

---

## FIRM RESUME

TOSTRUD LAW GROUP, P.C. was founded in 2011 with offices in Los Angeles and Minneapolis. We have a diversified legal practice, and have successfully represents plaintiffs in the areas of antitrust, securities and financial fraud, employment discrimination, unlawful employment practices including wage and hour disputes, personal injury, product defect, consumer protection, data breach, breach of contract, False Claims Act, and human rights in both state and federal courts. Our clients include individuals, classes or groups of persons, businesses, and public and private entities.

---

Tostrud Law Group, P.C. has extensive experience in antitrust class action litigation, including leadership roles in many of the major antitrust actions in district courts over the last 10 years. Representative leadership positions include: ***In Re: Fragrance Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation***, No. 23-cv-3249 (D.N.J.) (Allen, J.) (appointed to Steering Committee); ***In Re: Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation***, No. 20-cv-01319 (D. Minn.) (Bowbeer, H.) (appointed to Steering Committee); ***In Re: Pork Antitrust Litigation***, MDL No. 2998, Case No. 18-cv-1776-JRT/HB (D. Minn.) (Bowbeer, H.) (appointed to Steering Committee); ***In Re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation***, MDL No. 2724, Case No. 16-md-2724 (E.D. Pa.) (Rufe, C.) (appointed to Steering Committee); Tostrud Law Group, P.C. has also held leadership positions in numerous other class actions, including: ***Small v. University Medical Center of Southern Nevada***, No. 12-cv-395 (D. Nev.) (Leen, P.) (Co-Lead Counsel); ***Engquist, et al. v. City of Los Angeles*** No. BC591331 (Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles) (Co-Lead Counsel); ***Grahl v. Circle K Stores, Inc.***, No. 2:14-cv-305 (D. Nev.) (Boulware, R.) (Co-Lead Counsel); ***O'Garro v. Jersey City***, No. 2:20-cv-05282 (D.N.J.) (Co-Lead Counsel); ***Nicolas***

**Montalvo v. California Lutheran**, No. 21STCV38140 (Superior Court of California, County of Ventura)(Co-Lead Counsel); and **Bethany Lopez, et al. v. California Baptist University**, No. CVRI2000805 (Superior Court of California, County of Riverside)(Co-Lead Counsel).

### **FIRM BIOGRAPHY**

**JON A. TOSTRUD**, Admitted to practice in the State of California and the State of Minnesota; U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota; U.S. District Court, Eastern District of California; U.S. District Court, Southern District of California; U.S. District Court, Northern District of California; U.S. District Court, Central District of California; *Education*: William Mitchell College of Law; *Memberships*: State Bar of California; State Bar of Minnesota.

**ANTHONY M. CARTER**, Admitted to practice in the Commonwealth of Virginia; U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Virginia; U.S. District Court, Western District of Virginia; U.S. District Court, District of North Dakota; *Education*: James E. Rogers College of Law at the University of Arizona; *Memberships*: State Bar of Virginia.

---

### **SETTLED CASES**

- **In Re: Pork Antitrust Litigation**, MDL No. 2998 (United States District Court for the District of Minnesota). Plaintiffs negotiated a \$12.75M settlement with defendant JBS Food Company, and most recently, a \$42M settlement with defendant Smithfield Foods, Inc.
- **In Re: Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation**, No. 20-cv-01319 (United States District Court for the Northern District of Minnesota) The court most recently granted Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of a \$25M settlement with defendant JBS Food Company on November 21, 2023.

- **In Re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation**, MDL No. 2724 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania). The Court preliminarily approved a \$1 million “icebreaker” settlement with Defendant Breckenridge Corp. The settlement on behalf of nearly 29,000 class members secures cooperation by Defendant Breckenridge with Plaintiffs’ efforts against the remaining Defendants in this MDL.
- **In Re: TikTok, Inc. Consumer Privacy Litigation**, No. 20-cv-4699 (United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represented a nationwide class of individual users of the social media platform, TikTok, created and administered by Defendants. Plaintiffs alleged TikTok improperly scanned and collected users’ biometric identifiers in violation of the state of Illinois’ Biometric Information Privacy Act (“BIPA”). On August 22, 2022, the Hon. John Z. Lee granted final approval to a \$87 million dollar settlement of the action.
- **James Cottle, et al. v. Plaid Inc.**, No. 20-cv-03056 (United States District Court for the Northern District of California). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represented a nationwide class of consumers who alleged that Defendant Plaid Inc. used consumers’ banking login credentials to harvest and sell detailed financial data to third parties without consent. On July 20, 2022, the Hon. Donna M. Ryu granted final approval to a \$58 million dollar settlement of the action.
- **Engquist, et al. v. City of Los Angeles** No. BC591331 (Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles). Tostrud Law Group, P.C., served as co-counsel for a class of taxpayers who reside in the City of Los Angeles who paid taxes for gas services that were improperly collected by the City. Tostrud Law Group, P.C. sought refunds of taxes collected for gas services on behalf of consumers who paid the City Gas User Tax (“GUT”)

improperly collected by the City of Los Angeles. After several years of litigation, Plaintiffs negotiated a settlement in the amount of \$32.5 million for credit refunds of taxes improperly collected, as well as cessation of the tax.

- **Juan Jordan, et al. v. Meridian Bank, et al.**, No. 17-cv-5251 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. served as co-counsel in this class action on behalf of inside sales loan officers who were employed by Defendant Meridian Bank. Plaintiffs alleged Defendants violated the Fair Labor Standards Act and state labor laws by misclassifying them as exempt from receiving overtime pay and by failing to compensate them at the federally-mandated minimum wage. On March 19, 2019, the court granted conditional certification in part for those loan officers who were denied overtime wages for all time worked in excess of 40 hours per workweek. On April 3, 2019, the court approved the parties' form of notice to be distributed to the putative class. On September 30, 2019, the court issued an order granting preliminary approval of settlement of the case.
- **Grahl v. Circle K Stores, Inc.**, No. 2:14-cv-305 (United States District Court for the District of Nevada). Tostrud Law Group, P.C., served as co-counsel for a nationwide class of Store Managers employed by defendant Circle K Stores. Plaintiffs alleged Circle K Stores knowingly misclassified its Store Managers as exempt employees and failed to properly pay them the required minimum and overtime wages. On August 26, 2015, the court granted Plaintiff's motion for conditional certification and agreed the case should proceed as a national class action. On December 21, 2018, the court preliminarily approved the parties' settlement of claims. On April 8, 2019, the parties received final approval of the \$8.25 million settlement for more than 1,200 current and former store managers who joined the case seeking to recover unpaid wages.

- **Granados v. County of Los Angeles**, No. BC361470 (Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. served as co-counsel in this class action for the improper collection of telephone user taxes (“TUT”) on behalf of all individuals and businesses in the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles who paid for residential landline, business landline, and/or mobile telephone services. The Hon. Maren E. Nelson granted final approval of a \$16.9 million settlement for refunds of the telephone taxes on October 29, 2018.
- **McWilliams v. City of Long Beach**, No. BC361469 (Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. served as co-counsel in this class action for the imposition and collection of a Utility Users Tax (“UUT”) on behalf of all individuals and businesses within the City of Long Beach who paid for residential landline, business landline, and/or mobile telephone services. In 2013, Plaintiffs won a landmark appeal in the California Supreme Court, allowing the case to proceed. The Hon. Maren E. Nelson granted final approval of a \$16.6 million settlement for refunds of the telephone taxes on October 30, 2018.
- **Eaton v. Hamilton Group Funding, et al.**, No. 18-cv-21463 (United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. served as co-counsel in this class action on behalf of inside sales loan officers who were employed by Defendant Hamilton Group Funding. Plaintiffs alleged Defendant violated the Fair Labor Standards Act by misclassifying them as exempt from receiving overtime pay and by failing to compensate them at the federally-mandated minimum wage. In March 2019, the parties entered into a settlement agreement for an undisclosed amount and are currently awaiting final approval from the court.

- **Luis Bautista, et al. v. Carl Karcher Enterprises, LLC**, No. BC649777 (Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. served as co-counsel in a class action lawsuit for employees who worked for Carl's Jr. restaurants. Plaintiffs alleged that Carl's Jr.'s parent company, CKE, colluded with its franchisees to suppress the wages of the restaurant-based managers through a "no hire" agreement that expressly forbids franchises from employing or seeking to employ any of the restaurant-based managers who work for other franchisees or for CKE directly. Tostrud Law Group, P.C. recovered damages on behalf of the individual named plaintiffs, and successfully negotiated to permanently enjoin Defendants from enforcing the "no hire" term in its franchise agreement with franchisees.
- **Small v. University Medical Center of Southern Nevada**, No. 12-cv-395 (United States District Court for the State of Nevada). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel representing employees who allege defendant University Medical Center ("UMC") failed to pay them properly for missed meal breaks under the Fair Labor Standards Act. After the court granted Plaintiffs' motion for conditional certification on June 14, 2013, approximately 600 current and former UMC employees agreed to join the case. After granting Plaintiffs' motion to compel in July 2013, the court appointed a Special Master to oversee the discovery process. The Special Master ultimately made numerous factual findings in support of Rule 23 class certification and concluded in a 78-page Report and Recommendation that defendant UMC had failed to identify, preserve, search for, collect and process relevant evidence. Magistrate Judge Leen overruled Defendants' objection on August 9, 2018 in a 123-page ruling. On May 29, 2019, the United States District Judge Andrew Gordon granted approval to a \$4.25 million dollar settlement of the action.

- **Lane v. First National Bank of Layton**, No. 01-15-0005-5682 (American Arbitration Association). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped secure a settlement for a group of former inside sales loan officers who worked for Respondent First National Bank of Layton (“Layton”) for alleged violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act and Maryland state labor laws. Claimants received compensatory damages due to Layton’s misclassification of its inside loan officers as exempt employees and failure to properly pay these employees the required minimum and overtime wages.
- **Rocha, et al. v. Gateway Funding**, No. 15-cv-00482 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped secure a seven figure settlement of behalf of a class of inside sales loan officers who worked for defendant Gateway Funding. Plaintiffs received compensatory damages due to Gateway Funding’s misclassification of its inside loan officers as exempt employees and failure to properly pay these employees the required minimum and overtime wages.
- **Ardon v. City of Los Angeles**, No. BC363959 (Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles). Tostrud Law Group, P.C., helped secure a \$92.5 million dollar settlement on behalf of millions of Los Angeles city residents and businesses who paid taxes for telephone services that were improperly collected by the city. In October 2016, the City of Los Angeles agreed to provide refunds of taxes collected for telephone services on behalf of consumers who paid telephone utility user taxes to the City of Los Angeles for residential landline, business landline, and mobile telephone services.
- **Struett v. Susquehanna**, No. 5:15-cv-176 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped secure a settlement on behalf of a

Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of residential mortgage bankers for misclassification violations and failure to properly pay overtime wages.

- **Pomphrett, et al. v. American Home Bank, et al.**, No. 1:12-cv-10330 (United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped achieve a seven figure settlement of behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of several hundred former loan officers for the failure to pay overtime wages.
- **Wyler –Wittenberg, et al. v. Metlife Home Loans, Inc.**, No. 2:12-cv-00366 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped achieve a seven figure settlement of behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of current and former loan officers for the failure to pay overtime wages.
- **Ord, et al. v. First National Bank of Pennsylvania and F.N.B. Corp.**, No. 12-cv-00766 (United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped achieve a seven figure settlement of behalf of a Rule 23 class of several hundred account holders at First National Bank of Pennsylvania who were improperly charged overdraft fees on their checking accounts.
- **Molyneux, et al. v. Securitas Security Services, Inc.**, No. 4:10-cv-588 (United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped achieve a six figure settlement of behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of hundreds of hourly paid security officers for failure to pay for off-the-clock work.
- **Hansen, et al v. Per Mar Security Services, et al**, No. 4:09-cv-00459 (United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. helped achieve a confidential settlement of behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of hundreds of hourly paid security officers for back wages.



---

## **CASE PROFILES**

### **Current Cases**

- **In Re: Concrete and Cement Additives Antitrust Litigation**, No. 24-cv-03097 (United States District Court for the Southern District of New York). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs against major manufacturers of construction chemicals alleging Defendants conspired to fix the prices of key ingredients added to cement, concrete, and mortar. Plaintiffs are seeking treble damages under federal antitrust laws and an injunction to bar Defendants' alleged conspiratorial behavior.
- **In Re: Granulated Sugar Antitrust Litigation**, No. 24-cv-03110 (United States District Court for the District of Minnesota). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Commercial Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs in an antitrust class action against defendant sugar manufacturers for artificially inflating the price of granulated sugar, forcing buyers to pay more for the product in a market valued at more than \$13 billion.
- **Jack Tate d/b/a The Tin Pig, LLC v. Grubhub, Inc.**, No. 23-cv-15865 (United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in a class action against defendant Grubhub, Inc. for unlawfully listing restaurant businesses on defendant's website without the business' permission. Plaintiffs allege these false partnerships created by defendant causes significant damage to their reputations, loss of control over their online presence, and reduced consumer demand for their services. Plaintiffs are seeking monetary damages and injunctive relief.

- **Cabezas v. Mr. Cooper Group, Inc.**, No. 23-cv-02453 (United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in a data breach class action against defendant Mr. Cooper Group, Inc. for its failure to properly protect and safeguard Plaintiffs' identifiable information. Plaintiffs are seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.
- **In Re: Regents of the University of Minnesota Data Litigation**, No. 27-cv-23-14056 (County of Hennepin, 4<sup>th</sup> Judicial District). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in a data breach class action against defendant University of Minnesota for its failure to properly secure its data systems against cyber hackers, thereby exposing Plaintiffs' identifiable information, including dates of birth, Social Security numbers, and email addresses. Plaintiffs are seeking declaratory and injunctive relief to ensure the protection of Plaintiffs' personal information against future exposure.
- **In Re: 23andMe, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation**, No. 24-cv-03098 (United States District Court for the Northern District of California). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in a data breach class action against defendant 23andMe for its failure to properly secure and safeguard Plaintiffs' identifiable information, including names, cities and states of residence, dates of birth, ancestry, and DNA profiles. Plaintiffs are seeking declaratory and injunctive relief requiring Defendant to strengthen its data security systems.
- **Virginia Lambrix, et al. v. Tesla, Inc.**, No. 23-cv-1145 (United States District Court for the Northern District of California). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in an antitrust class action against defendant Tesla, Inc. alleging defendant engaged in unlawful monopolization and restraint of the markets for compatible replacement parts for Tesla

vehicle components and maintenance and repair services for Tesla vehicles. As a result of defendant Tesla's anticompetitive conduct, Plaintiffs have suffered lengthy delays in repairing their vehicles and pay supracompetitive prices for those parts and repairs. Plaintiffs are seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.

- **Owens v. MGM Resorts International**, No. 23-cv-01480 (United States District Court for the District of Nevada). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in a data breach class action against defendant MGM Resorts International for its failure to properly secure and safeguard Plaintiffs' identifiable information, including full names, dates of birth, Social Security numbers, and driver's license numbers. Plaintiffs are seeking monetary damages and injunctive relief requiring Defendant to implement comprehensive security measures designed to ensure the protection of Plaintiffs' sensitive information against future cyberattacks.
- **In Re: Harley-Davidson Aftermarket Parts Marketing, Sales Practices and Antitrust Litigation**, No. 23-MDL-3064 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in an antitrust class action against defendant Harley-Davidson alleging defendant engaged in unlawful monopolization of the repair service market for the marketing and sale of its consumer products using unfair tying arrangements. Plaintiffs allege these tying arrangements condition a consumer product's warranty on the use of a specific repair service in violation of state and federal law. Plaintiffs are seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.
- **Terrance Rosa, et al. v. Brightline, Inc.**, No. 23-cv-02132 (United States District Court for the Northern District of California). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. represents Plaintiffs in an ongoing data breach class action against defendant Brightline, Inc. for its failure to properly

secure and safeguard Plaintiffs' highly sensitive personally identifiable information. Plaintiffs are seeking monetary damages and injunctive relief to ensure implementation of security measures designed to ensure the protection of Plaintiffs' private information.

- **In Re: Fragrance Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation**, No. 23-cv-3249 (United States District Court of New Jersey). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. was appointed to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee on behalf of indirect purchasers of fragrance ingredients from the some of the largest manufacturers of fragrance ingredients and compounds. Plaintiffs allege Defendants illegally conspired to fix prices for fragrance ingredients. Through this unlawful coordination, Defendants charged their customers supracompetitive prices, which in turn passed through to the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are seeking damages sustained by them as a result of Defendants' unlawful behavior.
- **In Re: Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation**, No. 20-cv-01319 (United States District Court for the Northern District of Minnesota). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. was appointed to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee on behalf of indirect purchasers of beef products from several major beef suppliers. Plaintiffs allege Defendants violated federal and state antitrust laws by conspiring to illegally fix, raise and maintain the price of beef. The court most recently granted Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of a \$25M settlement with defendant JBS Food Company on November 21, 2023.
- **In Re: Pork Antitrust Litigation**, MDL No. 2998 (United States District Court for the District of Minnesota). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. was appointed to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee by the Honorable Hildy Bowbeer on behalf Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs in this antitrust litigation involving allegations of price-fixing by major pork manufacturer defendants. Plaintiffs negotiated a \$12.75M settlement with defendant

JBS Food Company, and most recently, a \$42M settlement with defendant Smithfield Foods, Inc.

- **In Re: Turkey Antitrust Litigation**, No. 19-cv-08318 (United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel on behalf of indirect purchasers of turkey products from several turkey suppliers. Plaintiffs allege defendants violated federal and state antitrust laws by conspiring to illegally fix, raise, and maintain the price of turkey in order to secure massive profits. Plaintiffs are seeking damages sustained by them as a result of Defendants' unlawful behavior.
- **In Re: Packaged Seafood Products Antitrust Litigation**, No. 15-cv-02670 (United States District Court for the Southern District of California). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel on behalf of indirect purchasers of seafood products from several seafood suppliers. Plaintiffs allege defendants violated federal and state antitrust laws by conspiring to illegally fix, raise, and maintain the price of seafood in order to secure massive profits. Plaintiffs are seeking damages sustained by them as a result of Defendants' unlawful behavior.
- **Nicolás Montalvo v. California Lutheran University**, No. 21STCV38140 (Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel seeking to represent a class of students who paid tuition and fees to attend Defendant California Lutheran University for the time period affected by COVID-19 and had their course work moved to online learning. Plaintiffs seek reimbursement of those fees and tuition paid to Defendant for the time Plaintiffs did not receive the benefits of the on-campus, in-person educational experience. On July 1, 2024, the court issued an order granting preliminary approval of settlement of the case.

- **Springmeyer v. Marriott International, Inc.**, No. 20-cv-00867 (United States District Court for the District of Maryland). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel seeking to represent a class of consumers whose personal information was stolen from Defendant Marriott International. Plaintiffs allege Marriott failed in its duty to protect its guests' sensitive information by not implementing adequate and reasonable cyber-security procedures and protocols for its databases. Plaintiffs seek an injunction and award of damages as a result of Defendant's negligent and unlawful actions.
- **Lopez, et al. v. California Baptist University**, No. CVRI2000805 (Superior Court of California, County of Riverside). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel seeking to represent a class of students attending California Baptist University who were deprived of the benefit of on-campus learning due to the cancellation of classes due to COVID-19. Plaintiffs allege Defendant failed to issue tuition refunds despite Plaintiffs' inability to receive on-campus instructions and access campus facilities. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief and a return of monies wrongfully obtained for tuition and fees.
- **O'Garro v. City of Jersey City**, No. 20-cv-5282 (United States District Court for the District of New Jersey). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. serves as co-counsel on behalf of persons with mobility disabilities against Defendants Mayor Steven Fulop and the City of Jersey City. Plaintiffs are seeking declaratory and injunctive relief for Defendants' failure to provide accessible pedestrian rights of way within the City of Jersey City in violation of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- **In Re: Generic Pharmaceuticals Pricing Antitrust Litigation**, MDL No. 2724 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania). Tostrud Law Group, P.C. was appointed to serve on the Plaintiffs Steering Committee as counsel in a class action lawsuit

seeking to represent thousands of independent pharmacies against several defendant generic drug manufacturers. Plaintiffs allege these drug manufacturers violated federal and state antitrust laws. Plaintiffs seek damages sustained by them as a result of Defendants' unlawful behavior and an award of statutory damages to all class members.

---

In addition, while with the firm of Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP, Mr. Tostrud headed the wage and hour practice and was appointed lead or co-lead counsel and achieved seven-figure and eight-figure settlements in several class and collective actions including:

- **Nerland v. Caribou Coffee, Inc. et al.**, Civil No. 05-1847 (United States District Court for the District of Minnesota). As co-lead class counsel, Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP achieved a \$2.7 million settlement on behalf of retail store managers improperly classified as exempt from overtime. The class action suit first filed in 2005, charged Caribou with wrongfully denying overtime pay due to current and former Caribou store managers. The lawsuit contended that Caribou misclassified its Store Manager position as exempt under the Minnesota and Federal Fair Labor Standards Acts to avoid paying overtime compensation. After nearly three years of litigation, the parties entered into a Settlement whereby, the Court granted final approval and Caribou Coffee Co. compensated participating class members.
- **Oliva, et al. v. International Coffee and Tea, LLC d/b/a The Coffee Bean and Tea Leaf, et al.**, Case No. BC296435 (Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles). As co-lead class counsel, Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP achieved a seven-figure settlement on behalf of retail store managers improperly classified as exempt from overtime, as well as hourly-paid barristas who were not compensated for their meal and rest breaks.

- **Lagunas v. Cargill Meat Solutions Corp.**, Case No. 10-cv-00220 (United State District Court for the Southern District of Iowa) (Final approval - 1/27/11 Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP served as co-lead counsel in six-figure class settlement on behalf of meat processing plant employees who were not properly paid for donning and doffing activities performed before their shifts, during meal breaks and after their shifts.
- **Wineland, et al. v. Casey's General Stores, Inc.**, No. 08 CV 00020 (United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa) (Final approval 10/22/09). Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP along with co-counsel was appointed lead counsel and achieved a seven figure settlement on behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of over 60,000 cooks and cashiers for unpaid wages, including time worked before and after their scheduled shifts and while off-the-clock.
- **Cedeno, et al. v. Home Mortgage Desk. Corp. et al.**, No. 08 CV 1168 (United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York) (Final approval - 6/15/10). Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP along with co-counsel was appointed lead counsel and achieved a six figure settlement on behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class of loan officers deprived of overtime wages.
- **Jones, et al. v. Casey's General Stores. Inc.**, No. 07 CV 400 (United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa) (Final approval - 10/22/09). Cuneo Gilbert & LaDuca, LLP along with co-counsel was appointed lead counsel and achieved a seven figure settlement on behalf of a Section 216(b) collective class and Rule 23 class of more than 6,000 assistant store managers for unpaid wages, including time worked before and after their scheduled shifts and while off-the-clock.



In addition to the above representative cases, Tostrud Law Group, P.C. is currently prosecuting several other class and/or collective actions, including data breach and privacy cases, product liability and securities fraud class actions, and several antitrust cases against large companies.