

BRONSTER FUJICHAKU ROBBINS
A Law Corporation

MARGERY S. BRONSTER #4750
ROBERT M. HATCH #7724
NOELLE E. CHAN #11280
1003 Bishop Street, Suite 2300
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813
Telephone: (808) 524-5644
Email: mbronster@bfrhawaii.com
rhatch@bfrhawaii.com
nchan@bfrhawaii.com

Electronically Filed
FIRST CIRCUIT
1CCV-23-0000486
14-JUN-2024
02:21 PM
Dkt. 79 MOT

CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER & SPRENGEL LLP
NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DANIEL O. HERRERA (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
135 S. LaSalle, Suite 3210
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Facsimile: (312) 782-4485
Email: rnhagman@caffertyclobes.com
Email: DHerrera@caffertyclobes.com

MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON
PHILLIPS GROSSMAN PLLC
GARY M. KLINGER (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
227 W. Monroe Street, Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (866) 252-0878
Email: gklinger@milberg.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAI'I

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN
TRENHAILIE, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 1CCV-23-0000486
(Other Civil Action)

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES,
REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES,
AND SERVICE AWARDS FOR CLASS**

(caption continued)

**REPRESENTATIVES; MEMORANDUM
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION;
DECLARATION OF ROBERT M.
HATCH; DECLARATION OF
NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN; NOTICE OF
HEARING; CERTIFICATE OF
SERVICE**

HEARING:

Date: August 7, 2024

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Dean E. Ochiai

Trial Date: None

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, REIMBURSEMENT
OF EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS FOR CLASS REPRESENTATIVES**

Plaintiffs Rose Spencer and Lewelyn Trenhailie, by and through their undersigned counsel, Bronster Fujichaku Robbins, Cafferty Clobes Meriwether & Sprengel LLP, and Milberg Coleman Bryson (“collectively” Class Counsel), respectfully move this court for an award of Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Service Awards for Class Representatives.

This motion is brought pursuant to Rule 7, and Rule 23 of the Hawai‘i Rules of Civil Procedure, and is based upon the attached Declarations of Robert M. Hatch and Nickloas J. Hagman, and the records and files herein.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai‘i, June 14, 2024.

/s/ Robert M. Hatch _____

MARGERY S. BRONSTER

ROBERT M. HATCH

NOELLE E. CHAN

NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DANIEL O. HERRERA (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

GARY M. KLINGER (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN TRENHAILIE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT
STATE OF HAWAII

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN
TRENHAILIE, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 1CCV-23-0000486
(Other Civil Action)

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION**

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

Plaintiffs Rose Spencer and Lewelyn Trenhaile respectfully submit this Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Service Awards for Class Representatives. In support thereof, Plaintiffs state as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

This class action lawsuit brought by Rose Spencer and Lewelyn Trenhaile ("Plaintiffs" or "Class Representatives") against Defendant Aloha Nursing Rehab Center ("Aloha" or "Defendant") (together with Plaintiffs, the "Parties"), and arises from a cyberattack perpetrated against Aloha between July and December 2022 (the "Data Breach"). *See* Amended Class Action Complaint ("Comp."), ¶¶ 1-2, 5.

Aloha, a skilled nursing and long-term care facility that provides full-service healthcare services, experienced a security incident involving unauthorized access to its file servers from July 8, 2022 to December 28, 2022. *Comp.* at ¶¶ 22-23. Subsequent investigation determined that unauthorized actors obtained access to files that included Plaintiffs' and Class members' names,

dates of birth, Social Security Numbers, and medical records (“Private Information”). *Id.* at ¶¶ 25-26. Aloha began notifying affected individuals on February 24, 2023. *Id.* at ¶ 25.

The Parties conducted extensive arms’-length negotiations and reached a fair, adequate, and reasonable settlement. If approved, the settlement provides Class Members with substantial relief, including the option to submit a claim for an ordinary expense reimbursement up to \$500 per person. Class members who were the actual victim of identity theft may also make a claim for extraordinary expense reimbursement up to \$2,000 in proven monetary loss. All Class members are also eligible to claim 30 months of credit monitoring services. Plaintiffs further secured confirmatory discovery regarding enhancements to Aloha’s data security practices.

In total, the Settlement is valued in excess of \$10,000,000.¹ Plaintiffs strongly believe the Settlement is favorable to the Settlement Class.²

Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and the Court’s inherent authority, Class Counsel respectfully submits this Motion for Award of Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Service Awards for Class Representative. First, Class Counsel request that the Court award \$225,000 for payment of attorneys’ fees and expenses (“Fee Request”). This represents just 2% of the total value of the Settlement. As detailed more fully herein, the factual and legal complexity of these claims required extensive investment of labor and advancement of costs by Class Counsel.

¹ As described below, each Class members is entitled to claim up to \$500 in ordinary expense reimbursements. For the Class of 20,599 members, the value of the ordinary expense reimbursement benefit alone (excluding the value of the extraordinary expense reimbursement, credit monitoring and enhanced data security practices implemented by Aloha), is \$10,599,500 (\$500 x 20,599 Members). The value of the 30-months of 1 Bureau credit monitoring is \$13.99/month, which has a value of \$8,645,400.30 for the entire Class (\$13.99 x 30 Months x 20,599 Class Members). The Settlement also permits Class members to claim up to \$2,000 in documented identity theft losses that were caused by the Data Breach.

² See Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. Doc. #66.

The work performed advancing the claims of Class Members—on a fully contingent basis—carried significant risk, and counsel forewent other opportunities and dedicated themselves to this case.

Further, Class Counsel request that the Court approve a service award for each Class Representative in the amount of \$2,500, for a total of \$5,000. This request is modest and is fully justified by the law and the work performed by Plaintiffs.

This Memorandum is supported by the cited and attached evidence, including: the Declaration of Robert M. Hatch in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Approval of Attorneys’ Fees Award, Expense Reimbursement, and Service Awards to Representative Plaintiffs (Hatch Fee Decl.”), and the Declaration of Nickolas J. Hagman in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Approval of Attorneys’ Fees Award, Expense Reimbursement, and Service Awards to Representative Plaintiffs (Declaration of Nickolas J. Hagman) (“Hagman Fee Decl.”).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 13, 2023, Plaintiff Rose Spencer filed a putative class action complaint against Aloha in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawai‘i, asserting claims allegedly arising out of the Cyberattack. On May 1, 2023, Plaintiff Lewelyn Trenhaile filed a putative class action complaint against Aloha in the Circuit Court of the First Circuit, State of Hawai‘i. On June 13, 2023, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Class Action Complaint, consolidating the *Spencer* and *Trenhaile* actions.

Shortly thereafter, the Parties determined that discussions regarding early resolution of this case were warranted and could be beneficial to both Plaintiffs and Defendant. The Parties began arm’s-length discussions regarding the same.

This Settlement came about as the result of protracted, arms'-length negotiations. *See* Hagman Fee Decl., ¶ 2. Both Parties negotiated in good faith and zealously defended their respective positions as they negotiated the Settlement Agreement. *Id.* The Settlement Agreement and the various exhibits thereto ("S.A.") were ultimately finalized and signed in February 2024. *See id.*

Class Counsel's work was not over and will continue throughout the claims period. Based on experience, Class Counsel will spend 50-100 additional hours seeking final approval, defending the Settlement from potential objections (of which there are none to date), and supervising claims administration and the distribution of proceeds. Hagman Fee Decl., ¶ 5.

In the Preliminary Approval Order the Court set the final fairness hearing for July 31, 2024. Doc. # 77.

B. SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT

The Settlement Class is defined as:

The persons whose private information was maintained on Defendant's computer systems that were compromised in the Cyberattack.

See S.A. ¶ 1. The Settlement Class is comprised of approximately 20,599 individuals (each, a "Settlement Class Member").

Excluded from the Settlement Class definition are:

(a) Defendants' officers and directors; (b) any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest; and (c) the affiliates, legal representatives, attorneys, successors, heirs, and assigns of Defendant. Also excluded from the Settlement Classes are members of the judiciary to whom this case is assigned, their families and members of their staff.

See S.A. ¶ 1.

1. Settlement Benefits

Credit Monitoring

Each Settlement Class Member is automatically entitled to a 30-month membership of one bureau credit monitoring with at least \$1 million in fraud protection. S.A. ¶ 3.B. Settlement Class Members are not required to file a formal claim to obtain this benefit, but rather merely need to enroll and activate the service after the Effective Date. Codes for the service will be sent to all Settlement Class Members and the retail value for the credit monitoring is \$13.99 per month. *See* S.A. ¶ 3.B.b. This is a significant benefit to the Class, at has an estimated value of approximately \$8,645,400.

Confirmatory Discovery

Plaintiffs also negotiated for and received commitments from Aloha that it adopted and implemented additional security measures to further strengthen the security of its systems. *See* S.A. ¶ 3.F. These business practice changes are not identified here due to their sensitive nature, however, Aloha agreed to provide confirmatory information to Class Counsel upon request. The costs associated with these measures (a.k.a. injunctive relief) shall be paid by Defendant separate and apart from other settlement benefits. *Id.*

Compensation for Out-of-Pocket Losses and Lost Time

Plaintiffs further negotiated for Aloha to provide Class Members with compensation for unreimbursed, documented, losses, up to a total of \$500.00 per person, upon submission of a claim and supporting documentation. S.A. ¶ 3.A. This category of compensation also provides for Settlement Class Members to claim up compensation for time spent responding to Data Breach, including by monitoring their accounts, reviewing their credit reports, and researching credit monitoring options. Settlement Class Members can claim up to three (3) hours of time at \$25 per hour (a value of nearly \$1,545,000).

Compensation for Extraordinary Losses:

Aloha will provide Settlement Class Members up to \$2,000.00 in compensation to each Claimant for proven monetary loss provided that the claimant demonstrate that the loss was not already covered by the categories covered by the Out-of- Pocket Losses and Lost time categories above. *See* S.A. ¶ 3.A.ii.

2. The Release

The relief provided to Settlement Class Members is tailored to the claims that have been pleaded or could have been pleaded that are related in any way to the activities stemming from the Data Breach. Settlement Class Members who do not exclude themselves from the Settlement Agreement will release claims related to the Data Breach. *See* S.A. ¶ 10.

3. Fees, Costs and Service Awards

For their work in obtaining an excellent result for the Class, the Settlement Agreement provides that Class Counsel may seek an award of Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Expenses from the Settlement Fund. S.A. ¶ 7.B. Aloha agreed not to oppose Class Counsel's request for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses not to exceed \$225,000. *Id.* Additionally, for their role in bringing this action and securing the significant relief for the Settlement Class discussed above, the Settlement Agreement provides for the payment of a court-ordered service award for each Class Representative. S.A. ¶ 7.B. Aloha agreed to not oppose Class Counsel's request for a service award not to exceed \$2,500 for each Class Representative. *Id.*

ARGUMENT

A. LEGAL STANDARDS GOVERNING THE AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES IN CLASS ACTIONS

Both the Ninth Circuit and Hawaii courts routinely approve attorney fee award requests for twenty-five percent (25%) or more of the total value of the settlement. Hawaii law is consistent

with federal law, awarding expense reimbursements in class actions and is “even more discretion[ary] (relative to federal law) in determining reasonable fee awards: Trial courts are ‘not require[d] . . . to apply specific factors in determining fee awards.’” *Aquilina v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd’s London*, 2022 WL 21309735, at *9–10 (D. Haw. Sept. 19, 2022) (quoting *Chun v. Bd. of Trs. of Employees’ Ret. Sys. of State of Haw.*, 106 P.3d 339, 361 (Haw. 2005) (“*Chun I*”)).

Hawai‘i courts should “identify the fee award that most equitably compensates plaintiffs’ counsel, while at the same time protecting the interests of the class members for whose benefit the common fund was created.” *Chun v. Bd. of Trs. of Employees Ret. Sys. of State of Haw.*, 992 P.2d 127, 140 (Haw. 2000) (“*Chun I*”). The Supreme Court of Hawai‘i has “given a general nod to the persuasiveness of federal case law on attorneys’ fee awards in class-action cases,” especially “in the face of [the Court’s] jurisprudential silence as to the appropriate [standards].” *Aquilina*, 2022 WL 21309735, at *10; *see also Chun II*, 106 P.3d at 360.

B. THE FEES REQUESTED BY CLASS COUNSEL ARE ROUTINELY GRANTED AND ARE FAIR AND REASONABLE

In the Settlement Agreement, the parties agreed that the Court may award Plaintiffs’ Counsel up to \$225,000 in attorneys’ fees and litigation costs and expenses. S.A. ¶ 7.A. Although the Parties’ Settlement standing alone is a sufficient basis for the Court to award attorney’s fees, the Court maintains an “independent obligation to ensure the award, like the settlement itself, is reasonable” *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 654 F.3d 935, 941 (9th Cir. 2011); *Lara v. Renaissance Hotel Operating Co.*, 2011 WL 6002521, at *3 (D. Haw. Nov. 29, 2011). Courts routinely recognize that in the settlement context, attorneys’ fees are the result of compromise and that courts “need not inquire into the reasonableness of the fees at even the high end with precisely the same level of scrutiny as when the fee amount is litigated.” *Staton v. Boeing*

Co., 327 F.3d 938, 966 (9th Cir. 2003). Courts retain discretion to determine the reasonableness of attorneys' fees by conducting either the "percentage of the fund" method or "lodestar" method. *Vizcaino v. Microsoft Corp.*, 290 F.3d 1043, 1047 (9th Cir. 2002); *Donkerbrook v. Title Guar. Escrow Services, Inc.*, 2011 WL 3649539, at *10 (D. Haw. Aug. 18, 2011).

Here, Plaintiffs' attorneys' fee and expenses are reasonable under either the percentage of the fund or lodestar method. Class Counsel seek an award of 2% of the total value of the Settlement.³ Courts routinely award significantly more than the amount Plaintiffs request here. *See Smith v. Bank of Hawaii*, No. 1:16-cv-00513-JMS-WRP, ECF No. 233, ¶14 (D. Haw. Dec. 22, 2020) (awarding 30% attorneys' fee award in action under unfair and deceptive acts and practices statutes); *see also Howerton v. Cargill, Inc.*, 2014 WL 6976041, at *6 (D. Haw. Dec. 8, 2014) (awarding 30% attorneys' fee award); *Martin v. Marriott Intl., Inc.*, 2021 WL 4888973, at *6 (D. Haw. Oct. 19, 2021) (awarding 30% of the original settlement fund); *Paul, Jonson, Alston & Hunt v. Graulity*, 886 F.2d 268, 272 (9th Cir. 1989) (holding that an award of attorneys' fees up to 33 1/3% of the fund can be reasonable).

When assessing the reasonableness of an attorneys' fee award under the percentage of the fund theory, courts consider: (1) the extent to which class counsel achieved exceptional results for the class; (2) whether the case was risky for class counsel; (3) whether counsel's performance generated benefits beyond the cash settlement fund; (4) the market rate for the particular field of

³ Class Counsel calculates the total value of the settlement to be in excess of \$10,478,505.30 (excluding the value of the Extraordinary Loss Reimbursement benefit). Accordingly, Class Counsel's Fee Request constitutes 2.14% of the total value of the Settlement. Class Counsel calculates the value of the credit monitoring benefit to be \$8,654,400. Class Counsel's Fee Request constitutes 2.9% of the total value of the credit monitoring alone. Even using only the value of the compensation for lost time that each Settlement Class member is entitled to receive without any documentation (a value of \$1,544,925 to the Settlement Class), the requested attorneys' fees represent a mere 14.5% of the value.

law; (5) the burdens class counsel experienced while litigating the case; and (6) whether the case was handled on a contingency basis. *Vizcaino* 290 F.3d at 1048-50; *Martin*, 2021 WL 4888973, at *6. As demonstrated *infra*, the relevant factors further support Class Counsel's Fee Request and should be approved.

1. Class Counsel Achieved an Exceptional Result

Class Counsel achieved an exceptional result for the class. The Settlement affords significant benefits to Settlement Class Members including the ability to make a claim for compensation for ordinary losses resulting from the Data Breach, which includes the ability to claim compensation for up to 3 hours of lost time. The Settlement Agreement also provides Settlement Class Members the opportunity to claim up to \$2,000.00 in compensation for extraordinary losses. S.A. ¶ 3.A.ii. The Settlement also secures significant identify theft protection for all Class Members, allowing Settlement Class Members to claim 30 months of Credit Monitoring, and obtaining assurances that Defendant has and/or will implement certain business practice changes to better protect the information of Settlement Class Members in the future. *See* S.A. ¶ 3.B. Courts routinely grant similar claims made settlements. *See Harris v. Vector Mktg. Corp.*, 2012 WL 381202 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2012) (granting final approval of claims-made settlement); *Lemus v. H & R Block Enters. LLC*, 2012 WL 3638550 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2012) (approving claims-made settlement); *Shames v. Hertz Corp.*, 2012 WL 5392159, at *9 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2012) (“courts routinely approve claim made settlements.”). This factor weights in favor of Class Counsels' Fee Request.

2. The Risks of the Litigation

Class Counsel faced substantial risks and uncertainties in the litigation that made it far from certain that any recovery would be obtained for the Class. “Data breach class actions are among

the riskiest and uncertain of all class action litigation due to the absence of direct precedent certifying data breach cases as class actions.” *Gaston v. FabFitFun, Inc.*, 2021 WL 6496734, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2021); *In re Sonic Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135573, at *14 (N.D. Ohio Aug. 12, 2019) (“Data breach litigation is complex and risky.”). Even cases of similar wide-spread notoriety that involved data far more sensitive than at issue here have been found wanting by courts throughout the country. *In re U.S. Office of Pers. Mgmt. Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 266 F. Supp. 3d 1, 19 (D.D.C. 2017) (“The Court is not persuaded that the factual allegations in the complaints are sufficient to establish . . . standing.”), *reversed in part*, 928 F.3d 42 (D.C. Cir. June 21, 2019) (holding that plaintiff had standing to bring a data breach lawsuit).

To the extent the law has gradually accepted this relatively new type of litigation, the path to a class-wide judgment remains unforged, particularly in the area of damages. For now, data breach cases are among the riskiest and uncertain of all class action litigation, making settlement the more prudent course when it provides adequate and reasonable compensation to the Settlement Class, as is the case here. The damages methodologies, while theoretically sound in Plaintiffs’ view, remain untested in a disputed class certification setting and unproven in front of a jury. And, as in any data breach case, establishing causation on a class-wide basis is rife with uncertainty. Consequently, Class Counsel incurred significant risk by taking and litigating this case. Despite these risks, Class Counsel invested substantial time and resources in the case to ensure zealous representation of the Settlement Class and obtained an excellent result. Class Counsel’s willingness to take on such risks supports approval of Class Counsel’s Fee Request.

3. The Settlement Provides Substantial Non-Monetary Relief Beyond the Cash Settlement Fund

The Settlement provides the Settlement Class with substantial non-monetary relief that further supports the Fee Request. Through the Settlement, Class Counsel obtained for each Class Member the option to claim a 30-month membership of one bureau credit monitoring that provides a minimum of \$1 million in fraud protection. *See* S.A. ¶ 3.B. Additionally, the Settlement requires Aloha to implement additional data security procedures to adequately secure its systems and IT environments, and that the costs associated with those measures be paid by Aloha separate and apart from the other settlement benefits. *See* S.A. ¶ 3.F. *See also Pfeiffer v. RadNet, Inc.*, 2022 WL 2189533, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 15, 2022) (benefits negotiated on behalf of the settlement class that “are protective measures geared towards preventing future harm to Class Members’ and other customers [] weigh in favor of the fee award.”). Consequently, this factor further weights in favor of the Fee Request.

4. The Requested Fee is Consistent with the Market Rate

As discussed *supra*, courts routinely grant much higher attorneys’ fees than requested here. In this case, Plaintiffs request a Fee Award of \$225,000, inclusive of costs and expenses, which is 2% of the total value of the Settlement. The Ninth Circuit established a benchmark of 25% of the common fund as a benchmark award for attorneys’ fees and “20% to 30% is the usual range.” *Martin*, 2021 WL 4888973, at *6 (internal citations omitted). The amount of attorneys’ fees requested by Class Counsel here is in line with awards regularly approved by federal courts in the 9th Circuit and nationwide. *See e.g., Martin*, 2021 WL 4888973, at *6 (awarding 30% fee); *Howerton*, 2014 WL 6976041, at *6; *Pfeiffer*, 2022 WL 2189533, at *3 (25% of the common fund was reasonable in data breach class action settlement); *Gaston v. FabFitFun, Inc.*, 2021 WL 6496734 (C.D. Cal., Dec. 9, 2021) (same). Accordingly, this factor supports Class Counsels’ Fee Request.

5. The Burdens Class Counsel Experienced While Litigating the Case Weigh in Favor of the Requested Fee

Class Counsel's activities included, but were not limited to, conducting an extensive pre-filing investigation of Plaintiffs' and Class Members' claims and damages and vigorously prosecuting those claims. Class Counsel engaged in protracted settlement negotiations and ultimately negotiated a comprehensive Settlement for the Settlement Class.

Since reaching the Settlement, Class Counsel has drafted a motion for preliminary approval of the Settlement, assisted with the drafting and preparation of the Settlement Agreement, short and long form notice, and claim forms, drafted the instant motion for a Fee Award, and worked with the Settlement Administrator to ensure the successful implementation of the Notice Program and to answer any questions from Settlement Class Members. Class Counsel anticipates expending approximately 50-100 hours of additional time administering the Settlement, including drafting a Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement and preparing for and attending the final fairness hearing. Thus, the work performed by Class Counsel to date has been comprehensive, complex, and wide ranging, and this factor supports the Fee Request.

6. Class Counsel Handled the Case on a Contingency Basis

Class Counsel undertook this case on an entirely contingent basis, assuming the significant risk that the litigation would yield no recovery, or very little recovery, and leave them uncompensated for their time and out of pocket expenses. In pursuing this matter, Class Counsel forwent the ability to devote time to other cases. Hagman Fee Decl., ¶¶ 9-12; Hatch Fee Decl., ¶¶ 7-10. Accordingly, Class Counsel undertook a substantial risk of nonpayment and the fee award should reflect Class Counsel's risk in prosecuting the case to a successful settlement. Accordingly, this factor weighs in favor of approving Class Counsel's Fee Request. *See Pfeiffer*, 2022 WL 2189533, at *6-7 ("Historically, data breach cases have had great difficulty in moving past the

pleadings stage and receiving class certification. . . . Because Class Counsel took this case on a contingency basis in a risky and still-developing area of law, this factor weighs in favor of the proposed attorneys' fee award.”).

C. A LODESTAR CROSS-CHECK SUPPORTS THE FEE AWARD

Although Class Counsel is not requesting a lodestar award of attorneys' fees, this Court “uses the fees that it could have awarded Plaintiffs under the lodestar analysis as a gauge of the reasonableness of the attorneys' fees provided for in the Settlement Agreement.” *See, e.g., Almodova v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 2011 WL 4625692, at *5 (D. Haw. Sept. 30, 2011) (using the lodestar method to review the agreed upon attorneys' fees reasonableness); *Shea v. Kahuku Hous. Found., Inc.*, 2011 WL 1261150, at *6 (D. Haw. Mar. 31, 2011) (citation omitted) (using the lodestar analysis to evaluate the reasonableness of the agreed upon attorneys' fees in a class action settlement). *See also Zyda v. Four Seasons Hotels and Resorts*, 2020 WL 9762910, at *2 (D. Haw. Apr. 1, 2020) (“Courts also sometimes engage in a streamlined lodestar ‘cross-check’ to analyze the reasonableness of fees.”). “[W]hile the primary basis of the fee award remains the percentage method, the lodestar may provide a useful perspective on the reasonableness of a given percentage award.” *Vizcaino*, 290 F.3d at 1050. “The aim is to do rough justice, not to achieve auditing perfection.” *In re Apple Inc. Device Performance Litig.*, 2021 WL 1022866, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 17 2021) (citation omitted).

Here, Class Counsel's Fee Request results in a multiplier, which verifies the reasonableness of the requested fee. *See Hopkins v. Stryker Sales Corp.*, 2013 WL 496358, *4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013) (“Multipliers of 1 to 4 are commonly found to be appropriate in complex class action cases.”). Since February 2023, Settlement Class Counsel has spent 356.7 hours litigating this case. Hagman Decl., ¶¶ 15-16; Hatch Fee Decl., ¶¶ 13-14. The rates charged by Class Counsel are well

within the acceptable range for class action litigators in general and under hourly rates that were approved in other Hawaii complex data breach class action litigation.⁴ *Id.* Accordingly, Class Counsel's lodestar is \$246,644,70. *Id.* This lodestar results in a multiplier of 0.9. A multiplier of less than one demonstrates that Class Counsel's fee is reasonable. *See, e.g., Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.*, 306 F.R.D. 245, 265 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (finding that the proposed 1.49 multiplier was reasonable and fair); *Howerton*, 2014 WL 6976041, at *4 (awarding 30% attorneys' fee award where lodestar multiplier was between 0.62 and 1.39). The lodestar cross-check confirms the reasonableness of Class Counsel's request.

D. CLASS COUNSEL'S REQUESTED LITIGATION COSTS ARE REASONABLE

Class Counsel seeks reimbursement of costs and expenses totaling \$8,611.38. Hagman Fee Decl., ¶ 20; Hatch Fee Decl., ¶ 18. These expenses are of the type of expenses routinely charged to hourly clients, are appropriately documented, and were necessary and reasonable to prosecute the litigation. Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the full requested amount should be awarded as part of the combined \$225,000 attorneys' fee and expense request. The submitted expenses are reasonable, necessary, and directly related to the prosecution of the action. *See In re OmniVision Techs., Inc.*, 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036, 1048 ("Attorneys may recover their reasonable expenses that would typically be billed to paying clients in non-contingency matters."). Therefore, Class Counsel requests that the Court award expenses.

E. PLAINTIFFS' REQUESTED SERVICE AWARDS ARE JUSTIFIED AND SHOULD BE APPROVED

The Court also has discretion to award a reasonable and equitable "incentive award," or "service award," to class-representing plaintiffs. *See Adams v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 2017 WL 3880651, at *1 (D. Haw. Sept. 5, 2017) ("Incentive awards are discretionary and fairly typical in

⁴ *See Martin v. Marriot Int'l, Inc.*, ECF No. 169-8.

class action cases.”) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Benedict v. Diamond Resorts Corp.*, 2013 WL 12149277, at *2 (D. Haw. June 6, 2013) (granting final approval of settlement which awarded incentive awards to each of the named Plaintiffs).

Here, Plaintiffs Spencer and Trenhaile have been vital in litigating this matter, including providing their personal information to Class Counsel. Plaintiffs have been personally involved in the case. For their commitment to this case, Plaintiffs Spencer and Trenhaile each seek \$2,500 as a service award for their important work in this case. Plaintiffs were subjected to extensive interviews, submitted documentation to prove that they were impacted by the Data Breach, and were prepared to take on the responsibilities of class representatives, including being deposed and testifying at trial. Hagman Fee Decl., ¶¶ 22-23. The amount requested is presumptively reasonable and commonly awarded in settled class action cases. *See, e.g., In re Pauley*, 2020 WL 5809953, at *4 (Granting “class representative enhancement fees in the amount of \$5,000 each to Plaintiffs,” and finding that amount to be “presumptively reasonable”); *Yahoo Mail Litig.*, 2016 WL 4474612, at *11 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2016) (“The Ninth Circuit has established \$5,000.00 as a reasonable benchmark [for service awards].”); *Aquilina*, 2022 WL 21309735, at *12 (awarding \$2,500 to each named plaintiff).

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Class Counsel requests that the Court grant this motion and (1) award \$225,000 as attorneys’ fees and expenses and (2) approve a service award of \$2,500 to each Plaintiff.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai‘i, June 14, 2024.

/s/ Robert M. Hatch
MARGERY S. BRONSTER
ROBERT M. HATCH
NOELLE E. CHAN
NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DANIEL O. HERRERA (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)
GARY M. KLINGER (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs ROSE SPENCER and
LEWELYN TRENHAILIE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN
TRENHAILIE, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 1CCV-23-0000486
(Other Civil Action)

**DECLARATION OF ROBERT M.
HATCH**

DECLARATION OF ROBERT M. HATCH

I, Robert M. Hatch, being competent to testify, make the following declaration:

1. I am currently of counsel at Bronster Fujichaku Robbins a Law Corporation (“BFR”). I am one of the lead attorneys for Plaintiffs. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Service Award to Class Representatives.

2. BFR has assisted co-class counsel Cafferty Clobes Meriwether & Sprengel, LLP (Cafferty Clobes), and Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC (“Milberg”) in representing the class in this action.

3. Class Counsel will continue to work throughout the claims period for this case. To date, this work has involved drafting and moving for final approval of the settlement, monitoring for and defending against potential objections (there are none to date), and the supervision of the claims administration process and the distribution of the settlement proceeds.

4. Based on my past experience Class Counsel expect to spend a minimum of another 50-100 hours seeking final approval, defending the Settlement from any potential objections, and supervising claims administration and the distribution of proceeds.

5. In my opinion, and the option of Class Counsel, the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and provides significant benefits for Plaintiffs and approximately 20,599 Settlement Class Members, and I strongly support the Settlement. Plaintiffs also strongly support this Settlement.

6. As of the date of filing, Class Counsel have received no objections to the Settlement Agreement, and no objections to the proposed attorneys' fees and costs (the amount of which was made known to the Class via the Court-approved notice program) in particular. It is my understanding that RG/2, the Settlement Administrator, has not received any opt-outs or objections through June 10, 2024 (the date of RG/2's last report to counsel). Plaintiffs will submit a declaration from RG/2 detailing the notice and claims administration with their Motion for Final Approval.

The Contingent Nature of the Case

7. Class Counsel were retained to represent Plaintiffs Spencer and Trenhaile on a contingent basis. Class Counsel's fees were not guaranteed—Class Counsel have not received any hourly fees for their work on this case, and had Plaintiffs' case been dismissed or if they lose at trial, Class Counsel would be paid nothing. As such, Class Counsel assumed a significant risk of nonpayment or underpayment.

8. This matter has required me, other attorneys at my firm, and my co-counsel to spend time on this litigation that could have been spent on other matters. At various times during the litigation of this class action, this lawsuit has consumed significant amounts of my time and my firm's time.

9. Such time could otherwise have been spent on other fee-generating work. Because Class Counsel undertook representation of this matter on a contingency-fee basis, we shouldered

the risk of expending substantial costs and time in litigating the action without any monetary gain in the event of an adverse judgment.

10. If not devoted to litigating this action, from which any remuneration is wholly contingent on a successful outcome, the time our firms spent working on this case could and would have been spent pursuing other potentially fee generating matters.

11. Litigation is inherently unpredictable and therefore risky. Here, that risk was very real, due to the rapidly evolving nature of case law pertaining to data breach litigation, and the state of data privacy law. Therefore, despite my firm's devotion to the case, the equal devotion of my co-counsel to the cases, and our confidence in the claims alleged against Defendant, there have been many factors beyond our control that posed significant risks.

Costs and Fees Incurred

12. Due to the early stage of litigation and efficiency by which Class Counsel was able to obtain this significant settlement, expenses and fees incurred by Plaintiffs are low.

13. The total lodestar of BFR to date is \$51,525.00 and of all Settlement Class Counsel to date is \$246,644.70.

14. To date, BFR professionals have worked a total of 81.40 hours on this case. The time spent by each of the timekeepers that performed work for this case, along with their respective billable rates was kept contemporaneously as the work was performed. At the request of the Court, Cafferty Clobes can and will produce detailed times records supporting the time set out above. The firm's rates are fair and reasonable and reflect the market rate for class action contingency litigation.

15. Additional time will be spent to prepare for and attend the Final Approval Hearing, defend any appeals taken from the final judgment approving Settlement, and ensure that the claims

process and distribution of Settlement proceeds to Class Members is done in a timely manner in accordance with the terms of the Settlement. I assert that the attorneys' fees sought in the Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards are reasonable and seek fair and reasonable compensation for undertaking this case on a contingency basis, and for obtaining the relief for Plaintiffs and the Class. As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the attorneys' fees and expenses sought in this Motion will not reduce the benefits payable to the Class.

16. Where possible, Class Counsel made efforts to carefully assign work so as to avoid duplication of efforts and have the work completed by the appropriate level of attorney.

17. All books and records in this case regarding costs expended were maintained in the ordinary course of business, from expense vouchers and check records. I have reviewed the records of costs expended in this matter.

18. BFR advanced costs in connection with this case in the amount of \$1,516,97.

19. These costs are reasonable, and necessary for the litigation, and are modest in comparison to the enormous costs that likely would have been incurred if litigation had continued. Reimbursement of these costs is sought as part of (and not in addition to) the \$225,000 in combined attorney fees and expenses requested. Based upon my past experience, the amount of out-of-pocket case expenses will increase prior to Final Approval.

20. I strongly believe that the Settlement Agreement is favorable for the Settlement Class. The Settlement addresses the type of injury and repercussions sustained by Settlement Class Members in the wake of the Data Incident. In the opinion of the undersigned and other Class Counsel, the settlement is fair, reasonable, adequate, as are the attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards requested here.

21. Although Plaintiffs believe in the merits of his claims, this litigation was inherently risky and complex. The claims involve the intricacies of data breach litigation (a fast-developing area in the law), and the Plaintiffs would face risks at each stage of litigation. Against these risks, it was through the hard-fought negotiations and the skill and hard work of Settlement Class Counsel and the Class Representatives that the Settlement was achieved for the benefit of the Settlement Class.

22. In contrast to the risks, the Settlement provides certain and substantial compensation to the Settlement Class Members. The benefits for ordinary and extraordinary losses are uncapped in the aggregate, meaning there will be no pro rata reduction of any Settlement Class Members' recovery. Due to the Settlement's uncapped structure, the Settlement makes available to the Class in excess of \$10 million in relief, even when accounting only for lost time damages and the value of the credit monitoring component.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed in Honolulu, Hawaii on June 14, 2024.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, June 14, 2024.

/s/ Robert M. Hatch
ROBERT M. HATCH

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN
TRENHAILIE, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 1CCV-23-0000486
(Other Civil Action)

**DECLARATION OF NICKOLAS J.
HAGMAN**

DECLARATION OF NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN

I, Nickolas J. Hagman, being competent to testify, make the following declaration:

1. I am currently a partner of the law firm of Cafferty Clobes Meriwether & Sprengel (“Cafferty Clobes”). I am one of the lead attorneys for Plaintiffs. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for an Award of Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Service Award to Class Representatives.

2. This Settlement came about as the result of protracted, arms’-length negotiations and mediation. On November 8, 2023, the Parties participated in a full-day mediation before Mr. Bruce A Friedman, Esq., of JAMS. Although the Parties were not able to reach a resolution at the mediation, the Parties continued to negotiate following the mediation. Eventually, Mr. Friedman made a mediator’s proposal, which each side accepted. Throughout the entire process, Defendant was ably represented by a well-regarded defense firm with experience in cyber-security investigation and litigation. After reaching an agreement on the relief for Settlement Class Members, the Parties continued to negotiate in good faith and at arms’ length regarding the finer points of the settlement, and drafted the Settlement Agreement and accompanying Notice documents and other exhibits. While negotiations were always collegial and professional between

the Parties, there is no doubt that the negotiations were also adversarial in nature, with both Parties strongly advocating their respective client's positions. The Settlement Agreement and the various exhibits thereto ("S.A.") were ultimately finalized and signed in February 2024.

3. Cafferty Clobes' work, and the work of co-counsel Milberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman PLLC ("Milberg") (collectively, "Class Counsel") involved investigating the cause and effects of the Aloha Nursing Rehab Centre ("Aloha" or "Defendant") Data Incident, evaluating potential class representatives, contributing to the evaluation of the merits of the case before filing the Complaint; conducting legal research; conducting extensive research into data security incidents and their causes and effects; drafting and filing the Complaint; obtaining information from Defendant regarding the Data Incident and analyzing that information; preparing for mediation and drafting a confidential mediation summary; participating in an all-day mediation; engaging in extensive settlement negotiations with Defendant over the course of several weeks following; drafting the settlement agreement, the relevant notices of settlement, the Motion for Preliminary Approval, and this instant motion for attorneys' fees; communicating with defense counsel; updating and handling questions from class representatives; overseeing the launching of the notice program with substantial interaction between the Settlement Administrator and Class Counsel; and overseeing the claims process.

4. Class Counsel will continue to work throughout the claims period for this case. To date, this work has involved drafting and moving for final approval of the settlement, monitoring for and defending against potential objections (there are none to date), and the supervision of the claims administration process and the distribution of the settlement proceeds.

5. Based on my past experience Class Counsel expect to spend a minimum of another 50-100 hours seeking final approval, defending the Settlement from any potential objections, and supervising claims administration and the distribution of proceeds.

6. In my opinion, and the option of Class Counsel, the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and provides significant benefits for Plaintiffs and approximately 20,599 Settlement Class Members, and I strongly support the Settlement. Plaintiffs also strongly support this Settlement.

7. As of the date of filing, neither Class Counsel have received no objections to the Settlement Agreement, and no objections to the proposed attorneys' fees and costs (the amount of which was made known to the Class via the Court-approved notice program) in particular. It is my understanding that RG/2, the Settlement Administrator, has not received any opt-outs or objections through June 10, 2024 (the date of RG/2's last report to counsel). Plaintiffs will submit a declaration from RG/2 detailing the notice and claims administration with their Motion for Final Approval.

The Contingent Nature of the Case

8. Class Counsel were retained to represent Plaintiffs Spencer and Trenhaile on a contingent basis. Class Counsel's fees were not guaranteed—Class Counsel have not received any hourly fees for their work on this case, and had Plaintiffs' case been dismissed or if they lose at trial, Class Counsel would be paid nothing. As such, Class Counsel assumed a significant risk of nonpayment or underpayment.

9. This matter has required me, other attorneys at my firm, and my co-counsel to spend time on this litigation that could have been spent on other matters. At various times during the

litigation of this class action, this lawsuit has consumed significant amounts of my time and my firm's time.

10. Such time could otherwise have been spent on other fee-generating work. Because Class Counsel undertook representation of this matter on a contingency-fee basis, we shouldered the risk of expending substantial costs and time in litigating the action without any monetary gain in the event of an adverse judgment.

11. If not devoted to litigating this action, from which any remuneration is wholly contingent on a successful outcome, the time our firms spent working on this case could and would have been spent pursuing other potentially fee generating matters.

12. Litigation is inherently unpredictable and therefore risky. Here, that risk was very real, due to the rapidly evolving nature of case law pertaining to data breach litigation, and the state of data privacy law. Therefore, despite my firm's devotion to the case, the equal devotion of my co-counsel to the cases, and our confidence in the claims alleged against Defendant, there have been many factors beyond our control that posed significant risks.

Costs and Fees Incurred

13. Due to the early stage of litigation and efficiency by which Class Counsel was able to obtain this significant settlement, expenses and fees incurred by Plaintiffs are low.

14. The total lodestar of all Settlement Class Counsel to date is \$246,644.70.

15. To date, Cafferty Clobes professionals have worked a total of 150 hours on this case, which represents \$104,132.50 worth of time at our firm's regular rates. The time spent by each of the timekeepers that performed work for this case, along with their respective billable rates was kept contemporaneously as the work was performed. At the request of the Court, Cafferty

Clobes can and will produce detailed times records supporting the time set out above. The firm's rates are fair and reasonable and reflect the market rate for class action contingency litigation.

16. To date, Milberg professionals have worked a total of 125.3 hours on this case, which represents \$90,987.20 worth of time at Milberg's regular rates. The time spent by each of the timekeepers that performed work for this case, along with their respective billable rates was kept contemporaneously as the work was performed. At the request of the Court, Milberg can and will produce detailed times records supporting the time set out above. The firm's rates are fair and reasonable and reflect the market rate for class action contingency litigation.

17. Additional time will be spent to prepare for and attend the Final Approval Hearing, defend any appeals taken from the final judgment approving Settlement, and ensure that the claims process and distribution of Settlement proceeds to Class Members is done in a timely manner in accordance with the terms of the Settlement. I assert that the attorneys' fees sought in the Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Service Awards are reasonable and seek fair and reasonable compensation for undertaking this case on a contingency basis, and for obtaining the relief for Plaintiffs and the Class. As set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the attorneys' fees and expenses sought in this Motion will not reduce the benefits payable to the Class.

18. Where possible, Class Counsel made efforts to carefully assign work so as to avoid duplication of efforts and have the work completed by the appropriate level of attorney.

19. All books and records in this case regarding costs expended were maintained in the ordinary course of business, from expense vouchers and check records. I have reviewed the records of costs expended in this matter.

20. Class Counsel advanced costs in connection with this case in the amount of \$7,094.41, including \$6,856.91 from Cafferty Clobes, and \$4,237.50 from my firm Milberg. These expenses include mediator fees, filing fees, and fees associated with *pro hac vice* admissions.

21. These costs are reasonable, and necessary for the litigation, and are modest in comparison to the enormous costs that likely would have been incurred if litigation had continued. Reimbursement of these costs is sought as part of (and not in addition to) the \$225,000 in combined attorney fees and expenses requested. Based upon my past experience, the amount of out-of-pocket case expenses will increase prior to Final Approval.

22. The Settlement Agreement calls for a reasonable service award to Plaintiffs in the amount of \$2,500, subject to approval of the Court, in addition to any benefits provided to Settlement Class Members and the costs of notice and settlement administration and separate from any award of attorneys' fees and expenses. The Service Awards are meant to recognize Plaintiffs for their efforts on behalf of the Class, including assisting in the investigation of the case, maintaining contact with counsel, reviewing the pleadings, answering counsel's many questions, communicating with counsel during the settlement negotiations, and reviewing the terms of the Settlement Agreement. Plaintiffs also put their personal reputations at risk, and put themselves forward for public scrutiny. Plaintiffs were not promised a service award, nor did they condition their representation on the expectation of an incentive award. The Service Award will diminish the recovery to the Settlement Class Members in any way

23. Plaintiffs Spencer and Trenhaile made vital contributions to our litigation efforts. Specifically, they provided documents to Class Counsel, reviewed pleadings, and remained in frequent contact with me and my firm in order to keep apprised of the status of proceedings and informed me on important decision-making processes. I believe that Plaintiffs should each receive

a service award and I support their request that the Court award each Plaintiff \$2,500 in recognition of the time, effort, and expense they incurred pursuing claims that benefited the Settlement Class.

24. I strongly believe that the Settlement Agreement is favorable for the Settlement Class. The Settlement addresses the type of injury and repercussions sustained by Settlement Class Members in the wake of the Data Incident. In the opinion of the undersigned and other Class Counsel, the settlement is fair, reasonable, adequate, as are the attorneys' fees, expenses, and service awards requested here.

25. Although Plaintiffs believe in the merits of his claims, this litigation was inherently risky and complex. The claims involve the intricacies of data breach litigation (a fast-developing area in the law), and the Plaintiffs would face risks at each stage of litigation. Against these risks, it was through the hard-fought negotiations and the skill and hard work of Settlement Class Counsel and the Class Representatives that the Settlement was achieved for the benefit of the Settlement Class.

26. In contrast to the risks, the Settlement provides certain and substantial compensation to the Settlement Class Members. The benefits for ordinary and extraordinary losses are uncapped in the aggregate, meaning there will be no pro rata reduction of any Settlement Class Members' recovery. Due to the Settlement's uncapped structure, the Settlement makes available to the Class in excess of \$10 million in relief, even when accounting only for lost time damages and the value of the credit monitoring component.

///

///

///

///

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: Chicago, Illinois June 14, 2024.

/s/ Nickolas J. Hagman

Nickolas J. Hagman (admitted *pro hac vice*)

**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**

135 S. LaSalle, Suite 3210

Chicago, Illinois 60603

Telephone: (312) 782-4880

Facsimile: (312) 782-4485

nhagman@caffertyclobes.com

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAI'I

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN
TRENHAILIE, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 1CCV-23-0000486
(Other Civil Action)

NOTICE OF HEARING

NOTICE OF HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that **PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES, AND SERVICE AWARDS FOR CLASS REPRESENTATIVES** shall come on for hearing before the Honorable Dean E. Ochiai, Judge of the Above-Entitled court, on **August 7, 2024, at 10:30 a.m.**, or as soon thereafter as the matter can be heard.

If you fail to appear at the hearing, the relief requested may be granted without further notice to you.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, June 14, 2024.

/s/ Robert M. Hatch

MARGERY S. BRONSTER

ROBERT M. HATCH

NOELLE E. CHAN

NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DANIEL O. HERRERA (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

GARY M. KLINGER (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs ROSE SPENCER and
LEWELYN TRENHAILIE

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAI'I

ROSE SPENCER and LEWELYN
TRENHAILIE, individually, and on behalf of
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO. 1CCV-23-0000486

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certified that on June 14, 2024, a filed marked copy of the foregoing document was duly served upon the parties listed below at the email below VIA JEFS:

J. GEORGE HETHERINGTON, ESQ.
Yamamoto Caliboso Hetherington
1100 Alakea Street, Suite 3100
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813
Email: ghetherington@ychawaii.com

Attorney for Defendant
ALOHA NURSING REHAB CENTRE

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, June 14, 2024.

/s/ Robert M. Hatch

MARGERY S. BRONSTER

ROBERT M. HATCH

NOELLE E. CHAN

NICKOLAS J. HAGMAN (*admitted pro hac vice*)

DANIEL O. HERRERA (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

GARY M. KLINGER (*pro hac vice* to be submitted)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs ROSE SPENCER and
LEWELYN TRENHAILIE