1 2 3 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA * * * 6 7 SARA SANGUINETTI, RAYMOND D. Case No. 2:21-cv-01768-RFB-DJA SPEIGHT, DAVID DIETZEL, PATRICIA 8 SAAVEDRA, AND NINA S. KUHLMANN, Consolidated with: 2:21-cv-01780-RFB-EJY individually and on behalf of all others 9 similarly situated, **ORDER** 10 Plaintiffs, 11 12 NEVADA RESTAURANT SERVICES, INC., 13 Defendant. 14 15 16 Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action 17 Settlement for an Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Service Awards to Plaintiffs 18 ("Renewed Motion"). 19 Having reviewed and considered the Settlement Agreement, as amended by the Parties 20 21 22 23

by way of an addendum to raise the cap on Alternative Cash Payments to \$250,000, and to lower the combined amount of attorneys' fees and expense requested to \$246,442, the prior Motion for Final Approval (ECF 124), the prior Motion for Attorneys' Fees (ECF 123), the Renewed Motion (ECF 132), and having conducted Final Approval Hearings on November 18, 2024 and June 12, 2025, the Court makes the following findings and grants the relief set forth below approving the Settlement upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Order.

24

25

26

27

28

WHEREAS, on May 28, 2024, the Court entered an Order Granting Preliminary

Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order") (Doc. No. 114) which,

among other things: (a) conditionally certified this matter as a class action, including

defining the class and class claims, (b) appointed Plaintiffs Sara Sanguinetti, Raymond D.

Speight, David Dietzel, and Nina S. Kuhlmann as the Class Representatives and appointed

David Lietz and Gary Klinger of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC; M.

Anderson Berry and Gregory Haroutunian of Clayeo C. Arnold, A Professional Corp.; Jean

Martin of Morgan & Morgan; and Geroge Haines and Gerardo Avalos of Freedom Law Firm,

Michael Kind of Kind Law, and David Wise and Joseph Langone of Wise Law Firm, PLC. as

Class Counsel; (c) preliminarily approved the Settlement Agreement; (d) approved the form and

manner of Notice to the Settlement Class; (e) set deadlines for opt-outs and objections; (f)

approved and appointed the Claims Administrator; and (g) set the date for the Final Fairness

WHEREAS, on June 18, 2024, pursuant to the Notice requirements set forth in the Settlement Agreement and in the Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Class was notified of the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement, of the right of Settlement Class Members to opt-out, and the right of Settlement Class Members to object to the Settlement Agreement and to

2122

23

24

17

18

19

20

be heard at a Final Approval Hearing;

WHEREAS, on August 27, 2024, at the suggestion of both Plaintiffs' and Defendant's counsel, an additional reminder mailing was sent to the Settlement Class. This reminder notice included a tear-off claim form in addition to the short notice;

2526

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2024, and June 12, 2025, the Court held a Final Approval Hearing to determine, inter alia: (1) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement (as amended by the Parties) are fair, reasonable, and adequate for the release of the

28

claims contemplated by the Settlement Agreement; and (2) whether a final judgment and order of dismissal with prejudice should be entered. Prior to the Final Fairness Hearings, a declaration of compliance with the provisions of the Settlement Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order relating to notice was filed with the Court as required by the Preliminary Approval Order;

WHEREAS, subsequent to the November 18, 2024 Final Approval Hearing, the Parties mutually agreed to raise the cap on Alternative Cash Payments to \$250,000, and agreed to lower the amount of combined attorneys' fees and expenses requested to \$246,442 (ECF 130);

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2025, the Court denied the initial motion for final approval and attorneys' fee motion (ECF 123 and 124) without prejudice and with leave to renew the motions to reflect the newly agreed upon terms relating to the Alternative Payment Cap and the attorneys' fees and expenses (ECF 131);

The Court is satisfied that Settlement Class Members were properly notified of their right to appear at the November 18, 2024 and June 12, 2025 Final Fairness Hearings in support of or in opposition to the proposed Settlement Agreement, the award of attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses to Class Counsel, and the payment of a Service Award to the Class Representatives;

WHEREAS, the Court not being required to conduct a trial on the merits of the case or determine with certainty the factual and legal issues in dispute when determining whether to approve a proposed class action settlement; and

WHEREAS, the Court being required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e) to make the findings and conclusions hereinafter set forth for the limited purpose of determining whether the settlement should be approved as being fair, reasonable, adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Class;

Having given an opportunity to be heard to all requesting persons in accordance with the

Preliminary Approval Order, having heard the presentation of Class Counsel and counsel

for Defendant, having heard testimony from Settlement Class Members who appeared at the

November 18, 2024 Final Approval hearing, having reviewed all of the submissions

presented with respect to the proposed Settlement Agreement, having determined that the

Settlement Agreement - with the Parties' agreed upon amendment to raise the cap on

Alternative Cash Payments to \$250,000 and to reduce the combined attorneys' fees and expenses

requested to \$246,442 – is fair, adequate, and reasonable, having considered the renewed

application made by Settlement Class Counsel for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses, and

the application for a Service Award to the Representative Plaintiffs, and having reviewed

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

IT IS ORDERED that:

the materials in support thereof, and good cause appearing:

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over all claims raised therein and all Parties thereto, including the Settlement Class.
- 2. The Settlement involves allegations in Plaintiffs' Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint against Defendant for failure to implement or maintain adequate data security measures and safeguards to protect Private Information, which Plaintiffs allege directly and proximately caused injuries to Plaintiffs and Settlement Class Members.
- 3. The Settlement does not constitute an admission of liability by Defendant, and the Court expressly does not make any finding of liability or wrongdoing by Defendant.
- 4. Unless otherwise indicated, words spelled in this Final Approval Order with initial capital letters have the same meaning as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

5. The Court, having reviewed the terms of the Settlement Agreement submitted by the Parties pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(2), grants final approval of the Settlement Agreement and for purposes of the Settlement Agreement and this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice only, the Court hereby finally certifies the following Settlement Class:

all persons who were mailed notice by NRS that their personal and/or financial information was impacted in a data incident occurring on or before January 16, 2021.

Specifically excluded from the Settlement Class are:

NRS, any Related Entities, and their officers and directors; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) any judges assigned to this case and their staff and family; and (iv) any other Person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Data Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

- 6. The Settlement was entered into in good faith following arm's length negotiations and is non-collusive. The Settlement is in the best interests of the Settlement Class and is therefore approved. The Court finds that the Parties faced significant risks, expenses, delays, and uncertainties, including as to the outcome, including on appeal, of continued litigation of this complex matter, which further supports the Court's finding that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class Members. The Court finds that the uncertainties of continued litigation in both the trial and appellate courts, as well as the expense associated with it, weigh in favor of approval of the settlement reflected in the Settlement Agreement.
- 7. The Settlement Agreement provides, in part, and subject to a more detailed description of the settlement terms in the Settlement Agreement, for:
 - a. Claims Administration as outlined in the Settlement Agreement whereby

Settlement Class Members can submit claims that will be evaluated by a Claims Administrator.

- b. Defendant to pay all costs of Claims Administration including the cost of the Claims Administrator, instituting Notice, processing and administering claims, and preparing and mailing checks.
- c. Defendant to pay, subject to the approval and award of the Court, the reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses of Class Counsel and a Service Award to the Class Representatives.
- 8. The Court readopts and incorporates herein by reference its preliminary conclusions as to the satisfaction of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3) set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order and notes that because this certification of the Settlement Class is in connection with the Settlement Agreement rather than litigation, the Court need not address any issues of manageability that may be presented by certification of the class proposed in the Settlement Agreement.
- 9. The terms of the Settlement Agreement as amended to raise the cap on Alternative Cash Payments to \$250,000 and to reduce the combined attorneys' fees and expenses requested to \$246,442 are fair, adequate, and reasonable and are hereby approved, adopted, and incorporated by the Court. Notice of the terms of the Settlement, the rights of Settlement Class Members under the Settlement, the Final Fairness Hearings, Plaintiffs' application for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses, and the Service Award payment to the Class Representatives have been provided to Settlement Class Members as directed by this Court's Orders, and proof of Notice has been filed with the Court.

- 10. The Court finds that the notice program, set forth in the Settlement Agreement and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, was reasonably calculated to provide and did provide due and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only, the existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement, and their right to object and to appear at the final approval hearing or to exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement, and satisfied the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution, and other applicable law.
- 11. The Court finds that Defendant has fully complied with the notice requirements of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715.
- 12. As of the Opt-Out deadline, no Settlement Class Members have requested to be excluded from the Settlement.
 - 13. No timely or untimely objections were filed by Settlement Class Members.
- 14. All Settlement Class Members who have not objected to the Settlement Agreement in the manner provided in the Settlement Agreement are deemed to have waived any objections by appeal, collateral attack, or otherwise.
- 15. Multiple Settlement Class Members and their family members appeared at the November 18, 2024 Final Approval Hearing. The Court took time to afford each of these persons an opportunity to speak on the record. Having listened carefully to the testimony of those individuals who appeared at the Final Approval Hearing, and having considered the substance of this testimony, the Court finds that none of these Settlement Class Members presented a valid basis to object to this Settlement, and these oral objections are overruled.

1

- 6 7
- 8
- 1011
- 12

13

- 14
- 1516
- 17
- 18 19
- 20
- 21
- 23

22

25

24

- 2627
- 28

- 16. The Court has considered all the documents filed in support of the Settlement, and has fully considered all matters raised, all exhibits and affidavits filed, all evidence received at the Final Approval Hearing, all other papers and documents comprising the record herein, and all oral arguments presented to the Court.
- 17. The Parties, their respective attorneys, and the Claims Administrator are hereby directed to consummate the Settlement in accordance with this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice and the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 18. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Defendant, the Claims Administrator, and Class Counsel shall implement the Settlement in the manner and timeframe as set forth therein.
- 19. Within the time period set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the relief provided for in the Settlement Agreement shall be made available to the various Settlement Class Members submitting valid Claim Forms, pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement.
- 20. Pursuant to and as further described in the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members release claims as follows:

Upon Final Approval of this Settlement Agreement, Settlement Class members release all causes of action and claims for relief that have been asserted, or could have been asserted, by any Settlement Class Member, including Representative Plaintiffs, against any of the Released Parties based on, relating to, concerning, or arising out of the Incident, the alleged compromising and/or theft of Personal Information as a result of the Incident, and the allegations, facts, or circumstances described in the Complaint and the Litigation including, but not limited to negligence; negligence per se; breach of contract; breach of implied contract; breach of fiduciary duty; breach of confidence; invasion of privacy; misrepresentation (whether fraudulent, negligent or innocent); unjust enrichment; bailment; wantonness; failure to provide adequate notice pursuant to any breach notification statute or common law duty; and including any claims for relief including, but not limited to, any and all claims for damages, injunctive relief, disgorgement, declaratory relief, equitable relief, attorneys' fees and expenses, pre-judgment interest, credit monitoring services, the creation of a fund for future damages, statutory damages, punitive damages, special damages, exemplary

1
2
3

damages, restitution, the appointment of a receiver, and any other form of relief. Released Claims shall not include the right of any Settlement Class Member or any of the Released Persons to enforce the terms of the settlement contained in the Settlement Agreement, and shall not include the claims of Settlement Class Members who have timely excluded themselves from the Settlement Class.

21. The Court grants final approval to the appointment of Plaintiffs as Class Representatives. The Court concludes that Class Representatives have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class and will continue to do so.

22. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, and in recognition of their efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class, the Court approves a payment to the Class Representatives in the amount of \$2500 each as a Service Award (for a total of \$10,000). Defendant shall make such payment in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

23. The Court grants final approval to the appointment of David Lietz and Gary Klinger of Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC; M. Anderson Berry and Gregory Haroutunian of Clayeo C. Arnold, A Professional Corp.; Jean Martin of Morgan & Morgan; and Geroge Haines and Gerardo Avalos of Freedom Law Firm, Michael Kind of Kind Law, and David Wise and Joseph Langone of Wise Law Firm, PLC. as Class Counsel. The Court concludes that Class Counsel has adequately represented the Settlement Class and will continue to do so.

24. The Court, after careful review of the fee petition filed by Class Counsel, and after applying the appropriate standards required by relevant case law, hereby grants Class Counsel's application for combined attorneys' fees and out-of-pocket case expenses in the amount of \$246,442.00. The Court notes that included in that combined amount is \$18,711.29 in litigation expenses, meaning that the attorneys' fees awarded are \$227,730.71. Payment shall be made pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

28

25. This Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice and the Settlement Agreement, and all acts, statements, documents, or proceedings relating to the Settlement Agreement are not, and shall not be construed as, used as, or deemed to be evidence of, an admission by or against Defendant of any claim, any fact alleged in the Litigation, any fault, any wrongdoing, any violation of law, or any liability of any kind on the part of Defendant's or of the validity or certifiability for litigation of any claims that have been, or could have been, asserted in the lawsuit. This Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, the Settlement Agreement, and all acts, statements, documents, or proceedings relating to the Settlement Agreement shall not be offered or received or be admissible in evidence in any action or proceeding, or be used in any way as an admission or concession or evidence of any liability or wrongdoing of any nature or that Plaintiffs, any Settlement Class Member, or any other person has suffered any damage; provided, however, that the Settlement Agreement and this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice may be filed in any action by Defendant, Class Counsel, or Settlement Class Members seeking to enforce the Settlement Agreement or the Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice (including, but not limited to, enforcing the releases contained herein). The Settlement Agreement and Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice shall not be construed or admissible as an admission by Defendant that Plaintiff's' claims or any similar claims are suitable for class treatment. The Settlement Agreement's terms shall be forever binding on, and shall have res judicata and preclusive effect in, all pending and future lawsuits or other proceedings as to Released Claims and other prohibitions set forth in this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice that are maintained by, or on behalf of, any Settlement Class Member or any other person subject to the provisions of this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice.

26

27

28

1

2

- 26. If the Effective Date, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, does not occur for any reason, this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice and the Preliminary Approval Order shall be deemed vacated, and shall have no force and effect whatsoever; the Settlement Agreement shall be considered null and void; all of the Parties' obligations under the Settlement Agreement, the Preliminary Approval Order, and this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice and the terms and provisions of the Settlement Agreement shall have no further force and effect with respect to the Parties and shall not be used in the Litigation or in any other proceeding for any purpose, and any judgment or order entered by the Court in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement shall be treated as vacated nunc pro tunc, and the Parties shall be restored to their respective positions in the Litigation, as if the Parties never entered into the Settlement Agreement (without prejudice to any of the Parties' respective positions on the issue of class certification or any other issue). In such event, the Parties will jointly request that all scheduled Litigation deadlines be reasonably extended by the Court so as to avoid prejudice to any Party or Party's counsel. Further, in such event, Defendant will pay amounts already billed or incurred for costs of notice to the Settlement Class, and Claims Administration, and will not, at any time, seek recovery of same from any other Party to the Litigation or from counsel to any other Party to the Litigation.
- 27. Pursuant to <u>Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.</u>, 511 U.S. 375, 382 (1994) and the parties' agreement, this Court shall retain the authority to issue any order necessary to protect its jurisdiction from any action, whether in state or federal court.
- 28. Without affecting the finality of this Final Judgment and Order of Dismissal with Prejudice, the Court will retain jurisdiction over the subject matter and the Parties with respect to the interpretation and implementation of the Settlement Agreement for all purposes.

1	29.	This Or	der reso	olves all	claims agai	nst all	l Parties in	this a	ction and	d is a f	inal order.
2	30.	The ma	atter is	hereby	dismissed	with	prejudice	and	without	costs	except as
3	provided in the	ne Settlem	nent Ag	reement	•						
5	DATED: Jur	ne 27, 202	5.								
6											
7							~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	B	,		
8							CHARD F				UDCE
9						UN	NITED ST.	AIL	DISTR	acı j	UDGE
0											
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
17											
8											
9											
20											
21											
22											
23											
24											
25											
26											
27											
28											