1 2	Elizabeth J. Cabraser (083151) LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEI 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor	N, LLP	
3	San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: (415) 956-1000		
4	Facsimile: (415) 956-1008 ecabraser@lchb.com		
5	Steve W. Berman (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP		
6	715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202 Berkeley, CA 94710		
7	Telephone: (510) 725-3000 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001		
8	steve@hbsslaw.com		
9	Adam J. Zapala (245748) COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP		
10	840 Malcolm Road Burlingame, CA 94010		
11	Telephone: (650) 697-6000 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577		
12	azapala@cpmlegal.com		
13	Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs		
14	[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17	OAKLAND DIVISION		
18	IN RE LITHIUM ION BATTERIES	Case No. 13-MD-02420 YGR (DMR)	
19 20	ANTITRUST LITIGATION	MDL No. 2420	
21			
22	This Documents Relates to:	INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT REGARDING	
23 24	ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS	DISTRIBUTION OF SETTLEMENT FUNDS	
25		DATE ACTION FILED: Oct. 3, 2012	
26			
27			
28			

r

Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs ("IPPs") respectfully submit this statement regarding the distribution of settlement funds, in response to the Court's October 16, 2023 Order (ECF No. 2772). As IPPs previously reported, during the Phase I period, the claims administrators experienced a high volume of requests and inquiries regarding the processing of settlement payments. *See* ECF No. 2769 at 1. To ensure claimants and administrators had sufficient time to resolve these issues, the deadline for claimants to make these requests was extended to September 29, 2023, and all such requests have now been resolved.

In its October 16 Order, the Court requested further information about concerns raised by claimant Randy Johnson in a recent letter. *See* ECF No. 2772 at 1–2. IPPs address each of the Court's questions in turn.

(1) Did class members experience widespread challenges arising out of claims administrators' email communications, including digital payments, being re-routed to recipients' spam folders?

No. The claims administrators have seen nothing to suggest that class members experienced widespread technical issues in receiving email communications regarding settlement payments. As of September 29, 2023, the claims administrators received emails from 1,768 class members requesting to have their payments resent based on initial difficulties accessing their payments. These requests covered a range of situations, including class members who needed to update an email address for the purpose of receiving their digital payment, class members who changed their minds and wished to receive a physical check instead of a digital payment, and class members who were unable to locate a payment notification. In total, these requests constitute approximately 0.166 percent of the 1,065,996 class members who requested digital payments via email. Based on their prior experience, the claims administrators do not view this as indicative of any widespread technical issues arising out of their email communications.

Moreover, initial data regarding the number of unclaimed payments—*i.e.*, payments for which a claimant did not accept their funds, due to a range of factors that may have no relation to spam filters—does not suggest any widespread technical problems. Specifically, the claims administrators report that approximately 20,500 claimants (or 1.9 percent of all claimants who requested digital payments) have not accepted their digital payments, representing an aggregate

value of approximately \$1.2 million (or 1.7 percent of the Net Settlement Fund). These figures are well within the normal range for claims-based programs such as this one.

Since receiving Mr. Johnson's letter, the claims administrators have attempted to contact him twice regarding his individual request for payment. As of this filing, Mr. Johnson has not responded. Provided Mr. Johnson timely responds and provides any necessary information, the claims administrators plan to reissue and facilitate completion of his digital payment.²

(2) If so, how extensive were these challenges, why were they not anticipated, *i.e.*, occur in the first place, and what steps were taken or are being taken to address them?

As explained above, class members have not experienced widespread challenges arising out of the claims administrators' email communications. IPPs add that in sending payment notifications to class members via email, the claims administrators utilized best practices to avoid and minimize the risk of such communications being blocked or caught by internet service providers and/or spam filters, similar to the methods they previously undertook to send settlement notices to the class. For example, the payment notification emails used an embedded HTML text format that was easy to read without graphics, tables, images, attachments, and other elements that would increase the likelihood of being blocked. The emails were sent using a server known to major email providers as one not used to send bulk spam or junk emails. And emails were sent in small groups to avoid being flagged as spam or junk. *See* ECF No. 2671-1 ¶ 14 (describing implementation of settlement notice plan).

(3) Is there cause to reopen the first distribution of settlement funds to address technical challenges relative to the claims administrators' email communications?

No. Because the claims administrators see no evidence that widespread technical difficulties occurred with respect to the email communications to class members, there is no cause to reopen the first round of distribution on that basis. In order to maximize payments to class members, IPPs propose an extended Phase I distribution effort for the approximately 20,500

¹ The claims administrators have now sent those claimants at least four communications regarding their digital payments—a warm-up/notification email, a payment email, and two reminder emails.

² On October 23, 2023, a second claimant, A. Prince Farmer, filed an "objection" describing difficulties receiving their digital payment, similar to those described by Mr. Johnson. ECF No. 2773. The claims administrators will also attempt to contact this claimant to resolve their inquiries.

claimants for whom digital payments were not accepted. This limited distribution would require reactivating those claimants' payments and sending a "Last Chance" email, as well as responding to a limited number of class members who have contacted the claims administrators since the September 29, 2023 deadline. Further, the claims administrators have agreed to undertake this effort at no additional cost to the class. Accordingly, IPPs propose extending the current schedule for distribution of settlement funds by seven weeks, as follows:

Event	Current Deadline (ECF No. 2772)	Proposed Modified Deadline
Report Results of Phase I DigitalPay and Epiq to identify and report funds that have not yet been taken by payees. Final accounting report and reconciliation will be created, along with proposed Second Round Distribution amounts. A report on first round distribution will be filed with the Court with a	October 25, 2023	December 13, 2023
proposed plan for Second Round Distribution. Phase II: Second Round Distribution	December 20, 2023	February 7, 2024
DigitalPay securely delivers a final pro rata payment to all payees who took a payment in the Initial Payment Offering (Phase I), as well as those that requested an updated method of payment in Phase I. This final phase delivers funds to all entitled claimants with the intent of taking the settlement balance as close to \$0 as possible (except for outstanding physical checks issued by Epiq). Epiq to reissue checks with 30-day expiration to those who did not cash 60 days from first issuance.		
Final Reporting DigitalPay to provide final report regarding the disbursement of the settlement funds.	January 12, 2024	March 1, 2024
Epiq to identify and report checks that have not been cashed 30 days from re-issuance. Any remaining funds will be distributed to the Attorneys General for the Class jurisdictions for use in prosecuting consumer antitrust claims.		

1	Dated: October 23, 2023	LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
2		By s/Brendan P. Glackin
3		BRENDAN P. GLACKIN Elizabeth J. Cabraser (SBN 083151)
4		Brendan P. Glackin (199643) Lin Y. Chan (SBN 255027)
5		Michael K. Sheen (288284) 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
6		San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: (415) 956-1000
7		Facsimile: (415) 956-1008 ecabraser@lchb.com
8		bglackin@lchb.com lchan@lchb.com
9		msheen@lchb.com
10	Data I. Oata I. a. 22, 2022	HACENC DEDMAN CODOL CHADIDO LLD
11	Dated: October 23, 2023	HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
12		By <u>s/ Shana E. Scarlett</u> SHANA E. SCARLETT
13		Steve W. Berman (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Shana E. Scarlett (217895)
14		Benjamin J. Siegel (256260) 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202
15		Berkeley, CA 94710
16		Telephone: (510) 725-3000 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001
17		steve@hbsslaw.com shanas@hbsslaw.com
18		bens@hbsslaw.com
19	Dated: October 23, 2023	COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP
20		By <u>s/Adam J. Zapala</u>
21		ADAM J. ZAPALA Joseph W. Cotchett (SBN 36324)
22		840 Malcolm Road Burlingame, CA 94010
23		Telephone: (650) 697-6000 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577
24		jcotchett@cpmlegal.com azapala@cpmlegal.com
25		Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs
26		
27		
28		