FILED
2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
Bernalillo County
6/18/2024 11:47 AM
KATINA WATSON
CLERK OF THE COURT
Christopher Waites

STATE OF NEW MEXICO COUNTY OF BERNALILLO SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

JESSE MARTINEZ, KYRA NIETO, MICHAEL O. GARCIA, and JUAN GONZALES, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PRESBYTERIAN HEALTHCARE SERVICES,

Defendant.

Case No. D-202-CV-2020-01578

Consolidated with Case Nos: 1:20-cv-00191-SMV-JFR D-202-CV-2020-02651

FINAL APPROVAL ORDER

(Assigned to the Hon. Beatrice J. Brickhouse)

This matter is before the Court on a motion pursuant to Rule 1-023(E) of the New Mexico Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts for final approval of the class action Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement") between Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, and Defendant Presbyterian Healthcare Services ("PHS"). The Court, being duly advised, now finds that the motion should be, and hereby is, GRANTED.

## ACCORDINGLY, THE COURT HEREBY FINDS AND ORDERS:

- 1. Terms capitalized in this Order and not otherwise defined shall have the meanings set forth in the Settlement.
  - 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and parties to this action.
- 3. The Court previously entered a Preliminary Approval Order, which granted preliminary approval to the Settlement; approved the form, manner, and method for

1

providing notice of the Settlement to the proposed Settlement Class; set dates for Settlement Class Members to object to, or exclude themselves from, the Settlement; and scheduled a final approval hearing to consider whether to grant final approval to the Settlement.

- 4. A declaration from the Settlement Administrator has been submitted to the Court showing that notice was given to the Settlement Class in the form, manner, and method prescribed by the Court. The Court finds that the notice complied with the requirements of Rule 1-023(C) of the New Mexico Rules of Civil Procedure of the District Courts and with the requirements of Due Process.
- 5. The deadline for Settlement Class Members to object to, or exclude themselves from, the Settlement has passed.
- 6. As of the final date of the Opt-Out Period, seventy-five (75) potential Settlement Class Members have submitted timely and valid Opt-Out Requests to be excluded from the Settlement. The names of those persons are set forth in Exhibit A to the Supplemental Settlement Administrator's Declaration in Support of the Final Approval Motion. These persons are not bound by this Judgment, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 7. One Settlement Class Member submitted a timely objection to the Settlement. The objection was briefed by the Plaintiffs and the objector, with the Court hearing argument from the parties and the objector at the Final Approval Hearing. In

considering the objection, the briefs, and the argument presented at the hearing, the Court overruled the objection for the reasons stated on the record at the Final Approval Hearing.

8. The Court reaffirms its certification of the Settlement Class for purposes of entering judgment on the Settlement and defined as:

The individuals to whom PHS sent letters notifying those individuals that information relating to them may have been compromised as a result of the Data Incident.

The Settlement Class specifically excludes: (i) officers and directors of PHS and/or the Related Entities; (ii) all Settlement Class Members who timely and validly request exclusion from the Settlement Class; (iii) the members of the judiciary who have presided or are president over this matter and their families and staff; and (iv) any other Person found by a court of competent jurisdiction to be guilty under criminal law of initiating, causing, aiding or abetting the criminal activity occurrence of the Data Incident or who pleads *nolo contendere* to any such charge.

- 9. As set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order, the Court finds that the Settlement Class meets the requirements for class certification under Rules 1-023(A) and (B)(3) of the New Mexico Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts.
- 10. The Court likewise reaffirms its appointment of Jesse Martinez, Kyra Nieto, Michael O. Garcia, and Juan Gonzales as Class Representatives and reaffirms the appointment of J. Gerard Stranch IV of Stranch, Jennings & Garvey, PLLC, Lynn A. Toops of Cohen & Malad, LLP, and David K. Lietz of Millberg Coleman Bryson Phillips Grossman LLP, as Class Counsel.
- 11. The Court finds that the Settlement represents a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the claims, particularly considering: (a) the Settlement was negotiated at arm's-length by experienced counsel and through the use of a third-party

neutral mediator; (b) the value of the Settlement compares favorably to the risks, uncertainties, and delays of continued litigation; (c) the response of the Settlement Class to the proposal has been overwhelmingly favorable; and (d) attorneys' fees and service awards were not negotiated until after the parties had reached agreement on the materials terms of the Settlement for the benefit of the Settlement Class. The Court therefore grants final approval to the Settlement.

- 12. The Court orders and directs the parties to implement the terms and benefits provided for by the Settlement.
- 13. Upon the Effective Date, each Settlement Class Member, including Plaintiffs, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims and Unknown Claims. Further, upon the Effective Date, and to the fullest extent permitted by law, each Settlement Class Member, including Plaintiffs, shall either directly, indirectly, representatively, as a member of or on behalf of the general public or in any capacity, be permanently barred and enjoined from commencing, prosecuting, or participating in any recovery in any action in this or any other forum (other than participation in the settlement) in which any of the Released Claims is asserted.
- 14. As outlined in the Settlement, all payments made to Settlement Class Members pursuant to the Settlement that are not cashed within ninety (90) days are void. If a check becomes void, the Settlement Class Member shall have until six (6) months after the Effective Date to request re-issuance. If no request for re-issuance is made within this

period, the Settlement Class Member will have failed to meet a condition precedent to recovery of settlement benefits, the Settlement Class Member's right to receive monetary relief shall be extinguished, and PHS shall have no obligation to make payments to the Settlement Class Member for expense and reimbursement under ¶ 2.1 or any other type of monetary relief. The same provisions shall apply to any re-issued check. For any checks that are issued or re-issued for any reason more than one hundred eighty (180) days from the Effective Date, requests for re-issuance need not be honored after such checks become void.

- 15. For the reasons stated in the Plaintiffs' Motion for an award of attorneys' fees, expenses and class member service awards and in the reply in response to the objection, the Court grants the motion for attorney's fees, expenses and incentive awards for the class representatives. Payment shall be made pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 16. The matter is hereby dismissed with prejudice and without costs, except as to those costs and fees provided in the Settlement and approved by the Court. This is a final order, and judgment is entered upon the Settlement; this Order resolves all claims as to all parties, notwithstanding the Court's continuing jurisdiction over the implementation of the Settlement.

THERE BEING NO JUST REASON FOR DELAY, LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED.

## DONE and ORDERED this 17th day of June 2024.

BEATRICE J. BRICKHOUSE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Respectfully submitted,

O'STEEN & HARRISON, PLC

Lincoln Combs, No.153434

300 W. Clarendon Ave., Suite 400

Phoenix, AZ 85013-3424

T: (602) 252-8888 F: (602) 274-1209

lcombs@vanosteen.com

Lynn A. Toops (pro hac vice forthcoming)

COHEN & MALAD, LLP

One Indiana Square, Suite 1400

Indianapolis, IN 46204

T: (317) 636-6481 F: (317) 636-2593

ltoops@cohenandmalad.com

Gerard Stranch, IV (pro hac vice)

STRANCH, JENNINGS & GARVEY, PLLC

223 Rosa L. Parks Ave. Ste. 200

Nashville, TN 37203

T: (615) 254-8801 F: (615) 255-5419

gstranch@stranchlaw.com

Christopher D. Jennings (pro hac vice forthcoming)

JENNINGS, PLLC

P.O. Box 25972

Little Rock, Arkansas 72221

T: (501) 247-6267

e-mail: chris@jenningspllc.com

David K. Lietz (pro hac vice)

MILBERG COLEMAN BRYSON PHILLIPS GROSSMAN, PLLC 5335 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Ste 440 Washington, D.C. 20015-2052 T: 866-252-0878 F: 202-686-2877 dlietz@milberg.com

Christopher M. Moody MOODY & STANFORD P.C. 4169 Montgomery Blvd., NE Albuquerque, NM 87109 T: (505) 944-0033 moody@nmlaborlaw.com

Counsel for Class Representatives and the Proposed Settlement Class

## Approved as to Form this 11th day of June 2024:

Kenneth L. Chernof Stephanna F. Szotkowski ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE et al 601 Massachusetts Ave., NW Washington DC 20011 Ken.Chernof@arnoldporter.com Stephanna.Szotkowski@arnoldporter.com

Daniel E. Raymond
ARNOLD & PORTER
70 West Madison Street, Ste 4200
Chicago, IL 60602
Washington DC 20011
Daniel.Raymond@arnoldporter.com

Charles K. Purcell Noell Sauer Huffmyer RODEY, DICKASON, SLOAN et al Post Office Box 1888 Albuquerque, NM 87103-1888 kpurcell@rodey.com nhuffmyer@rodey.com

Attorneys for Defendant Presbyterian Healthcare Services