

Susan D. Fahringer, Bar No. 21567
SFahringer@perkinscoie.com
Nicola C. Menaldo, *pro hac vice*
NMenaldo@perkinscoie.com
Erin K. Earl, *pro hac vice*
EEarl@perkinscoie.com
Anna M. Thompson, *pro hac vice*
AnnaThompson@perkinscoie.com
PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
Telephone: 206.359.8000
Facsimile: 206.359.9000

Attorneys for Defendant
Thomson Reuters Corporation

Gabriella Gallego, Bar No. 324226
GGallego@perkinscoie.com
PERKINS COIE LLP
3150 Porter Drive
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1212
Telephone: 650.838.4300
Facsimile: 650.838.4350

Hayden M. Schottlaender, *pro hac vice*
HSchottlaender@perkinscoie.com
PERKINS COIE LLP
500 N. Akard Street, Suite 3300
Dallas, TX 75201-3347
Telephone: 214.965.7700
Facsimile: 214.965.7799

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

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

Plaintiffs,

v.

THOMSON REUTERS CORPORATION,

Defendant.

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

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS MOTION TO
EXCLUDE DEFENDANT THOMSON
REUTERS' EXPERT OPINIONS ON
CLASS CERTIFICATION**

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Plaintiffs have moved to exclude the opinions of two experts offered by Defendant Thomson Reuters: Dr. Ran Kivetz and Professor Jane Bambauer. Doc. 159 (the “Motion”). Having considered the Motion, Thomson Reuters’ Opposition, and all associated briefing, documents, and evidence on the record at the time of this Order, the Motion is hereby **DENIED**. The Court finds that the opinions offered by Dr. Kivetz and Prof. Bambauer meet the standards set forth by *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 589 (1993). Dr. Kivetz is well-qualified in consumer surveying, perception, and preferences, and those areas of expertise are put at issue by Plaintiffs’ expert, Professor Joseph Turow. And Prof. Bambauer’s opinion is not subject to exclusion merely because she has declined to opine on Thomson Reuters’ conduct under the lens of California law. Expert witnesses “cannot testify to a matter of law amounting to a legal conclusion.” *United States v. Tamman*, 782 F. 3d 543, 552-53 (9th Cir. 2015).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen
United States District Judge

Submitted by:

PERKINS COIE LLP

By: /s/ Hayden M. Schottlaender

Hayden M. Schottlaender

Admitted *pro hac vice*

Attorneys for Defendant
Thomson Reuters Corporation