

1 Bill Lann Lee – CA State Bar No. 108452
2 Andrew Lah – CA State Bar No. 234580
3 Joshua Davidson – CA State Bar No. 275168
4 LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE, RENAKER &
5 JACKSON, P.C.
6 476 9th Street
7 Oakland, CA 94607
8 Telephone: (510) 839-6824
9 Facsimile: (510) 839-7839
10 Email: blee@lewisfeinberg.com

Timothy P. Fox – CA State Bar No. 157750
Amy Robertson (*pro hac vice*)
Fox & Robertson, P.C.
104 Broadway, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: (303) 595-9700
TTY: (877) 595-9706
Facsimile: (303) 595-9705
Email: tfox@foxrob.com

[Additional attorneys listed within]

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Mohan Vallabhapurapu; *et al.*, on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Case No. C-11-00667-WHA (JSC)

Plaintiffs,

**JOINT NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF STIPULATION
AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

vs.

Burger King Corporation,

Date: October 25, 2012
Time: 3:00 pm
Courtroom: 8
Judge: Hon. William Alsup

Defendant/Third Party Plaintiff,

vs.

Antelope Valley Restaurants, Inc., *et al.*,

Third Party Defendants.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on October 25, 2012, at 3:00 p.m., or as soon
thereafter as the matter may be heard in the above-entitled Court, Plaintiffs and Defendant Burger
King Corporation (“BKC”) will and hereby do move the Court as follows:

To finally approve the Settlement Agreement (“Settlement” or “Settlement Agreement”) previously filed with the Court on July 14, 2012 (ECF 216-1) between Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the 86 Settlement Classes certified by the Court, and Defendant BKC, by and through their respective counsel.

This motion is based on the Memorandum of Points and Authorities filed herewith and in support of this Motion, the Declarations of Andrew Lah, Michael Joblove, and Jennifer M.

1 Keough in Support of the Joint Motion for Final Approval of Settlement Agreement, and all other
2 papers filed in this action.

3 Dated: October 12, 2012

LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE,
RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.

4
5 By: _____/s/

Bill Lann Lee
Andrew Lah
Joshua Davidson
LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE,
RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.
476 -- 9th Street
Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: (510) 839-6824
Facsimile: (510) 839-7839

6
7
8
9
10
11 Timothy P. Fox
Amy F. Robertson
FOX & ROBERTSON, P.C.
104 Broadway, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: (303) 595-9700
Facsimile: (303) 595-9705

12
13
14
15 Mari Mayeda
P O Box 5138
Berkeley, CA 94705
Telephone: (510) 848-3331
Facsimile: (510) 841-8115

16
17
18 *Attorneys for the Plaintiff Classes*

19 By: _____/s/
20 Michael D. Joblove (pro hac vice)
Jonathan E. Perlman (pro hac vice)
GENOVESE JOBLOVE &
21 BATTISTA, P.A.
100 SE Second Street, 44th Floor
22 Miami, FL 33131

23 Clement L. Glynn
Adam Friedenberg
24 GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP
One Walnut Creek Center
25 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

26
27 *Attorneys for Defendant Burger King
Corporation*

28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
1	
2	
3	I. BACKGROUND 2
4	A. Applicable Statutes..... 2
5	B. History of this Litigation..... 3
6	C. Certification of Settlement Classes 4
7	D. Order Directing Notice..... 5
8	E. Objections and Opt-Outs..... 6
9	II. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT..... 7
10	A. Injunctive Relief..... 7
11	B. Damages..... 8
12	C. Attorneys’ Fees and Costs..... 9
13	III. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL..... 10
14	A. The Notice Provided by the Parties Satisfies Due Process and F.R.C.P. 23..... 10
15	B. The Proposed Settlement Agreement is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate. 10
16	1. The Settlement Will Benefit the Class..... 11
17	a. Injunctive Relief..... 12
18	b. Monetary Relief 12
19	C. The Distribution Plan Is Fair to the Class..... 13
20	1. The Settlement Was Reached Through Arm’s-Length Negotiation
21	Following Sufficient Discovery..... 14
22	2. The Recommendations of Experienced Counsel Favor Approval of the
23	Settlement..... 15
24	3. Litigating This Action Would Be Risky, Expensive, and Time
25	Consuming, and Delay Any Recovery..... 15
26	III. CONCLUSION..... 16
27	
28	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FEDERAL CASES

1

2

3 *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.*,
485 F. Supp. 610 (N.D. Cal. 1979) 15

4

5 *Browning v. Yahoo, Inc.*,
No. C04-01463 HRL, 2006 WL 3826714 (N.D. Cal., Dec. 27, 2006) 14

6 *Burns v. Elrod*,
757 F.2d 151 (7th Cir. 1985)..... 10

7

8 *Castaneda v. Burger King Corp.*,
264 F.R.D. 557 (N.D. Cal. 2009).....passim

9 *Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*,
361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004)..... 10

10

11 *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*,
955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir.1992)..... 11

12 *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*,
417 U.S. 156 (1974)..... 10

13

14 *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*,
150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir.1998)..... 11

15 *Lane v. Facebook, Inc.*, -- F.3d --,
2012 WL 4125857 (9th Cir. Sept. 20, 2012) 11

16

17 *In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.*,
213 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 2000)..... 15

18 *Nat’l Rural Telecomm. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*,
221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2004)..... 11, 14, 15, 16

19

20 *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Comm’n.*,
688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)..... 11

21 *In re Omnivision Technologies Inc.*,
559 F. Supp. 2d 1036 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2008)..... 15

22

23 *Stern v. Gambello*,
012 WL 1744453 (9th Cir. May 17, 2012) 11

24 *In re Syncor ERISA Litig.*,
516 F.3d 1095 (9th Cir. 2008)..... 11

25

26 *Torrise v. Tucson Elec. Power Co.*,
8 F.3d 1370 (9th Cir.1993)..... 11

27

28

1 **STATE CASES**

2 *People ex. rel. Deukmejian v. CHE, Inc.*,
 3 150 Cal. App. 3d 123 (1983)..... 2

4 **FEDERAL STATUTES**

5 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*..... 2

6 42 U.S.C. § 12188..... 2

7 42 U.S.C. § 12205..... 2

8 42 U.S.C. § 12212..... 11

9 **STATE STATUTES**

10 Cal. Civ. Code § 51 *et seq.*..... 2

11 Cal. Civ. Code § 52..... 2, 3

12 Cal. Civ. Code § 54 *et seq.*..... 2, 3

13 Cal. Civ. Code § 55..... 2

14 Cal. Gov’t Code § 4450 2

15 **FEDERAL RULES**

16 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)..... 10

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b) 3, 4

18 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)..... passim

19 **FEDERAL REGULATIONS**

20 28 C.F.R. pt. 36, App. A 2

21 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

22 A. Conte & H. Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* (4th ed. 2002)..... 16

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF JOINT MOTION**
2 **FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

3 The Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the 86 restaurant-specific Settlement Classes
4 certified by the Court, jointly request that this Court finally approve the proposed Settlement
5 Agreement (“Settlement Agreement” or “Settlement”). The Court ordered that notice of the
6 settlement be given to Class Members and scheduled a fairness hearing (the “Fairness Hearing”)
7 for October 25, 2012. (ECF 228 at 1.) Following the Court’s approval of the notices and notice
8 plan, the Class Administrator provided notice of the Settlement to Class Members. (*See*
9 Declaration of Jennifer M. Keough (“Keough Decl.”) ¶¶ 4-8).

10 The parties believe that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, see Fed. R. Civ.
11 P. 23(e), for the following reasons. The Settlement will benefit the Classes with extensive
12 injunctive relief, including the elimination of alleged accessibility barriers, the use of mandatory
13 checklists with specific accessibility items for remodeling, alterations, repairs and maintenance,
14 and the monitoring of compliance over four years. The proposal is also likely to provide a
15 substantial average per-capita monetary award on the order of \$20,000 to the Class Members and
16 Named Plaintiffs who have opted-in.

17 Experienced Class Counsel, who recommend approval of the Settlement, conducted
18 sufficient investigation and discovery to be able to evaluate and test the claims and defenses in
19 the action. Defense counsel, also experienced and knowledgeable, also recommend approval.
20 The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness given the risk, expenses, and complexity
21 of further litigation. The period for objections and opt-outs ended September 17, 2012. To date,
22 no Class Members have objected to the Settlement and only one Class Member opted-out in
23 response to the notice describing the Settlement.

24 This Settlement ensures that 77 Burger King® restaurants (“Remaining BKLs” or
25 “Restaurants”) are accessible to Class Members.¹ In addition, the Settlement compares quite
26 favorably with settlements in similar cases and average expected recovery.

27 _____
28 ¹ Of the 86 Remaining BKLs that have existed during the tolled class period, 9 are not subject to
remediation under the Settlement Agreement because they have closed or are no longer leased

1 For these and other reasons discussed below, Class Counsel believes that this
 2 Settlement—negotiated at arm’s length over more than four months with the assistance of a
 3 federal Magistrate Judge selected by the Court after several years of investigation and litigation—
 4 to be a fair, adequate, and reasonable resolution of the claims against Defendant. Accordingly,
 5 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e), the parties jointly request that the Court finally
 6 approve the Settlement.

7 **I. BACKGROUND.**

8 **A. Applicable Statutes.**

9 The relief provided in the Settlement Agreement is authorized by the following statutes.
 10 Title III of the ADA prohibits disability discrimination in places of public accommodation. 42
 11 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* The specific design criteria required by Title III are set forth in the
 12 Department of Justice Standards for Accessible Design (“DOJ Standards”). 28 C.F.R. pt. 36, app.
 13 A. Title III is enforceable through a private right of action for injunctive relief; there is no federal
 14 damages remedy for private plaintiffs. 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(1) & (2). Prevailing plaintiffs are
 15 entitled to attorneys’ fees and costs. *Id.* § 12205.

16 Under California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 51 *et seq.* (“Unruh” or “the
 17 Unruh Act”), and Disabled Persons Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 54 *et seq.* (the “CDPA”), plaintiffs may
 18 also sue for injunctive relief to require compliance with California’s access standards, set forth in
 19 Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (“CBC”). *See, e.g.*, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 51(b),
 20 52(c)(3), 54(a), 55 (prohibiting disability discrimination in public accommodations and providing
 21 injunctive remedy); *People ex. rel. Deukmejian v. CHE, Inc.*, 150 Cal. App. 3d 123, 133-34
 22 (1983) (holding that Cal. Civ. Code § 54 required compliance with standards promulgated
 23 pursuant to Cal. Gov’t Code § 4450, that is, Title 24 of the Code of Regulations). In addition to
 24 injunctive relief, Unruh and CDPA also provide for minimum statutory damages of \$4,000 under
 25 Unruh, and \$1,000 under the CDPA. Cal. Civ. Code § 52(a), 54.3(a). An award of attorneys’
 26 fees and costs is also authorized by state law to the prevailing party. *Id.*

27 _____
 28 restaurants. Eighty-two of the Remaining BKLs remain open as of this date. *See Decl. of*
Michael Joblove (“Joblove Decl.”) ¶ 2.

1 **B. History of this Litigation.**

2 Prior to the filing of *Castaneda v. Burger King*, 08-4262 WHA in 2008, Class Counsel
3 spent more than a year investigating possible access violations at Burger King® restaurants
4 throughout California. (ECF 215-1 (Decl. of Timothy P. Fox (“Fox Decl.”) ¶ 2).) In *Castaneda*
5 *v. Burger King*, 3:08-cv-04262-WHA, three plaintiffs filed a class action lawsuit challenging
6 violations of the ADA and state law at all California BKL restaurants. This Court ultimately
7 certified, pursuant to Rule 23(b)(3), ten classes, one for each of the restaurants that the three
8 plaintiffs had patronized (“*Castaneda* BKLs”). *Castaneda v. Burger King Corp.*, 264 F.R.D. 557,
9 572 (N.D. Cal. 2009). The claims of individuals concerning the 86 Remaining BKL restaurants
10 were tolled by agreement of the parties, with the tolling period commencing on October 16, 2006.
11 (Fox Decl. ¶ 7.)

12 The *Castaneda* case settled and the Court approved the settlement in 2010. (C-ECF 361.)
13 Pursuant to the terms of the *Castaneda* Settlement, BKC committed to maintain access at the
14 *Castaneda* BKLs in three primary ways: (1) by requiring the franchisees to perform a checklist
15 of access-related tasks prior to opening each day, (*id.*, C-ECF 359 (“*Castaneda* Settlement
16 Agreement”), ¶ 7.1.1); (2) by surveying each of the ten restaurants at least once every three years
17 using an agreed-upon form and requiring the franchisees to take any required corrective action,
18 (*id.* ¶ 7.1.2); and (3) by requiring the franchisees to hire registered architects to survey each
19 restaurant every time the lease agreement is renewed and resurveying to ensure that the
20 remodeled restaurant complies. (*Id.* ¶ 7.1.3.)

21 In February 2011, 27 plaintiffs in the instant case filed suit against BKC, alleging
22 violations of the ADA and state law at the 86 BKL restaurants that were not covered by the
23 *Castaneda* Settlement (“Remaining BKLs”). In addition to the discovery concerning the
24 Remaining BKLs in *Castaneda*, the parties conducted further substantial discovery, including
25 depositions of 26 potential named plaintiffs and of one Burger King corporate representative, and
26 surveys of the Remaining BKLs. On December 21, 2011, the Court permitted two individuals to
27 withdraw as named Plaintiffs. On December 8, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Class
28 Certification covering 62 restaurants, which Defendant opposed on January 18, 2012.

1 On December 2, 2011, the Court directed that the parties engage in settlement negotiations
2 in this case and the related case, *Newport v. Burger King*, 10-04511. (ECF 160.)

3 On January 4, 2012, pursuant to Court order, the parties met for their first Settlement
4 Conference with Magistrate Judge Spero. Because of the *Newport* case, the settlement
5 conference also involved representatives of the franchisees and insurance carriers for Burger King
6 and the franchisees. Prior to that settlement conference, all parties understood that injunctive
7 relief would adhere to the principles of the *Castaneda* settlement. (ECF 230-1 (Decl. of Bill Lann
8 Lee (“Lee Decl.”) ¶ 24.) Settlement negotiations continued after the January 4th mediation. In
9 January and February, Plaintiffs completed their surveys of the Remaining BKLs that had not
10 been surveyed prior to class certification. (*Id.* ¶ 20.)

11 The parties eventually reached agreement on the basic outlines of the injunctive relief and
12 damages and fees. The parties met in person under Judge Spero’s supervision on several
13 occasions into May, and engaged in a number of conference calls, to negotiate the remaining
14 terms of the settlement. (*Id.* ¶ 23.) All parties were represented in these negotiations by counsel
15 with substantial experience in both disability rights and class action litigation.

16 C. Certification of Settlement Classes.

17 Upon reaching agreement on the Settlement, Plaintiffs filed an unopposed Motion to
18 Amend the Complaint for Settlement Purposes—seeking to add fifteen named Plaintiffs, who had
19 been to the remaining 24 BKLs, so that the complaint included a named Plaintiff who had been to
20 all of the Remaining BKLs—and a Motion for Settlement Class Certification. The Court allowed
21 Plaintiffs to file the amended complaint on July 2, 2012. (ECF 225.) By separate order dated
22 July 2, 2012, the Court granted Plaintiffs’ Unopposed Motion for Certification of Settlement
23 Classes pursuant to Rule 23(b)(2) for injunctive relief and Rule 23(b)(3) for damages claims.
24 (ECF 227.)

25 D. Order Directing Notice.

26 With respect to class notice, the parties proposed a notice procedure based on the process
27 previously approved by the Court in *Castaneda* for giving notice for opting-in for monetary relief.
28 (*See* C-ECF 340 at 15-17). Adding several amendments, the Court approved the parties’ notice

1 proposal that included posting for 30 days of short form notices at the Restaurants with
2 information on how to obtain long form notices for opting-in, personal service by mail of the long
3 form injunctive relief notice to those with known addresses and those who request the notice, and
4 personal service by mail of the Damage Claimant long form notice and claim form to Damages
5 Claimants. (*See* ECF 228). Class Counsel incorporated each of the Court’s amendments in its
6 Order Regarding Notice. (Decl. of Andrew Lah (“Lah Decl.”) ¶ 3.) The amended notices and
7 claim forms were timely distributed by the Class Administrator, The Garden City Group, Inc.
8 (“Garden City”) by July 16, 2012, the notice deadline set by the Court. (Keough Decl. ¶ 9). At
9 Class Counsel’s request, the Class Administrator also emailed a copy of the Opt-Out Notice and
10 the Claim Form to existing Damages Claimants with email addresses known to Class Counsel.
11 (Keough Decl. ¶ 10, 11.) Those emails, which were not required by the Court, were sent on July
12 16, 2012, and August 17, 2012. (*Id.*)

13 BKC instructed franchisees to post short form notices at 82 Restaurants, the number of
14 Restaurants that remain open today. (Joblove Decl. ¶ 2; *see also supra* at fn. 1.) Plaintiffs
15 discovered that several stores had not posted the short form notices and advised BKC. (Lah Decl.
16 ¶ 4.) BKC investigated and found that several stores had initially failed to post the notices by the
17 date specified by the Court, but that all of the 82 stores had the notice posted as of August 15,
18 2012. BKC also ensured that those stores that had not timely posted the notices would
19 nevertheless keep the notices posted for the full 30 day period ordered by the Court. (Joblove
20 Decl. ¶ 8.) No objections were rejected on timeliness grounds. (Keough Decl. ¶ 14.) The Class
21 Administrator reports that 620 individuals have submitted claim forms to recover damages, to
22 date. (*See* Keough Decl. ¶ 16.)

23 One aspect of the notice program varied from the Court’s order. The Court’s order
24 provided that disability rights organizations be sent the long form notice for Damages Claimants.
25 (ECF 228 at 4.) Instead, Plaintiffs’ counsel instructed the Class Administrator to send these
26 organizations the short form notice, which was the notice that was intended for the general public
27 and posted at Burger King restaurants. (Lah Decl. ¶ 5.)
28

1 Class counsel only recently recognized this discrepancy. (*Id.*) Otherwise, they would
2 have sought permission from the Court to send disability rights organizations the short form
3 notice, rather than the long form notice for Damages Claimants, for three reasons.

4 First, Plaintiffs believe that the Court ordered sending notices to these organizations in
5 order to enhance giving notice to the general public, particularly potential Damages Claimants
6 who had not already contacted Plaintiffs' Counsel. (*Id.*) The short form notice is much easier to
7 understand and thus more suitable for posting at these organizations' offices or to be forwarded to
8 the membership of these organizations. The notice generally describes the case, the injunctive
9 relief provided, the availability of damages for those eligible to apply, and how to obtain copies
10 of the long form notice in order to opt in or apply for damages. Second, the long form notice is
11 not designed for members of the general public. It is designed for Damages Claimants to apply
12 for damages and was intended for people who had previously contacted Class Counsel. It also
13 contains an opt out notice, meaning that the notice informed recipients that they were releasing
14 their claims to proceed separately unless they opted out of the settlement. The vast majority of
15 members of disability rights organizations had not previously contacted Class Counsel, and had
16 not already opted into the class. Third, the short form notice informs Damage Claimants how
17 they may request a long form notice, thus nobody was deprived of an opportunity to obtain a copy
18 of the long form.

19 **E. Objections and Opt-Outs.**

20 The Class Administrator has not received any objections in response to the notice of
21 Settlement. (Keough Decl. ¶ 15.) One Class Member opted out of the settlement. (*Id.* ¶ 14.)
22 Class Counsel attempted to contact the Class Member by telephone on October 4, 2012, without
23 success. (Lah Decl. ¶ 6.) Class Counsel subsequently sent a letter to the opt-out Class Member
24 that requested that the Class Member contact Class Counsel. On October 9, 2012, Ms. Mazzara
25 left a voice message with a legal assistant at Lewis Feinberg confirming that she did not want to
26 take part in the settlement. Further attempts to reach the Class Member were unsuccessful.

1 **II. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT.**

2 The terms of the Proposed Settlement Agreement are set forth in the Settlement
3 Agreement, a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A to the Proposed Final Approval Order. The
4 following summarizes the principal terms of the Settlement:

5 **A. Injunctive Relief.**

6 In approximately September 2008, BKC experts began surveying the BKLs (including the
7 Remaining BKLs) and BKC instructed its tenant franchisees to remediate the accessibility issues
8 identified. Plaintiffs' experts have since conducted extensive surveys of each of the Remaining
9 BKLs. These surveys established that the remediation work done in response to this lawsuit had
10 greatly enhanced the accessibility of the Remaining BKLs.

11 The injunctive relief provided by the proposed Settlement Agreement mirrors the
12 injunctive relief approved by this Court in *Castaneda*. In addition, the proposal provides for
13 additional relief to maintain the appropriate door force for entry and restroom doors. *See infra*.

14 First, the proposed Agreement specifically identifies the remaining architectural elements
15 that will be remediated. (*See* Settlement Agreement ¶ 6 & ex. A.)

16 Second, to ensure that access is maintained, the Settlement Agreement requires three types
17 of periodic access surveys geared to the frequency and type of access barriers that typically arise
18 in restaurants (*Id.* ¶ 7):

- 19 (1) Daily surveys conducted by tenant franchisee managers that focus on ensuring
20 that frequently-changing elements remain in compliance. For example, during
21 these surveys, managers make sure that movable condiment dispensers are kept
22 within reach, and the path of travel to restrooms is not obstructed by high
23 chairs or other items. (*See id.* ¶ 7.1.1.)
24 (2) Mid-level surveys conducted every three years. These surveys target elements
25 that change less frequently than those found in daily surveys, including, for
26 example, parking lot re-striping and restroom fixtures. (*See id.* ¶ 7.1.2 and Ex.
27 C.)
28 (3) Successor remodel surveys, which are comprehensive surveys conducted when
a restaurant is remodeled, approximately once every 20 years. (*See id.* ¶ 7.1.3
and Ex. D.)

 Third, BKC will produce to Class Counsel on a periodic basis the mid-level and remodel
survey forms for monitoring. (*See id.* ¶ 8.)

1 Fourth, BKC will include in its manual that franchisees should check the force required to
2 open all public exterior and restroom doors twice per month to ensure that they do not exceed 5
3 pounds of pressure to open. (*See id.* ¶ 7.1.2.)

4 Finally, the parties have also agreed to a dispute resolution process in which disputes that
5 the parties cannot resolve can be brought to the Court for resolution during the term of the
6 Settlement Agreement. (*See Id.* ¶ 11.)

7 **B. Damages.**

8 As in *Castaneda*, Damages Claimants will include all Class Members who contacted
9 Class Counsel prior to the date of settlement. (*Compare Castaneda* Settlement Agreement ¶ 3.4
10 with Settlement Agreement ¶ 3.6.) While Damages Claimants are required to release all damages
11 relating to accessibility at the Restaurants (Settlement Agreement ¶ 16.2.2 (including release of
12 “statutory, actual, compensatory, consequential, special, emotional harm or punitive damages”)),
13 they have the right to opt out of the monetary provisions of the Settlement if they wish to pursue
14 claims on an independent basis in lieu of what the Settlement provides. (*Id.* ¶ 10.) Additionally,
15 Class Members who did *not* contact Class Counsel prior to the Settlement Agreement but who
16 wish to receive damages may opt into the class as Damages Claimants. In addition, Paragraph
17 10.4 of the Agreement (the “Blow Up Provision”) provided BKC the right to declare the
18 Agreement null and void if the number of Damages Claimants who opt out of the Class exceeds
19 100, or consists of Damages Claimants whose claims, in the aggregate, exceed \$1,500,000. (*Id.*)
20 Since only one person opted out, the Blow-Up provision did not come into effect.

21 In addition to payments to Damages Claimants, discussed below, the money from the \$19
22 million fund may be used for two other purposes: (a) Payment for the costs of notifying the class
23 of the Settlement, and administering the Settlement, to the extent that those costs exceed
24 \$100,000, as costs *up to* these amounts will be paid by Class Counsel; and (b) reasonable costs
25 and attorneys’ fees to Class Counsel, in an amount to be determined by the Court. (Settlement
26 Agreement ¶¶ 9.2.2, 9.2.1.2.) If there are any funds remaining after disbursements to Damages
27 Claimants and towards these other obligations, *e.g.*, returned checks, they will be donated to
28

1 Disability Rights California, a non-profit organization located in Oakland, California, devoted to
2 ensuring accessibility for the disabled. (*Id.* ¶ 9.6.)

3 As in *Castaneda*, monetary awards will be distributed *pro rata* based on the total number
4 of eligible claims for all Damages Claimants, with a maximum of six (6) visits for which an
5 individual Damages Claimant can obtain recovery. (*Id.* ¶ 9.5.1.²) For example, if (a) the amount
6 of the fund remaining after disbursements for costs and fees (the “Net Settlement Fund”) is \$14
7 million; (b) there are 1,500 Eligible Claimants, and (c) the sum of all Qualifying Visits for all
8 Eligible Claimants (with Class Member averaging three visits) is 4,500, then the amount that an
9 Eligible Claimant would recover for a Qualifying Visit would be (\$14 million / 4,500), or
10 \$3111.11 per Qualifying Visit. Under this scenario, an Eligible Claimant seeking recovery for
11 one Qualifying Visit would receive \$3111.11, and an Eligible Claimant seeking recovery for six
12 or more Qualifying Visits would receive \$18,666.67. (*Id.* ¶ 9.5.2.) The average recovery per
13 Class Member based on the claims received to date is set forth below.

14 C. Attorneys’ Fees and Costs.

15 The parties have agreed that Class Counsel may seek an award of attorneys’ fees and costs
16 in an amount not to exceed 25% of the Total Settlement Fund remaining after litigation and
17 administrative costs have been deducted, and that BKC will not oppose such request. Plaintiffs
18 filed their application for attorneys’ fees and costs on August 27, 2012. (ECF 230.) The
19 application was posted on Plaintiffs’ website on August 27, 2012, in order to give Class Members
20 an opportunity to review and comment on the application in advance of the September 17, 2012
21 deadline to object to or opt-out of the Settlement. (Lah Decl. ¶ 7.)

22 Class Counsel have included the totals for the amount deleted per timekeeper as billing
23 judgment, per this Court’s Order Re Fairness Hearing. (*See* Lah Decl. ¶ 8 & Ex. A.) All
24 timekeepers are accounted for in Exhibit A. (*Id.*) In total, Class Counsel cut the time of twelve
25 attorneys, five summer associates, and eleven paralegal interviewers. (*Id.*)

26
27
28 ² Named Plaintiffs shall be eligible for monetary payments under the same criteria and
procedures as other eligible claimants. (Settlement Agreement ¶ 9.3.9.)

1 In addition, Class Counsel will pay the costs of the Class Administrator and notice up to
2 \$100,000, with costs in excess of these amounts to be paid from the damages fund. (Settlement
3 Agreement ¶ 9.2.) As of October 11, 2012, the settlement administration costs are approximately
4 \$52,000. (Keough Decl. ¶ 17.)

5 **III. THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT MERITS FINAL APPROVAL.**

6 **A. The Notice Provided by the Parties Satisfies Due Process and F.R.C.P. 23.**

7 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 23(e)(1), the court “must direct notice in a
8 reasonable manner to all Class Members who would be bound by a propos[ed settlement].” Class
9 Members are entitled to receive “the best notice practicable” under the circumstances. *Burns v.*
10 *Elrod*, 757 F.2d 151, 154 (7th Cir. 1985)(citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)). Notice is satisfactory
11 “if it generally describes the terms of the settlement in sufficient detail to alert those with adverse
12 viewpoints to investigate and to come forward and be heard.” *Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen.*
13 *Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004) (internal citation omitted). Moreover, notice that is
14 mailed to each member of a settlement class “who can be identified through reasonable effort”
15 constitutes reasonable notice. *Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin*, 417 U.S. 156, 176 (1974).

16 The notice standard is satisfied here. The Class Administrator timely and properly
17 provided the notice prescribed in the Court’s Order Regarding Notice of Class Action and
18 Proposed Settlement. (Keough Decl. ¶¶ 4-9.) The Class Administrator mailed 945 notices and
19 claim forms to Class Members. (*Id.* ¶ 9.) As noted above, all 82 Remaining BKLs still open
20 posted the short form notice for at least 30 days. (Joblove Decl. ¶ 2.) The Class Administrator
21 also sent the short-form notice to sixty-nine disability rights organizations across California.
22 (Keough Decl. ¶¶ 4-8.)

23 Accordingly, the notice procedure previously approved by the Court and now
24 implemented by the Class Administrator was the best notice practicable under the circumstances
25 and satisfied the requirements of due process and F.R.C.P. 23(e).

1 **B. The Proposed Settlement Agreement is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate.**

2 In drafting the ADA, Congress provided that “[w]here appropriate and to the extent
3 authorized by law, the use of alternative means of dispute resolution, including settlement
4 negotiations . . . is encouraged to resolve disputes arising under this chapter.” 42 U.S.C. § 12212
5 (2009). Similarly, “there is a strong judicial policy that favors settlement, particularly where
6 complex class action litigation is concerned.” *In re Syncor ERISA Litig.*, 516 F.3d 1095, 1101
7 (9th Cir. 2008) (citing *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1276 (9th Cir.1992)).

8 Final approval of a proposed class action settlement should be granted where the proposed
9 settlement is “fair, reasonable, and adequate.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e). In determining whether to
10 grant final approval, the Court can consider a number of factors, including the benefit to the
11 individual Class Members; the strength of plaintiffs’ case; the risk, expense, complexity, and
12 likely duration of further litigation; the extent of discovery completed, and the stage of the
13 proceedings; and the experience and views of counsel. *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011,
14 1026–27 (9th Cir.1998); *see also Stern v. Gambello*, 2012 WL 1744453 (9th Cir. May 17, 2012).

15 These factors, however, are not exclusive, and a court must consider whether the
16 settlement “taken as a whole” is fair to absent Class Members. *Torrise v. Tucson Elec. Power*
17 *Co.*, 8 F.3d 1370, 1376 (9th Cir.1993) (citing *Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir.
18 1982). Furthermore, “under certain circumstances, one factor alone may prove determinative in
19 finding sufficient grounds for court approval.” *Nat’l Rural Telecomm. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*,
20 221 F.R.D. 523, 525-26 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2004) (citing *Torrise*, 8 F.3d at 1376).

21 Here, the proposed Settlement satisfies the approval requirements. Class Counsel believe
22 that the proposed Settlement is an excellent result for the Class Members, reached after hard-
23 fought litigation and negotiation, after years of litigation and case development, and with
24 assistance of a federal Magistrate Judge experienced in mediation. (Fox Decl. ¶¶ 9-13). As
25 explained below, these factors support a finding that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and
26 reasonable.

27 **1. The Settlement Will Benefit the Class.**

28 The Settlement provides substantial injunctive and monetary benefits to the members of

1 the Class.

2 **a. Injunctive Relief.**

3 The Settlement will provide substantial injunctive relief to the Class. As this Court is
4 aware, as a result of this litigation, BKC has already enhanced accessibility at the Remaining
5 BKL restaurants. Additionally, under the Settlement, BKC has committed to ensuring additional
6 accessibility enhancements, and the parties have negotiated injunctive relief that ensures that
7 Restaurants remain in compliance with applicable accessibility requirements. *See supra* pp. 6-8.

8 One disability access expert believed that similar injunctive relief provided in the
9 *Castaneda* settlement was “exemplary” and would become the model for future agreements in
10 cases involving chain restaurants. (Declaration of Claudia Center (“Center Decl.”), C-ECF 354 ¶
11 10.) The expert noted that the detailed checklists and survey requirements are impressive and
12 commendable. (*Id.* ¶ 11.) The agreed upon expansion of the daily opening checklist, for example,
13 will ensure that current and future restaurant employees will take the steps necessary at the
14 beginning of each day to ensure an accessible path of travel to all restaurant areas. (*Id.*)

15 **b. Monetary Relief.**

16 Assuming the Court grants Plaintiffs’ request for fees and costs, there will be
17 approximately \$14 million to be distributed to the class. As demonstrated below, this monetary
18 recovery compares very favorably to court-approved settlements in similar class actions in terms
19 of total recovery obtained. Moreover, as in *Castaneda*, the monetary relief for the class here
20 consists entirely of cash, rather than coupons.

21 *Total recovery in similar cases:* Plaintiffs are aware of the total settlement recoveries in
22 the following disability access class actions:

Case	Total Recovery Amount	Maximum or Average Recovery Per Class Member
<i>Castaneda</i>	\$5 million	\$13,000
<i>Lucas v. Kmart</i>	Just under \$13 million	\$8,000
<i>National Federation of the Blind v. Target Corp.</i> , No. C 06-01802 MHP (N.D. Cal.)	\$6 million	\$8,000
<i>Lieber v. Macy’s West</i> ,	\$2.8 million	\$2,000

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28		
---	--	--

Inc., Case Nos. C96-02955 MHP (N.D. Cal.)

Expected average recovery per Class Member: The court-approved settlements in the *Target*, *Kmart*, and *Macy's* cases capped the number of claims for which an individual Class Member could recover at two, meaning that the most that Class Members obtained was \$8,000 in the *NFB* and *Kmart* cases, and \$2,000 in the *Macy's* case, and that assumes that those amounts were not reduced based on a pro rata reduction because total claims exceeded the settlement funds. In the *Kmart* case, the maximum recovery obtained by an individual Class Member was \$6,000 (of which \$2,300 was in the form of a gift card) after a pro rata reduction.

As of October 10, 2012, the Class Administrator reports that it had received and processed 620 damages claim forms. (Keough Decl. ¶ 16.) Of those, claimants have indicated a raw total of 11,367 store visits to Burger King Restaurants. (*Id.*) If each claimant is limited to the store visits they claimed, but no more than six store visits per individual claim, the adjusted total store visit count for all claims processed to date is 2,868. (*Id.*) Assuming the number of Damage Claimants the Class Administrator finds eligible is 620 and the Net Settlement Fund remains at \$14,250,000.00, the average award value is \$22,983.87 per processed claim, \$1,253.62 per store visit based on a raw store visit count, and \$4,968.61 per store visit based on an adjusted store visit count. (*Id.*)

If the numbers reported by the Class Administrator do not change significantly, the average recovery in the instant case will be two times the maximum recoveries in the *Target* and *Kmart* cases. The average recovery here will be 50% above the average recovery in *Castaneda*.

C. The Distribution Plan Is Fair to the Class.

As in *Castaneda*, the Class Members will be compensated for each visit to a covered restaurant during the class period. Imposing a maximum on the number of visits for each claimant represents a fair balance between a distribution that closely approaches reality and one that protects Class Members from possibly illegitimate claims. The Court approved the same

1 maximum in *Castaneda* (C-ECF 361) and a similar—though lower—maximum was approved in
2 the *Lucas v. Kmart* settlement. (Fox Decl. ¶ 12 (capping the number of eligible visits at two).)

3 Second, Class Counsel believe that if the average recovery is \$20,000, that average will be
4 the largest per person monetary recovered in a disability rights class action involving a public
5 accommodation.

6 **1. The Settlement Was Reached Through Arm’s-Length Negotiation**
7 **Following Sufficient Discovery.**

8 “A settlement following sufficient discovery and genuine arms-length negotiation is
9 presumed fair.” *Browning v. Yahoo, Inc.*, No. C04-01463 HRL, 2006 WL 3826714, at *8 (N.D.
10 Cal., Dec. 27, 2006) (quoting *Nat’l Rural Telecomm.*, 221 F.R.D. at 528).

11 Here, Plaintiffs settled the case only after approximately six years of pre-suit investigation
12 and litigation. (Fox Decl. ¶ 10.) *Castaneda* was settled after full discovery had been completed
13 and was at the brink of trial, and Class Counsel therefore settled both *Castaneda* and this case
14 with the benefit of an extensive factual record aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their
15 claims as well as the strengths and weaknesses of their defenses. (*Id.*). The same is true here.
16 Class Counsel conducted discovery of the Remaining BKLs, defended the depositions of 26
17 named plaintiffs, engaged in document discovery, surveyed the Remaining BKLs, and deposed a
18 Burger King’s corporate representative.

19 In addition, this Settlement Agreement is the result of genuine arm’s length negotiations.
20 On January 4, 2012, pursuant to Court order, the parties met for their first Settlement Conference
21 with Magistrate Judge Spero. Because of the *Newport v. Burger King* case, the settlement
22 conference also involved representatives of the franchisees and insurance carriers for Burger King
23 and the franchisees. (ECF 160.) Prior to that settlement conference, all parties understood that
24 injunctive relief would adhere to the principles of the *Castaneda* settlement. Settlement
25 negotiations continued after the January 4th mediation. In January and February, Plaintiffs
26 completed their surveys of the Remaining BKLs that had not been surveyed prior to class
27 certification.

28 The parties eventually reached agreement on the basic outlines of the injunctive relief and

1 damages and fees. From February into May, the parties met in person several times under the
 2 supervision of Judge Spero, and engaged in a number of conference calls, to negotiate the
 3 remaining terms of the settlement, including the details of further barrier removal at Remaining
 4 BKLs. All parties have been represented throughout these negotiations by counsel with
 5 substantial experience in both disability rights and class action litigation. As a result of
 6 settlement following more than a year of investigation and four years of litigation in *Castaneda*
 7 and this action and the arm's-length nature of the settlement negotiations, the Court has
 8 substantial guaranty of the fairness of the Settlement.

9 **2. The Recommendations of Experienced Counsel Favor Approval of the**
 10 **Settlement.**

11 In appraising the fairness of a proposed settlement, the judgment of experienced counsel
 12 favoring the settlement is entitled to substantial weight and also should be accorded a
 13 "presumption of reasonableness." *In re Omnivision Technologies Inc.*, 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036,
 14 1043 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2008) (citing *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.*, 485 F. Supp. 610, 622 (N.D. Cal.
 15 1979); *Nat'l Rural Telecomm.*, 221 F.R.D. at 528 (internal quotations and citations omitted)
 16 (noting counsel are "most closely acquainted with the facts of the underlying litigation.") Here,
 17 the parties' counsel jointly submit that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

18 The Court appointed the undersigned Plaintiffs' counsel as Class Counsel after
 19 considering their qualifications and experience. (ECF 227). Class Counsel have extensive
 20 experience in prosecuting civil rights class actions generally, and disability access class actions
 21 specifically. (See Lee Decl. ¶ 3-8, Fox Decl. ¶ 21-34, ECF 230-3, Declaration of Mari Mayeda ¶
 22 3-4.) It is their considered opinion that the Settlement is excellent and achieves the best result
 23 possible for Class Members under the circumstances. (Fox Decl. ¶ 10.) BKC's counsel, also
 24 experienced and knowledgeable in complex litigation, also recommend approval.

25 **3. Litigating This Action Would Be Risky, Expensive, and Time**
 26 **Consuming, and Delay Any Recovery.**

27 A settlement is evaluated in light of the risks and costs of litigation. *In re Mego Fin.*
 28 *Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 213 F.3d 454, 458 (9th Cir. 2000). "The Court shall consider the vagaries of

1 litigation and compare the significance of immediate recovery by way of the compromise to the
2 mere possibility of relief in the future, after protracted and expensive litigation.” *Nat’l Rural*
3 *Telecomm.*, 221 F.R.D. at 526. “[U]nless the settlement is clearly inadequate, its acceptance and
4 approval are preferable to lengthy and expensive litigation with uncertain results.” *Id.* (quoting 4
5 A. Conte 7 H. Newberg, *Newberg on Class Actions* § 11:50 at 155 (4th ed. 2002)).

6 Although Plaintiffs believe that they have strong claims against BKC, they recognize that
7 there is always substantial litigation risk. For example, this Court suggested in *Castaneda* that
8 Class Members would have to appear in person at the trial to obtain damages. (C-ECF #218)
9 (Transcript of Oral Argument at 26 (Sept. 17, 2009)). If the Court reached the same conclusion
10 here, it is likely that some Class Members with valid claims would not have the ability to appear
11 at trial, thus possibly reducing aggregate class damages. Additional risks include: (1) the fact
12 finder’s possible failure to credit evidence of the existence of barriers; (2) the fact finder’s
13 possible failure to credit the number of visits to which a Class Member testifies; (3) uncertainties
14 regarding recovering for “deterred” visits; (4) the possibility that novel legal issues may be
15 reversed on appeal; and (5) the years-long delay in receipt by Class Members of monetary relief
16 during the pendency of appeals, even if the appeals were ultimately denied.

17 BKC believes the results obtained in the Settlement are more than could be achieved had
18 the claims been fully litigated because: (a) it is not liable under state law for damages because the
19 Restaurants are independently operated and because BKC neither engaged in, fostered nor aided
20 any of the alleged discrimination; (b) a large number of opt-in Claimants did not personally
21 encounter barriers, as required by the Unruh Act and CDPA; (c) the opt-in Claimants did not
22 encounter barriers in the quantity of visits contended; and (d) a number of Claimants’ contentions
23 are not credible.

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28

1 **III. CONCLUSION.**

2 For the reasons set forth above, the parties respectfully request that the Court grant final
3 approval to the Settlement Agreement and enter the parties' concurrently-filed Proposed Order of
4 Final Approval of Settlement.

5
6 Dated: October 12, 2012

LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE,
RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.

7 By: _____ /s/

8
9 Bill Lann Lee
Andrew Lah
Joshua Davidson
10 LEWIS, FEINBERG, LEE,
RENAKER & JACKSON, P.C.
11 476 – 9th Street
Oakland, CA 94607
12 Telephone: (510) 839-6824
13 Facsimile: (510) 839-7839

14 Timothy P. Fox
Amy F. Robertson
15 FOX & ROBERTSON, P.C.
104 Broadway, Suite 400
16 Denver, CO 80203
Telephone: (303) 595-9700
17 Facsimile: (303) 595-9705

18 Mari Mayeda
P O Box 5138
19 Berkeley, CA 94705
Telephone: (510) 848-3331
20 Facsimile: (510) 841-8115

21 *Attorneys for the Plaintiff Classes*

22 By: : _____ /s/

23
24 Michael D. Joblove
Jonathan E. Perlman
25 GENOVESE JOBLOVE &
BATTISTA, P.A.
100 SE Second Street, 44th Floor
26 Miami, FL 33131
Telephone: (305) 349-2333
27 Facsimile: (305) 349-2310

28 Clement L. Glynn

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Adam Friedenberg
GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP
One Walnut Creek Center
100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Telephone: (925) 210-2809
Facsimile: (925) 945-1975

Attorneys for Defendant Burger King Corporation