) Finding that the requirements for preliminary certification of the Class have been satisfied, appointing Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class and their counsel as Class Counsel, and preliminarily approving the Settlement as being within the range of reasonableness such that the Class Notice should be provided pursuant to this Agreement;
- (c) Scheduling the Fairness Hearing on a date ordered by the Court, provided in the Preliminary Approval Order, and in compliance with applicable law, to determine whether the Settlement should be approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and to determine whether a Final Order and Final Judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice.
- (d) Determining that the notice of the Settlement and of the Fairness Hearing, as set forth in this Agreement, complies with all legal requirements, including but not limited to the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution;
- (e) Preliminarily approving the form of the Final Order and Final Judgment;
  - (f) Appointing Angeion Group as the Settlement Administrator;
- (g) Directing that Class Notice shall be given to the Class as provided in Section V of this Agreement.
- (h) Providing that Class Members will have until the Claim Deadline to submit Claim Forms;
- (i) Providing that any objections by any Class Member to the certification of the Class and the proposed Settlement contained in this Agreement, and/or the entry of the Final Order and Final Judgment, shall be heard and any papers submitted in support of said objections shall be considered by the Court at the Fairness Hearing only if, on or before the Objection Deadline set by the Court, such objector files with the Court a written objection and notice of the objector's intention to appear, and otherwise complies with the requirements in Section IX of this Agreement;

- (j) Establishing dates by which the Parties shall file and serve all papers in support of the application for final approval of the Settlement and/or in response to any valid and timely objections;
- (k) Providing that all Class Members will be bound by the Final Order and Final Judgment dismissing the Action with prejudice unless such members of the Class timely file valid written Requests for Exclusion in accordance with this Agreement and the Class Notice;
- (l) Providing that Class Members wishing to exclude themselves from the Settlement will have until the Opt Out Date to submit a valid written Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator, in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section IX of this Agreement;
- (m) Directing the Parties, pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, to take all necessary and appropriate steps to establish the means necessary to implement the Settlement;
- (n) Pending the Fairness Hearing, staying all proceedings in the Action, other than proceedings necessary to carry out or enforce the terms and conditions of this Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order; and
- (o) Pending the Fairness Hearing, enjoining Plaintiffs and Class Members, or any of them, from commencing or prosecuting, either directly or indirectly, any action in any forum (state or federal) asserting any Released Claims.
- 41. Following the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, the Class Notice shall be given and published in the manner directed and approved by the Court, as set forth in fuller detail in Section V of this Agreement.
- 42. At the Fairness Hearing, the Parties shall seek to obtain from the Court a Final Order and Final Judgment in the form substantially similar to Exhibits A and Exhibit B, respectively. The Final Order and Final Judgment shall, among other things:
  - (a) Find that the Court has personal jurisdiction over all Class

Members, the Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the claims asserted in the Action, and that venue is proper;

- (b) Finally approve the Agreement and the Settlement pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;
  - (c) Certify the Class for settlement purposes only;
- (d) Find that the notice to the Class complied with all laws and requirements, including, but not limited to, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution;
- (e) Incorporate and effectuate the release set forth in the Agreement and make the Release effective as of the date of the Final Order and Final Judgment;
  - (f) Authorize the Parties to implement the terms of the Settlement;
  - (g) Dismiss the Action with prejudice; and
- (h) Notwithstanding the aforementioned dismissal with prejudice, retain jurisdiction relating to the administration, consummation, enforcement, and interpretation of the Agreement, the Final Order and Final Judgment, any final order approving Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and incentive awards, and for any other necessary purpose.
- 43. The Parties acknowledge that each intends to implement the terms of this Agreement. The Parties shall, in good faith, cooperate and assist with and undertake all reasonable actions and steps to accomplish all required events on the schedule set by the Court, and shall use reasonable efforts to implement all terms and conditions of this Agreement. In the event the Court does not preliminarily or finally approve this Agreement, the Parties further agree to continue to cooperate in good faith in an attempt to address any deficiencies raised by the Court in an expeditious manner.

# IV. THE SETTLEMENT CONSIDERATION

The Net Cash Amount will be distributed in the form of cash payments and product vouchers as follows:

# A. Settlement Fund and Awards to Class Members

- 44. <u>Total Financial Commitment:</u> Defendants' maximum financial commitment under the Settlement shall be eight million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$8,250,000.00). This amount shall include any Court ordered Attorneys' Fees and Expenses, Plaintiffs' incentive awards, any and all Settlement Administration Expenses, and the monetary value of all cash awards and product vouchers paid to or issued to Class Members. All Settlement Administration Expenses will be paid by Millennium to the Settlement Administrator as incurred and on terms to be negotiated between Millennium and the Settlement Administrator.
- 45. <u>Cash or Voucher Option:</u> Class Members who (a) execute and submit a valid Claim Form on or before the Claim Deadline; (b) attest under the penalty of perjury that they purchased one or more of the Subject Products during the Class Period; and (c) provide all required Proof of Purchase or other required documentation (as necessary), and comply with all other conditions and requirements specified herein, may opt to receive either a cash award or a product award (but not both) as follows:
- Claimant who (i) submits a valid Claim Form on or before the Claim Deadline pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and (ii) and opts to receive a cash award, is a \$3.50 cash award for each Subject Product the Authorized Claimant purchased during the Class Period, up to a maximum of ten (10) claims (or \$35.00 in cash) if the Authorized Claimant does not provide Proof of Purchase. Authorized Claimants who claim more than \$35.00 in cash awards must submit Proof of Purchase establishing their purchase during the Class Period of each Subject Product claimed and may receive up to \$60.00 in cash awards based on the retail value of the Subject Products shown in the Proof of Purchase.
- (b) <u>Product Voucher Option</u>: The relief to be provided to each Authorized Claimant who (i) submits a valid Claim Form on or before the Claim Deadline pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and (ii) and opts to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

shall be sent cash awards or product vouchers or, as applicable, a letter explaining the rejection of their Claim Forms, within forty-five (45) calendar days of the Effective Date (the "Award Issuance Date"). Millennium shall pay the Settlement Administrator the aggregate value of all cash awards to be distributed to Class Members no later than fifteen (15) calendar days before the Award Issuance Date. All cash awards to Class Members will be in the form of checks, and such checks will

state that they must be redeemed within 120 calendar days of the Award Issuance Date (the "Expiration Date") or they will become void. Millennium shall provide the Settlement Administrator with all product vouchers no later than fifteen (15) calendar days before the Award Issuance Date. The product vouchers will have no expiration date.

46. <u>Insufficient Funds:</u> If the aggregate value of the cash rewards and product vouchers claimed by Authorized Claimants pursuant to valid and timely Claim Forms exceeds the Net Cash Amount, then the monetary value of the awards to be provided to each Authorized Claimant shall be reduced on a pro rata basis, such that the aggregate value of the awards does not exceed the Net Cash Amount. After the Award Issuance Date, the Settlement Administrator, in consultation with the Parties as necessary, shall determine each Authorized Claimant's pro rata share based upon each Authorized Claimant's Claim Form and the aggregate value of the awards claimed by Authorized Claimants.

# B. Injunctive Relief

- 47. In consideration for the Release contained in this Agreement, and as a result of the efforts of the Plaintiffs and their counsel:
- (a) No later than 120 days after the Effective Date, Millennium will cease ordering and/or printing labels for the Subject Products bearing the term "antioxidant." This agreement will not prevent Millennium from implementing label changes regarding the antioxidant content of Millennium's products that are (a) reasonably necessary to comply with any statute, regulation, or other law of any kind; (b) necessitated by product and/or ingredient changes; or (c) permitted by subsequent statute, regulation, or case law concerning the use of the term "antioxidant" on food and beverage labels.
- (b) No later than 120 days after the Effective Date, Millennium will begin ordering and/or printing labels, for Subject Products within Millennium's Enlightened Kombucha and Enlightened Synergy product lines, that state that the

- products contain naturally occurring alcohol and should not be consumed by individuals seeking to avoid alcohol due to pregnancy, allergies, sensitives, or religious beliefs. This agreement will not prevent Millennium from implementing label changes regarding the alcohol content of Millennium's products that are (a) reasonably necessary to comply with any statute, regulation, or other law of any kind; (b) necessitated by product and/or ingredient changes; or (c) permitted by subsequent statute, regulation, or case law concerning alcohol disclosures and/or alcohol warnings on food and beverage labels.
- (c) To ensure that all such products continue to comply with federal and state labeling standards, Millennium will regularly test samples from every Subject Product line (at the time of bottling and the time of expiration) using a third-party laboratory.
- (d) Should the working group formed by the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists ("AOAC"), the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau ("TTB"), and Kombucha Brewers International ("KBI"), develop an industry-wide standard testing methodology for ethanol in kombucha that differs from Millennium's methodology, Millennium will adopt that standard no later than 60 days after the standard is announced as an official AOAC testing methodology.
- (e) To ensure that all such products continue to comply with federal and state labeling standards, Millennium will, every three months, test the sugar content of multiple product samples, drawn from every Subject Product line, using a third-party laboratory. If such testing reveals that the sugar content of a product sample varies from the declared sugar content on that product's label to a greater extent than allowed by federal or state labeling standards, Millennium will review the testing and sampling methodology employed by its third-party laboratory, including repeating the testing for the product line at issue, and, if the variability is repeated, make label adjustments regarding sugar content as necessary.
  - (f) To ensure that all such products continue to comply with federal

26

27

28

and state labeling standards, no later than 120 days after the Effective Date, the labels of the Subject Products s will state that the products may be under pressure and that the failure to refrigerate the products may result in leaking or gushing.

### V. NOTICE TO THE CLASS

- The Parties shall jointly recommend and retain Angeion Group as the 48. Settlement Administrator. Following the entry of the Preliminary Approval Order and the Court's appointment of the proposed Settlement Administrator, the Settlement Administrator shall disseminate the Class Notice as specified in the Preliminary Approval Order and in this Section, to comply with all applicable laws and requirements, including, but not limited to, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution. The Settlement Administrator shall develop a notice and claims administration program, subject to the approval of the Parties and the Court, designed to achieve at least 80% reach. Defendants shall pay all Settlement Administration Expenses up to \$400,000. Any reasonable Settlement Administration Expenses above \$400,000 shall be deducted on a pro rata basis from the cash rewards and product vouchers claimed by Authorized Claimants, regardless of whether the entire \$8,250,000 fund is fully exhausted. Following the dissemination of the Class Notice, the Settlement Administrator shall submit a declaration under the penalty of perjury attesting that the Class Notice has achieved at least 80% reach.
- 49. The Long Form Notice: The Long Form Notice, which shall be made available on the Settlement Website, to Class Members requesting a hard copy from the Settlement Administrator and to Class Members that Millennium can identify in its records through reasonable effort, shall be in a form substantially similar to the document attached to this Agreement as Exhibit E and shall comport to the following terms and requirements:
- (a) <u>General Terms</u>: The Long Form Notice shall contain a plain and concise description of the nature of the Action and the proposed Settlement, including information on the definition of the Class, the identity of eligible Class Members,

- how the proposed Settlement would provide relief to Class Members, what claims are released under the proposed Settlement, and other relevant information.
- (b) Opt Out Rights: The Long Form Notice shall inform Class

  Members that they have the right to opt out of the Settlement. The Long Form Notice shall provide the deadlines and procedures for exercising this right.
- (c) <u>Objection to Settlement</u>: The Long Form Notice shall inform Class Members of their right to object to the proposed Settlement and appear at the Fairness Hearing. The Class Notice shall provide the deadlines and procedures for exercising these rights.
- (d) <u>Fees and Expenses</u>: The Long Form Notice shall inform Class Members about the amounts being sought by Class Counsel as Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Plaintiffs' incentive awards, and shall explain that the Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Plaintiffs' incentive awards, in addition to amounts being made available for relief to Class Members, will be deducted from the Settlement Fund and be paid out of the Settlement Fund.
- (e) <u>Claim Form</u>: The Long Form Notice and Settlement Website shall include the Claim Form, which shall inform Class Members that they must fully complete and timely return the Claim Form prior to the Claim Deadline to be eligible to obtain relief pursuant to this Agreement.
- 50. The Summary Notice: Upon the Notice Date, the Settlement Administrator shall cause the Summary Notice, in the form substantially similar to Exhibit F, to be published once a week, for four successive weeks, in the California edition of USA Today.
- 51. <u>Internet Advertising Program:</u> No later than the Notice Date, the Settlement Administrator shall cause notice of the settlement to be provided through digital advertising, pursuant to the Settlement Administrator's notice plan set forth in the declaration of the Settlement Administrator to be filed in support of preliminary approval of the Settlement. Millennium shall also cause notice of the settlement to be

3 4

5

6 7

9

8

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28 posted on Millennium's website and on Millennium's Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter accounts, in the form of a link to the Settlement Website.

- 52. Settlement Website: No later than the Notice Date, the Settlement Administrator shall establish and caused to be published an Internet website (the "Settlement Website"), www.millennium-settlement.com. All Internet advertising that is part of the Class Notice program will direct Class Members to the Settlement Website. The Settlement Website will allow Class Members to submit Claim Forms online and will contain information relevant to Class Members, including but not limited to all applicable deadlines, the Agreement, Class Notice, a downloadable Claim Form, all papers filed by the Parties in support of this Agreement (including Plaintiffs' anticipated motion for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses), orders of the Court pertaining to this Agreement, and contact information for reaching the Settlement Administrator via a toll-free telephone number, e-mail and U.S. mail. The Parties shall use reasonable efforts to agree on all information and documents to be posted on this website and no information shall be posted or provided on the website without the Parties' express approval. The website shall be rendered inactive one hundred fifty (150) days after the Award Issuance Date. Settlement Administration Expenses include the costs associated with maintenance of the Settlement Website.
- 53. Toll-Free Telephone Number: Prior to the dissemination of the Class Notice, the Settlement Administrator shall establish a toll-free telephone number that will provide Settlement-related information to Class Members, pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Agreement. Settlement Administration Expenses include the costs associated with maintenance of this toll-free telephone number. The Parties shall also create a protocol for the Settlement Administrator to refer Class Member inquiries to Class Counsel. The toll-free telephone number shall be rendered inactive one hundred fifty (150) calendar days after the Award Issuance Date.
- Nothing contained herein shall limit Class Counsel's ability to disseminate notice by publishing a link to the Settlement Website on their firm or

attorneys' websites, Facebook pages, or social media accounts, provided that any such dissemination must comply with Paragraph 109 of this Agreement.

3 4

#### **ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES AND CLASS** VI. REPRESENTATIVE INCENTIVE AWARD

6 7

5

8 9

10 11

12 13

15 16

14

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

In recognition of the time and effort the representative Plaintiffs 55. expended in pursuing this action and in fulfilling their obligations and responsibilities as class representatives, and of the benefits conferred on all Class Members by the Settlement, Class Counsel may ask the Court for the payment of incentive awards to the representative Plaintiffs and Related Plaintiffs. Millennium will not oppose and Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will submit an application for an incentive award of two thousand dollars (\$2,000.00) to each Plaintiff and Related Plaintiff. Any courtordered incentive award will be paid to Plaintiffs by Millennium no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after the Effective Date.

Class Counsel will make an application to the Court for an award of 56. Attorneys' Fees and Expenses in the Action. Defendants will not have the right to challenge Class Counsel's entitlement to Attorneys' Fees and Expenses. Defendants will have the right to challenge the amount of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses requested by Class Counsel. The Parties have no agreement between themselves as to the amounts of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses that Class Counsel will request or that Defendants will oppose. The Attorneys' Fees and Expenses ordered by the Court shall represent Class Counsel's sole compensation under the Settlement, will be in lieu of statutory fees Plaintiffs and/or their attorneys might otherwise have been entitled to recover from Millennium, and shall be inclusive of all fees and costs of Class Counsel to be paid by Millennium. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree that Millennium shall not pay or be obligated to pay Class Counsel in excess of any award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses ordered by the Court. And in no event shall Millennium be obligated to pay Attorneys' Fees and Expenses (or any other payments) that would make Millennium's total payment towards the Settlement an

- 57. Any Attorneys' Fees and Expenses ordered to be paid to Class Counsel shall be paid by Millennium to Class Counsel no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the Court's order awarding Attorneys' Fees and Expenses, provided that, pursuant to the terms of the undertaking attached as Exhibit G to this Agreement, any such Attorneys' Fees and Expenses will be repaid to Millennium by Class Counsel should the Court's order awarding Attorneys' Fees and Expenses or Final Approval Order be reversed on appeal and/or should the Settlement be terminated according to its terms.
- 58. In the event that any dispute between Class Counsel and any other counsel arises relating to the allocation of fees, Class Counsel agree to hold Millennium harmless from, and indemnify Millennium with respect to, any and all such liabilities, costs, and expenses, including attorneys' fees and dispute costs, of such dispute.

## VII. RELEASES AND DISMISSAL OF ACTION

59. Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Parties shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Final Order and Final Judgment shall have, fully, finally and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims against the Released Parties. In connection with the Released Claims, each Releasing Party shall be deemed as of the Effective Date to have expressly, knowingly, and voluntarily waived any and all provisions, rights, benefits conferred by Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, and any statute, rule, and legal doctrine similar, comparable, or equivalent to Section 1542, which provides as follows:

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

19

2021

2324

22

2526

2728

In connection with such waiver and relinquishment, the Releasing Parties hereby acknowledge that they are aware that they or their attorneys may hereafter discover claims or facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe exist with respect to Released Claims, but that it is their intention to hereby fully, finally, and forever settle and release all of the Released Claims, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, that they have against the Released Parties. In furtherance of such intention, the release herein given by the Releasing Parties shall be and remain in effect as a full and complete general release notwithstanding the discovery or existence of any such additional different claims or facts. Each of the Releasing Parties expressly acknowledges that he/she/it has been advised by its attorney of the contents and effect of Section 1542, and with knowledge, each of the Parties hereby expressly waives whatever benefits he/she/it may have had pursuant to such section. Plaintiffs and Class Members are not releasing any claims for personal injuries. Plaintiffs acknowledge, and the Class Members shall be deemed by operation of the Final Judgment to have acknowledged, that the foregoing waiver was separately bargained for and a material element of the Settlement of which this release is a part.

- 60. Upon the Effective Date, the Action shall be dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall have the responsibility for ensuring that the Action is dismissed with prejudice in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.
- 61. The Court shall enter an order retaining jurisdiction over the Parties to this Agreement with respect to the future performance of the terms of this Agreement. In the event that any applications for relief are made, such applications shall be made to the Court.
- 62. Upon the Effective Date: (a) the Agreement shall be the exclusive remedy for any and all Released Claims of Plaintiffs and Class Members; and (b) Plaintiffs and the Class Members stipulate to be and shall be permanently barred and enjoined by Court order from initiating, asserting, or prosecuting against the Released

Parties in any federal or state court or tribunal any and all Released Claims.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### VIII. ADMINISTRATION OF THE SETTLEMENT

- 63. Millennium shall, subject to the approval of Class Counsel, retain Angeion Group as the Settlement Administrator to help implement the terms of the Agreement. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Agreement, Millennium shall pay all costs associated with the Settlement Administrator, including costs of providing Class Notice and reviewing and processing claims.
- 64. In fulfilling its responsibilities, the Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for, without limitation: (a) consulting on and designing the notice to be disseminated to Class Members; (b) arranging for the publication of the Summary Notice and dissemination of Class Notice; (c) responding to requests from Class Counsel and/or Defense Counsel; and (d) otherwise assisting with administration of the Settlement.
- 65. The Settlement Administrator also shall be responsible for, without limitation, the dissemination of Class Notice and implementing the terms of the claim process and related administrative activities that include communications with Class Members concerning the Settlement, claim process, and their options thereunder. In particular, the Settlement Administrator shall be responsible for: (a) printing, emailing, mailing or otherwise arranging for the mailing of the Class Notice in response to Class Members' requests; (b) making any mailings required under the terms of this Agreement; (c) establishing the Settlement Website; (d) establishing a toll-free voice line to which Class Members may refer for information about the Action and the Settlement; (e) receiving and maintaining any Class Member correspondence regarding requests for exclusion and objections to the Settlement; (f) forwarding inquiries from Class Members to Class Counsel or their designee for a response, if warranted; (g) establishing a post office box for the receipt of Claim Forms, exclusion requests, and any correspondence; (h) reviewing Claim Forms according to the review protocols agreed to by the Parties and standards set forth in

4 5

7 8

6

10

9

12

11

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

22 23

21

24

25 26

27

28

this Agreement; and (i) otherwise implementing and/or assisting with the claim review process and payment of the claims.

- 66. The Settlement Administrator shall administer the Settlement in accordance with the terms of this Agreement and, without limiting the foregoing, shall: (a) treat any and all documents, communications and other information and materials received in connection with the administration of the Settlement as confidential and shall not disclose any or all such documents, communications or other information to any person or entity except as provided for in this Agreement or by court order; and (b) receive Requests for Exclusion and provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel a copy thereof within three (3) business days of receipt. If the Settlement Administrator receives any Requests for Exclusion after the deadline for the submission of such forms and requests, the Settlement Administrator shall promptly provide Class Counsel and Defense Counsel with copies thereof and receive and maintain all correspondence from any Class Member regarding the Settlement.
- The Claim Form will be available for downloading and may be 67. completed and submitted online at the Settlement Website, and, at Class Counsel's option, the Claim Form will be available for downloading on Class Counsel's websites. The Claim Form may also be requested by calling the toll-free number provided by the Settlement Administrator or by writing to the Settlement Administrator.
- 68. To be eligible for a cash award or product voucher, each Class Member must submit or postmark a Claim Form, on or before the Claim Deadline, containing his or her name, mailing address, and e-mail address, and an attestation, under penalty of perjury, that the Class Member purchased one or more Subject Products during the Class Period. The Claim Form will also direct Class Members to submit Proof of Purchase for any awards claimed in excess of \$35.00 in cash or \$35.00 in product vouchers. The Claim Form will be deemed to have been submitted when the Claim Form, including any necessary Proof of Purchase, is posted, if received with a

14

24 25 26

27

28

22

23

postmark, or equivalent mark by a courier company indicated on the envelope or mailer and if mailed with pre-paid postage and addressed in accordance with the instructions set out in the Claim Form. In the case of online claims, the Claim Form shall be deemed to have been submitted when it is fully uploaded, including any necessary Proof of Purchase, to the Settlement Website.

- Any Class Member who, in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, neither seeks exclusion from the Class nor submits a valid and timely Claim Form, will not be entitled to receive any relief pursuant to this Agreement, but will be bound together with all Class Members by all of the terms of this Agreement, including the terms of the Final Order and Final Judgment to be entered in the Action and the releases provided for herein, and will be barred from bringing any action in any forum (state or federal) against any of the Released Parties concerning the Released Claims.
- 70. The Settlement Administrator shall use adequate and customary procedures and standards to determine whether a Claim Form meets the requirements set forth in this Agreement and to prevent the payment of fraudulent claims and/or pay only valid and eligible claims. Each Claim Form shall be submitted to and reviewed by the Settlement Administrator, who shall determine the extent, if any, to which each claim shall be allowed. The Settlement Administrator shall use all reasonable efforts and means to identify and reject duplicate and/or fraudulent claims, including, without limitation, indexing all awards provided to Class Members.
- 71. Claim Forms that do not meet the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall be promptly rejected by the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement Administrator shall have forty-five (45) calendar days from the Effective Date to exercise the right of rejection. The Settlement Administrator shall notify the Class Member using the contact information provided in the Claim Form of the rejection, including via electronic mail. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel shall be provided with copies of all such notifications to Class Members. If any claimant

- whose Claim Form has been rejected, in whole or in part, desires to contest such rejection, the claimant must, within fifteen (15) business days from receipt of the rejection, transmit to the Settlement Administrator by e-mail or U.S. mail a notice and statement of reasons indicating the claimant's grounds for contesting the rejection, along with any supporting documentation, and requesting further review by the Settlement Administrator, in consultation with Class Counsel and Defense Counsel, of the denial of the claim. If Class Counsel and Defense Counsel cannot agree on a resolution of claimant's notice contesting the rejection, the disputed claim shall be presented to the Court or a referee appointed by the Court for summary and non-appealable resolution.
- 72. No person shall have any claim against Defendants, Defense Counsel, Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' Counsel, the Class, Class Counsel, and/or the Settlement Administrator based on any eligibility determinations, distributions, or awards made in accordance with this Agreement. This provision does not affect or limit in any way the right of review by the Court or referee of any disputed Claim Forms as provided in this Agreement.
- 73. Class Counsel and Defense Counsel shall have the right to inspect the Claim Forms and supporting documentation received by the Settlement Administrator at any time upon reasonable notice.
- 74. Not later than seven (7) calendar days before the date of the Fairness Hearing, the Settlement Administrator shall file with the Court: (a) a list of those persons who have opted out or excluded themselves from the Settlement; and (b) the details regarding the number of valid Claim Forms received and processed by the Settlement Administrator.
- 75. The Settlement Administrator may retain one or more persons to assist in the completion of its responsibilities.
- 76. The Settlement Administrator shall distribute benefits to eligible Class Members only after the Effective Date and pursuant to the deadlines set forth in

- 77. If the Settlement is not approved or for any reason the Effective Date does not occur, no payments or distributions of any kind shall be made pursuant to this Agreement, except for the costs and expenses of the Settlement Administrator, for which Plaintiffs and/or Plaintiffs' Counsel are not responsible.
- 78. In the event the Settlement Administrator fails to perform its duties, and/or makes a material or fraudulent misrepresentation to, or conceals requested material information from, Class Counsel, Defendants, and/or Defense Counsel, then the party to whom the misrepresentation is made shall, in addition to any other appropriate relief, have the right to demand that the Settlement Administrator immediately be replaced. No party shall unreasonably withhold consent to remove the Settlement Administrator. The Parties will attempt to resolve any disputes regarding the retention or dismissal of the Settlement Administrator in good faith, and, if they are unable to do so, will refer the matter to the Court for resolution.
- 79. The Settlement Administrator shall coordinate with Defense Counsel to provide notice as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1715, and the costs of such notice shall be considered Settlement Administration Expenses.
- 80. Defendants and the Released Parties are not obligated to (and will not be obligated to) compute, estimate, or pay any taxes on behalf of any Plaintiffs, any Class Member, Plaintiffs' Counsel, Class Counsel, and/or the Settlement Administrator.

#### IX. OBJECTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION

81. Members of the Class who fail to file, no later than the Objection Deadline, through the Court's Case Management/Electronic Case Files ("CM/ECF") system or through any other method in which the Court will accept objections, if any, and serve upon the Settlement Administrator, Class Counsel, and Defense Counsel, written objections in the manner specified in this Agreement and the Class Notice shall be deemed to have waived all objections and shall be foreclosed from making

any objection (whether by appeal or otherwise) to the Settlement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Any Class Member who intends to object to the fairness, reasonableness, 82. and/or adequacy of the Settlement must, in addition to filing the written objection with the Court through the Court's CM/ECF system (or any other method in which the Court will accept filings, if any) no later than the Objection Deadline, provide a copy of the written objection by U.S. mail or e-mail to the Settlement Administrator with a copy by U.S. Mail or e-mail to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel (at the addresses set forth below) postmarked no later than the Objection Deadline. Class Members who object must set forth in their written objection: (a) their full name; (b) current address; (c) a written statement of their objection(s) and the reasons for each objection; (d) a statement of whether they intend to appear at the Fairness Hearing (with or without counsel); (e) their signature; (f) a statement, sworn to under penalty of perjury, attesting to the fact that he or she purchased one or more of the Subject Products during the Class Period; (f) details of their purchase of the Subject Products, including the Subject Products purchased, and the date and location of purchase; and (g) the case name and number of the Action. Objections must be served on Class Counsel and Defense Counsel as follows:

#### Upon Class Counsel at:

L. Timothy Fisher Yeremey Krivoshey

#### **BURSOR & FISHER P.A.**

1990 North California Blvd., Suite 940 Walnut Creek, California 94596 ltfisher@bursor.com

ykrivoshey@bursor.com

Upon Defense Counsel at:

Scott M. Voelz Daniel J. Faria

#### O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, California 90071-2899

svoelz@omm.com dfaria@omm.com

James M. Lee David Crane

#### LTL ATTORNEYS LLP

601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3900 Los Angeles, California 90017 james.lee@ltlattorneys.com david.crane@ltlattorneys.com

- 83. The Parties shall request that the Court allow any interested party to file a reply to any objection no later than seven (7) calendar days before the Fairness Hearing, or as the Court may otherwise direct.
- 84. Members of the Class may also elect to opt out of the Settlement, relinquishing their rights to benefits hereunder. Members of the Class who opt out of the Settlement will not release their claims pursuant to this Agreement. Proposed Class Members wishing to opt out of the Settlement must send to the Settlement Administrator by U.S. Mail a Request for Exclusion postmarked no later than the Opt Out Date. The Request for Exclusion must be a personally signed letter from the Class Member including (a) their full name; (b) current address; (c) a clear statement communicating that they elect to be excluded from the Class, do not wish to be a Class Member, and elect to be excluded from any judgment entered pursuant to the Settlement; (d) their signature; and (e) the case name and case number of the Action. Members of the Class who fail to submit a valid Request for Exclusion on or before the Opt Out Date shall, in accordance with Paragraph 68 of this Agreement, be bound by all terms of this Agreement and the Final Order and Final Judgment, regardless of whether they have requested exclusion from the Settlement.
- 85. Any member of the Class who submits a timely Request for Exclusion or opt out may not file an objection to the Settlement and shall be deemed to have waived any rights or benefits under this Agreement. So-called "mass" or "class" opt

outs shall not be allowed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The Settlement Administrator shall promptly provide copies of all 86. Requests for Exclusion, objections, and/or related correspondence from Class Members to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel. Not later than three (3) business days after the deadline for submission of Requests for Exclusion, the Settlement Administrator shall provide to Class Counsel and Defense Counsel a complete list of Class Members requesting exclusion from the Settlement together with copies of the Requests for Exclusion. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, if more than one thousand (1,000) members of the Class opt out of the Settlement, Defendants, in their sole discretion, may rescind and revoke the entire Settlement and this Agreement, thereby rendering the Settlement null and void in its entirety, by sending written notice that Defendants revoke the settlement pursuant to this paragraph to Class Counsel within ten (10) business days following the date the Settlement Administrator informs Defendants of the number of Class members who have requested to opt out of the Settlement pursuant to the provisions set forth above. If Defendants rescind the Settlement pursuant to this paragraph, they shall have no further obligations to pay into the settlement and Millennium shall be responsible for only the fees and expenses actually incurred by the Settlement Administrator, for which Plaintiffs and his Counsel are not liable.

87. On the date set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order, a Fairness Hearing shall be conducted to determine final approval of the Settlement. A Motion in support of the Fairness Hearing shall be filed no later than fourteen (14) calendar days after the deadline to object or opt out of the Settlement. Upon final approval of the Settlement by the Court at or after the Fairness Hearing, the Parties shall present the Final Order and Final Judgment, substantially in the form attached to this Agreement as Exhibits A and B, and a final order approving Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and incentive award, to the Court for approval and entry. Class Members who wish to be heard at the Fairness Hearing (whether individually or through

separate counsel) and are objecting to the Settlement shall comply with the provisions of this Agreement. Class Members who wish to be heard at the Fairness Hearing (whether individually or through separate counsel) and are not objecting to the Settlement shall file a notice of appearance with the Court's CM/ECF system or through any other method in which the Court will accept filings, if any, and serve upon Class Counsel and Defense Counsel at the addresses indicated above at least seven (7) calendar days before the Fairness Hearing.

#### X. SCOPE AND EFFECT OF CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION OF THE CLASS SOLELY FOR PURPOSES OF SETTLEMENT

- 88. For purposes of settlement only, the Parties agree to seek preliminary certification, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3), of a damages and injunctive relief Class on a nationwide basis, including United States territories. The Parties further agree that the Court should make preliminary findings and enter the Preliminary Approval Order (substantially in the form attached at Exhibit D) granting preliminary certification of the Class subject to final findings and ratification in the Final Order and Final Judgment, and appointing Plaintiffs as the representative of the Class and Class Counsel as counsel for the Class.
- 89. Defendants do not consent to certification of the Class for any purpose other than to effectuate the Settlement of the Action or otherwise admit that the litigation of any claims that have or could have been asserted in the Action on a classwide basis is appropriate under applicable laws and standards. Defendants' agreement to conditional certification does not constitute an admission of wrongdoing, fault, liability, or damage of any kind to Plaintiffs or any of the putative class members.
- 90. If this Agreement is terminated pursuant to its terms, disapproved by any court (including any appellate court), and/or not consummated for any reason, or the Effective Date for any reason does not occur, the order certifying the Class for purposes of effectuating this Agreement, and all preliminary and/or final findings

regarding that class certification order, shall be automatically vacated upon notice of 1 the same to the Court, the Action shall proceed as though the Class had never been 2 certified pursuant to this Agreement and such findings had never been made, the 3 Action shall return to the procedural status quo in accordance with this paragraph, 4 5 and nothing in this Agreement or other papers or proceedings related to the Settlement shall be used as evidence or argument by any Party concerning whether 6 the Action may properly be maintained as a class action, whether the purported class 7 8 is ascertainable, or whether Class Counsel or the Plaintiffs can adequately represent the Class Members under applicable law. 9 10 11 12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### XI. MODIFICATION OR TERMINATION OF THE SETTLEMENT

- 91. If the preconditions necessary to trigger the Effective Date (as set forth in Paragraph 13 of this Agreement) are not met, this Agreement shall be cancelled and terminated unless Defense Counsel and Class Counsel mutually agree in writing to proceed with and effectuate this Agreement.
- The terms and provisions of this Agreement may be amended, modified, 92. or expanded by written agreement of the Parties and approval of the Court; provided, however that, after entry of the Final Order and Final Judgment, the Parties may by written agreement effect such amendments, modifications, or expansions of this Agreement and its implementing documents (including all exhibits hereto) without further notice to the Class or approval by the Court if such changes are consistent with the Court's Final Order and Final Judgment and do not materially alter, reduce or limit the rights of Class Members under this Agreement.
- Either Party may terminate this Agreement by providing written notice 93. to the other Party and the Court within ten (10) days of the occurrence of the following: (a) The preliminary or final approval of this Agreement is not obtained without substantial modification, which modification the Parties did not agree to and which modification the terminating Party deems in good faith to be material (e.g., because it significantly increases the costs of the settlement or deprives the

24 25

22

23

26 27

28

terminating party of an expressly stated benefit of the settlement); or (b) The Final Order and Final Judgment is reversed, vacated, or modified in any material respect by another court, except that it is expressly agreed by the Parties that any reduction of the Court's award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses shall not be grounds to terminate this Agreement.

- 94. In the event that this Agreement is not approved by the Court or the settlement set forth in this Agreement is terminated or fails to become effective in accordance with its terms, the Parties shall be restored to their respective presettlement positions in the Action, including with regard to any agreements concerning tolling and similar agreements, and this entire Agreement shall be null and void, shall have no further force and effect with respect to any Party in the Action, and shall not be offered in evidence or used in any litigation for any purpose, including the existence, certification, or maintenance of any purported class or Defendants' liability with respect to the claims that are, were or could have been asserted in the Action. In the event of such, this Agreement and all negotiations, proceedings, documents prepared, and statements made in connection with it shall be without prejudice to the Parties, and shall not be deemed or construed to be an admission or confession by any Party of any fact, matter, or proposition of law, and shall not be used in any manner for any purpose, and all Parties to the Action shall stand in the same position as if this Agreement had not been negotiated, made, or filed with the Court.
- 95. In the event of termination, the terminating Party shall cause the Settlement Administrator to post information regarding the termination on the Settlement Website.
- In the event of termination, all Parties shall be restored to their 96. respective positions as of immediately prior to the date of execution of this Agreement. Upon termination, Paragraphs 88-98 herein shall survive and be binding on the Parties, but this Agreement shall otherwise be null and void.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### XII. SETTLEMENT NOT EVIDENCE AGAINST PARTIES

- The Parties expressly acknowledge and agree that this Agreement and its 97. exhibits, along with all related drafts, motions, pleadings, conversations, negotiations, and correspondence, constitute an offer of compromise and a compromise within the meaning of Federal Rule of Evidence 408 and any equivalent state law or rule. In no event shall this Agreement, any of its provisions or any negotiations, statements or court proceedings relating to its provisions in any way be construed as, offered as, received as, used as, or deemed to be evidence of any kind in the Action, any other action, or in any judicial, administrative, regulatory or other proceeding, except in a proceeding to enforce this Agreement or the rights of the Parties or their counsel. Without limiting the foregoing, neither this Agreement nor any related negotiations, statements, or court proceedings shall be construed as, offered as, received as, used as or deemed to be evidence or an admission or concession of any liability or wrongdoing whatsoever on the part of any person or entity, including, but not limited to, Defendants, the Released Parties, Plaintiffs, or the Class, or as a waiver by Defendants, the Released Parties, Plaintiffs, or the Class of any applicable privileges, claims or defenses.
- 98. The provisions contained in this Agreement are not and shall not be deemed a presumption, concession, or admission by Defendants of any default, liability or wrongdoing as to any facts or claims alleged or asserted in the Action, or in any actions or proceedings, nor shall they be interpreted, construed, deemed, invoked, offered, or received in evidence or otherwise used by any person in the Action, or in any other action or proceeding, whether civil, criminal or administrative. Defendants expressly deny the allegations in the Action. Defendants do not admit that it or any of the Released Parties has engaged in any wrongful activity or that any person has sustained any damage by reason of any of the facts complained of in the Action. And Defendants do not consent to certification of the Class for any purpose other than to effectuate the Settlement of the Action or otherwise admit that the

treatment of any claims that have been or could have been asserted in the Action on a classwide basis is appropriate.

#### XIII. BEST EFFORTS

- 99. Class Counsel shall take all necessary actions to accomplish approval of the Settlement, the Class Notice, and dismissal of the Action. The Parties (including their counsel, successors, and assigns) agree to cooperate fully and in good faith with one another and to use their best efforts to effectuate the Settlement, including without limitation in seeking preliminary and final Court approval of the Agreement and the Settlement embodied herein, carrying out the terms of this Agreement, and promptly agreeing upon and executing all such other documentation as may be reasonably required to obtain final approval by the Court of the Settlement. In the event that the Court fails to approve the Settlement or fails to issue the Final Order and Final Judgment, the Parties agree to use all reasonable efforts, consistent with this Agreement and subject to Section XI, to cure any defect identified by the Court.
- 100. Each party will cooperate with the other party in connection with effectuating the Settlement or the administration of claims thereunder. Any requests for cooperation shall be narrowly tailored and reasonably necessary for the requesting party to recommend the Settlement to the Court, and to carry out its terms.

#### XIV. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- 101. The Parties agree that the recitals are contractual in nature and form a material part of this Agreement.
- 102. This Agreement and its accompanying exhibits set forth the entire understanding of the Parties. No change or termination of this Agreement shall be effective unless in writing and signed by Plaintiffs' Counsel and Defense Counsel. No extrinsic evidence or parol evidence shall be used to interpret this Agreement.
- 103. Any and all previous agreements and understandings between or among the Parties regarding the subject matter of this Agreement, whether written or oral, are superseded and hereby revoked by this Agreement. The Parties expressly agree

that the terms or conditions of this Agreement will control over any other written or oral agreements.

- 104. All of the Parties warrant and represent that they are agreeing to the terms of this Agreement based upon the legal advice of their respective attorneys, that they have been afforded the opportunity to discuss the contents of this Agreement with their attorneys and that the terms and conditions of this document are fully understood and voluntarily accepted.
- 105. The waiver by any party of a breach of any term of this Agreement shall not operate or be construed as a waiver of any subsequent breach by any party. The failure of a party to insist upon strict adherence to any provision of the Agreement shall not constitute a waiver or thereafter deprive such party of the right to insist upon strict adherence.
- 106. The headings in this Agreement are inserted merely for the purpose of convenience and shall not affect the meaning or interpretation of this document.
- 107. This Agreement may be executed by facsimile signature and in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which, when taken together, shall constitute one and the same instrument. The date of execution shall be the latest date on which any party signs the Agreement.
- 108. This Agreement has been negotiated among and drafted by Class Counsel and Defense Counsel. Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' Counsel, Class Members, and Defendants shall not be deemed to be the drafter of this Agreement or of any particular provision, nor shall they argue that any particular provision should be construed against its drafter or otherwise resort to the contra proferentem canon of construction. Accordingly, this Agreement should not be construed in favor of or against one party as to the drafter, and the Parties agree that the provisions of California Civil Code § 1654 and common law principles of construing ambiguities against the drafter shall have no application. All Parties agree that counsel for the Parties drafted this Agreement during extensive arm's-length negotiations. No parol

or other evidence may be offered to explain, construe, contradict, or clarify its terms, the intent of the Parties or their counsel, or the circumstances under which this Agreement was made or executed.

- 109. Except in connection with any court filing or proceeding, or the dissemination of notice to the Class or as otherwise provided in this Agreement, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will not issue any press releases regarding the Settlement or the Action without prior approval of Defendants. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel agree not to disparage Defendants, Millennium Products, Defense Counsel, or the Settlement in the media, through any public statements, or otherwise. Defendants agree not to disparage Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, or the Settlement.
- 110. Each individual Defendant represents and warrants that the individual(s) executing this Agreement on behalf of that Defendant are authorized to enter into this Agreement on behalf of that Defendant.
- 111. Any disagreement and/or action to enforce this Agreement shall be commenced and maintained only in the Court in which this Action is pending.
- 112. Whenever this Agreement requires or contemplates that one of the Parties shall or may give notice to the other to the addresses set forth in Section 81, such notice shall be provided by e-mail and/or next-day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Legal Holidays) express delivery service.
- 113. The Parties reserve the right, subject to the Court's approval, to agree to any reasonable extensions of time that might be necessary to carry out any of the provisions of this Agreement.
- 114. Plaintiffs expressly affirm that the allegations contained in the consolidated complaints filed in the Action were made in good faith and have a basis in fact, but consider it desirable for the Action to be settled and dismissed because of the substantial benefits that the proposed Settlement will provide to Class Members.
- 115. In the event any one of the provisions contained in this Agreement shall for any reason be held to be invalid, illegal, or unenforceable in any respect, such

# Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 51 of 139 Page ID #:1922 invalidity, illegality, or unenforceability shall not affect other provisions if Defense

Counsel and Class Counsel, on behalf of the Parties, mutually elect to proceed as if

such invalid, illegal, or unenforceable provision had never been included in thisAgreement.

28 | [SIGNATURES ON NEXT PAGE]

### Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 52 of 139 Page ID #:1923

	* ,	
1	D-4-4.	-
2	Dated:, 2016	Whole Foods Market, Inc.
3		
4		By:
5		Its:
6		
7	AGREED AS TO FORM:	
8		PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL
9		I DAINTIFFS COUNSEL
0	Dated:, 2016	5
1	, 2010	By: L. Timothy Fisher
12		Bursor & Fisher P.A. Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class
13		
14   15		DEFENSE COUNSEL
16		
17	Dated: November 14, 2010	By: Scott M. Voelz
18	4	O'Melveny & Myers LLP
9		Attorneys for Millennium Products, Inc.
20		
21	Dated:, 201	By: James M. Lee
22		LTL Attorneys LLP
23		Attorneys for Whole Foods Market, Inc.
24		
25	,	
26		
27		
28		46
	STIPLIL	ATION OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

#### Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 53 of 139 Page ID 1 Dated: , 2016 Whole Foods Market, Inc. 2 3 By: \_\_\_\_\_ 4 Its: \_\_\_\_\_ 5 6 **AGREED AS TO FORM:** 7 8 **PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL** 9 10 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2016 11 By: L. Timothy Fisher Bursor & Fisher P.A. 12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class 13 14 **DEFENSE COUNSEL** 15 16 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2016 17 By: Scott M. Voelz O'Melveny & Myers LLP 18 Attorneys for Millennium Products, Inc. 19 20 Dated: November 17, 2016 21 By: James M. Lee LTL Attorneys LLP 22 Attorneys for Whole Foods Market, Inc. 23 24 25 26 27 28 46

Case	2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW	Document :	103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 54 of 139 Page ID #:1925
1	Dated:	, 2016	
2		3	Whole Foods Market, Inc.
3	4		By:
4			
5	v 2		Its:
6			
7	AGREED AS TO FOR	M:	
8			PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL
9			
10	Dated: November 5	2016	
11	Dated. 1000emge/ D	_, 2016	By: L. Timothy Fisher
12			Bursor & Fisher P.A.  Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class
13			Attorneys for Framitins and the Class
14			DEFENSE COUNSEL
15			
16	Dated:	, 2016	
17			By: Scott M. Voelz O'Melveny & Myers LLP
18 19			Attorneys for Millennium Products, Inc.
20			
21	Dated:	, 2016	
22			By: James M. Lee LTL Attorneys LLP
23			Attorneys for Whole Foods Market, Inc.
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
			46
		TIDI II ATION OI	F CLASS ACTION SETTI EMENT

DocuSign Envelo	6,2i1.5eevo118914-RSG0A1M6cBeeum	gent 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 55 of 139 Page ID #:1926
		— DocuSigned by:
1	Dated: November 17, 2016	Popertin Tring
2		Whole Foods Market, Inc.
3		By: Roberta Lang
4		Its: Global Vice President of Legal Affairs
5		115. Olocal vice Hesiacht of Began Hilans
6		
7	AGREED AS TO FORM:	
8		PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL
9		
10	D-4-1- 2016	
11	Dated:, 2016	By: L. Timothy Fisher
12		Bursor & Fisher P.A.
13		Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class
14		DEFENSE COUNSEL
15		
16	Dated: , 2016	
17	Dated, 2010	By: Scott M. Voelz
18		O'Melveny & Myers LLP Attorneys for Millennium Products, Inc.
19		Attorneys for witheninum Froducts, file.
20		
21	Dated:, 2016	By: James M. Lee
22		LTL Attorneys LLP
23		Attorneys for Whole Foods Market, Inc.
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		47
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	STIPULATI	ON OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

## Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 56 of 139 Page ID #:1927

1	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto, by and through their respective		
2	attorneys, and intending to be legally bound hereby, have duly executed this		
3	Agreement as of the date set forth below.		
4	¥ .		
5	AGREED AND ACCEPTED:	PLAINTIFFS	
6		PLAINTIFFS	
7			
8	Dated:, 2016	Jonathan Retta	
9	•	Plaintiff	
10			
11	Dated:, 2016		
12		Kirsten Schofield Plaintiff	
13			
14	Dated: , 2016		
15	Dated, 2010	Jessica Manire	
16		Plaintiff	
17		DEFENDANTS	
18			
19	a shuma 14	0-51	
20	Dated: NOVEMBER 14, 2016	Millennium Products, Inc.	
21		A	
22		By: GT DAVE	
23		Its: (FO	
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	*	45	
		45	

Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 57 of 139 Page ID #:1928

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto, by and through their respective attorneys, and intending to be legally bound hereby, have duly executed this Agreement as of the date set forth below.

<b>AGREED</b>	AND	ACC	EPT	ED.
			A PERSON NAMED IN	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

#### **PLAINTIFFS**

Dated:	, 2016	

Plaintiff

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2016 \_\_\_\_\_\_

Kirsten Schofield
Plaintiff

Dated: 11 10 110 , 2016 Jessica Manire

Jessica Manire Plaintiff

#### DEFENDANTS

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2016 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Millennium Products, Inc.

By:

Its!

AS

## Case 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW Document 103-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 58 of 139 Page ID #:1929

IN WITNE	SS WHEREOF, t	the Parties hereto, by and through their respecti
attorneys, and intending to be legally bound hereby, have duly executed this		
Agreement as of the date set forth below.		
AGREED AND	ACCEPTED:	<u>PLAINTIFFS</u>
Dated:	, 2016	Jonathan Retta Plaintiff
Dated:	, 2016	Kirsten Schofield Plaintiff
Dated:	, 2016	Jessica Manire Plaintiff
		<u>DEFENDANTS</u>
Dated:	, 2016	Millennium Products, Inc.
		By:
		Its:
		45
	STIPULATION	OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Case	e 2:15-cv-01801-PSG-AJW	Document 10	3-3 Filed 11/18/16 Page 59 of 139 Page ID 930		
	IN WITNESS W	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto, by and through their respective			
2	11	attorneys, and intending to be legally bound hereby, have duly executed this			
2	Agreement as of the da				
4	II .				
5	AGREED AND ACC	EPTED:	PLAINTIFFS PLAINTIFFS		
6	5				
7	Dated:	2016			
8	Buttou.		Jonathan Retta		
9			Plaintiff		
10			Ma Can		
11	Dated: // //ov/.	, 2016	Kirsten Schofield		
12			Plaintiff		
13					
14	Dated:	. 2016			
15			Jessica Manire		
16			Plaintiff		
17			DEFENDANTS		
18					
19					
20	Dated:	, 2016	Millennium Products, Inc.		
21			William I roducts, mc.		
22			By:		
23			Its:		
24					
25					
26					
27					
28			AS		
			45		