

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 CAT BROOKS and RASHEED SHABAZZ,
13 individually and on behalf of all others
14 similarly situated,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 THOMSON REUTERS CORPORATION,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 3:21-cv-01418-EMC-KAW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Hon. Edward M. Chen

1 On November 9, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a motion seeking to certify the following class:

2 All persons who, during the limitations period, both resided in the
3 state of California and whose information Thomson Reuters made
4 available for sale through CLEAR without their consent.¹

5 Having considered Plaintiffs' motion, reply, and supporting materials, Defendant's
6 opposition and supporting materials, and the arguments made by the parties at the class
7 certification hearing, and having conducted a rigorous analysis of the requirements of
8 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion for class
9 certification and enters the following order.

10 Plaintiffs have met the requirements of Rule 23(a): the classes contain well over 40
11 individuals, satisfying the numerosity requirement; there are numerous questions of law and
12 fact common to the class for each of Plaintiffs' claims, satisfying the commonality
13 requirement; the claims and defenses of the representatives are typical of those of the classes,
14 satisfying the typicality requirement; and Plaintiffs and their counsel will adequately
15 represent the interests of the proposed class, satisfying the adequacy requirement.

16 Plaintiffs' claims also meet the requirements of Rule 23(b)(2) and (b)(3). Rule 23(b)(2)
17 certification of Plaintiffs' Unfair Competition Law (UCL) claim is warranted because
18 Thomson Reuters' allegedly unlawful conduct can be "remedied by a single classwide
19 order." *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 360 (2011). In addition, Rule 23(b)(3) class
20 certification of Plaintiffs' UCL and unjust-enrichment claims are appropriate because
21 common issues predominate over individual ones, proceeding as a class action will be
22 superior to individual litigations, and the requested monetary relief is capable of
23 measurement on a classwide basis. *See, e.g., Allegra v. Luxottica Retail N. Am.*, 341 F.R.D. 373,
24 460 (E.D.N.Y. 2022) (certifying California unjust-enrichment class and collecting cases); *see*
25 *also Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 569 U.S. 27, 34 (2013).

26
27
28 ¹ Excluded from this class definition are "any officers and directors of Thomson Reuters;
Class Counsel; and the judicial officer(s) presiding over this action and the members of
his/her immediate family and judicial staff."

1 Accordingly, the Court certifies the requested class of Californians, as defined above,
2 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(2) and/or (23)(b)(3).

3 The Court appoints Cat Brooks and Rasheed Shabazz as representatives of the
4 California Class; and it appoints Gibbs Law Group LLP and Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll
5 PLLC as Class Counsel.

6 Within 14 days of this Order, Plaintiffs shall submit a schedule for submission and
7 approval of a plan to distribute notice to the certified class.

8
9
10 Dated: _____

HONORABLE EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge