UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

KEVIN MCCLINTIC on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

LITHIA MOTORS, INC.,

Defendant.

CLASS ACTION

No. 2:11-cv-00859-RAJ

DECLARATION OF ROB WILLIAMSON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Noted for Hearing: October 11, 2012 @ 2:00 p.m.

Rob Williamson hereby declare as follows:

- 1. My partner, Kim Williams, and I are counsel for Plaintiff and the proposed Settlement Class in this action.
- 2. This case was resolved relatively soon after the complaint was filed. It involved claims under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227, and various state laws, including RCW 80.36.400, RCW 19.190.060 and RCW 19.86. Lithia expressed its desire to attempt to settle the claims of this case utilizing the services of the Honorable Terrence Lukens of JAMS, in Seattle. The Settlement Agreement provides for payments \$175.00 to class members for each text they received, except that if a class member received a second text after requesting Lithia to stop sending text messages, they will be paid \$500.00 for the second text, for

DECLARATION OF ROB WILLIAMSON IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OFCLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT - 1 (No. 2:11-cv-00859-RAJ)



Dockets.Justia.co

McClintic v. Lithia Moto

22

23 24

25

26

a total of \$675.00. The Settlement Agreement also provided that payments were to be adjusted based upon claims rates. *See* paragraph 8, *infra*. In addition, Defendant is required to pay all costs of settlement administration, including costs of notice (estimated to be \$150,000.00), litigation expenses and costs of the Plaintiff and the class, and an incentive award to the class representative.

- 3. The parties agreed to use The Garden City Group ("GCG") as the settlement administrator. The costs of administration incurred to date and any additional costs GCG incurs through final distribution will be paid by Defendant.
- 4. The names of the persons requesting exclusion are listed on Attachment 1 to the proposed Final Order and Judgment and as Exhibit B to the Declaration of Jennifer M. Keough of GCG.
- 5. The Court has also been asked to approve an award of attorney's fees and costs of a total not to exceed \$600,000.00 and a class representative service award of \$10,000.00 for Plaintiff McClintic. A separate motion regarding the payments to Counsel and Plaintiff was submitted to the Court and posted on the website created by the settlement administrator on July 10, 2012 as required in the Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. #37). There have been no objections to the requested fees for Counsel or to the service award for Plaintiff.
- 6. In this case, the parties proposed a notice plan specifically designed to reach the maximum number of members of the class. Direct mail notice was accomplished for the vast majority of class members. This was the most effective way to provide class members with the requisite information about this case. In addition, a long form of notice was posted on a website maintained by GCG, which also included a downloadable version of the Claim or Exclusion

form and various court documents, including the Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, the Order Approving Class Notice, and the Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Service Award to the Named Plaintiff.

- 7. The notice summarized the settlement in plain language and identified the deadlines for making claims, opting out or objecting. The notice also identified Class Counsel and the class representative, the date when Class Counsel would submit their motion for fees and an incentive award for the named Plaintiff, and described the relief that would be provided to class members. Counsel for the parties believes the notice was an adequate and easily comprehended explanation of the settlement and its terms to class members.
- 8. As set forth in the Declaration of Jennifer Keough, GCG approved 2703 claims, and identified five categories of claims which were considered deficient. The parties have agreed, subject to the Court's approval, to permit the claims of categories 1 through 4 and disallow all of category 5. With respect to categories 2 and 3, which total 368, the parties agree to treat the claims as asserting the receipt of one text only. With respect to category 1, which total 6 claims, one class member will be deemed to have asserted the receipt of one text only, three will deemed to have asserted the receipt of two texts and two will be deemed to have asserted the receipt of a second text after attempting to opt out of the texting from Defendant. Category 4 includes 39 class members who signed both boxes on the Claim or Exclusion Form. The parties are mindful that the Court required the Form to include this language: "If you enter information in both boxes, your response will be invalid, and you will be deemed to have submitted no response." Nevertheless, it is clear that each of these class members intended to make a claim as they completed the box, "Participating In The Settlement." Included within the

39 class members, eight requested payment for one text, seven claimed receipt of two texts, fifteen claimed receipt of a second text after trying to opt out, and nine did not indicate receipt of one or two texts and would be deemed to have made a claim for one text only.

If all four categories of deficient claims are allowed, then a total number of claims for one text only would be 992, for 2 texts only would be 787, and for receipt of a second text after attempting to opt out would be 1337. This would amount to a total number of claims of 3116. Payment of those claims at \$175, \$350, and \$675, respectively, would total \$1,351,525 (\$173,600, \$275,450, \$902,475, respectively). The Settlement Agreement provides for \$1,740,000 to be available for claims. Accordingly, payment to each class member to the increased by 28.74%. Thus a class member entitled to \$175 would be paid \$225.30, and one entitled to \$350 would be paid \$450.60, and one entitled to \$675 will be paid \$869.

Payments in these amounts compare favorably to other settlements in which we have been involved, and facto our knowledge represent the most ever been paid for violations of the TCPA.

- 9. In this case, Class Counsel believed the Plaintiff's case was strong. Defendant would have certainly argued that class members had consented, implicitly or otherwise, to the receipt of text messages, and would have raised objections to class certification because of individual issues regarding consent.
- 10. There is no question that continued litigation in this case would involve formal discovery and the potential for discovery disputes, motion practice, protracted trial preparation and attendant expenses for all parties and a lengthy trial during which numerous witnesses, including experts for both sides, would likely be called to testify.



Further, the trial would likely be followed by an appeal on one or more issues, and the total duration of this litigation would extend for the next several years to come. The settlement assures a timely and relatively expeditious resolution of the case for all concerned.

- 11. As set forth in our Declaration in Support of Preliminary Approval (Dkt. #20) and Motion for Attorney Fees (Dkt. #39), the experience of class counsel is extensive, both with respect to consumer class action litigation in general, as well as litigation involving state and federal violations of laws restricting robo-call and junk fax solicitations.
- 12. At the time we filed our Motion for Attorney Fees, we estimated that a combined additional 25 hours would be needed to complete our work on this case. In fact, we have spent an additional 39 hours working on claims review and administration, the final approval pleadings and on other matters related to settlement approval.
- 13. The proposed Class in this case meets the numerosity, commonality, and typicality standards. Defendant identified approximately 59,000 unique Class Members.
- 14. In evaluating the proposed Settlement, Plaintiff and his counsel have considered the expense and length of time necessary to prosecute the claims through trial and possible appeal, the claims asserted by the Class, the logistic complexities involved in resolving such claims, and the defenses available to the Defendant. The risk, expense, and uncertainty in class actions and defenses asserted in this case were all considered.
- 15. Based on these and other considerations, Plaintiff and his counsel have concluded that it is in the best interest of the members of the class to compromise and settle without further adversarial proceedings.
 - 16. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is Dan McLaren's Claim Form.

1	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the
2	foregoing is true and correct.
3	Dated this 28th day of September, 2012 on Bainbridge Island, WA.
4	
5	WILLIAMSON & WILLIAMS
6	
7	By <u>/s/ Rob Williamson</u> Rob Williamson, WSBA #11387
8	WILLIAMSON & WILLIAMS 17253 Agate Street NE
9	Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
10	Telephone: (206) 780-4447 FAX: (206) 780-5557 roblin@williamslaw.com
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	A



26

EXHIBIT A

MUST BE POSTMARKED ON OR BEFORE SEPTEMBER 14, 2012 McClintic v. Lithia Motors, Inc. Class Action Litigation

c/o GCG P.O. Box 9786 Dublin, OH 43017-5686 Toll-Free: 1 (888) £24-6705



Claim No: LAD7458617

· Control No: 7176174414



DAN MCLAREN 755 STEVEN STREET #223 MEDFORD, OR 97504



Claim or Exclusion Form

McClintic v. Lithia Motors, Inc. Class Action Litigation
No. C11-859RAJ, United States District Court for the Western District of Washington

YOUR CLAIM OR EXCLUSION FORM MUST BE POSTMARKED NO LATER THAN SEPTEMBER 14, 2012. Please review a summary of the Release in the Notice accompanying this Claim or Exclusion Form. A copy of the complete Release can be found on the Settlement Administrator's website at www.TextClassSettlement.com and in the Settlement Agreement.

1,000 1,000	ea vie	se Wil	lyóe igiy	oni Onio	neal laim	.	•	•	dio	wing) (Init	single	llon	, Th	© (St	allle	mên	βÁ	rei mini	strå	or v	m d	Se (ihis	info	nai	Sizal Ion) Y	ist olel	y for	2. 被禁
Ŋ.	am \	e <u>(</u> (irst	mid !	dle.	and /	last)	2	•			70.				M	24		23.). 				* 1j			1
		4 <u>6</u>	//	<i> </i> 	10	別級	Sink	はない	/ 200		N	a		a		然然 八人	S88	が	a		e	N			 	* CE		49.24 49.24		
	7	5	5	i I	5	1	<u>.</u>	V	e	N	S	2433	5	1	()82	壮	2	2	.S.		165	20.48				ř říř	N.E.	×3.40	المنا	×
Ç	ıy.	11.	10								Ž,	N.								200		Sia	31 € 6 9: - 1	200	Zip	Coc	e L		11 A	
	7	e	d	4	0	r	d) (1) \$70	F7.470	130.12	N. P. G.S.	100 (SEC.)	12461	SEE SEC	EXPUR.		*:4G0	aener	un e	- S. /AL		0	R		9	Z	5	0	4	2
H. N.	<u>سر</u> د	e:T .∐	elep	hon	e Ni	imbe	riii I) k	3 (C)	llula	riPh	one K	Nui	nber	lha	Rec	eive	ediji	ext A	less	age	(S)	· 第第	1
	_	1 7 25 F	(Vija	<u>"</u>	ы <u>/</u>	A 128	18			2 <u>`</u>	7 0	- (- *****	2 17		W	<u>ک</u>	4 1	1835	E.	/ 	/ SX Y	8	Ο	0	9	Z M/M	6	数件	第	1

Please complete only one of the following two boxes. If you enter information in both boxes, your response will be invalid, and you will be deemed to have submitted no response.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
PARTICIPATING IN THE SETTLEMENT
If you wish to submit a claim, please provide the following information:
I received ONE TWO ext messages from Lithia. (Circle "ONE" or "TWO")
I received a second text message from Lithia after I attempted to opt out: (YES) NO
I certify that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
Dated: 9/11/2012 Signature: 2 //
EXCLUDING YOURSELF FROM THE SETTLEMENT
If you do not wish to participate in the settlement, please sign below:
I wish to request to exclude myself from being a member of the Settlement Class.
Dated: Signature:

Mcdard of 97504 Mcdard of 97504

WESTER OF THE

14 SEP 2012 PM 1 L



the Clintic v Lithia Waters, Inc Closes Ration Litigation 60 GCG POBOX 9786 Dublin, OH 43017-5686