| 1 | DLA PIPER LLP (US) | | |
|-----|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | Angela C. Agrusa (SBN 131337) | | |
| 2 | angela.agrusa@dlapiper.com | | |
| 3 | Shannon E. Dudic (SBN 261135) | | |
| | shannon.dudic@dlapiper.com | | |
| 4 | 2000 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400 North Tower Los Angeles, California 90067 | | |
| 5 | Telephone: (310) 500-3500 | | |
| 6 | Facsimile: (310) 500-3300 | | |
| _ | MESSNER REEVES LLP | | |
| 7 | Charles C. Cavanagh (SBN 198468) | | |
| 8 | ccavanagh@messner.com | | |
| | 1430 Wynkoop Street, Suite 300 | | |
| 9 | Denver, Colorado 80202 | | |
| 10 | Telephone: (303) 623-1800 Facsimile: (303) 623-0552 | | |
| 11 | 1 acsimic. (303) 023-0332 | | |
| 12 | Attorneys for Defendant | | |
| 13 | CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC. | | |
| 14 | INITED STATES | S DISTRICT COURT | |
| 15 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | |
| 16 | NORTHERN DISTR | ICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| | | | |
| 17 | MARTIN SCHNEIDER, et al., individually and | Case No.: 4:16-CV-02200-HSG | |
| 18 | on behalf of all others similarly situated, | | |
| 1.0 | 71.1.100 | STIPULATION REGARDING AUGUST | |
| 19 | Plaintiff, | 2020 AMENDMENT TO SETTLEMENT | |
| 20 | | AGREEMENT AND RELEASE [DKT. | |
| | V. | NO. 205-2] | |
| 21 | CHIPOTLE MEXICAN GRILL, INC., a | | |
| 22 | Delaware corporation, | Ctrm.: 2 (Oakland Courthouse) | |
| | 2 con mare corporations, | Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. | |
| 23 | Defendant. | , | |
| 24 | | Action Filed: April 22, 2016 | |
| | | Trial Date: Vacated | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 20 | | | |

In response to the Court's concerns at the July 30, 2020 hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of Settlement filed by Plaintiffs,¹ the Parties have agreed to amend the Agreement (Dkt. No. 205-2) with respect to claim distribution as follows:

- 1. Double the Settlement Award per valid Claim from \$2.00 to \$4.00;
- 2. Consider the 16 untimely Claims received by the Class Action Settlement Administrator, as of August 14, 2020, to be timely and valid; and
- 3. Consider the 328 incomplete Claims received by the Class Action Settlement Administrator, as of August 14, 2020, to be timely and valid, subject to sending deficiency letters and receiving cured responses from such Settlement Class Members within 14 calendar days of mailing.

As modified, Settlement Class Members with timely and valid Claims will receive twenty times what they otherwise would have recovered at trial, while at the same time contributing a sum to cy pres that will indirectly benefit Settlement Class Members who did not submit Claims.

Assuming that all incomplete Claims are cured and all late Claims are valid, and adding these Claims to the existing valid and timely Claims, the Settlement Awards to claiming Settlement Class Members will total approximately \$2,865,896.00, leaving approximately \$419,787.96 to cy pres. These estimates account for adjusted administrative costs of sending deficiency letters, additional processing, and issuing checks.² The revised distributions present an equitable result given that each recipient organization will receive about \$200,000, which is substantial enough to have a meaningful indirect impact for all of the class members' interests, but would be insubstantial if distributed per capita.

The Parties agree that additional notice of the Amendment to Settlement Class Members is neither warranted nor appropriate. Indeed, courts in this district and nationwide have repeatedly held that, where, as here, a settlement is modified after class notice has been issued, the class need not

¹ Capitalized terms used herein without definition shall have the meanings assigned to them in the Agreement (Dkt. No. 205-2).

² Any uncured claims will revert to cy pres, adding a few thousand dollars at most.

| 1 | receive additional notice unless the modification would have a material adverse effect on class | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | member rights. The rationale is that a class member who did not opt out after receiving notice of the | |
| 3 | original settlement would not opt out based on a modified and improved settlement. E.g., In re | |
| 4 | Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig., 327 F.R.D. 299, 330-31 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (declining to order | |
| 5 | supplemental notice where, in response to court's concerns, class settlement was modified to reduce cy | |
| 6 | pres and increase payments to claiming class members); Knuckles v. Elliott, 2016 WL 3912816, *5-6 | |
| 7 | (E.D. Mich. July 20, 2016) (notice of settlement modification "required only where the amendment | |
| 8 | would have a material adverse effect on the rights of class members," and declining to order | |
| 9 | supplemental notice where cy pres reduced and payments to claiming class members increased); Klee | |
| 10 | v. Nissan North America, Inc., 2015 WL 4538426, *5 (C.D. Cal. July 7, 2015) ("[W]hen a settlement | |
| 11 | is amended to make it more valuable, it is unnecessary to give additional notice to those class | |
| 12 | members that received adequate notice of the original proposed settlement and decided not to opt | |
| 13 | out."); In re Prudential Ins. Co. of America Sales Practices Litig., 962 F. Supp. 450, 473 n.10 (D.N.J. | |
| 14 | 1997) ("Class members need not be informed of the Final Enhancements to the settlement because the | |
| 15 | Proposed Settlement is only more valuable with these changes. Plainly, class members who declined | |
| 16 | to opt out earlier, would not choose to do so now."); see also Shaffer v. Continental Cas. Co., 362 F. | |
| 17 | App'x. 627, 631 (9th Cir. 2010) ("Although changes were made to the release after potential class | |
| 18 | members received the notice, the changes did not render the notice inadequate because they narrowed | |
| 19 | the scope of the release."). | |
| 20 | Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in the Motion for Final | |
| 21 | Approval of Settlement, the Parties respectfully request that the Court grant the Motion and finally | |
| 22 | approve the Settlement, with the revised claim distribution plan set forth herein. | |
| 23 | | |
| | | |

24

25

Respectfully submitted,

26 27

28

| 1 | Dated: August 13, 2020 | DLA PIPER LLP (US) |
|----------|---|---|
| 3 | | By: /s/Angela C. Agrusa Angela C. Agrusa Shannon E. Dudic Attorneys for Defendant |
| 5 | Dated: August 13, 2020 | KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP |
| 6 | | By: <u>/s/ Laurence D. King</u> |
| 7 | | Laurence D. King Attorneys for Plaintiffs |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1 | |
| 11 | | oncurrence in the filing has been obtained from the other |
| 12 | signatory. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed August 13, 2020 at Los Angeles, California. | |
| 13 | Toregoing is true and correct. Executed F | August 13, 2020 at Los Angeles, Camorina. |
| 14 | | <u>Angela C. Agrusa</u> Angela C. Agrusa |
| 15 | | Anigola C. Algrusa |
| 16 | | |
| 17 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | 2 |

DLA PIPER LLP (US) Los Angeles