

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER STEIN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
ETHOS TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
Defendant.


Case No. [22-cv-09203-SK](#)

ORDER REGARDING POST-DISTRIBUTION ACCOUNTING

The Court has reviewed the declarations filed regarding the distribution of the settlement funds. Pursuant to the class action settlement approved by the Court, remaining funds would be paid out to eligible claimants on a *pro rata* basis. (Dkt. No. 42 at p. 14.) The Court notes that taking into account the approved attorney’s fees and costs and the service awards, and the amount Scott M. Fenwich from Kroll Settlement Administration (“Kroll”) calculated for eligible claimants, there would be \$189,035.87 remaining from the \$1,000,000 settlement fund. Additionally, although Plaintiffs represented that Kroll’s costs were estimated at \$97,987, it does not appear as though Plaintiffs ever requested that the Court to approve Kroll’s final costs for administering the settlement. Before the Court releases the \$50,000 in attorney’s fees, the Court must approve the final amount of Kroll’s requested costs, including any justification, if any, for increasing it beyond the disclosed \$97,987 and needs to ensure that any remaining amount from the settlement fund will be paid on a *pro rata* basis to eligible claimants from the class. Plaintiffs shall file a response to this Order by no later than March 19, 2025.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 5, 2025


SALLIE KIM
United States Magistrate Judge