

1 Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857)  
(msobol@lchb.com)  
2 Allison S. Elgart (State Bar No. 241901)  
(aelgart@lchb.com)  
3 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &  
BERNSTEIN, LLP  
4 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339  
5 Telephone: (415) 956-1000  
Facsimile: (415) 956-1008  
6

7 Michael A. Caddell (State Bar No. 249469)  
(mac@caddellchapman.com)  
8 Cynthia B. Chapman (State Bar No. 164471)  
(cbc@caddellchapman.com)  
9 CADDELL & CHAPMAN  
1331 Lamar St., Suite 1070  
Houston, TX 77010  
10 Telephone: (713) 751-0400  
Facsimile: (713) 751-0906  
11

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

12  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
15 (SOUTHERN DIVISION)

16 TERRI N. WHITE, *et al.*,  
17 Plaintiffs,  
18 v.  
19 EXPERIAN INFORMATION  
20 SOLUTIONS, INC.,  
21 Defendant.

Case No. 05-CV-1070 DOC (MLGx)  
(Lead Case)

NOTICE OF CONTINUATION OF  
FINAL FAIRNESS HEARING TO MAY  
16, 2011 AND REPORT ON  
SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE  
CAMPAIGN

The Honorable David O. Carter

22 and Related Cases:

23 05-cv-01073-DOC (MLGx)  
24 05-cv-7821-DOC (MLGx)  
06-cv-0392-DOC (MLGx)  
25 05-cv-1172-DOC(MLGx)  
06-cv-5060-DOC (MLGx)  
26

27  
28

1           Settling Plaintiffs Jose Hernandez, Bertram Robison, Kathryn Pike, and  
2 Robert Randall hereby submit the following:

3           On February 4, 2011, the Court approved the Settling Plaintiffs' revised  
4 Supplemental Notices to Convenience Award Claimants, Actual Damage Award  
5 Claimants, and opt-outs and objectors, and ordered that these Supplemental Notices  
6 be mailed out on or before February 15, 2011. (Dkt. No. 742.) The Settlement  
7 Administrator complied with the Court's order and completed the Supplemental  
8 Notice mailings by February 15, 2011. (Ex. 1, Keough Decl. at ¶ 3.) The response  
9 deadline set forth in the Supplemental Notices was March 31, 2011. (*Id.*) A total  
10 of 771,738 supplemental notices were issued. (*Id.*) In response, there were 46,674  
11 calls to the telephone assistance program, 53,376 visits to the settlement website,  
12 and 1,086 emails requesting information. (*Id.*) 47,692 claims were submitted  
13 either by mail or online. (*Id.*)

14           The Supplemental Notice campaign also allowed (1) claimants who had not  
15 previously opted out to request exclusion and, conversely, (2) those who had  
16 previously requested exclusion to withdraw their opt-out and participate in the  
17 settlement. 614 prior claimants exercised their right to opt-out and 43 class  
18 members who had previously requested exclusion filed Claim Forms. (*Id.* at ¶ 4.)  
19 In addition, 15 class members took advantage of the extended deadline for  
20 objections to assert either new or revised objections.<sup>1</sup> (*Id.*)

21           As part of its administration of the Supplemental Notice campaign, the  
22 Settlement Administrator conducted several tasks with respect to the 47,692  
23 submitted supplemental claim forms. First, 852 of the claim forms were identified  
24 as untimely (post-marked after March 31, 2011), and therefore invalid (meaning  
25

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> The new and revised objections are attached, except for the recent objections filed  
28 by the White Plaintiffs (Dkt. No. 746) and Marsha and Jimmy Green (Dkt. No. 747), which were previously filed with the Court.

1 only that these claims are converted to or remain qualified for a Convenience  
2 Award). (*Id.* at ¶ 5.)

3 3,905 timely claimants requested a Convenience Award, and 1,716 other  
4 claimants submitted nothing more on their supplemental claim form than their  
5 name and personal identifying information, i.e., there was no claim category option  
6 selected, nor did they provide any identifying information (dates, etc.) relative to a  
7 claim. (*Id.* at ¶ 5,6.) All of these claims (5,621) will be treated as Convenience  
8 Award claims.<sup>2</sup> (*Id.* at ¶ 6.)

9 Of the remaining 41,219 timely claims requesting an Actual Damage Award,  
10 23,822 were converted to Convenience Award Claims for failing to provide any  
11 additional documentation.<sup>3</sup> (*Id.*) As to these claim forms, the Settlement  
12 Administrator confirmed that not only was there no documentation of the types  
13 identified in the Actual Damage Award claim form (ten examples of acceptable  
14 additional documentation were outlined on the supplemental actual damage award  
15 claim form), but there was also no attempt to satisfy the “Other” option of  
16 providing some other form of additional documentation. (*Id.*)

17 Next, the Settlement Administrator reviewed all 197 claims that selected both  
18 the Employment and Mortgage Loan or Housing Rental categories, together with a  
19 random sampling of the other three groups of claim forms in which more than one  
20

---

21 <sup>2</sup> 268 of the 1,716 claimants who provided only their names and personal  
22 identification did accompany their claim form with at least some documentation,  
23 which the Settlement Administrator is currently reviewing to determine if any of  
24 these claimants can qualify for an Actual Damage Award. This review includes a  
review of their original filing, to see if documentation or category identification was  
provided on the original filing. (Ex. 1, Keough Decl. at ¶ 6 n.1.)

25 <sup>3</sup> The Supplemental Notice To Actual Damage Award Claimants noted the  
following: “the Court has determined that additional information is required...,”  
26 “You must submit...additional documentation,” **“If you do not submit the  
Additional Claimant Information Form and required documentation, your  
claim will be converted to a Convenience Award,”** and **“You must submit some  
documentation in order for your claim to be considered valid. If you do not  
submit any documentation at all, your claim will be converted to a  
27 Convenience Award.”** (Dkt. No. 739, Exhibit A (emphasis in the original).)  
28

1 claim category was selected, to confirm that the documentation provided was  
2 consistent with the highest category selected. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.) Thus far, approximately  
3 60% of the Actual Damage Award Claimants claiming both an Employment and a  
4 Mortgage Loan or Housing Rental claim provided employment-related documents  
5 consistent with the higher level claim. (*Id.*) Thus far, approximately 75% of the  
6 other claimants in the groups in which more than one claim category was selected  
7 submitted documents consistent with their higher claim. (*Id.*)

8 Therefore, of the 17,397 timely and complete Supplemental Actual Damage  
9 Award Claims received, the Settlement Administrator reports that 4,302 claimants  
10 made an Employment claim<sup>4</sup>, either alone or in combination with another category,  
11 6,984 asserted a Mortgage Loan or Housing Rental claim, either alone or in  
12 combination with the Credit Card category, and 6,111 claimed only the Credit  
13 Card, Auto Loan, or Other Credit category. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.) Even if the Settlement  
14 Administrator ultimately validates each timely and documented actual damage  
15 award claim at the "highest award" claimed by each actual damage award  
16 claimant,<sup>5</sup> there will be sufficient settlement funds available to provide an initial  
17 payment value<sup>6</sup> to each of these claims of \$750, \$500, and \$150, respectively, and  
18 the total payment of actual damage awards will be \$7,635,150. (*Id.* at ¶ 9.)

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 <sup>4</sup> This number includes claims for which Employment was the only category  
21 selected, as well as claims for which Employment was selected along with one or  
22 more other categories. All such claims will be treated as Employment claims, since  
23 the Settlement Agreement provides that the "Settlement Administrator shall pay to  
24 the Actual Damage Award Claimant the highest award for which he or she is  
25 eligible." Settlement Agreement at ¶7.7.c. (iv). (Dkt. No. 384, p.40.)

26 <sup>5</sup> The Settlement Administrator expects to complete its review of these claims and  
27 the supporting documentation next week and will issue a final report. The Settling  
28 Plaintiffs will provide a Supplemental Report at that time detailing the final  
proposed allocation of the settlement funds, although the estimates provided infra  
for the initial payment amounts to each valid actual damage award claimant will not  
change.

<sup>6</sup> The Settlement Agreement provides that "any unclaimed or uncashed  
Convenience Awards" "will expire after ninety (90) days from issuance and the  
amount thereof added to the amounts available for payment of the Predetermined  
Actual Damage Awards." *Ibid* at ¶7.7.b. (iii). (Dkt. No. 384, p.37.) Given the  
certainty that some Convenience Award payments will go unclaimed or uncashed

1 Payment of this amount in Actual Damage Awards will leave remaining in  
2 the Settlement Fund, after deducting accrued and estimated future notice and  
3 administrative costs,<sup>7</sup> and attorneys fees and expenses, an estimated \$18,125,000.  
4 This means that the remaining estimated<sup>8</sup> 752,720 settlement claimants will receive  
5 Convenience Awards of approximately \$24.07. (*See id.* at ¶ 10.)

6 Therefore, Settling Plaintiffs request that the Fairness Hearing for the  
7 proposed settlement be completed on May 16, 2011, that their report be accepted,  
8 and that the settlement be fully and finally approved.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 the amount paid to Actual Damage Award Claimants will increase.

24 <sup>7</sup> Excluding the notice costs associated with the Supplemental Notice campaign,  
25 which the Settling Plaintiffs Counsel has agreed, and the Court has ordered, will be  
deducted from the amount awarded by the Court for attorneys' fees. (Dkt. No.  
742.)

26 <sup>8</sup> Estimated only because some of the 1716 claims which provided only the name  
27 and personal identifying information may yet be validated by the Settlement  
28 Administrator as Actual Damage Awards through reference to the documentation  
which accompanied 268 of those claim forms and/or the original claim forms  
submitted by those individuals.

1 Dated: April 22, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Michael A. Caddell  
3 Michael A. Caddell

4 Michael A. Caddell (State Bar No. 249469)  
(mac@caddellchapman.com)  
5 Cynthia B. Chapman (State Bar No. 164471)  
(cbc@caddellchapman.com)  
6 CADDELL & CHAPMAN  
1331 Lamar, Suite 1070  
7 Houston, TX 77010  
Telephone: (713) 751-0400  
8 Facsimile: (713) 751-0906

9 Michael W. Sobol (State Bar No. 194857)  
(msobol@lchb.com)  
10 Allison S. Elgart (State Bar No. 241901)  
(aelgart@lchb.com)  
11 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &  
BERNSTEIN, LLP  
12 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339  
13 Telephone: (415) 956-1000  
Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

14 Stuart T. Rossman (BBO No. 430640)  
(srossman@nclc.org)  
15 Charles M. Delbaum (BBO No. 543225)  
(cdelbaum@nclc.org)  
16 NATIONAL CONSUMER LAW CENTER  
7 Winthrop Square, 4th Floor  
17 Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-8010  
18 Facsimile: (617) 542-8028

19 Leonard A. Bennett (VSB No. 37523)  
(lenbennett@cavtel.net)  
20 Matthew Erasquin (VSB No. 65434)  
(matt@clalegal.com)  
21 CONSUMER LITIGATION ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
12515 Warwick Boulevard, Suite 201  
22 Newport News, Virginia 23606  
Telephone: (757) 930 3660  
23 Facsimile: (757) 930-3662  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

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

Mitchell A. Toups (TSB No. 20151600)  
(matoups@wgttlaw.com)  
WELLER, GREEN, TOUPS & TERRELL, L.L.P.  
Bank of America Tower  
2615 Calder St., Suite 400  
Beaumont Texas 77702  
Telephone: (409) 838-0101  
Facsimile: (409) 832-8577

*Attorneys for White/Hernandez Plaintiffs*

Lee A. Sherman (State Bar No. 172198)  
CALLAHAN, THOMPSON, SHERMAN &  
CAUDILL  
111 Fashion Lane  
Tustin, CA 92780  
Telephone: (714) 730-5700  
Facsimile: (714) 730-1642

*Attorneys for the Acosta/Pike Plaintiffs*