

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**JOINT DECLARATION OF CO-LEAD CLASS COUNSEL IN SUPPORT OF
CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

Sherrie R. Savett, Roberta D. Liebenberg, Benjamin F. Johns, and Linda P. Nussbaum
hereby jointly declare as follows:

1. On June 12, 2020, the Court held that we met the criteria of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g) for purposes of interim class counsel appointments and appointed us as Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel for the Consumer Track¹ plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs") of this litigation against Defendant Wawa, Inc. ("Wawa"). *See* Dkt. 120. In that capacity, we submit this joint declaration in support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards.

2. We have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this Declaration. If called as witnesses, we could and would competently testify to these facts.

I. Class Counsel's Experience

3. Individually and collectively, we have extensive experience in class actions in

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all capitalized terms herein are defined in the Amended Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement") filed with the Court on April 29, 2021 (Dkt. 201-1). References to the Settlement Agreement are cited herein as "SA ¶ ___."

general and data breach litigation in particular. *See* Dkt. 78-2 to 78-5 (firm resumes attached as exhibits to motion for appointment as Interim Co-Lead Counsel).

4. Below we summarize each of our respective backgrounds.

A. Sherrie R. Savett, Berger Montague PC

5. Ms. Savett is a Managing Shareholder and Chair Emeritus of Berger Montague PC. She is Co-Chair of the firm's Technology, Privacy, and Data Breach practice area, as well as the Securities Litigation department and *Qui Tam*/False Claims Act department.

6. She has been a prominent class action and commercial litigator in Philadelphia for nearly 50 years.

7. She is widely recognized as a leading litigator and top female leader in the profession by local and national legal rating organizations. For example, in 2019 *The Legal Intelligencer* named Ms. Savett a "Distinguished Leader," and in 2018 she was named to the *Philadelphia Business Journal's* 2018 Best of the Bar: Philadelphia's Top Lawyers.

8. Ms. Savett has served as Lead or Co-Lead Counsel in dozens of complex class actions throughout her career. A detailed discussion of her recognitions and accomplishments is set forth on her resume previously filed with the Court. (Dkt. 78-2.)

9. Data breach cases in which Ms. Savett personally held a court-appointed role include *In re Experian Data Breach Litig.*, No. 15-cv-01592 (C.D. Cal.), where she served on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in a case that settled for benefits valued at over \$170 million including cash payments, credit monitoring, and injunctive relief. Ms. Savett also served on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re Heartland Payment Systems, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, MDL 2046, No. 09-MD-2046 (S.D. Tex.), a case that settled for benefits consisting of a cash fund to reimburse out-of-pocket losses and injunctive relief. She also served

on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee in *In re Countrywide Fin'l. Corp. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, MDL 1998, No. 08-MD-01998-TBR (W.D. Ky.), a case that settled for benefits consisting of two years of free credit monitoring offered to 1.9 million individuals, a \$6.5 million cash fund to reimburse out-of-pocket losses for 17 million individuals, and injunctive relief involving improvements to Countrywide's data security systems.

10. Ms. Savett also served as Co-Lead Counsel in *In re: TJX Cos. Retail Security Breach Litig.*, MDL No. 1838, No. 07-cv-10162-WGY (D. Mass.). In that case, a settlement was reached in 2008 valued at over \$200 million consisting of: (i) two years of free credit monitoring and identity theft insurance for 455,000 individuals whose driver's license numbers were exposed; (ii) a \$17 million cash and voucher fund available to 45 million individuals whose credit and debit card numbers were exposed, which was used to reimburse out-of-pocket costs and lost time; and (iii) injunctive relief involving improvements to TJX's data security systems. These elements became the template for many subsequent data breach settlements. In approving the settlement, former Chief Judge William Young noted that the result was an "excellent settlement" containing "innovative" and "groundbreaking" elements. *See In re: TJX Cos. Retail Security Breach Litig.*, No. 07-cv-10162-WGY, Dkt. No. 297 at 6:12 (D. Mass. Sept. 27, 2007) (transcript of hearing on preliminary approval of settlement).

11. In addition to these cases, Ms. Savett has been involved in several other data breach cases including *In re: Equifax Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, MDL 2800, No. 17-md-2800 (N.D. Ga.), *In re: Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, MDL 2617, No. 15-MD-02617 (N.D. Cal.), *In re: Medical Informatics Engineering, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, MDL 2667, No. 15-md-02667 (N.D. Ind.), and *In re Hannaford Bros. Co. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, MDL 1954, No. 08-md-01954 (D. Me.), as discussed further in her resume. (Dkt. 78-2.)

12. Her firm has also held leadership roles in other data breach cases including *In re: MGM Resorts International Data Breach Litig.*, No. 20-cv-00376 (D. Nev.) (Co-Lead Counsel), *In re: American Medical Collection Agency, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, MDL 2904, No. 19-md-02904 (D.N.J.) (Plaintiffs' Steering Committee), and *Beckett v. Aetna, Inc.*, No. 17-cv-03864 (E.D. Pa.) (Co-Lead Counsel). *See* Dkt. 78-2 (firm resume).

B. Roberta D. Liebenberg, Fine, Kaplan and Black, R.P.C.

13. Ms. Liebenberg is a senior partner at Fine, Kaplan and Black ("Fine Kaplan"), a nationally recognized firm located in Philadelphia. Fine Kaplan devotes its practice entirely to litigation, with an emphasis on antitrust, class actions, consumer protection, complex commercial litigation, and white-collar criminal defense. Since its founding in 1975, Fine Kaplan has been involved in many of the country's most significant antitrust and consumer class action cases. *See* Dkt. 78-3 (firm resume).

14. Ms. Liebenberg has been appointed by numerous courts to serve as Lead Counsel, including her appointment by Judge Cynthia Rufe as Lead Counsel for the End Payer Class in *In re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 2724 (E.D. Pa. 2016), and by Judge Joy Flowers Conti as Co-Lead Counsel for the Class in *In re Railway Industry Employees No-Poach Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 2850 (W.D. Pa. 2018).

15. Ms. Liebenberg and Fine Kaplan also have experience in cases involving data breach issues and the credit card industry. For example, Ms. Liebenberg served as Lead Counsel in *In re Providian Financial Corp. Credit Card Terms Litig.*, MDL No. 1301 (E.D. Pa. 2001), a large consumer fraud class action where she achieved a \$105 million cash settlement, which at the time was the largest all-cash settlement ever reached on behalf of credit card holders for unfair marketing and billing practices. In addition, she served as a member of the Financial

Institution Class expert committee in *In re Target Corp. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, No. 14-cv-02522 (D. Minn.), where a settlement was reached on behalf of that class that was worth over \$100 million. She also served on the expert committee in *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee and Merchant Discount Antitrust Litig.*, No. 05-md-01720 (E.D.N.Y.), which was settled with Visa and Mastercard for over \$5.54 billion.

16. In addition, in *In re Urethane Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1616 (D. Kan. 2004), Ms. Liebenberg and Fine Kaplan served as Co-Lead Counsel for 12 years in an action alleging price-fixing of certain urethane chemical products by five major manufacturers. After a four-week trial in which Ms. Liebenberg served as one of the trial counsel, plaintiffs obtained a jury verdict in excess of \$400 million against Dow Chemical Company. The court entered judgment for \$1.06 billion after trebling. This was the largest judgment in the U.S. in 2013 and largest price-fixing judgment ever. On appeal, the Tenth Circuit unanimously affirmed the judgment. *In re Urethane Antitrust Litig.*, 768 F.3d 1245 (10th Cir. 2014). Thereafter, while the case was pending in the U.S. Supreme Court, the plaintiffs settled with Dow for \$835 million, the largest amount ever received from a single defendant in a price-fixing case. Combined with four pre-trial settlements, the total settlements reached in the case were \$974 million, which was more than 2.4 times the damages found by the jury. The court commented: “In almost 25 years of service on the bench, this Court has not experienced a more remarkable result.” *In re Urethane Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1616, 2016 WL 4060156, at *4 (D. Kan. July 29, 2016).

17. Ms. Liebenberg also has significant experience defending Fortune 500 companies and other entities in class actions and other complex commercial cases. This defense experience has provided her with important perspectives and insights that have assisted her in formulating litigation and settlement strategies when she is representing plaintiff classes, including in this case.

C. Benjamin F. Johns, Chimicles Schwartz Kriner & Donaldson-Smith LLP

18. Mr. Johns is a Partner at Chimicles Schwartz Kriner & Donaldson-Smith (“Chimicles Schwartz”).

19. He has a history of successfully prosecuting complex class actions in general and data breach cases in particular, including *Gordon v. Chipotle Mexican Grill*, No. 17-cv-01415 (D. Colo.) (served as Co-Lead Counsel in payment card data breach case that settled for cash and injunctive relief); *Perdue v. Hy-Vee, Inc.*, No. 19-cv-01330 (C.D. Ill.) (same); *Bray et al. v. GameStop Corp.*, No. 17-cv-01365 (D. Del.) (same); *Kyles v. Stein Mart, Inc. et al.*, No. 19-cv-00483 (D. Del.) (same); and *Winstead v. ComplyRight, Inc.*, No. 18-cv-04990 (N.D. Ill.) (served as member of Plaintiffs’ Executive Committee in data breach case that settled for cash and credit monitoring).

20. In addition to having relevant data breach experience, Mr. Johns served as Co-Lead Counsel in other consumer class actions including *In re Nexus 6P Product Liab. Litig.*, No. 17-cv-02185 (N.D. Cal.) (defective smartphone class action resulting in settlement valued at \$9.75 million, which Judge Beth Labson Freeman described as “substantial” and an “excellent resolution of the case”); *Weeks v. Google LLC*, No. 18-cv-00801, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 215943, at *8-9 (N.D. Cal.) (defective smartphone class action resulting in \$7.25 million settlement that Magistrate Judge Nathanael Cousins described as an “excellent result”); *In re MyFord Touch Consumer Litig.*, No. 13-cv-03072, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 216783 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2019) (allegedly defective MyFord Touch infotainment system class action resulting in \$17 million settlement shortly before trial); and *Udeen v. Subaru of Am., Inc.*, No. 18-cv-17334, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 172460 (D.N.J. Oct. 4, 2019) (allegedly defective Subaru infotainment system class action resulting in settlement valued at \$6.25 million).

21. Mr. Johns was named a “Lawyer on the Fast Track” by *The Legal Intelligencer* in 2012.

22. Further information about Mr. Johns and Chimicles Schwartz is set forth on the firm’s resume. (Dkt. 78-4.)

D. Linda P. Nussbaum, Nussbaum Law Group

23. Linda P. Nussbaum is the founder and Managing Director of Nussbaum Law Group, P.C. (“Nussbaum”). She has substantial experience in class action litigation after having practiced in the field for over 35 years.

24. She served as lead or co-lead counsel in over 20 cases, including several cases in this District including *In re Microcrystalline Cellulose Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1402, No. 01-cv-00111 (E.D. Pa.); *In re Plastics Additives Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1684, No. 03-cv-02038 (E.D. Pa.); and *Meijer, Inc. v. Warner Chilcott Public Ltd. Co.*, No. 12-cv-03824 (E.D. Pa.).

25. In the data breach field, Ms. Nussbaum currently serves as one of two co-lead counsel for a proposed class of over 14 million current and former Morgan Stanley clients victimized by a data security incident in *Tillman v. Morgan Stanley Smith Barney LLC*, No. 20-cv-05914 (S.D.N.Y.), and co-lead counsel for a proposed class of over 10 million LabCorp patients victimized by a data breach in *In re Am. Medical Collection Agency, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, No. 19-md-2904 (D.N.J.). She and her firm are also involved in *In re Marriott Int’l. Customer Data Security Breach Litig.*, No. 19-md-2879 (D. Md.).

26. In *In re Payment Card Interchange Fee & Merch. Disc. Antitrust Litig.*, No. 05-md-1720 (E.D.N.Y.), Ms. Nussbaum was appointed as co-lead counsel for a class of millions of merchants seeking injunctive relief regarding certain rules imposed by the Visa and Mastercard payment card networks. In that role, she has further developed her already-extensive

understanding of the operations of card networks, particularly as they relate to their dealings with merchants. She has also become familiar with EMV technology and the rules and issues raised by it.

27. Ms. Nussbaum has been actively involved in payment card litigation for over ten years. Her resulting knowledge of the payment card industry has been invaluable in this litigation.

28. Further information about Ms. Nussbaum and her firm is set forth on the firm's resume. (Dkt. 78-5.)

E. Other Plaintiffs' Counsel

29. Throughout the litigation, the Class Counsel team coordinated with and delegated work to other plaintiffs' counsel in the Consumer Track as proposed in Class Counsel's leadership brief (Dkt. 78 at pg. 19-20 and chart at Dkt. 78-6) and approved by the Court (Dkt. 120 at pg. 4).

30. Each of those other firms have extensive experience in complex class action litigation. *See* Dkt. 78-6 (chart summarizing each firm's experience); *see also* Exhibits 1 - 24 hereto (Declarations of each non-lead counsel firm).

II. Class Counsel's Efforts in the Action

31. Soon after Wawa announced the data breach on December 19, 2019, numerous plaintiffs and their counsel filed class actions in this District on behalf of Wawa consumers. One case was filed in the District of Delaware but was voluntarily dismissed two weeks later. No other federal cases were filed in any other districts. One state court case was filed in New Jersey. *Kasan Laster v. Wawa, Inc.*, No. BUR-L-000037-20 (N.J. Superior Court). That case was stayed pending resolution of the federal litigation. The plaintiff in that action has joined in this

Settlement. *See* Amended Settlement Agreement (“SA”) (Dkt. 201-1 at ¶ 17).

32. On January 2, 2020, Berger Montague and Chimicles Schwartz filed a motion to consolidate all pending cases in this District. (Dkt. 3-1.) On January 8, 2020, Chief Judge Juan Sanchez granted the motion and consolidated the cases. (Dkt. 9.) The actions were consolidated into the first-filed docket, which had been assigned to this Court.

33. On January 14, 2020, the Court issued a Standing Order governing the case and scheduled a preliminary status conference for January 24, 2020. (Dkt. 15, 16.) At the conference, the Court addressed various administrative issues including the process for submitting applications for leadership in the Consumer Track, Financial Institution Track, and Employee Track.

34. On February 19, 2020, Berger Montague, Chimicles Schwartz, Fine Kaplan, and Nussbaum filed a joint leadership application. (Dkt. 78.) The application was consented to by all plaintiffs’ counsel in the Consumer Track after significant discussions among plaintiffs’ counsel to arrive at an agreeable structure that would best serve the interests of the Class. The application proposed a structure in which Class Counsel would oversee the Consumer Track and delegate certain discrete tasks to other plaintiffs’ counsel if and as needed. (Dkt. 78 at pg. 19-20 and Ex. 5 thereto.)

35. On June 11, 2020, the Court held a hearing on the leadership applications in all tracks. On June 12, 2020, the Court granted the Consumer Track application and made leadership appointments in the other tracks as well. (Dkt. 120.)

36. Class Counsel performed significant work on behalf of the Consumer Track Class both before and after their leadership appointment. The efforts of Class Counsel and other Plaintiffs’ counsel in the Consumer Track collectively included, among other things:

- Investigating the facts of the data breach and its aftermath;

- Drafting and filing twenty-five pre-consolidation Complaints with fifty collective plaintiffs in the Consumer Track;
- Drafting and sending an evidence preservation letter to Wawa;
- Drafting and filing the motion for consolidation (Dkt. 3-1);
- Preparing for and arguing at the January 24, 2020 preliminary status conference;
- Drafting and filing the leadership application (Dkt. 78), including coordinating with all plaintiffs' counsel in advance of the filing;
- Preparing for and arguing at the June 11, 2020 hearing on leadership applications;
- Vetting multiple data security experts, retaining a primary expert, and consulting with the expert throughout the litigation and settlement negotiations;
- Working with a private investigator to gather facts about the breach and Wawa's data security systems;
- Performing legal research regarding, *e.g.*, standing, damages, causation, duty of care, class certification, and potential common law and state statutory claims to include in the Consolidated Complaint and in connection with settlement negotiations;
- Researching data security standards and best practices established by, *e.g.*, the Payment Card Industry Data Security Standards (PCI DSS), Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. § 45), and National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST);
- Corresponding with approximately 1,000 class members who contacted Class Counsel prior to the Settlement to discuss the litigation;
- Conducting telephone interviews of dozens of potential class representatives using a detailed vetting questionnaire tailored to the Wawa data breach, and gathering their relevant documents;
- Drafting and sending evidence preservation letters to the named Plaintiffs;
- Conducting subsequent ESI interviews with the named Plaintiffs to understand where and how they store their electronically stored information in preparation for discovery;
- Coordinating with counsel in the Financial Institution Track and Employee Track on various administrative issues, and monitoring case developments and filings in those tracks;

- Drafting a 97-page thirteen-count Consolidated Complaint with plaintiffs from all six states and the District of Columbia in which Wawa operates (Dkt. 132);
- Negotiating a Protective Order (Dkt. 130) and ESI Protocol (Dkt. 139) with defense counsel and plaintiffs' counsel in the other Tracks;
- Monitoring the New Jersey state court action and coordinating with plaintiffs' counsel in that action;
- Engaging in formal and informal discovery including: (i) issuing document requests to Wawa, (ii) analyzing and summarizing 3,596 pages of documents produced by Wawa, and (iii) gathering, reviewing, and producing 212 pages of documents of behalf of the class representatives;
- Drafting and submitting Plaintiffs' Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures;
- Conducting an RFP process with potential e-Discovery vendors;
- Preparing and filing two briefs (Dkt. 148, 154) in connection with the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' joinder of Wawa's motion to stay the Employee Track case in light of the Consumer Track settlement;
- Preparing for and arguing at the November 10, 2020 hearing on Wawa's motion to dismiss or stay the Employee Track case;
- Engaging in countless meet and confer phone calls and emails with Wawa's counsel regarding discovery and other issues;
- Corresponding with the named Plaintiffs to keep them updated of key developments;
- Submitting monthly status updates to the Court;
- Collecting and analyzing monthly lodestar and expense reports from all plaintiffs' counsel, and sending quarterly summaries to the Court; and
- Engaging in settlement, notice, and claims administration matters discussed more fully below.

A. Mediation and Settlement

37. Shortly after the leadership appointments, the Parties determined that it would be worthwhile to begin a settlement dialogue.

38. After a series of initial discussions between Class Counsel and Wawa's counsel,

the Parties agreed that an experienced mediator could evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and defenses and help bring the Parties together to agree upon settlement relief for the Class.

39. The Parties evaluated several mediators and ultimately agreed to retain the Honorable Diane Welsh (Ret.) of JAMS. Judge Welsh is a highly experienced and prominent mediator with experience with class actions and data breach matters. She is also familiar with practice in this District, having served as a Magistrate Judge in this Court from 1994 to 2005. *See* ECF No. 181-2 at ¶ 4 (Jan. 14, 2021 Decl. of Hon. Diane M. Welsh (Ret.) of JAMS in Support of Proposed Class Settlement) (“Welsh Decl.”).

40. The Parties agreed to exchange discovery and other information prior to the mediation. The Parties issued document requests and produced various documents. Wawa produced 3,596 pages of documents to Class Counsel through a series of rolling productions. The documents included, among other things, a preliminary report on the Data Security Incident, other relevant evaluations of its data security, internal and external emails regarding the discovery and investigation of the data breach, Board presentations, and other relevant documents.

41. Plaintiffs produced 212 pages of documents to Wawa. The documents included, among other things, evidence of Plaintiffs’ payment card purchases at Wawa during the period of the data breach, subsequent fraudulent charges on those same cards, instances of further identity theft beyond payment card fraud (where applicable), out of pocket costs incurred by Plaintiffs due to the Wawa data breach (where applicable), and Plaintiffs’ involvement in other data breaches beyond the Wawa breach (where applicable).

42. Wawa informed Plaintiffs that there are approximately 22 million Class Members.

43. Before the mediation, Class Counsel reviewed the documents Wawa produced as well as significant amounts of publicly available information about the data breach. Class Counsel also consulted with a data security expert who analyzed the security evaluations produced by Wawa and detailed Wawa's deficient data security and potential injunctive relief.

44. At the direction of Judge Welsh, the Parties prepared and exchanged detailed mediation statements in advance of the mediation. The mediation statements addressed, *e.g.*, the factual issues in the case and the key legal issues including standing, damages, class certification, and data breach precedent in this District and beyond. Each mediation statement also set forth proposals for potential settlement benefits and notice plans.

45. On September 15, 2020, the Parties took part in an all-day mediation presided over by Judge Welsh. The mediation lasted nearly 12 hours and included joint sessions and numerous break-out sessions. The mediation was attended by all four Class Counsel, other attorneys from their firms, Wawa's outside counsel, and Wawa's General Counsel.

46. As confirmed by Judge Welsh in her Declaration (Dkt. 181-2 at ¶¶ 9-10, 16), the negotiations were hard fought and conducted at arm's length and in good faith.

47. The work involved in preparing Plaintiffs' mediation statement, analyzing Wawa's mediation statement, developing counterpoints, and discussing the issues with Wawa at the mediation informed our assessment of the relative strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiffs' claims. Class Counsel refined their assessments as appropriate during the lengthy mediation.

48. At the mediation, Wawa's counsel provided additional details and facts surrounding the data breach and events subsequent to the breach. Importantly, Wawa's counsel confirmed that there was a lack of widespread credit and debit card fraud after the data breach, which Wawa learned from its interactions with the card networks.

49. Wawa also strenuously argued that fraudulent credit and debit card purchases are typically reversed by card-issuing banks, leaving cardholders with no out-of-pocket fraud losses. This is consistent with the experiences of the named Plaintiffs, each of whom experienced fraudulent charges that were blocked or reversed by their banks. (Dkt. 132 at ¶¶ 7-133) (Consolidated Compl.).

50. Wawa also emphasized the difficult causation hurdles Plaintiffs would face at summary judgment and trial, whereby Plaintiffs would need to prove that their fraudulent transactions were the result of the Wawa data breach as opposed to other potential sources.

51. Wawa also aggressively raised other defenses regarding standing, damages, and class certification, among other things.

52. Class Counsel had counterarguments to each of Wawa's defenses. However, Class Counsel recognized the substantial risks Plaintiffs would face if the litigation were to continue. Class Counsel also recognized that years of protracted litigation would lead to lengthy delays in Class Members receiving benefits from any resolution of the case.

53. The Parties exchanged multiple settlement proposals throughout the mediation. At the end of the mediation, with the assistance of Judge Welsh, the Parties reached an agreement in principle to resolve the litigation. The settlement benefits included up to \$9 million in cash and Wawa Gift Cards, substantial Injunctive Relief, and Wawa's agreement to make a separate \$3.2 lump-sum payment to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees, expenses, Service Awards, and Settlement Administrator costs. SA ¶¶ 36-41, 79, 84-85.

54. After the mediation, the Parties spent a significant amount of time in drafting, negotiating, and revising the details of the final written Settlement Agreement and exhibits.

55. During this period of post-mediation negotiations, Wawa received and produced

to Plaintiffs the final report regarding the data breach and an amended report. Class Counsel reviewed the reports in detail to confirm the reasonableness of the negotiated settlement.

56. Based on the information obtained at the mediation, our independent investigation of the relevant facts and applicable law, our review of the data security reports and other documents produced by Wawa, and our broad experience with other payment card and similar data breach cases, we determined that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interest of the Settlement Class.

57. Judge Welsh noted that “from an experienced mediator’s perspective, the negotiated settlement produced by the mediation process represents a thorough, deliberative, and comprehensive resolution that will benefit class members through meaningful relief.” (Dkt. 181-2 at ¶ 17) (Welsh Decl.).

58. Judge Welsh also noted that both Parties were “zealously represented” at the mediation by “highly qualified attorneys with extensive experience and expertise in complex class actions in general, and data breach litigation in particular.” *Id.* at ¶ 10.

i. The Monetary Relief

59. The Settlement provides for monetary relief to Class Members via a three-tier system totaling up to \$9 million in aggregate payments. The relief consists of: (i) Wawa Gift Cards totaling up to \$6 million for consumers who used payment cards at Wawa during the period of the data breach and did not experience any subsequent fraudulent activity on their cards (“Tier One”); (ii) Wawa Gift Cards totaling up to \$2 million for consumers who used payment cards at Wawa during the period of the data breach and did experience fraudulent activity on their cards, which was ultimately blocked or reversed by their card-issuing banks (“Tier Two”); and (iii) cash payments of up to \$500 per claimant and \$1 million in aggregate for consumers

who incurred out-of-pocket fraud losses or other costs as a result of the data breach (“Tier Three”). SA ¶ 36.

60. Total Tier One compensation is subject to a \$1 million floor, meaning if the aggregate amount of all Tier One claims submitted by Class Members is less than \$1 million, the value of each Gift Card will be increased *pro rata* until the total value distributed for this tier is \$1 million. SA ¶ 36(a)(vi).

61. The Gift Cards provided as compensation will be fully transferable, will be valid for one year, and will be usable toward the purchase of any item sold in Wawa’s convenience stores (including fuel if the payment is completed inside the store), excluding cigarettes and other tobacco or nicotine delivery products. SA ¶ 33. More than 3,000 products sold in Wawa’s stores cost less than \$5, and 78% of Wawa’s products are below that \$5 threshold. (Dkt. 181 at ¶ 27) (Jt. Decl. of Co-Lead Counsel in Support of Prelim. Settlement Approval).

62. The Settlement Administrator will send an e-mail to all claimants who have not yet used the full value of their Gift Cards nine months after they are disseminated to remind claimants that unused funds remain on the Gift Cards. (Dkt. 209 at pg. 1) (Jt. Status Rpt. Concerning the Proposed Consumer Track Settlement).

ii. The Injunctive Relief

63. In addition to the direct monetary relief to the Class, Wawa also agreed to implement various injunctive measures aimed at strengthening its payment card data security environment.

64. *First*, Wawa agreed to “[r]etain a qualified security assessor on an annual basis to assess compliance with PCI-DSS requirements and issue a Report on Compliance that evidences compliance with all such requirements.” SA ¶ 40(a).

65. *Second*, Wawa agreed to “[c]onduct annual penetration testing and remediate critical vulnerabilities or implement compensating controls where feasible.” SA ¶ 40(b).

66. *Third*, Wawa agreed to “[o]perate a system that is designed to encrypt payment card information and complies with Europay, Mastercard, and Visa (‘EMV’) security procedures at the point of sale terminals in Wawa stores.” SA ¶ 40(c).

67. *Fourth*, Wawa agreed to “[o]perate a system that implements EMV security procedures at the point of sale terminals at Wawa fuel pumps.” SA ¶ 40(d).

68. *Fifth*, Wawa agreed to “[m]aintain written information security programs, policies, and procedures.” SA ¶ 40(e).

69. These security enhancements will be in place for a period of two years. Defendant’s counsel will provide Class Counsel with semi-annual updates during the two-year period in which it will implement these measures. SA ¶¶ 38, 40, 41.

70. The Parties agreed that the Injunctive Relief and Wawa’s prior improvements to its data security posture, which improvements were attributed in part to this litigation, are valued at no less than \$35 million. SA ¶ 39. This valuation is based on costs Wawa paid and will continue to pay to enhance its data security. SA ¶ 38.

71. These security enhancements are designed to minimize the likelihood of a future breach involving payment card information.

72. The enhancements will benefit Class Members, many of whom are repeat customers who make purchases at Wawa stores on a recurring basis. Class Members do not need to submit a claim to receive the benefits of the injunctive portion of the Settlement.

iii. Wawa’s Agreement to Pay Attorneys’ Fees, Expenses, Service Awards, and Settlement Administrator Costs

73. At the end of the mediation, after negotiating the substantive terms of relief for

the Class, the Parties broached the topic of attorneys' fees. Judge Welsh assisted the Parties in coming to agreement that Wawa will make a separate lump sum payment of \$3.2 million to be used to pay attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, Service Awards, and Settlement Administrator fees. *See* Welsh Decl. ¶ 15 ("This [\$3.2 million] lump sum payment was agreed to with my assistance, at the end of the mediation after the substantive terms for the class relief were already agreed upon.").

74. The \$3.2 million payment by Wawa will not reduce any settlement benefits made available to the Class.

iv. Class Counsel's Efforts to Maximize Notice

75. The Notice Program set forth in the Settlement Agreement and approved by the Court provides for notice to Class Members by means of: (i) signs at all Wawa in-store payment terminals and fuel pumps for four consecutive weeks; (ii) a Settlement Website at www.WawaConsumerDataSettlement.com; (iii) a Settlement announcement on Wawa's website; and (iv) a press release issued by Wawa. SA ¶ 55. The Notice Program is designed to also benefit from the resulting media coverage.

76. The Notice Program began on August 30, 2021 in accordance with the schedule set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. 234 at ¶ 18).

77. Class Counsel have made several trips to various Wawa stores to ensure that the signs remained properly displayed and unobstructed.

78. After the Notice Program began, in an effort to further maximize notice, Class Counsel made proposals to Wawa's counsel to increase the reach of notice beyond what was required in the Settlement Agreement. Through a series of discussions, the Parties agreed that Wawa would: (i) keep the signs up at all in-store payment terminals and fuel pumps for several

more weeks beyond the initial four week period; (ii) issue a second press release to remind Class Members about the Settlement (the second press release was issued on September 30, 2021);² (iii) include a video on all Wawa fuel pumps equipped with video screens to narrate the message of the in-store signs (the videos ran for several weeks beginning on September 28, 2021); (iv) send multiple reminders to Wawa's in-store employees to ensure that the signs remain visible and unobstructed; and (v) increase the prominence of the settlement announcement on Wawa's homepage at www.wawa.com.

79. Class Counsel also reached out to approximately 1,000 Class Members who contacted them throughout the litigation to notify them of the Settlement and how to submit claims.

80. Class Counsel also initiated a social media campaign to further publicize the Settlement.

v. Summary of Class Counsel's Work on the Settlement

81. Class Counsel performed the following tasks, among others, in negotiating, drafting, and finalizing the Settlement:

- Engaging in preliminary settlement discussions with Wawa's counsel prior to the mediation;
- Preparing a detailed mediation statement, as well as counterpoints to Wawa's mediation statement;
- Participating in an all-day mediation overseen by Judge Welsh;
- Negotiating and drafting the Settlement Agreement and exhibits;
- Drafting and filing the preliminary approval brief, joint declaration, and related filings (Dkt. 180, 181);

² The press release is available at <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/wawa-reminds-customers-how-to-submit-a-claim-to-receive-settlement-benefits-301388758.html>.

- Drafting and filing a brief (Dkt. 193) in response to detailed objections to preliminary settlement approval raised by the Employee Track Plaintiffs;
- Filing an Amended Settlement Agreement to clarify the language in the Release (Dkt. 201-1);
- Preparing for and arguing at the May 5, 2021 hearing on the motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement;
- Conducting an RFP process with several potential settlement administrators;
- Working closely with Defendant's counsel to ensure that the notice program was adequately implemented and voluntarily expanded to maximize notice;
- Working closely with the Settlement Administrator (KCC) to prepare the Settlement Website and call script, respond to Class Member inquiries, analyze claim submissions, reply to claimants to cure claims deficiencies, and oversee the overall claims process; and
- Preparing the motion papers seeking approval of an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and Service Awards.

82. Going forward, Class Counsel will also draft the motion for final settlement approval, prepare for and attend the Final Approval Hearing, and oversee the claims administration and distribution process. Class Counsel will also monitor the Injunctive Relief for two years, including analyzing periodic compliance reports from Wawa. SA ¶ 41.

III. Class Counsel's Lodestar

83. In performing the litigation and settlement tasks detailed above, Class Counsel took measures to ensure that the work was necessary in light of the needs of the case, was carried out efficiently, and was non-duplicative.

84. For example, Class Counsel allocated specific tasks among members of the Class Counsel group. Class Counsel also delegated narrowly tailored assignments to non-lead counsel on a limited as-needed basis. Examples of tasks delegated to non-lead counsel include vetting certain prospective class representatives for inclusion in the Consolidated Complaint, assisting

with drafting the Protective Order and ESI Protocol, performing legal research regarding potential common law and state statutory claims to include in the Consolidated Complaint, and assisting with retaining the primary expert witness.

85. Class Counsel also implemented a monthly billing protocol in which all plaintiffs' counsel in the Consumer Track – including Class Counsel – were required to submit monthly time and expense reports to the Class Counsel group to ensure that the time spent was reasonable, not excessive, and consistent with assignments from Class Counsel.

86. In an abundance of caution and billing discretion, Class Counsel are reducing their submitted hours and lodestar by 25%. All other Plaintiffs' counsel are reducing their hours and lodestar by 30%. This is consistent with how Consumer Track counsel reported their lodestar to the Court in their quarterly lodestar submissions.

87. The 30% reduction for other Plaintiffs' counsel is greater than the 25% reduction rate for Class Counsel because, *e.g.*, the other Plaintiffs' counsel incurred much of their time prior to leadership appointments when there was overlap among the work being performed by all collective counsel.

88. Class Counsel reviewed each firm's lodestar entries in detail to ensure that no firm submitted inefficient or duplicative entries exceeding the 25% and 30% reductions.

89. The following chart summarizes the hours and lodestar incurred by all counsel in the Consumer Track as of September 30, 2021, recorded at each firm's historical hourly rates:

Law Firm	Hours	Lodestar
Class Counsel		
Berger Montague	1,795.20	\$1,236,460.00
Chimicles Schwartz Kriner & Donaldson-Smith	1,772.30	\$931,368.50
Fine, Kaplan and Black	1,603.00	\$1,133,215.00
Nussbaum Law	<u>1,154.80</u>	<u>\$873,523.00</u>
Class Counsel Subtotal	6,325.30	\$4,174,566.50
Less: 25% Reduction	(1,581.33)	(\$1,043,641.63)
Class Counsel Adjusted Total	4,743.97	\$3,130,924.87
Other Plaintiffs' Counsel		
Ademi LLP	26.60	\$14,160.00
Ahdoot & Wolfson	38.20	\$30,305.00
Barrack, Rodos & Bacine	67.50	\$37,509.50
Criden & Love	61.90	\$33,975.00
Federman & Sherwood	74.20	\$44,788.00
George, Gesten & McDonald	200.10	\$143,505.00
Goldman, Scarlato & Penny	55.60	\$40,310.00
Grant Law Firm	28.00	\$21,000.00
Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman	7.80	\$6,772.50
Kaplan, Fox & Kilsheimer	13.40	\$7,146.00
Kohn, Swift & Graf	185.80	\$97,549.50
Law Offices of Bernard M. Gross	26.50	\$17,387.50
Mazie, Slater, Katz & Freeman	34.60	\$21,114.50
McLafferty & Associates	30.80	\$28,798.00
Milberg, Phillips, Grossman	62.00	\$31,876.50
Morgan & Morgan	34.30	\$27,494.60
Morrison & Associates	17.30	\$12,542.50
Shaffer & Gaier	10.70	\$5,617.50
Miller Shah LLP (f/k/a Shepherd Finkelman Miller & Shah)	219.70	\$122,478.50
Shub Law Firm	30.00	\$8,625.00
Spector, Roseman & Kodroff	68.95	\$47,562.75
Stull, Stull & Brody	129.30	\$107,888.50
Tadler Law Firm	134.70	\$96,707.50
Weir & Partners	<u>153.80</u>	<u>\$61,095.00</u>
Other Plaintiffs' Counsel Subtotal	1,711.75	\$1,066,208.85
Less: 30% Reduction	(513.52)	(\$319,862.66)
Other Plaintiffs' Counsel Adjusted Total	1,198.23	\$746,346.19
All Counsel Adjusted Total	5,942.20	\$3,877,271.06

A. Berger Montague's Lodestar

90. Berger Montague's time incurred by each individual biller is as follows as of September 30, 2021, recorded at historical hourly rates:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Sherrie Savett	Shareholder	368.00	\$985-\$1,005	\$366,940.00
Michelle Drake	Shareholder	2.00	\$725	\$1,520.00
Eric Lechtzin	Shareholder	1.50	\$675	\$1,020.00
Jon Lambiras	Shareholder	1,255.00	\$635-\$670	\$812,623.00
Peter Hamner	Associate	4.10	\$500-\$505	\$2,070.50
Amey Park	Associate	7.40	\$435-\$465	\$3,441.00
Reginald Streater	Associate	28.10	\$450	\$12,645.00
William Fedullo	Associate	7.90	\$440	\$3,476.00
Valeriya Kudinenko	Intake Analyst	90.30	\$250-\$260	\$23,046.00
Max Brandy	Paralegal	29.50	\$300-\$330	\$9,247.50
Rachel Gebo	Paralegal	1.40	\$250-\$310	\$431.00
Subtotal		1,795.20		\$1,236,460.00
Less: 25% Reduction		(448.80)		(\$309,115.00)
Adjusted Total		1,346.40		\$927,345.00

91. The hourly rates set forth above are the usual and customary rates charged by each biller in the firm's cases.

92. Berger Montague's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Shaw v. AMN Servs., LLC*, No. 16-cv-02816, Dkt. 167 (N.D. Cal. May 31, 2019) ("The Court further finds that the hourly rates of . . . Berger Montague PC also are within the prevailing range of hourly rates charged by attorneys providing similar services in class action . . . cases."); *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.*, No. 11-cv-07178, 2017 WL 4776626, at *9 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2017) (accepting lodestar figures based on historical hourly rates of Co-Lead Counsel Berger Montague and all other firms for purposes of a

lodestar cross-check);³ *Scolaro v. RightSourcing, Inc.*, No. 16-cv-01083, Dkt. 44 at p. 10 (C.D. Cal. June 26, 2017) (approving Berger Montague’s hourly rates of \$580-\$795 for Shareholders and \$415-\$450 for Associates); *Devlin v. Ferrandino & Son, Inc.*, No. 15-cv-04976, 2016 WL 7178338, at *10 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 9, 2016) (“the hourly rates for [Berger Montague] are well within the range of what is reasonable and appropriate in this market”); *Dennard v. Transamerica Corp.*, No. 15-cv-00030, 2016 WL7654650, at *1 (N.D. Iowa Oct. 25, 2016) (accepting Berger Montague’s hourly rates for purposes of a lodestar-based fee award);⁴ *In re High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litig.*, No. 11-cv-02509, 2015 WL 5158730, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2015) (approving Berger Montague’s standard “partner rates,” “non-partner attorney rates,” and “paralegal and staff rates”); *In re Imprelis Herbicide Mktg., Sales Practices & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 296 F.R.D. 351, 370 (E.D. Pa. 2013) (approving overall fee request) (Pratter, J.).⁵

B. Chimicles Schwartz’s Lodestar

93. Chimicles Schwartz’s time incurred by each individual biller is as follows as of September 30, 2021, recorded at historical hourly rates:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Benjamin F. Johns	Partner	510.70	\$675-\$700	\$356,965.00
Beena M. McDonald	Sr. Counsel	.60	\$525	\$315.00
Andrew W. Ferich	Former Associate	343.70	\$475-\$525	\$178,602.50

³ Berger Montague’s underlying hourly rates were set forth in the firm’s Declaration at Dkt. 513-9.

⁴ The Order cited class counsel’s total lodestar and resulting 1.4 multiplier. Berger Montague’s underlying hourly rates were set forth in the firm’s Declaration at Dkt. 107-4 ¶ 5. The hourly rates were \$775-\$925 for Shareholders, \$625 for a Senior Counsel, \$405 for an Associate, and \$150-\$320 for Paralegals.

⁵ The Order approved class counsel’s overall fee request but did not specify class counsel’s hourly rates. *Imprelis*, 296 F.R.D. at 370. Berger Montague’s underlying hourly rates were set forth in the firm’s Declaration at Dkt. 189-3 ECF pg. 13.

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Samantha E. Holbrook	Associate	397.30	\$475-\$525	\$208,052.50
Mark B. DeSanto	Associate	232.20	\$510	\$118,422.00
Alex M. Kashurba	Associate	12.40	\$450	\$5,580.00
Zachary P. Beatty	Associate	.70	\$400	\$280.00
David W. Birch	IT	14.40	\$300	\$4,320.00
Justin P. Boyer	Paralegal	92.90	\$275	\$25,547.50
Sydney B. Spott	Paralegal	1.50	\$275	\$412.50
Corneliu P. Mastraghin	Former Paralegal	3.00	\$250	\$750.00
Carlynnne A. Wagner	Law Clerk	23.40	\$225	\$5,265.00
Kiera A. Wadsworth	Paralegal	2.50	\$225	\$562.50
Madeline C. Landry	Former Paralegal	137.00	\$165-\$200	\$26,294.00
Subtotal		1,772.30		\$931,368.50
Less: 25% Reduction		(443.07)		(\$232,842.13)
Adjusted Total		1,329.23		\$698,526.38

94. The hourly rates set forth above are the usual and customary rates charged by each biller in the firm's cases.

95. Chimicles Schwartz's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Alessandro Demarco v. Avalon Bay Communities, Inc.*, No. 15-cv-00628 (D.N.J. July 11, 2017), Dkt. No. 223 at ¶ 18 ("The Court, after careful review of the time entries and rates requested by Class Counsel [including Chimicles Schwartz] and after applying the appropriate standards required by relevant case law, hereby grants Class Counsel's application for attorneys' fees"); *In re Elk Cross Timbers Decking Marketing, Sales Practices and Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 15-cv-00018 (D.N.J. Feb 27, 2017), Dkt. No. 126 at 2 ("the hourly rates of each of Plaintiffs' Steering Committee firm are . . . reasonable and appropriate in a case of this complexity"); *Mendoza v. Hyundai Motor Co.*, No. 15-cv-01685, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9129, at *36-38 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2017) (approving Chimicles Schwartz's hourly rates); *Chambers v. Whirlpool Corp.*, 214 F. Supp. 3d 877, 899 (C.D. Cal. 2016) (approving Chimicles Schwartz's hourly rates in contested fee petition over defendants' objections, stating: "[T]he court finds that counsel from [Chimicles Schwartz] . . .

have provided sufficient documentation to support their claimed hourly rates. . . . The rates charged by these attorneys range from \$485 to \$750 per hour. . . . [T]he court finds that the challenged rates are reasonable.”); *Johnson v. W2007 Grace Acquisition I, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-02777, 2015 WL 12001269, at *13 (W.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2015) (“the [Chimicles Schwartz] hourly rates are reasonable”); *Imprelis*, 296 F.R.D. at 370 (approving overall fee request);⁶ *In re Philips/Magnavox TV Litig.*, No. 09-cv-03072, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 67287, at *47 (D.N.J. May 14, 2012) (“The Court finds the billing rates [of Chimicles Schwartz and other firms] to be appropriate . . .”).

C. Fine, Kaplan’s Lodestar

96. Fine Kaplan’s time incurred by each individual biller is as follows as of September 30, 2021, recorded at historical hourly rates:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Roberta D. Liebenberg	Member	271.70	\$950	\$258,115.00
Gerard A. Dever	Member	473.10	\$775	\$366,652.50
Mary L. Russell	Associate	748.80	\$625	\$468,000.00
Jessica D. Khan	Associate	15.60	\$550	\$8,580.00
Joseph J. Borgia	Associate	6.30	\$475	\$2,992.50
Nancy M. Blakeslee	Paralegal	86.90	\$330	\$28,677.00
Susan J. Hufnagel	Paralegal	.60	\$330	\$198.00
Subtotal		1,603.00		\$1,133,215.00
Less: 25% Reduction		(400.73)		(\$283,303.74)
Adjusted Total		1,202.27		\$849,911.26

97. The hourly rates set forth above are the usual and customary rates charged by each biller in the firm’s cases.

98. Fine Kaplan’s hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the

⁶ The Order approved the overall fee request but did not specify class counsel’s hourly rates. *Imprelis*, 296 F.R.D. at 370. Chimicles Schwartz’s underlying hourly rates were set forth in the firm’s Declaration at Dkt. 189-3 ECF pg. 30.

country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In re Railway Industry Employees No-Poach Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 2850, Dkt. 313 at ¶ 3 (W.D. Pa. Aug. 26, 2020) (approving percentage of fund award after lodestar cross-check where Fine Kaplan was Co-Lead Counsel); *In re Navistar MaxxForce Engines Marketing, Sales Practices and Products Liability Litig.*, Master Case No. 14-cv-10318, 2020 WL 2477955, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 21, 2020); *In re Capacitors Antitrust Litig.*, No. 17-md-2801, 2020 WL 654472, at *2, (N.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2020), 2018 WL 4790575, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2018); *In re Lithium Ion Batteries Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 2420, 2018 WL 3064391, at *2 (N.D. Cal. May 16, 2018); *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur, Inc.*, 2017 WL 4776626, at *9 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2017); *In re Urethane Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1616, 2016 WL 4060156, at *7 (D. Kan. July 29, 2016); *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1917, 2016 WL 721680, at *40 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2016); *In re Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1775, 2015 WL 5918273, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 9, 2015); *Standard Iron Works v. ArcelorMittal*, No. 08-cv-05214, 2014 WL 7781572, at *2 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 22, 2014); *In re Southeastern Milk Antitrust Litig.*, No. 08-MD-1000, 2013 WL 2155387, at *4 (E.D. Tenn. May 17, 2013) (accepting hourly rates of Fine Kaplan and all other firms for purposes of lodestar cross-check); *In re Processed Egg Prod. Antitrust Litig.*, No. 08-MD-2002, 2012 WL 5467530, at *6 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 9, 2012) (“the Court finds that the stated hourly rates of these attorneys and staff . . . are reasonable”); *In re Auto. Refinishing Paint Antitrust Litig.*, No. 10-md-01426, 2008 WL 63269, at *6 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 3, 2008) (accepting hourly rates of Fine Kaplan and all other firms for purposes of lodestar cross-check); *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1261, 2004 WL 1221350, at *3 (E.D. Pa. June 2, 2004).

D. Nussbaum Law Group’s Lodestar

99. Nussbaum’s time incurred by each individual biller is as follows as of September

30, 2021, recorded at historical hourly rates:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Linda P. Nussbaum	Partner	218.00	\$975-\$995	\$213,318.00
Bart D. Cohen	Partner	327.90	\$825-\$925	\$281,027.50
Susan Schwaiger	Of Counsel	.50	\$800	\$400.00
Chris Sanchez	Of Counsel	372.30	\$750	\$279,225.00
James Perelman	Associate	15.40	\$450-\$475	\$6,965.00
Brett Leopold	Associate	54.50	\$525	\$28,612.50
Marc Foto	Associate	79.30	\$525	\$41,632.50
Zachary Shutran	Law Clerk	21.40	\$350	\$7,490.00
Vivian Lee	Paralegal	63.20	\$225	\$14,220.00
Alix Gallipoli	Paralegal	2.30	\$275	\$632.50
Subtotal		1,154.80		\$873,523.00
Less: 25% Reduction		(288.70)		(\$218,380.75)
Adjusted Total		866.10		\$655,142.25

100. The hourly rates set forth above are the usual and customary rates charged by each biller in the firm's cases.

101. Nussbaum's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., FWK Holdings LLC v. Shire PLC*, No. 16-cv-12653, Order of Dec. 9, 2020, Dkt. 551 (D. Mass.); *First Impressions Salon, Inc. v. Nat'l Milk Producers Federation*, No. 13-cv-00454, Order of Apr. 27, 2020, Dkt. 540 (S.D. Ill.); *Sanofi*, 2017 WL 4776626, at *9 (accepting lodestar figure based on historical hourly rates of Co-Lead Counsel Nussbaum Law and all other firms for purposes of lodestar cross-check).⁷

E. Lodestar of All Other Plaintiffs' Counsel

102. All other plaintiffs' counsel prepared Declarations setting forth their hours, hourly

⁷ Nussbaum's underlying hourly rates in *Sanofi* were set forth in the firm's Declaration at Dkt. 513-10.

rates, and lodestar incurred in this case. *See* Exhibits 1 - 24 hereto.

IV. Litigation Expenses

103. In the interests of billing judgment and conservatism, Class Counsel and all other Consumer Track plaintiffs' counsel are seeking recovery of only their filing fees, service of process fees, expert and professional services fees, mediation fees, Westlaw/LEXIS fees, and PACER fees. All counsel will forgo seeking reimbursement of their other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. This is consistent with how all counsel reported their expenses to the Court in their quarterly expense submissions.

104. The following chart summarizes the applicable expenses incurred by Class Counsel and all other plaintiffs' counsel as of September 30, 2021:

Law Firm	Filing Fees/ Service of Process	Expert Fees	Prof'l Services	Mediation Fees	Westlaw/ Lexis/ Pacer	Total
Class Counsel						
Berger Montague	\$1,150.00	\$0	\$6,575.35	\$1,775.00	\$4,322.42	\$13,822.77
Fine, Kaplan and Black	\$848.00	\$0	\$0	\$1,775.00	\$2,439.90	\$5,062.90
Chimicles Schwartz Kriner & Donaldson- Smith	\$1,363.00	\$2,012.50	\$2,571.52	\$1,775.00	\$2,788.46	\$10,510.48
Nussbaum Law	\$840.00	\$0	\$110.68	\$1,775.00	\$1,787.74	\$4,513.42
Total Class Counsel	\$4,201.00	\$2,012.50	\$9,257.55	\$7,100.00	\$11,338.52	\$33,909.57
Other Plaintiffs' Counsel						
Ademi & O'Reilly	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Ahdoot & Wolfson	\$55.87	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$42.90	\$98.77
Barrack, Rodos & Bacine	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$139.20	\$539.20
Criden & Love	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federman & Sherwood	\$220.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$769.81	\$989.81
George, Gesten & McDonald	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,087.60	\$3,087.60
Goldman Scarlato & Penny	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2.46	\$402.46
Grant Law Firm	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$37.04	\$37.04
Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Law Firm	Filing Fees/ Service of Process	Expert Fees	Prof'l Services	Mediation Fees	Westlaw/ Lexis/ Pacer	Total
Kohn Swift & Graf	\$440.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$120.98	\$560.98
Law Offices of Bernard M. Gross	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10.00	\$410.00
Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman	\$315.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$315.00
McLafferty & Associates	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Milberg Phillips Grossman	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$226.82	\$226.82
Morgan & Morgan	\$459.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23.80	\$483.00
Morrison & Associates	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Shaffer & Gaier	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Miller Shah LLP (f/k/a Shepherd Finkelman Miller & Shah)	\$480.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$688.25	\$1,168.25
Shub Law Firm	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2.20	\$2.20
Spector Roseman & Kodroff	\$479.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,067.68	\$1,547.18
Stull, Stull & Brody	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$95.21	\$95.21
Tadler Law Firm	\$80.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$80.00
Weir & Partners	\$485.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,502.34	\$1,987.34
Total Other Plaintiffs' Counsel	\$4,214.57	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,816.29	\$12,030.86
Grand Total All Counsel	\$8,415.57	\$2,012.50	\$9,257.55	\$7,100.00	\$19,154.81	\$45,940.43

105. The expenses incurred by Class Counsel are reflected in the books and records of each firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

106. All other Consumer Track plaintiffs' counsel prepared Declarations addressing their expenses included in the chart above. *See* Exhibits 1 - 24 hereto.

107. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this case.

V. Service Awards

108. Plaintiffs request a \$1,000 Service Award to each of the fourteen Class Representatives for their time and effort pursuing this case on behalf of the Class.

109. Defendant consents to funding these payments from the \$3.2 million lump sum.

SA ¶ 77. The \$14,000 aggregate amount will not detract from any settlement benefits made available to the Class.

110. The Class Representatives' efforts included, among other things:

- Undergoing lengthy initial and follow-up interviews by Class Counsel to gather their facts;
- Searching for, reviewing, and producing documents regarding their transactions with Wawa, fraudulent activity on their accounts, out of pocket losses, history with other data breaches, and related issues;
- Agreeing to burdensome evidence preservation obligations regarding hard copy documents, emails, financial records, and other ESI;
- Reviewing major case filings;
- Monitoring the overall progress of the litigation;
- Engaging in frequent communications with Class Counsel; and
- Approving the Settlement Agreement.

VI. Settlement Administration Costs

111. The Settlement Administrator (KCC) estimates that its settlement administration fees will be approximately \$100,000.

112. The Settlement Administrator's fees are for its services in, among other things, maintaining the Settlement Website (www.WawaConsumerDataSettlement.com), maintaining an automated call center, administering various aspects of the claims process, fielding inquiries from claimants, corresponding with claimants about deficiencies in claim submissions, mailing settlement checks to valid Tier Three claimants, and compiling a list of eligible claimants for Wawa to email Gift Cards to. SA ¶¶ 43-52.

113. The Settlement Website provides detailed information about the Settlement, Class Members' rights and options, and instructions on and deadlines for filing claims. The Settlement

Website includes copies of key documents including the Settlement Notice, Claim Forms, Consolidated Complaint, Settlement Agreement, Preliminary Approval Order, and Wawa's press release announcing the settlement. The Settlement Administrator will upload the fee brief and this Declaration to the Settlement Website when filed with the Court for easy access by Class Members and others.

114. Additional information about the notice and claims administration process will be contained in the forthcoming motion for final approval of the Settlement, which Class Counsel will file with the Court on December 27, 2021.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1746, we declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.

Executed this 28th day of October, 2021.

/s/ Sherrie R. Savett
Sherrie R. Savett

/s/ Roberta D. Liebenberg
Roberta D. Liebenberg

/s/ Benjamin F. Johns
Benjamin F. Johns

/s/ Linda P. Nussbaum
Linda P. Nussbaum

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit 1: Declaration of Shpetim Ademi of Ademi LLP in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 2: Declaration of Bradley K. King of Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 3: Declaration of Jeffrey B. Gittleman of Barrack, Rodos & Bacine in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 4: Declaration of Michael E. Criden of Criden & Love, P.A. in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 5: Declaration of William B. Federman of Federman & Sherwood in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 6: Declaration of Lori G. Feldman of George Gesten McDonald, PLLC in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 7: Declaration of Mark S. Goldman of Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C. in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 8: Declaration of Lynda J. Grant of The Grant Law Firm, PLLC in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 9: Declaration of Susan R. Gross of the Law Offices of Bernard M. Gross, P.C. in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 10: Declaration of Melissa R. Emert of Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C. in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 11: Declaration of Joel B. Strauss of Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards

- Exhibit 12: Declaration of William E. Hoese of Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C. in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 13: Declaration of Matthew Mendelsohn of Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 14: Declaration of David P. McLafferty of McLafferty Law Firm, P.C. in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 15: Declaration of Andrei V. Rado of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 16: Declaration of Natalie Finkelman Bennett of Miller Shah in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 17: Declaration of Jean S. Martin of Morgan & Morgan Complex Litigation Group in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 18: Declaration of Mark A. Morrison of Morrison & Associates in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 19: Declaration of Michael H. Gaier of Shaffer & Gaier in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 20: Declaration of Jonathan Shub of Shub Law Firm LLC in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 21: Declaration of William G. Caldes of Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 22: Declaration of Aaron Brody of Stull, Stull & Brody in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards
- Exhibit 23: Declaration of Ariana J. Tadler of Tadler Law LLP in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards

Exhibit 24: Declaration of Steven E. Angstreich of Weir & Partners LLP in Support of Consumer Track Plaintiffs' Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards

Exhibit 1

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF SHPETIM ADEMI OF ADEMI LLP IN SUPPORT OF
CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Shpetim Ademi, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Ademi LLP (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Ademi LLP's Professional Qualifications

3. Ademi & O'Reilly has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.ademilaw.com/>.

B. Ademi LLP's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Shpetim Ademi	Partner	11.00	\$750	\$8,250.00
Mark A. Eldridge	Associate	1.20	\$425	\$510.00
Jesse Fruchter	Associate	4.90	\$375	\$1,837.50
Ben J. Slatky	Associate	9.50	\$375	\$3,562.50
Subtotal		26.60		\$14,160.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(7.98)		(\$4,248.00)
Adjusted Total		18.62		\$9,912.00

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Reetz v. First Portfolio Ventures I, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 21-cv-20, Final Approval Order (E.D. Wis., June 25, 2021); *Beaufrand v. Encore Receivable Management, Inc.*, Case No. 17-cv-721, Final Order on Class Action Settlement (E.D. Wis., Mar. 4, 2019); *Liptai v. Spectrum Brands Holdings, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2018CV321, Final Approval Order and Judgment, (Dane County Cir. Ct., March 22, 2019); *Sievert v. Alltran Financial LP*, Case No. 16-cv-1309, Order granting final approval of class action settlement (E.D. Wis. Sept. 19, 2018).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily: investigating the underlying facts respecting the data breach; drafting and filing of a complaint; reviewing the settlement terms and documents; and communication with client respecting updates on the litigation.

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Ademi LLP's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Ademi LLP are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14th, 2021

/s/ SHPETIM ADEMI .

Shpetim Ademi

ADEMI LLP

3620 East Layton Avenue

Cudahy, Wisconsin 53110

Phone: (414) 482-8000

Email: sademi@ademilaw.com

Exhibit 2

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF BRADLEY K. KING OF AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC IN
SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Bradley K. King, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC's Professional Qualifications

3. Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.ahdootwolfson.com/>.

B. Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Bradley King	Partner	17.90	\$650	\$11,635.00
Henry Kelston	Partner	4.10	\$800	\$3,280.00
Tina Wolfson	Partner	16.20	\$950	\$15,390.00
Subtotal		38.20		\$30,305.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(11.46)		(\$9,091.50)
Adjusted Total		26.74		\$21,213.50

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Eck, et al. v. City of Los Angeles*, No. BC577028 (Los Angeles Superior Court ("LASC") (February 2018) (\$295 million finally approved settlement where the Court awarded Class Counsel's full request of approximately \$15 million based on percentage of the fund method and commensurate hourly rates); *Lavinsky v. City of Los Angeles*, No. BC542245 (LASC) (October 2019) (\$51 million minimum value finally approved settlement where the Court awarded Class Counsel's full request of approximately \$8 million based on percentage of the fund method and commensurate hourly rates); *Pantelyat v. Bank of America*, No. 1:16-cv-08964 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2019) (Dkt. 116; \$22 million finally approved settlement where the Court awarded Class Counsel's full request of \$5.5 million based on percentage of the fund method and commensurate hourly rates); *Williamson, et al. vs. McAfee, Inc.*, Case No. 5:14-cv-00158-EJD (N.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2017) (Dkt. 118; \$85 Million settlement in deceptive auto renewal case); *Smith v. Floor & Decor Outlets of Am., Inc.*, Case

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

No. 1:15-cv-04316-ELR, (N.D. Ga. Jan. 10, 2017) (Dkt. No. 69; \$14.5 Million product liability settlement re: laminate flooring); *Chimeno-Buzzi v. Hollister Co.*, Case No. 1:14-cv-23120-MGC (S.D. Fla. April 11, 2016) (Dkt. No. 155; \$10 Million TCPA Settlement).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm’s work included primarily pre-suit investigation of the breach, communications and vetting with potential class representatives, drafting and revising of the initial complaint, and related case management coordination with the Chimicles firm.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC’s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm’s litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$55.87
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$42.90
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$98.77

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs’ counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Ahdoot & Wolfson, PC are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14, 2021

/s/ Bradley K. King
Bradley K. King
AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC
2600 W. Olive Avenue, Suite 500
Burbank, CA 91505
Tel: (310) 474-9111
Email: bking@ahdootwolfson.com

Exhibit 3

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF JEFFREY B. GITTLEMAN OF BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Jeffrey B. Gittleman, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Barrack, Rodos & Bacine (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Barrack, Rodos & Bacine's Professional Qualifications

3. Barrack, Rodos & Bacine has 45 years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.barrack.com/>.

B. Barrack, Rodos & Bacine's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Jeffrey W. Golan	Partner	5.90	\$800	\$4,720.00
Jeffrey B. Gittleman	Partner	11.30	\$780	\$8,814.00
Chad A. Carder	Partner	2.30	\$630	\$1,449.00
Julie B. Palley	Associate	40.50	\$495	\$20,051.50
Nina L. McGarvey	Paralegal	5.50	\$330	\$1,815.00
Joseph J. Morrison	Paralegal	2.00	\$330	\$660.00
Subtotal		67.50		\$37,509.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(20.25)		(\$11,252.85)
Adjusted Total		47.25		\$26,256.65

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's contingency fee cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In re WageWorks, Inc. Securities Litig.*, Case No. 4:18-CV-01523-JSW (N.D. Cal.) (Docket No.187 August 20, 2021).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included, among other things: case investigation, including factual research; assisting lead counsel with drafting the consolidated class action complaint, including plaintiff research and research regarding defendant corporate entities; drafting a protective order at the request of lead counsel.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

C. **Barrack, Rodos & Bacine's Litigation Expenses**

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$400.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$139.20
Total	\$539.20

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Barrack, Rodos & Bacine are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14, 2021

/s/ Jeffrey B. Gittleman
 Jeffrey B. Gittleman
BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE
 3300 Two Commerce Square
 2001 Market Street
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 Tel: 215.963.0600
 Email: jgittleman@barrack.com

Exhibit 4

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL E. CRIDEN OF CRIDEN & LOVE, P.A. IN SUPPORT
OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Michael E. Criden, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a principal of the law firm Criden & Love, P.A. (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Criden & Love, P.A.'s Professional Qualifications

3. Criden & Love, P.A. has years of relevant experience in class action litigation.

The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.cridenlove.com/>.

B. Criden & Love, P.A.'s Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Michael E. Criden	Partner	15.30	\$850	\$13,005.00
Lindsey C. Grossman	Partner	46.60	\$450	\$20,970.00
Subtotal		61.90		\$33,975.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(18.57)		(\$10,192.50)
Adjusted Total		43.33		\$23,782.50

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily plaintiff vetting, communications with class representative and obtaining client discovery in furtherance of the mediation.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Criden & Love, P.A.'s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Criden & Love, P.A. are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14, 2021

/s/ Michael E. Criden
Michael E. Criden
CRIDEN & LOVE, P.A.
7301 S.W. 57th Court
Suite 515
South Miami, Florida 33143
Tel: (305) 357-9000
Email: mcriden@cridenlove.com

Exhibit 5

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM B. FEDERMAN OF FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD IN
SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, William B. Federman, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Federman & Sherwood (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Federman & Sherwood's Professional Qualifications

3. Federman & Sherwood has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.federmanlaw.com/>.

B. Federman & Sherwood's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Bill Federman	Partner	37.80	\$850.00	\$32,130.00
Emily Siekel	Associate	0.20	\$500.00	\$100.00
Molly Brantley	Associate	1.30	\$450.00	\$585.00
Cedric Bond	Associate	20.30	\$410.00	\$8,323.00
Tiffany Peintner	Paralegal	14.00	\$250.00	\$3,500.00
Robin Hester	Paralegal	0.60	\$250.00	\$150.00
Subtotal		74.20		\$44,788.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(22.26)		(\$13,436.40)
Adjusted Total		51.94		\$31,351.60

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Bahnmaier v. Wichita State University*, Case No. 2:20-cv-02246 (D. Kan., Aug. 18, 2021); *Perdue v. Hy-Vee, Inc.*, Case No. 19-1330 (C.D. Ill., Jul. 27, 2021); *Tilleman v. Leaffilter North, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 5:18-cv-1152-DAE (W.D. Tex., Nov. 25, 2019); *Perez v. IZEA, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:18-cv-02784-SVW-GJS (C.D. Cal., Sept. 26, 2019); *Angeley v. UTi Worldwide Inc., et al.*, Case No. 14-cv-02066 (C.D. Cal, Feb. 28, 2019).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included investigating claims and allegations, coordinating with plaintiffs, researching relevant legal issues, drafting pleadings, reviewing filings, and working with Co-Lead Counsel on case strategy and management.

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Federman & Sherwood's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$220.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$738.87
Pacer	\$30.94
Total	\$989.81

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Federman & Sherwood are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 19, 2021

/s/William B. Federman
 William B. Federman
FEDERMAN & SHERWOOD
 10205 North Pennsylvania Avenue
 Oklahoma City, OK 73120
 Phone: (800) 237-1277
 Email: wbf@federmanlaw.com

Exhibit 6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF LORI G. FELDMAN OF GEORGE GESTEN MCDONALD PLLC
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Lori G. Feldman, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a Member of the law firm George Gesten McDonald PLLC (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. George Gesten McDonald PLLC's Professional Qualifications

3. Attorneys at George Gesten McDonald PLLC have decades of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are well-established litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions, and serve as Co-Lead Counsel, Executive Committee Members, and Named Plaintiffs' Counsel in numerous data breach class actions across the country.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.4-justice.com/>.

B. George Gesten McDonald PLLC's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Lori G. Feldman	Partner	135.10	\$800	\$108,080.00
David J. George	Partner	25.00	\$800	\$20,000.00
Christopher McDonald	Partner	9.00	\$600	\$5,400.00
Matt Chiapperini	Partner	15.30	\$450	\$6,885.00
Hailey George	Paralegal	.80	\$200	\$160.00
Susan Stirling	Paralegal	14.90	\$200	\$2,980.00
Subtotal		200.10		\$143,505.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(60.03)		(\$43,051.50)
Adjusted Total		140.07		\$100,453.50

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily: researching and drafting supporting memoranda regarding various potential state and federal claims for the Consumer Plaintiffs' Consolidated Class Action Complaint ("Consolidated Complaint"); preparing the first draft of the Consolidated Complaint; assisting with the vetting of named plaintiffs; working with our named plaintiff who was vetted and whose claims were included in the Consolidated Complaint;

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

corresponding with our other plaintiffs in this case regarding case status and developments, including the proposed settlement; and reviewing the terms of the proposed settlement.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. George Gesten McDonald PLLC's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$3,087.00
Pacer	\$0.60
Total	\$3,087.60

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by George Gesten McDonald PLLC are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ Lori G. Feldman
Lori G. Feldman
GEORGE GESTEN MCDONALD PLLC
102 Half Moon Bay Drive
Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520
Phone: (917) 983-9821
Email: lfeldman@4-justice.com

Exhibit 7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF MARK S. GOLDMAN OF GOLDMAN SCARLATO & PENNY,
P.C. IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Mark S. Goldman, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C. (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C.'s Professional Qualifications

3. Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C. has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.lawgsp.com/>.

B. Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C.'s Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Mark Goldman	Partner	55.60	\$725	\$40,310.00
Subtotal		55.60		\$40,310.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(16.68)		(\$12,093.00)
Adjusted Total		38.92		\$28,217.00

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In re Livent Corp. Sec. Litig.*, Ct. Com. Pl. (Philadelphia, PA 2021); *McComas v. Brightview Holdings, Inc., et al.*, Ct. Com. Pl. (Montgomery Cty., PA 2021).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included the performance of a factual investigation of potential claims, the drafting of a complaint for the Firm's client, communications with the Firm's client and with co-counsel regarding case strategy and claims in the amended complaint.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C.'s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$400.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$2.46
Total	\$402.46

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Goldman Scarlato & Penny, P.C. are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14, 2021

/s/Mark S. Goldman
 Mark S. Goldman
GOLDMAN SCARLATO & PENNY, P.C.
 Eight Tower Bridge
 161 Washington Street, Suite 1025
 Conshohocken, PA 19428
 Phone: (484) 342-0700
 Email: goldman@lawgsp.com

Exhibit 8

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF LYNDA J. GRANT OF THE GRANT LAW FIRM, PLLC
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Lynda J. Grant, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm The Grant Law Firm, PLLC (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. The Grant Law Firm, PLLC's Professional Qualifications

3. The Grant Law Firm, PLLC has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and affiant are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions, among other things.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.grantfirm.com>.

B. The Grant Law Firm, PLLC's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Lynda J. Grant	Partner	28.00	\$750	\$21,000.00
Subtotal		28.00		\$21,000.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(8.40)		(\$6,300.00)
Adjusted Total		19.60		\$14,700.00

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily researching and drafting a complaint, speaking to and investigating the client's claim, drafting and speaking to the client about the document preservation letter, sending the required letter to the New Jersey Attorney General's Office prior to filing a complaint, and attending a conference before the Court.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. The Grant Law Firm, PLLC's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$37.04
Total	\$37.04

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by The Grant Law Firm, PLLC are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ Lynda J. Grant

Lynda J. Grant

THE GRANT LAW FIRM, PLLC

521 Fifth Avenue, 17th Floor

New York, NY 10175

Phone: (212) 292-4441

Email: lgrant@grantfirm.com

Exhibit 9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF SUSAN R. GROSS OF LAW OFFICES BERNARD M. GROSS,
P.C. IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Susan R. Gross, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the Law Offices Bernard M. Gross, P.C. (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Law Offices Bernard M. Gross, P.C.'s Professional Qualifications

3. The Law Offices Bernard M. Gross, P.C. has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.bernardmgross.com/>.

B. Law Offices Bernard M. Gross, P.C.'s Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Bernard M. Gross	Of Counsel	12.50	\$775	\$9,687.50
Susan R. Gross	Partner	14.00	\$550	\$7,700.00
Subtotal		26.50		\$17,387.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(7.95)		(\$5,216.25)
Adjusted Total		18.55		\$12,171.25

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily investigating and researching this matter, drafting the initial complaint for our client, filed the initial complaint for our client, attended lead plaintiff hearing, reviewed the pleadings, communicated with my client on a regular basis, corresponded and conferred with co-counsel.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Law Offices Bernard M. Gross, P.C.'s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$400.00
Pacer	10.00
Total	\$410.00

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by the Law Offices Bernard M. Gross, P.C. are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 15, 2021

/s/ Susan R. Gross
Susan R. Gross
LAW OFFICES BERNARD M. GROSS, P.C.
Two Penn Center, Suite 1910
1500 John F. Kennedy Blvd
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Tel: 215-561-3600
Email: susang@bernardmgross.com

Exhibit 10

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF MELISSA R. EMERT OF KANTROWITZ, GOLDHAMER &
GRAIFMAN P.C. IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Melissa R. Emert, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C. (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C.'s Professional Qualifications

3. Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C. has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.kgglaw.com/>.

B. Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C.'s Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Melissa Emert	Partner	7.50	\$895	\$6,712.50
Danielle Baron	Paralegal	.30	\$200	\$60.00
Subtotal		7.80		\$6,772.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(2.34)		(\$2,031.75)
Adjusted Total		5.46		\$4,740.75

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In re: Daily Fantasy Sports Litigation*, 16-md-02677-GAO, Order dated 10/6/21 (D. Mass. 2016); *In Re: Apple, Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, 5:18-md-02827 (M.D. Ca. 2018).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily communication with all named plaintiffs and plaintiffs vetting interviews for inclusion into the Consolidated Complaint; drafting plaintiffs' paragraphs for inclusion into the Consolidated Complaint; working with co-counsel to obtain plaintiffs' approval of the filing of the Consolidated Complaint.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C.'s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Kantrowitz, Goldhamer & Graifman P.C. are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 15, 2021

/s/ *Melissa R. Emert*

Melissa R. Emert
**KANTROWITZ, GOLDHAMER
 & GRAIFMAN P.C.**
 747 Chestnut Ridge Road
 Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977
 Phone: (866) 986-0081
 Email: memert@kgglaw.com

Exhibit 11

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF JOEL B. STRAUSS OF KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Joel B. Strauss, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP's Professional Qualifications

3. Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at www.kaplanfox.com.

B. Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Laurence King	Partner	1.20	\$910	\$1,092.00
Joel Strauss	Partner	.60	\$890	\$534.00
David Straite	Partner	3.60	\$800	\$2,880.00
Kevin Cosgrove	Investigator	8.00	\$330	\$2,640.00
Subtotal		13.40		\$7,146.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(4.02)		(\$2,143.80)
Adjusted Total		9.38		\$5,002.20

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In Re: Dr. Reddy's Laboratories Sec. Litig.*, Case No. 3:17-cv-06436-PGS-DEA (D.N.J.) Dkt. Nos. 101-4,112.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily communications with the client and counsel designated by lead counsel in connection with plaintiff vetting.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ Joel B. Strauss

·

KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP

Joel B. Strauss
850 Third Avenue 14th Floor
New York, NY 10022
Phone: (212) 687-1980
Email: Jstrauss@kaplanfox.com

Exhibit 12

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM E. HOESE OF KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, William E. Hoese, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a shareholder in the law firm Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C. (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C.'s Professional Qualifications

3. Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C. has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.kohnswift.com/>.

B. Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C.'s Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Jonathan Shub	Shareholder	65.00	\$750	\$48,750.00
Kevin Laukaitis	Associate Attorney	25.90	\$450	\$11,655.00
Denis Sheils	Shareholder	27.60	\$725	\$20,010.00
William Hoese	Shareholder	4.30	\$725	\$3,117.50
Barbara Moyer-Gibson	Associate Attorney	5.70	\$500-525	2,877.50
Alden Daniels	Paralegal	2.80	\$190	\$532.00
Taylor Reynolds	Paralegal	41.50	\$190-195	\$8,072.50
Rachel Garvey	Paralegal	13.00	\$195	\$2,535.00
Subtotal		185.80		\$97,549.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(55.74)		(\$29,264.85)
Adjusted Total		130.06		\$68,284.65

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Sobiech v. U.S. Gas & Electric*, No. 2:14-CV-04464 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 18, 2017) (ECF No. 64); *Silvis v. Ambit Energy L.P.*, 326 F.R.D. 419, 434 (E.D. Pa. 2018); *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, No. CIV.A. 98-5055, 2004 WL 1221350, at *19 (E.D. Pa. June 2, 2004), *amended*, No. CIV.A.98-5055, 2004 WL 1240775 (E.D. Pa. June 4, 2004).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily pre-filing factual investigation into the data breach, interviews and communications with plaintiffs, preparation and filing the complaint and

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

other pleadings with the court as well as conferences with counsel regarding case strategy.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C.’s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm’s litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$440.00
Pacer	\$120.98
Total	\$560.98

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs’ counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C. are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ William E. Hoese
 William E. Hoese
KOHN, SWIFT & GRAF, P.C.
 1600 Market Street
 Suite 2500
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 Phone: (215) 238-1700
 Email: whoese@kohnsswift.com

Exhibit 13

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF MATTHEW MENDELSON OF MAZIE SLATER KATZ &
FREEMAN LLC IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Matthew Mendelsohn, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC's Professional Qualifications

3. Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.mazieslater.com/>.

B. Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
David Mazie	Partner	2.30	\$950	\$1,845.00
Matthew Mendelsohn	Partner	32.30	\$595-\$625	\$19,269.50
Subtotal		34.60		\$21,114.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(10.38)		(\$6,334.35)
Adjusted Total		24.22		\$14,780.15

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Bauman v. V Theater Group, LLC*, 2:14-cv-1125 (D.NV. July 2, 2020) (approving Mazie Slater's hourly rates); *Majdipour v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC*, 2:12-cv-07849 (D.N.J. Feb. 3, 2020) (approving Mazie Slater's hourly rates of \$425 for associates and \$595 to \$900 for partners); *Feldman v. BRP US, Inc.*, Civ. Ac. No. 17-cv-61150 (S.D. FL. Nov. 19, 2018) (approving Mazie Slater's hourly rates ranging from \$395 to \$850); *Gray v. BMW of N. Am., LLC*, Civ. Ac. No. 13-cv-3417 (D.N.J. Aug. 24, 2017) (approving Mazie Slater's hourly rates of \$395 for associates and \$570 to \$850 for partners); *In re HIKO Energy, LLC Litigation*, Civ. Ac. No. 7:14-cv-1771-VB (S.D.N.Y. May 9, 2016) (holding that Mazie Slater's hourly rates of \$395 for associates and \$550 to \$825 for partners was reasonable); *Overton v. sanofi-aventis US, LLC*, Civ. Ac. No. 3:13-cv-05535-PGS-DEA (D.N.J. Feb. 10, 2016) (approving Mazie Slater's attorney fees with hourly rates ranging from \$395 for associates to \$825 for the most senior partner); *Aarons v. BMW of North America, LLC*, 2014 WL 4090564

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

(C.D.Cal. Apr. 29, 2014) (The Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez, U.S.D.J. stated that “the Court is satisfied that those requested rates are reasonable”); *In re Nissan Radiator/Transmission Cooler Litigation*, 2013 WL 4080946 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2013)(holding that “the hourly rates charged by Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman, LLC ranged from \$795 (partner) to \$325 (associate), with the bulk of the work being handled by a partner who charged \$525 per hour. Accordingly, a lodestar cross check confirms the reasonableness of the requested fee.”)

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm’s work included primarily investigating the subject data breach, vetting potential plaintiffs, researching potential causes of action and drafting a Complaint that was filed in New Jersey Superior Court. The Firm has coordinated its New Jersey matter with the consolidated federal cases and remained apprised of settlement discussions.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC’s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm’s litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$315.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$315.00

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs’ counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Mazie Slater Katz & Freeman LLC are reflected in the

books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 15, 2021

/s/Matthew R. Mendelsohn
Matthew R. Mendelsohn
MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN LLC
103 Eisenhower Parkway, 2nd Floor
Roseland, NJ 07068
Phone: (973) 228-9898
Email: mrm@mazieslater.com

Exhibit 14

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF DAVID P. McLAFFERTY OF McLAFFERTY LAW FIRM, P.C. IN
SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, David P. McLafferty, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am the managing partner of the McLafferty Law Firm, P.C. (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. McLafferty Law Firm, P.C.'s Professional Qualifications

3. McLafferty Law Firm, P.C. has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.mclaffertylaw.com/>.

B. McLafferty Law Firm, P.C.'s Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
David P. McLafferty	Partner	30.80	\$935	\$28,798.00
Subtotal		30.80		\$28,798.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(9.24)		(\$8,639.40)
Adjusted Total		21.56		\$20,158.60

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In re Interior Molded Doors* (E.D. Va.) (3:18-cv-00718-JAG); *In re Dental Supplies Antitrust Litigation* (E.D.NY.) (1:16-CV-00696-BMC-GRB) and *Domestic Drywall Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Pa.) (13-MD-2437).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily contact with lead counsel regarding case discovery, conference calls with discovery committee regarding client documents, client questionnaires and other relevant case matters.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. McLafferty Law Firm, P.C.'s Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm is not submitting any of the following litigation type expenses:

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by McLafferty Law Firm, P.C. are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ David P. McLafferty

David P. McLafferty

McLAFFERTY LAW FIRM, P.C.

923 Fayette Street

Conshohocken, PA 19428

Phone: (610) 940-4000

Email: dmclafferty@mclaffertylaw.com

Exhibit 15

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF ANDREI V. RADO OF MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON PHILLIPS
GROSSMAN IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Andrei V. Rado, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman's Professional Qualifications

3. Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.milberg.com/>.

B. Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Andrei Rado	Partner	15.40	\$700	\$10,780.00
Matthew Kupillas	Partner	4.50	\$700	\$3,150.00
Kent Bronson	Partner	0.80	\$680	\$544.00
Blake Yagman	Associate	39.80	\$425	\$16,915.00
Elina Feldblyum	Paralegal	1.50	\$325	\$487.50
Subtotal		62.00		\$31,876.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(18.60)		(\$9,562.95)
Adjusted Total		43.40		\$22,313.55

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In re Yahoo! Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 16-MD-02752-LHK, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129939 (N.D. Cal. July 22, 2020); *In re Allura Fiber Cement Siding Litig.*, No. 2:19-mn-02886-DCN, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 96931 (D.S.C. May 21, 2021).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily in depth factual and legal research of potential claims, writing the complaint, vetting potential Firm clients for the initial complaint and for the consolidated complaint, cooperating with/having conference calls with co-counsel regarding the prosecution of the case, updating the Firm's client, and communicating with members of the Class.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

C. **Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman's Litigation Expenses**

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$226.82
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$226.82

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ Andrei V. Rado
 Andrei V. Rado*
**MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON PHILLIPS
 GROSSMAN, PLLC**
 100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500
 Garden City, NY 11530
 Phone: (212) 594-5300
 Email: arado@milberg.com

**Pro Hac Vice Admitted*

Exhibit 16

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF NATALIE FINKELMAN BENNETT OF MILLER SHAH LLP IN
SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Natalie Finkelman Bennett, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Miller Shah LLP (the "Firm" or "Miller Shah"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Miller Shah's Professional Qualifications

3. Miller Shah has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.millersshah.com/>.

B. Miller Shah's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Alec Berin - 2019	Associate	2.80	\$275	\$770.00
Alec Berin - 2020	Associate	8.30	\$325	\$2,697.50
Christine Mon - 2020	Paralegal	1.60	\$215	\$344.00
Henry Graney -2020	Project Manager	5.40	\$215	\$1,161.00
Jayne A. Goldstein - 2019	Partner	0.50	\$875	\$437.50
Jayne A. Goldstein - 2020	Partner	2.40	\$900	\$2,160.00
Jaclyn Reinhart - 2020	Associate	76.00	\$400	\$30,400.00
James C. Shah - 2019	Partner	0.40	\$825	\$330.00
James C. Shah - 2020	Partner	3.70	\$850	\$3,145.00
Michael Ols - 2020	Associate	0.60	\$375	\$225.00
Natalie Finkelman Bennett - 2019	Partner	12.50	\$850	\$10,625.00
Natalie Finkelman Bennett - 2020	Partner	73.80	\$875	\$64,575.00
Natalie Finkelman Bennett - 2021	Partner	1.40	\$900	\$1,260.00
Nathan Zipperian - 2019	Partner	0.50	\$700	\$350.00
Sue Moss - 2019	Paralegal	4.70	\$200	\$940.00
Sue Moss - 2020	Paralegal	8.40	\$215	\$1,806.00
Terrill Malone -2020	Legal Intern	16.70	\$75	\$1,252.50
Subtotal		219.70		\$122,478.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(65.91)		(\$36,743.55)
Adjusted Total		153.79		\$85,734.95

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout this District and Circuit for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Riaubia v. Hyundai Motor America*, No. 16-5150 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 20, 2019) [Dkt. 65] (approving fee request with hourly rates of up to \$850 for experienced class counsel); *In re Comcast Corp. Set-Top Cable Television Box Antitrust Litig.*, No. CV 09-MD-2034, 2019 WL 4645331 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 24, 2019)

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

(approving fee request with hourly rates up to \$950 for experienced class counsel). *See also In re: Caterpillar, Inc. C13 and C15 Engine Products Liability Litig.*, MDL No. 2540 (D.N.J.) [Dkt. 54]; *Q+Food v. Mitsubishi Fuso Truck of America, Inc.*, 3:14-cv-06046 (D.N.J. March 27, 2017) [Dkt. 70]; and *Trewin v. Church and Dwight, Inc.*, Case No. 3:12-cv-01475-MAS-DEA (D.N.J. 2015) [Dkt. 68]. *See also In re Merck & Co. Vytorin ERISA Litig.*, No. 08-285 (DMC), 2010 WL 547613 (D.N.J. Feb. 9, 2010) (approving rates between \$250 and \$850 per hour). The Firm's hourly rates also have routinely been approved by courts throughout the United States. *See, e.g., Bowerman v. Field Asset Services, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-00057-WHO (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2018) [ECF 464] (awarding hourly rate of \$775 for partners and \$300 for associates); *In re: Ford Motor Co. Spark Plug and 3-Valve Engine Products Liability Litigation*, Case No. 1:12-md-02316-BYP (N.D. Oh. 2016) [Dkt. 122]; *Corson v. Toyota Motor Sales U.S.A., Inc.*, Case No. 1:12-cv-8499-JGB (C.D. Ca. 2016) [Dkt. 107]; *Allison Gay v. Tom's of Maine, Inc.*, Case No. 0:14-cv-60604-KMM (S.D. Fl. 2016) [Dkt. 43]; *Golden Star, Inc. v. Mass Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, Case No. 3:11-30235-MGM (D. Mass. 2015) [Dkt. 55]; and *Butler National Corp. v. The Union Central Life Insurance Co.*, Case No. 1-1:12-cv-00177-SJD-KLL (S.D. Oh. 2014) [Dkt. 55].

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily, as requested by Lead Counsel, analyzing the claims and causes of action set forth in the numerous complaints filed, extensively researching the applicable security breach and consumer fraud (both statutory and common law based) laws of the various states, preparing legal memoranda, and drafting the consolidated complaint.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. **Miller Shah's Litigation Expenses**

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$480.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$688.25
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$1,168.25

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopying, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Miller Shah are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred during this litigation.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary in the litigation of this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021

/s/ Natalie Finkelman Bennett.

MILLER SHAH, LLP
 1845 Walnut St, Suite 806
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 Phone: (866) 540-5505
 Email: nfinkelman@millershah.com

Exhibit 17

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

DECLARATION OF JEAN S. MARTIN OF MORGAN & MORGAN COMPLEX
LITIGATION GROUP IN SUPPORT OF
CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS

I, Jean S. Martin, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner at Morgan and Morgan Complex Litigation Group (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. Except as otherwise noted, the facts set forth in this declaration are based in part upon my personal knowledge, and I would competently testify to them if called upon to do so.

A. Morgan & Morgan's Professional Qualifications

3. Morgan & Morgan is a leading civil trial law firm representing consumers and commercial clients nationwide. With over 700 lawyers, and more than 3,000 non-lawyer employees, Morgan & Morgan is the largest plaintiffs' firm in the nation. Morgan & Morgan has a dedicated Complex Litigation Group staffed with lawyers, paralegals, and retired FBI agents serving as investigators committed to representing consumers in complex litigation, MDL proceedings and class action cases throughout the country.

4. The attorneys in the class action department of Morgan and Morgan Complex

Litigation have numerous years of experience in data privacy litigation and have led the charge in many of the largest data privacy cases litigated to date, including: *In Re: Capital One Consumer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 19-md-2915 (E.D. Va.) (Co-Lead Counsel); *In re Yahoo! Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 16-md-02752-LHK (N.D. Cal.) (Lead Counsel); *In re Equifax, Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 17-md-2800-TWT (N.D. Ga.) (member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee); *In re U.S. Office of Pers. Mgmt. Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 15-mc-01394-ABJ (D.D.C.) (member of the Executive Committee); *In re The Home Depot, Inc. Consumer Data Sec. Data Breach Litig.*, No. 14-md-02583-TWT (N.D. Ga.) (co-Lead Counsel); and, *In re Target Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, MDL No. 2522 (D. Minn.) (Executive Committee member). A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.forthethepeople.com/>.

5. Personally, I have concentrated my practice on complex litigation, including consumer protection and defective products class action, for more than 20 years. I presently serve by appointment as interim co-lead counsel in *Combs, et al. v. Warner Music Group*, Case No. 1:20-cv-07473-PGG (S.D.N.Y.), *In re Morgan Stanley Data Security Litigation*, 1:20-cv-05914 (S.D.N.Y.), *In Re: Ambry Genetics Data Breach Litigation*, No. 20-cv-00791 (C.D. Cal.), and *Aguallo, et al. v. Kemper Corp., et al.*, Case No.: 1:21-cv-01883 (N.D. Ill.). I am also a member of the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in *In re: Smith & Nephew Birmingham Hip Resurfacing (BHR) Hip Implant Products Liability Litigation*, No. 17-md-2775 (D. Md.) and *In re: Allergan Biocell Textured Breast Implant Products Liability Litigation*, No. 19-md-2921 (D. N.J.).

B. Morgan & Morgan's Lodestar

6. The Firm maintained detailed records regarding the amount of time spent and the lodestar calculation based on my firm's current billing rates. The information was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by the Firm in the usual course and manner of the Firm. Time expended in preparing this application for fees and

reimbursement of expenses has not been included in this request.

7. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Jean S. Martin	Partner	28.30	\$894	\$25,300.20
Michael Braun	Associate	1.00	\$894	\$894.00
Ryan McGee	Associate	0.20	\$742	\$148.40
Patrick Barthle	Associate	0.40	\$658	\$263.20
Jennifer Cabezas	Paralegal	0.80	\$202	\$161.60
Andrea Carbone	Paralegal	3.60	\$202	\$727.20
Subtotal		34.30		\$27,494.60
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(10.29)		(\$8,248.38)
Adjusted Total		24.01		\$19,246.22

8. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

9. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

10. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Adkins v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. C 18-05982-WHA (JSC), Doc. 369 (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2021); *In re: Google Plus Profile Litigation*, No. 5:18-cv-06164-EJD, Doc. 125 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2021); *In re: Citrix Data Breach Litigation*, No. 19-61350-ALTMAN/Hunt, Doc. 67 (S.D. Fla. June 11, 2021).

11. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

12. The Firm's work included primarily initial factual investigation and speaking with potential class members regarding their experiences after the breach, conducting legal research

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

regarding potential claims; drafting initial pleadings; attending the initial court status conference; working with experts on discovery matters; and multiple client conferences for the purposes of, among other things, review of relevant facts in the complaint and providing status of matter.

13. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Morgan & Morgan's Litigation Expenses

14. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$459.20
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$23.80
Total	\$483.00

15. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

16. The expenses incurred by Morgan & Morgan are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

17. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 19, 2021

/s/ Jean S. Martin

Jean S. Martin

MORGAN & MORGAN

201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor

Tampa, FL 33602

Phone: (813) 559-4908

Email: jeanmartin@forthepeople.com

Exhibit 18

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF MARK A. MORRISON OF MORRISON & ASSOCIATES IN
SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Mark A. Morrison, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Morrison & Associates (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Morrison & Associates' Professional Qualifications

3. Morrison and Associates has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.https://www.mpaclassaction.com/>.

B. Morrison & Associates' Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Mark A. Morrison	Partner	17.30	\$725	\$12,542.50
Subtotal		17.30		\$12,542.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(5.19)		(\$3,762.75)
Adjusted Total		12.11		\$8,779.75

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Stefanyshyn, et. al. v. Consolidated Industries*, 4:98-CV-00047; *Congdon v. Uber Technologies, Inc.*, 4:16-cv-02499-YGR.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily conducting due diligence in the initial case analysis and interviewing multiple class representatives.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Morrison & Associates' Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Morrison & Associates are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 19, 2021

/s/ Mark Morrison

Mark A. Morrison

MORRISON & ASSOCIATES

Phone: (512) 478-1616

Email:

Exhibit 19

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF MICHAEL H. GAIER OF SHAFFER & GAIER IN SUPPORT OF
CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Michael H. Gaier, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Shaffer & Gaier (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Shaffer & Gaier's Professional Qualifications

3. Shaffer & Gaier has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.https://www.shaffergaier.com/>.

B. Shaffer & Gaier's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Michael H. Gaier	Partner	10.70	\$525	\$5,617.50
Subtotal		10.70		\$5,617.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(3.21)		(\$1,685.25)
Adjusted Total		7.49		\$3,932.25

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards.

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily client intake, meetings, research and document review. In addition, my firm engaged in several conference calls and strategy meetings.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Shaffer & Gaier's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$0.00

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Shaffer & Gaier are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14, 2021

/s/ Michael H. Gaier
Michael H. Gaier
SHAFFER & GAIER
8 Penn Center
1628 JFK Boulevard, Suite 400
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 751-0100
Email: mhgaier@shaffergaier.com

Exhibit 20

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF JONATHAN SHUB OF SHUB LAW FIRM LLC
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Jonathan Shub, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a Partner of the law firm Shub Law Firm LLC (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Shub Law Firm LLC's Professional Qualifications

3. Shub Law Firm LLC has years of relevant experience in class action litigation.

The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at

<https://www.shublawyers.com/>.

B. Shub Law Firm LLC's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Jonathan Shub	Partner	4.00	\$800	\$3,200.00
Kevin Laukaitis	Partner	1.00	\$550	\$550.00
Taylor Reynolds	Paralegal	25.00	\$195	\$4,875.00
Subtotal		30.00		\$8,625.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(9.00)		(\$2,587.50)
Adjusted Total		21.00		\$6,037.50

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Taha v. County of Bucks*, 2:12-cv-06867-WB (E.D.Pa. 2020).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily of analysis of class representatives' experiences with WAWA and drafting of pleadings.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Shub Law Firm LLC's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$2.20
Total	\$2.20

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Shub Law Firm LLC are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 15, 2021

/s/ Jonathan Shub.
Jonathan Shub
SHUB LAW FIRM LLC
134 Kings Highway East, 2nd Floor
Haddonfield, NJ 08033
Phone: (856) 772-7200
Email: jshub@shublawyers.com

Exhibit 21

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF WILLIAM G. CALDES OF SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, PC
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, William G. Caldes, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC's Professional Qualifications

3. Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.srkattorneys.com/>.

B. Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of

September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Eugene Spector	Partner	12.05	\$955	\$11,507.75
John Macoretta	Partner	4.40	\$800	\$3,520.00
William Caldes	Partner	22.20	\$800	\$17,760.00
Jeffrey Spector	Partner	9.30	\$590	\$5,487.00
Diana Zinser	Partner	15.60	\$525	\$8,190.00
Gerri De Marshall	Paralegal	1.40	\$270	\$378.00
Alex Iozzo	Paralegal	4.00	\$180	\$720.00
Subtotal		68.95		\$47,562.75
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(20.69)		(\$14,268.83)
Adjusted Total		48.27		\$33,293.93

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., In Re: Blood Reagents Antitrust Litigation* (E.D.Pa.) (09-md-2081); *In re Automotive Parts Antitrust Litigation* (E.D. Mi.) (12-md-02311); and *In re Interior Molded Doors* (E.D.Va.) (3:18-cv-00718-JAG).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included, as a member of the Discovery Committee, constant contact with lead counsel regarding all aspects of discovery in the case including discussions regarding creation of discovery documents, client questionnaires and client vetting.

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$479.50
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$983.88
+Pacer	\$83.80
Total	\$1,547.18

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Spector Roseman & Kodroff, PC are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 15, 2021

/s/ William G. Caldes
William G. Caldes
SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, PC
Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street, Suite 3420
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Phone: (215) 496-0300
Email: bcaldes@srkattorneys.com

Exhibit 22

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF AARON BRODY OF STULL, STULL & BRODY
IN SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Aaron Brody, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am the Managing Attorney at the law firm of Stull, Stull & Brody (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. **Stull, Stull & Brody's Professional Qualifications**

3. Stull, Stull & Brody has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.ssbny.com/>.

B. **Stull, Stull & Brody's Lodestar**

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Howard Longman	Attorney	0.70	\$850	\$595.00
Melissa Emert	Attorney	105.80	\$835	\$88,343.00
Patrick Slyne	Attorney	5.30	\$835	\$4,425.50
Patrice Bishop	Attorney	17.50	\$830	\$14,525.00
Subtotal		129.30		\$107,888.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(38.79)		(\$32,366.55)
Adjusted Total		90.51		\$75,521.95

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., See, e.g., In re: Daily Fantasy Sports Litigation*, 16-md-02677-GAO, Order dated 10/6/21 (D. Mass. 2016); *In Re: Apple, Inc. Device Performance Litigation*, 5:18-md-02827 (M.D. Ca. 2018).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily communications with all named plaintiffs; preparation of plaintiffs' vetting questionnaire; conducting plaintiffs' vetting interviews for inclusion into the Consolidated Complaint; drafting plaintiffs' paragraphs for inclusion into the Consolidated Complaint; working with co-counsel to obtain plaintiffs' approval of the filing of the Consolidated Complaint as well as participating in day to day litigation of the action.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

C. Stull, Stull & Brody's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$0.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$95.21
Total	\$95.21

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Stull, Stull & Brody are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021



 Aaron Brody
STULL, STULL & BRODY
 6 East 45th Street, 5th Floor
 New York, NY 10017
 Phone: (212) 687-7230
 Email: abrody@ssbny.com

Exhibit 23

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF ARIANA J. TADLER OF TADLER LAW LLP IN SUPPORT OF
CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF
ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Ariana J. Tadler, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am the founder and managing partner of the law firm Tadler Law LLP (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Tadler Law LLP's Professional Qualifications

3. I founded Tadler Law LLP just over two years ago as a women-owned litigation boutique, and our attorneys collectively have decades of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer-protection class actions, including data-breach class actions. I personally have 29+ years' experience advocating for consumers and investors against corporate fraud and abuse while litigating consumer and data breach class actions, securities fraud matters, and other complex litigation. I also am recognized as one of the nation's leading authorities on electronic discovery and pioneered the establishment of an E-Discovery Practice group within a plaintiffs' firm structure more than 15

years ago. I remain the only plaintiffs' lawyer to be ranked repeatedly as a Band 1 e-Discovery Practitioner by Chambers and Partners in the Global-USA and USA-Nationwide categories.

4. A detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.tadlerlaw.com/>.

B. Tadler Law LLP's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Ariana Tadler	Partner	46.9	\$925	\$43,382.50
Melissa Clark	Partner	0.5	\$725	\$362.50
Brian Morrison	Partner	79.3	\$625	\$49,562.50
Jason Joseph	Paralegal	8	\$425	\$3,400.00
Subtotal		134.70		\$96,707.50
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(40.41)		(\$29,012.25)
Adjusted Total		94.29		\$67,695.25

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The Firm's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards, including most recently in the following cases in which Ariana Tadler serves or served among plaintiffs' counsel in a leadership role:

- *Adkins v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. C 18-05982 WHA (JSC) (ECF No. 369) (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2021) (Ms. Tadler served as Co-Lead Class Counsel in this data breach

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

litigation with \$6.5 million in fees and costs approved by the Court.).

- *In re Yahoo! Inc. Customer Data Breach Security Litig.*, No. 16-md-02752-LHK, 2020 WL 4212811, *26 (N.D. Cal. July 22, 2020) (Ms. Tadler serves on the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee).
- *In re: Equifax, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. 1:17-md-02800 (N.D. Ga.) (ECF. No. 956) (January 13, 2020) ("Class counsel supplied substantial evidence that the prevailing rates for complex litigation in Atlanta and around the country are commensurate with or even in excess of the rates applied here and none of the objectors have presented any evidence to the contrary. The Court therefore finds class counsel's rates are reasonable and well supported, including specifically the hourly rates charged by [lead counsel] Mr. Barnes (\$1050); Mr. Canfield (\$1000); Ms. Keller (\$750), and Mr. Siegel (\$935).") (Ms. Tadler serves on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee).
- *In re Intuit Data Litig.*, No. 5:15-cv-01778 (N.D. Cal.) (ECF No. 196) (May 15, 2019) ("The Court finds that the requested fees are reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances and under applicable standards, given *inter alia* the novelty and complexity of the issues in this case, the results achieved, Class Counsel's commitment of time and resources in this case; and the risks that Class Counsel assumed in litigating this case on a contingency basis.").
- *In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 15-md-02617 (ECF No. 1047) (N.D. Cal. August 16, 2018) – approving fees including hourly rates of relevant lawyers and staff from MTPG and Milberg LLP (A. Tadler approved rate at \$825 for billing during 2015-2017).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work included primarily negotiating E-Discovery issues in the litigation. Both Ms. Tadler and Mr. Morrison performed significant work drafting and negotiating the ESI Protocol, which included many discussions and detailed collaboration with other plaintiffs' tracks in the case. Additionally, the Firm coordinated on the selection of data hosting providers for discovery collections and reviews.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Tadler Law LLP's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$80.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$0.00
Pacer	\$0.00
Total	\$80.00

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Tadler Law LLP are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 18, 2021



/s/

Ariana J. Tadler
TADLER LAW LLP
22 Bayview Avenue, Suite 200
Manhasset, NY 11030
Phone: (212) 946-9300
Email: atadler@tadlerlaw.com

Exhibit 24

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE WAWA, INC. DATA SECURITY
LITIGATION

Case No. 19-6019-GEKP

Class Action

This Document Relates To: Consumer Track

**DECLARATION OF STEVEN E. ANGSTREICH OF WEIR & PARTNERS LLP IN
SUPPORT OF CONSUMER TRACK PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS**

I, Steven E. Angstreich, declare and state to the best of my knowledge as follows:

1. I am a member of the law firm Weir & Partners LLP (the "Firm"). I submit this Declaration in support of the Consumer Track Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards.

2. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this Declaration. If called as a witness, I would and could competently testify to these facts.

A. Weir & Partners LLP's Professional Qualifications

3. Weir & Partners LLP has years of relevant experience in class action litigation. The Firm and its lawyers are litigators in the field of consumer protection class actions, including data breach class actions. A copy of the Firm's class action bio is attached as Exhibit "A."

4. Further, a detailed description of the Firm is available on its website at <https://www.weirpartners.com>.

B. Weir & Partners LLP's Lodestar

5. The lodestar incurred by each individual biller at the Firm is as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Name	Position	Hours	Hourly Rate	Lodestar
Steven Angstreich	Partner	23.90	\$500-\$575	\$13,197.50
Amy Brandt	Associate	92.40	\$400-\$420	\$37,806.00
Brett Datto	Partner	7.70	\$430	\$3,311.00
Levi Morris	Associate	17.50	\$275	\$4,812.50
Emily Yates	Paralegal	12.30	\$160	\$1,968.00
Subtotal		153.80		\$61,095.00
Less: 30% Reduction ¹		(46.14)		(\$18,328.50)
Adjusted Total		107.66		\$42,766.50

6. The hourly rates above are the historical hourly rates in effect at the time the work was performed.

7. The hourly rates above are the usual and customary rates charged by each applicable biller in the Firm's cases.

8. The attorney's hourly rates are regularly accepted by courts throughout the country for purposes of class action fee awards. *See, e.g., Williams, et. al v. Sweet Home Healthcare, et. al*, 2:16-cv-02353-BMS, (E.D. Pa.); *Castellano v. Coastal Eagle Point Oil Company*, No. 04cv5612 (U.S.D.C. of New Jersey); *Carnegie v. Household International, Inc., et al.*, No. 98 C 2178 (U.S.D.C. N.D. Ill.); *In re: Telectronics Pacing Systems*, (U.S.D.C. S.D. Ohio) and *Jeffers v. American Home Products Corp., (In re Diet Drug Products Liability Litigation, MDL 1203) C.A. No. 98-CV-20626* (E.D. Pa.).

9. All hours were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

10. The Firm's work primarily included: researching the applicable claims that could be asserted nationwide and/or multiple jurisdictions; drafting and circulating a detailed memorandum of that research; and drafting portions of the Consolidated Amended Class Complaint. The Firm also vetted their client Marisa Graziano to determine if she was an

¹ I understand that the total hours and lodestar of all non-lead firms, including the Firm, are being reduced by 30% in the interest of conservatism and billing judgment.

appropriate class representative and prepared her for and participated in her initial interview and completion of the class representative questionnaire. Finally, the Firm assisted Ms. Graziano in the production of documents to be used in class discovery.

11. In incurring the time set forth above, the Firm followed the detailed billing protocol circulated by Co-Lead Counsel on March 27, 2020.

C. Weir & Partners LLP's Litigation Expenses

12. The Firm's litigation expenses are as follows as of September 30, 2021:

Expense Type	Total
Filing Fees/Service of Process	\$485.00
Expert Fees	\$0.00
Mediation Fees	\$0.00
Westlaw/Lexis	\$1,491.34
Pacer	\$11.00
Total	\$1,987.34

13. The Firm is not seeking reimbursement of its other costs such as printing, photocopies, and similar administrative items. My understanding is that all plaintiffs' counsel in this case are forgoing reimbursement of those items.

14. The expenses incurred by Weir & Partners LLP are reflected in the books and records of the Firm. The books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, invoices, receipts, and other reasonable supporting records and are an accurate record of the expenses incurred.

15. All expenses were reasonably incurred and necessary to litigating this matter.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: October 14, 2021

/s/ Steven E. Angstreich _____

WEIR & PARTNERS LLP

1339 Chestnut Street, Suite 500

Philadelphia, PA 19107

Tel: 215-665-818

Email: sangstreich@weirpartners.com

EXHIBIT A

WEIR & PARTNERS LLP – CLASS ACTION BIO

Steven E. Angstreich. Mr. Angstreich is a partner in the Weir firm. Prior to joining Weir & Partners LLP in 2009, he was the managing shareholder and founder of Levy, Angstreich, Finney, Baldante, Rubenstein & Coren, P.C. (“LAF”) for more than 30 years. He received a Bachelor of Science Degree from the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania in 1967 and a Doctor of Jurisprudence from Temple University in 1970. He is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts in New Jersey and Pennsylvania as well as the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, the Supreme Court of the United States and the Courts of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. He has been admitted *pro hac vice* in other State Courts including North Carolina, Alabama, Delaware, New York, Maryland, Minnesota, Illinois, and Rhode Island and the United States District Courts in California, Ohio, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, New York, Texas and the District of Columbia. Mr. Angstreich has been a speaker or lecturer at national and state level professional seminars on the subjects of class action litigation, toxic tort litigation and professional liability. Mr. Angstreich has over fifty (50) years of experience in consumer, business, securities and complex litigation including class actions.

He was judicially appointed as national co-lead counsel in *In re St. Jude Medical Silzone Litigation*, MDL No. 1396 (D. Minn.) and in the nationwide H & R Block Refund Anticipation Loan consumer fraud class action, *Carnegie v. Household International, Inc., et al.*, No. 98 C 2178 (U.S.D.C. N.D. Ill.)(Case settled for \$39,000,000.) He has successfully litigated or concluded class action litigation in the securities, commercial fraud, consumer fraud and false advertising, employee wages and toxic tort areas among others.

In addition, he was lead counsel, co-lead counsel, or class counsel in the following class actions or shareholder derivative actions:

Consumer

- *Cummins v. H & R Block*, Circuit Court of Kanawha County, West Virginia, Civ. Action No. 03-C-134 (consumer fraud litigation stemming from Block's Refund Anticipation Loan program: Case settled for \$62,500,000);
- *Basile v. H & R Block, et al.*, April Term 1993, No. 3246 (CCP, Phila. Co.) (Consumer class action against H & R Block for breach of fiduciary duty for accepting undisclosed kickbacks in connection with Block's Rapid Refund Program.);
- *Coyne v. Nationwide Telecom, Inc., et al.*, No. L-10322-96 (Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Camden County) (class action arising from the unauthorized switching of consumers' long distance telephone service by defendants);
- *Sexton v. Fisher-Price, Inc., et al.*, (CCP, Bucks County, PA) No. 98-08117-20-1 (Co-class counsel in nationwide class of consumers deprived of use of defective, recalled Power Wheels™ toy vehicles);
- *Turner v. Ocwen Federal Bank, FSB*, Docket No. L-6637-00 (Superior Court of New Jersey, Law Division, Camden County) (nationwide consumer class action for improper charge of satisfaction fee by bank);
- *Vadino, et al. v. AHP*, Docket No. MID-L-425-98 (New Jersey statewide Unfair and Deceptive Acts and Practices and medical monitoring class);
- *Krouk v. Countrywide Home Loans Servicing, L.P., et al.*, Docket No. MID-L-2169-02 (New Jersey consumer fraud class action for improperly billing and collecting a payoff statement fee);

- *Victor Klein, et al. v. Robert's American Gourmet Foods and Keystone Food Products, Inc.*, Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Nassau, Index No. 006956/02 (nationwide consumer class action for mislabeling of food products);
- *Favorito v. Oasis Motors, Inc. d/b/a "Oasis Ford"*, Docket No. MID-L-011542-99 (statewide consumer class action to recover under New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act title and registration fees overcharges);
- *Frenkel v. Sansone Plaza Dodge, Inc.*, Docket Nos. MID- L-7425-02, L-7191-03, L-8927-03 (consolidated)(New Jersey consumer fraud class action relating to motor vehicle title and registration fees);

Breach of Fiduciary Duty

- *Cummins v. Maryland National Bank*, Circuit Court for Baltimore City, 83-096010/L4034 (breach of fiduciary duty);
- *McShea v. City of Philadelphia*, August Term, 1994, No. 1294 (CCP, Phila. Co.) (waste, mismanagement, breach of fiduciary duty and fraud class action in administration of City Employee Deferred Compensation Plan);

License Fees

- *Domb v. City of Philadelphia*, July Term, 1995 (CCP, Phila. Co.) (Lead class counsel for city-wide classes of (1) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania multi-family dwelling property owners who were illegally charged multiple license fees by City's Licenses and Inspections department; and (2) property owners subject to City's Residential Rental Property License requirement that were not multi-family dwellings; case settled by creation of a \$1,000,000 repayment program for multi-family license fees illegally

doubled charged and by forgiveness of past years fees and late charges for residential rental property owners);

Toxic Torts

- *In re Kreamer Municipal Well Litigation*, (CCP, Snyder Co., PA) No. 154 of 1991 (community wide toxic tort);
- *In Re GEMS Landfill Superior Court Litigation*, L-068199-85 (N.J. Super. Ct.) (property damage class action stemming from hazardous substance landfill);
- *Hagendorf v. Rohm & Haas Company*, May Term, 1986, No. 4283 (CCP, Phila. Co.) (mass toxic tort);

Medical

- *In re: Telectronics Pacing Systems*, (U.S.D.C. S.D. Ohio) (national class action for personal injuries and medical monitoring involving defective medical device);
- *Jeffers v. American Home Products Corp., (In re Diet Drug Products Liability Litigation*, MDL 1203) C.A. No. 98-CV-20626 (E.D. Pa.) (nationwide medical monitoring class);
- *In re Pennsylvania Diet Drug Litigation*, Master Docket No. 9709-3162 (CCP Phila. Co.) (Pennsylvania statewide medical monitoring class);

Wages

- *Castellano v. Coastal Eagle Point Oil Company*, No. 04cv5612 (U.S.D.C. of New Jersey)(class of employees deprived of wages for paid time off upon the acquisition of the Eagle Point Refinery by Sunoco)
- *Williams, et. al v. Sweet Home Healthcare, et. al*, 2:16-cv-02353-BMS, (E.D. Pa.)(class of employees deprived of overtime wages);

Shareholder/Securities

- *Ensign Corp., S.A. v. Intelogic Trace, Inc.*, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, 90 Civ. 3497 (LBS) (shareholder waste and mismanagement suit);
- *Hoffman v. Geriatric & Medical Centers, Inc.*, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, No. 93-CV-2129 (securities fraud and misrepresentation class action);
- *Albertini v. Peat Marwick Main & Company*, Circuit Court for Baltimore City, 90087031/C11170 (securities fraud, bank failure);
- *Sachs v. Nortek*, United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island, Civil Action No. 80-0005 (securities fraud action);
- *Connor v. DiDomenico*, C.A. No. 91-4756 (JBS) (securities fraud action);
- *Shapiro v. Jiffy Industries*, United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, Civil Action No. 85-2251 (securities fraud action);
- *Cohen v. Natco*, United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (securities);
- *Graf v. Commercial Properties Group, Inc.*, United States District Court, NY, No. 89 Civ 2057 (securities fraud action);

Other

- *Kaplan v. United Penn Bank*, June Term, 1989, No. 914 (CCP, Monroe Co., PA) (land fraud).

He has also recently acted as defense counsel in *Harrison, et. al v. Fresh Grocer Holdings, LLC, et. al* relating to defendants' grocery loyalty discount program.

Amy R. Brandt. Ms. Brandt is a member of the Weir firm. She is a 1989 graduate of Penn State University and received her Juris Doctorate from Temple University School of Law in 1992, graduating with honors and receiving the George P. Williams Scholarship. Ms. Brandt has continually practiced with Mr. Angstreich at LAF and Weir & Partners in the areas of commercial litigation, legal malpractice, class actions, employment litigation, environmental litigation, false advertising, consumer fraud, and insurance litigation. Ms. Brandt was appointed co-lead counsel in *Williams and Castellano* and served as a member of the litigation team on several successful class action cases described above including *Gems, Kreamer, Basile, Krouk, Favorito, Turner, Domb, Coyne* and *Frenkel*. Additionally, she acted as co-lead defense counsel in the wage payment class actions, *Acosta, et. all v. All American Home Care, 2:17-cv-01656* and *Cooper v. All American Home Care, No. 2:17-cv-01563*, which were recently concluded in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and is presently serving as co-lead defense counsel in *Chaparro v. All American Home Care*, pending in Philadelphia Common Pleas Court. She is admitted to both the State and Federal courts in New Jersey and Pennsylvania and has been admitted *pro hac vice* to litigate matters in New York, Delaware, Illinois and South Carolina.

Weir & Partners have successfully handled cyber-litigation matters including:

Helmer, Conley & Kasselmann, P.C., et al v. Hark and Hark, et al, 1:18-cv-10927, United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

Monique Michel, et. al v. Burger King Corporation, 1:18-cv-24304, United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida

U.S. Auto Parts Network v. Parts Geek LLC, et al, CV09-4609, United States District Court for the Central District of California

Michael J. Horan v. Professional Video Association, Inc., et al., United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Adversary Proceeding Number 98-00247