

EXHIBIT 6

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

IN RE: AGGRENEX ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master Docket No. 3:14-cv-02516 (SRU) Judge Stefan R. Underhill
---	--

**DECLARATION OF PETER KOHN IN SUPPORT OF CLASS COUNSEL’S MOTION
FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS’ FEES, REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES AND
INCENTIVE AWARDS TO CLASS REPRESENTATIVES**

I, Peter Kohn, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America, declare as follows:

1. I am a partner of the law firm Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP. I am submitting this declaration in support of Class Counsel’s motion for attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of expenses in connection with services rendered to the Direct Purchaser Class in the above-captioned litigation. A copy of my firm’s resume is attached hereto as Exhibit 1. The factual matters set forth and the assertions made herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

2. My firm has acted as counsel to the named plaintiffs and the Direct Purchaser Class in this action, and has been involved in the following activities, as assigned by Lead Counsel:

- Drafting portions of various briefs, principally (a) the successful opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss, (b) oppositions to several discovery motions filed by Defendants, and (c) Plaintiffs’ successful

response to the Court's Order to Show Cause on relevant market and market power issues;

- Drafting the successful opposition to Defendants' 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) petition for permission to appeal to the Second Circuit from this Court's decision on the Order to Show Cause regarding relevant market issues;
- Arguing several discovery motions before this Court;
- Drafting responses to discovery requests, and negotiating discovery production of class representatives;
- Reviewing and analyzing documents from Defendants and third-parties and creating written analyses of such evidence;
- Taking the deposition of the former General Counsel of Defendant Teva, who was the lead negotiator of the settlement agreement from which this case arose.

3. All attorneys, paralegals and law clerks at my firm were instructed to keep contemporaneous time records reflecting their time spent on this case.

4. The schedule below is a summary of the amount of time spent by my firm's attorneys, paralegals and law clerks from the inception of the litigation through September 19, 2017, the date that the Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement.

5. The schedule was prepared from contemporaneous, daily time records regularly prepared and maintained by my firm. Time expended in preparing this application for fees and reimbursement of expenses has not been included in this request.

Name	Status	Total Hours	Current Hourly Rate	Total Lodestar
Peter Kohn	Partner	614.6	\$900.00	\$553,140.00
Joseph T. Lukens	Partner	98.2	875.00	85,925.00
Adam Steinfeld	Partner	1,871.1	750.00	1,403,325.00
Neill Clark	Associate	22.2	650.00	14,430.00

Name	Status	Total Hours	Current Hourly Rate	Total Lodestar
Richard Schwartz	Associate	882.3	590.00	520,557.00
Sarah Westby	Associate	272.2	495.00	134,739.00
Luke Smith	Associate	33.9	495.00	16,780.50
Elizabeth A. Silva	Associate	128.8	475.00	61,180.00
David C. Calvello	Associate	421.2	450.00	189,540.00
Anthony J. Ruggeri	Associate	11.4	400.00	4,560.00
Kristyn Fields	Associate	29.0	400.00	11,600.00
Andrew Coyle	Associate	13.4	400.00	5,360.00
Daniela Mercado	Paralegal	109.9	325.00	35,717.50
Inha Kang	Paralegal	0.9	300.00	270.00
Michael LoBosco	Paralegal	8.5	310.00	2,635.00
Anthony J. Aloise	Paralegal	45.6	310.00	14,136.00
Joy Williams	Paralegal	2.3	275.00	632.50
Stephen G. Doherty	Paralegal	91.20	375.00	34,200.00
Derek Behnke	Paralegal	1.20	375.00	450.00
Totals:		4,657.90		\$ 3,089,177.50

6. My firm has also incurred a total of \$101,775.58 in unreimbursed expenses in connection with the prosecution of the litigation. These expenses were reasonably and necessarily incurred in connection with this litigation and include:

Expense	Amount
Travel/Hotel/Meal Expenses	\$1,447.98
Service of subpoenas	169.95
Filing fees or other court costs	281.00
Litigation fund contributions	95,000.00

Expense	Amount
Postage and Messenger	898.50
Telephone/Teleconference/Fax	348.00
Research	3,630.15
Total:	\$ 101,775.58

7. The expenses incurred in this action are also reflected on the books and records of my firm. These books and records are prepared from expense vouchers, receipts and other source material and accurately record the expenses incurred.

Dated: September 27, 2017



Peter Kohn



Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP focuses on complex civil litigation, including securities, antitrust, whistleblower/false claims litigation, wage and hour, and consumer class actions as well as shareholder derivative and merger and transactional litigation. The firm is headquartered in New York, and maintains offices in California, Delaware and Pennsylvania.

Since its founding in 1995, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP has served as lead or co-lead counsel in numerous high-profile cases which ultimately provided significant recoveries to investors, consumers, employees and through its false claims practice, to the U.S. Government and the States.

PRACTICE AREAS

SECURITIES FRAUD LITIGATION

Since its inception over eighteen years ago, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP has devoted a substantial portion of its practice to class action securities fraud litigation. In *In re PurchasePro.com, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. CV-S-01-0483 (JLQ) (D. Nev.), as co-lead counsel for the class, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP secured a \$24.2 million settlement in a securities fraud litigation even though the corporate defendant was in bankruptcy. As noted by Senior Judge Justin L. Quackenbush in approving the settlement, ***“I feel that counsel for plaintiffs evidenced that they were and are skilled in the field of securities litigation.”***

Other past achievements include: *In re Olsten Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 97-CV-5056 (RDH) (E.D.N.Y.) (recovered \$24.1 million dollars for class members) (Judge Hurley stated: “The quality of representation here I think has been excellent.”), *In re Tellium, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 02-CV-5878 (FLW) (D.N.J.) (recovered \$5.5 million dollars for class members); *In re Mitcham Indus., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. H-98-1244 (S.D. Tex.) (recovered \$3 million dollars for class members despite the fact that corporate defendant was on the verge of declaring bankruptcy), and *Ruskin v. TIG Holdings, Inc.*, No. 98 Civ. 1068 LLS (S.D.N.Y.) (recovered \$3 million dollars for class members).

Recently, in *Shapiro v. Matrixx Initiatives, Inc.*, No. CV-09-1479 (PHX) (ROS) (D. Ariz.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel for the class, defeated defendants’ motion to dismiss, succeeded in having the action certified as a class action, and secured final approval of a \$4.5 million dollar settlement for the class. In *In re Ebix, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. 11-cv-2400 (RWS) (N.D. Ga.), the court denied defendants’ motion to dismiss and Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as sole lead counsel, obtained final approval on June 13, 2014 of a \$6.5 million settlement for the class. In *In re L&L Energy, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 13-cv-6704 (RA) (S.D.N.Y.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel, obtained final approval on July 31, 2015 of a \$3.5 million settlement for the class.

In *In re Longwei Petroleum Inv. Holding Ltd. Sec. Litig.*, No. 13 Civ. 214 (HB) (S.D.N.Y.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as sole lead counsel, defeated defendants’ motions to dismiss, including those filed by the



company's auditors, on January 27, 2014, and is currently conducting discovery on behalf of class members.

Additionally, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP is serving as court-appointed lead counsel in the following cases:

- *In re Dynavax Techs. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, No. 13-CV-2796 (CRB) (N.D. Cal) (defeated defendants' motion to dismiss and currently in the discovery phase);
- *McIntyre v. Chelsea Therapeutics Int'l, LTD*, No. 12-CV-213 (MOC) (DCK) (W.D.N.C.) (defeated defendants' motion to dismiss and currently in the discovery phase);
- *In re Geron Corp., Sec. Litig.*, No. 14-CV-1424 (CRB) (N.D. Cal.) (defeated defendants' motion to dismiss and currently in the discovery phase);
- *Simmons v. Spencer, et al.*, No. 13 Civ. 8216 (RWS) (S.D.N.Y.) (preliminary approval of settlement pending); and
- *In re China Mobile Games & Entertainment Group, Ltd. Sec. Litig.*, No. 14-CV-4471 (KMW) (S.D.N.Y.) (sole lead counsel).

WHISTLEBLOWER/FALSE CLAIMS LITIGATION

Faruqi & Faruqi's False Claims Litigation Department represents whistleblowers nationwide in all types of fraud, including Medicare and Medicaid fraud, pharmaceutical, educational, financial, pharmacy, government contractor and defense contractors' fraud. In addition, we represent clients in matters involving bribery under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and in matters involving violations of securities, commodities and tax laws under the SEC, CFTC and IRS whistleblower awards programs. Our attorneys have represented whistleblowers in pharmaceutical, financial, health care, defense, and government contractor cases, with settlements totaling over \$5.0 billion. Among these settlements was a \$1.6 billion settlement against Abbott Laboratories related to off-label promotion and payment of kickbacks for anti-seizure drug Depakote, a \$3 billion settlement against GlaxoSmithKline related to unlawful marketing tactics and kickbacks for GSK drugs, and a \$491 million recovery against Pfizer involving illegal promotion of its kidney transplant drug Rapamune.

Our attorneys assisted the government's investigation and prosecution of alleged False Claims Act (FCA) violations at a uranium enrichment facility in the state of Kentucky by one of the largest government defense contractors; alleged violations under a Government Services Administration (GSA) contract by a leading provider of security products; and alleged violations under a GSA contract of a leading copying and postage provider. Our attorneys have been involved in numerous investigations and pending cases against large health care providers for Medicare and Medicaid fraud, including violations of Anti-Kickback Statute and Stark law. The firm currently represents a whistleblower in an unsealed case *United States of America, ex rel. Ronald J. Streck v. Allergan, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:08-cv-05135 (E.D. Pa.) against a number of top brand-name prescription drug manufacturers. The lawsuit stems from allegations that several pharmaceutical companies underreported Average Manufacturer Prices, enabling them to underpay rebates on



pharmaceuticals sold through the states' Medicaid programs. Three of the defendants, AstraZeneca, Cephalon and Biogen have already settled the claims against them for \$55.5 million.

SHAREHOLDER MERGER AND TRANSACTIONAL LITIGATION

Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP is nationally recognized for its excellence in prosecuting shareholder class actions brought nationwide against officers, directors and other parties responsible for corporate wrongdoing. Most of these cases are based upon state statutory or common law principles involving fiduciary duties owed to investors by corporate insiders as well as Exchange Act violations.

Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP has obtained significant monetary and therapeutic recoveries, including millions of dollars in increased merger consideration for public shareholders; additional disclosure of significant material information so that shareholders can intelligently gauge the fairness of the terms of proposed transactions and other types of therapeutic relief designed to increase competitive bids and protect shareholder value. As noted by Judge Timothy S. Black of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio in appointing lead counsel *Nichting v. DPL Inc.*, Case No. 3:11-cv-14 (S.D. Ohio), "[a]lthough all of the firms seeking appointment as Lead Counsel have impressive resumes, the Court is most impressed with Faruqi & Faruqi."

For example, in *In re Playboy Enterprises, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, Consol. C.A. No. 5632-VCN (Del. Ch.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP recently achieved a substantial post close settlement of \$5.25 million. In *In re Cogent, Inc. Shareholders Litigation*, Consol. C.A. No. 5780-VC (Del. Ch.) Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel, obtained a post-close cash settlement of \$1.9 million after two years of hotly contested litigation; In *Rice v. Lafarge North America, Inc., et al.*, No. 268974-V (Montgomery Cty., Md. Circuit Ct.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel represented the public shareholders of Lafarge North America ("LNA") in challenging the buyout of LNA by its French parent, Lafarge S.A., at \$75.00 per share. After discovery and intensive injunction motions practice, the price per share was increased from \$75.00 to \$85.50 per share, or a total benefit to the public shareholders of \$388 million. The Lafarge court gave Class counsel, including Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, shared credit with a special committee appointed by the company's board of directors for a significant portion of the price increase.

Similarly, in *In re: Hearst-Argyle Shareholder Litig.*, Lead Case No. 09-Civ-600926 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.) as co-lead counsel for plaintiffs, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP litigated, in coordination with Hearst-Argyle's special committee, an increase of over 12.5%, or \$8,740,648, from the initial transaction value offered for Hearst-Argyle Television Inc.'s stock by its parent company, Hearst Corporation. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, in *In re Alfa Corp. Shareholder Litig.*, Case No. 03-CV-2007-900485.00 (Montgomery Cty, Ala. Cir. Ct.) was instrumental, along with the Company's special committee, in securing an increased share price for Alfa



Corporation shareholders of \$22.00 from the originally-proposed \$17.60 per share offer, which represented over a \$160 million benefit to class members, and obtained additional proxy disclosures to ensure that Alfa shareholders were fully-informed before making their decision to vote in favor of the merger, or seek appraisal.

Moreover, in *In re Fox Entertainment Group, Inc. S'holders Litig.*, Consolidated C.A. No. 1033-N (Del. Ch. 2005), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, a member of the three (3) firm executive committee, and in coordination with Fox Entertainment Group's special committee, created an increased offer price from the original proposal to shareholders, which represented an increased benefit to Fox Entertainment Group, Inc. shareholders of \$450 million. Also, in *In re Howmet Int'l S'holder Litig.*, Consolidated C.A. No. 17575 (Del. Ch. 1999) Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, in coordination with Howmet's special committee, successfully obtained an increased benefit to class members of \$61.5 million dollars).

Recently, in *In re Orchard Enterprises, Inc. Stockholder Litigation*, C.A. No. 7840-VCL (Del. Ch.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP acted as co-lead counsel with two other firms. That action involved the approval of a merger by Orchard's Board of Directors pursuant to which Dimensional Associates LLC would cash-out the stock of Orchard's minority common stockholders at a price of \$2.05 per share and then take Orchard private. On April 11, 2014, the parties reached an agreement to settle their claims for a payment of \$10.725 million to be distributed among the Class, which considerably exceeded the \$2.62 per share difference between the \$2.05 buyout price and the \$4.67 appraisal price determined in *In re Appraisal of The Orchard Enterprises, Inc.*, C.A. No. 5713-CS, 2012 WL 2923305 (Del. Ch. July 18, 2012).

Faruqi also has noteworthy successes in achieving injunctive or declaratory relief pre and post close in cases where corporate wrongdoing deprives shareholders of material information or an opportunity to share in potential profits. In *In re Harleysville Group, Inc. S'holders Litigation*, C.A. No. 6907-VCP (Del. Ch. 2014), Faruqi as sole lead counsel obtained significant disclosures for stockholders pre-close and secured valuable relief post close in the form of an Anti-Flip Provision providing former stockholders with 25% of any profits in Qualifying Sale. In April 2012, Faruqi as sole lead obtained an unprecedented injunction in *Knee v. Brocade Communications Systems, Inc.*, No. 1-12-CV-220249, slip op. at 2 (Cal. Super. Ct. Apr. 10, 2012) (Kleinberg, J.). In *Brocade*, Faruqi, as sole lead counsel for plaintiffs, successfully obtained an injunction enjoining Brocade's 2012 shareholder vote because certain information relating to projected executive compensation was not properly disclosed in the proxy statement. (Order After Hearing [Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction; Motions to Seal]). In *Kajaria v. Cohen*, No. 1:10-CV-03141 (N.D. Ga., Atlanta Div.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, succeeded in having the district court order Bluelinx Holdings Inc., the target company in a tender offer, to issue additional material disclosures to its recommendation statement to shareholders before the expiration of the tender offer.



SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE LITIGATION

Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP has extensive experience litigating shareholder derivative actions on behalf of corporate entities. This litigation is often necessary when the corporation has been injured by the wrongdoing of its officers and directors. This wrongdoing can be either active, such as the wrongdoing by certain corporate officers in connection with purposeful backdating of stock-options, or passive, such as the failure to put in place proper internal controls, which leads to the violation of laws and accounting procedures. A shareholder has the right to commence a derivative action when the company's directors are unwilling or unable, to pursue claims against the wrongdoers, which is often the case when the directors themselves are the wrongdoers.

The purpose of the derivative action is threefold: (1) to make the company whole by holding those responsible for the wrongdoing accountable; (2) the establishment of procedures at the company to ensure the damaging acts can never again occur at the company; and (3) make the company more responsive to its shareholders. Improved corporate governance and shareholder responsiveness are particularly valuable because they make the company a stronger one going forward, which benefits its shareholders. For example, studies have shown the companies with poor corporate governance scores have 5-year returns that are 3 .95% below the industry average, while companies with good corporate governance scores have 5-year returns that are 7.91 % above the industry-adjusted average. The difference in performance between these two groups is 11 .86%. *Corporate Governance Study: The Correlation between Corporate Governance and Company Performance*, Lawrence D. Brown, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor of Accountancy, Georgia State University and Marcus L. Caylor, Ph.D. Student, Georgia State University. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP has achieved all three of the above stated goals of a derivative action. The firm regularly obtains significant corporate governance changes in connection with the successful resolution of derivative actions, in addition to monetary recoveries that inure directly to the benefit of the company. In each case, the company's shareholders indirectly benefit through an improved market price and market perception.

In *In re UnitedHealth Group Incorporated Derivative Litig.*, Case No. 27 CV 06-8065 (Minn. 4th Judicial Dist. 2009) Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel for plaintiffs, obtained a recovery of more than \$930 million for the benefit of the Company and corporate governance reforms designed to make UnitedHealth a model of corporate responsibility and transparency. **At the time, the settlement reached was believed to be the largest settlement ever in a derivative case.** See "UnitedHealth's Former Chief to Repay \$600 Million," Bloomberg.com, December 6, 2007 ("the settlement . . . would be the largest ever in a 'derivative' suit . . . according to data compiled by Bloomberg.").



As co-lead counsel in *Weissman v. John, et al.*, Cause No. 2007-31254 (Tex. Harris County 2008) Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, diligently litigated a shareholder derivative action on behalf of Key Energy Services, Inc. for more than three years and caused the company to adopt a multitude of corporate governance reforms which far exceeded listing and regulatory requirements. Such reforms included, among other things, the appointment of a new senior management team, the realignment of personnel, the institution of training sessions on internal control processes and activities, and the addition of 14 new accountants at the company with experience in public accounting, financial reporting, tax accounting, and SOX compliance.

More recently, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP concluded shareholder derivative litigation in *The Booth Family Trust, et al. v. Jeffries, et al.*, Lead Case No. 05-cv-00860 (S.D. Ohio 2005) on behalf of Abercrombie & Fitch Co. Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel for plaintiffs, litigated the case for six years through an appeal in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit where it successfully obtained reversal of the district court's ruling dismissing the shareholder derivative action in April 2011. Once remanded to the district court, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP caused the company to adopt important corporate governance reforms narrowly targeted to remedy the alleged insider trading and discriminatory employment practices that gave rise to the shareholder derivative action.

The favorable outcome obtained by Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP in *In re Forest Laboratories, Inc. Derivative Litigation*, Lead Civil Action No. 05-cv-3489 (S.D.N.Y. 2005) is another notable achievement for the firm. After more than six years of litigation, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, as co-lead counsel, caused the company to adopt industry-leading corporate governance measures that included rigorous monitoring mechanisms and Board-level oversight procedures to ensure the timely and complete publication of clinical drug trial results to the investing public and to deter, among other things, the unlawful off-label promotion of drugs.

ANTITRUST LITIGATION

The attorneys at Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP represent direct purchasers, competitors, third-party payors, and consumers in a variety of individual and class action antitrust cases brought under Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. These actions, which typically seek treble damages under Section 4 of the Clayton Act, have been commenced by businesses and consumers injured by anticompetitive agreements to fix prices or allocate markets, conduct that excludes or delays competition, and other monopolistic or conspiratorial conduct that harms competition.

Actions for excluded competitors. Faruqi & Faruqi represents competitors harmed by anticompetitive practices that reduce their sales, profits, and/or market share. One representative action is *Babyage.com, Inc., et al. v. Toys "R" Us, Inc., et al.* where Faruqi & Faruqi was retained to represent three internet retailers of baby products, who challenged a dominant retailer's anticompetitive scheme, in concert



with their upstream suppliers, to impose and enforce resale price maintenance in violation of §§ 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and state law. The action sought damages measured as lost sales and profits. This case was followed extensively by the Wall Street Journal. After several years of litigation, this action settled for an undisclosed amount.

Actions for direct purchasers. Faruqi & Faruqi represents direct purchasers who have paid overcharges as a result of anticompetitive practices that raise prices. These actions are typically initiated as class actions. A representative action on behalf of direct purchasers is *Rochester Drug Co-Operative, Inc. v. Warner Chilcott Public Limited Company, et al.*, No. 12-3824 (E.D. Pa.), in which Faruqi & Faruqi was appointed co-lead counsel for the proposed plaintiff class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(g). Faruqi & Faruqi's attorneys are counsel to direct purchasers (typically wholesalers) in multiple such class actions.

Actions for third-party payors. Faruqi & Faruqi represents, both in class actions and in individual actions, insurance companies who have reimbursed their policyholders at too high a rate due to anticompetitive prices that raise prices. One representative action is *In re Tricor Antitrust Litigation*, No. 05-360 (D. Del.), where Faruqi & Faruqi represented PacifiCare and other large third-party payors challenging the conduct of Abbott Laboratories and Laboratories Fournier in suppressing generic drug competition, in violation of §§ 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act. The *Tricor* litigation settled for undisclosed amount in 2010.

Results. Faruqi & Faruqi's attorneys have consistently obtained favorable results in their antitrust engagements. Non-confidential results include the following: *In re Iowa Ready-Mixed Concrete Antitrust Litigation*, No. C 10-4038 (N.D. Iowa) (\$18.5 million settlement); *In re Metoprolol Succinate Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, 06-52 (D. Del.) (\$20 million settlement); *In re Ready-Mixed Concrete Antitrust Litigation*, No. 05-979 (S.D. Ind.) (\$40 million settlement); *Rochester Drug Co-Operative, Inc., et al. v. Braintree Labs, Inc.*, No. 07-142-SLR (D. Del.) (\$17.25 million settlement).

A more complete list of Faruqi & Faruqi's active and resolved antitrust cases can be found on its web site at www.faruqilaw.com.

CONSUMER PROTECTION LITIGATION

Attorneys at Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP have advocated for consumers' rights, successfully challenging some of the nation's largest and most powerful corporations for a variety of improper, unfair and deceptive business practices. Through our efforts, we have recovered hundreds of millions of dollars and other significant remedial benefits for our consumer clients.



For example, in *Bates v. Kashi Co., et al.*, Case No. 11-CV-1967-H BGS, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 127624 (S.D. Cal. 2011), as co-lead counsel for the class, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP secured a \$5.0 million settlement fund on behalf of California consumers who purchased Kashi products that were deceptively labeled as “nothing artificial” and “all natural.” The settlement provides class members with a full refund of the purchase price in addition to requiring Kashi to modify its labeling and advertising to remove “All Natural” and “Nothing Artificial” from certain products. As noted by Judge Marilyn L. Huff in approving the settlement, “*Plaintiffs’ counsel has extensive experience acting as class counsel in consumer class action cases, including cases involving false advertising claims.*”

Moreover, in *Thomas v. Global Vision Products*, Case No. RG-03091195 (California Superior Ct., Alameda Cty.), Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP served as co-lead counsel in a consumer class action lawsuit against Global Vision Products, Inc., the manufacturer of the Avacor hair restoration product and its officers, directors and spokespersons, in connection with the false and misleading advertising claims regarding the Avacor product. Though the company had declared bankruptcy in 2007, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP, along with its co-counsel, successfully prosecuted two trials to obtain relief for the class of Avacor purchasers. In January 2008, a jury in the first trial returned a verdict of almost \$37 million against two of the creators of the product. In November 2009, another jury awarded plaintiff and the class more than \$50 million in a separate trial against two other company directors and officers. This jury award represented the largest consumer class action jury award in California in 2009 (according to VerdictSearch, a legal trade publication).

Below is a non-exhaustive list of settlements where Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP and its partners have served as lead or co-lead counsel:

- *In re: Haier Freezer Consumer Litig.*, Case No. 5:11-CV-02911-EJD (N.D. Cal. 2011). The firm represented a nationwide class of consumers who purchased certain model freezers, which were sold in violation of the federal standard for maximum energy consumption. A settlement was obtained, providing class members with cash payments of between \$50 and \$325.80.
- *Rossi v Procter & Gamble Company*, Case No. 11-7238 (D.N.J. 2011). The firm represented a nationwide class of consumers who purchased deceptively marketed “Crest Sensitivity” toothpaste. A settlement was obtained, providing class members with a full refund of the purchase price.
- *In re: Michaels Stores Pin Pad Litig.*, Case No. 1:11-CV-03350 CPK (N.D. Ill. 2011). The firm represented a nationwide class of persons against Michaels Stores, Inc. for failing to secure and safeguard customers’ personal financial data. A settlement was obtained, which provided class members with monetary recovery for unreimbursed out-of-pocket losses incurred in connection with the data breach, as well as up to four years of credit monitoring services.
- *Kelly, v. Phiten*, Case No. 4:11-cv-00067 JEG (S.D. Iowa 2011). The firm represented a proposed nationwide class of consumers who purchased Defendant Phiten USA’s jewelry and other products, which were falsely promoted to balance a user’s energy flow. A settlement was obtained, providing class members with up to 300% of the cost of the product and substantial injunctive relief requiring Phiten to modify its advertising claims.
- *In re: HP Power-Plug Litigation*, Case No. 06-1221 (N.D. Cal. 2006). The firm represented a proposed nationwide class of consumers who purchased defective laptops manufactured by defendant. A

settlement was obtained, which provided full relief to class members, including among other benefits a cash payments up to \$650.00 per class member, or in the alternative, a repair free-of-charge and new limited warranties accompanying repaired laptops.

- *Delre v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, C.A. No. 3232-02 (N.J. Super. Ct. 2002). The firm represented a proposed nationwide class of consumers (approximately 170,000 members) who purchased, HP dvd-100i dvd-writers (“HP 100i”) based on misrepresentations regarding the write-once (“DVD+R”) capabilities of the HP 100i and the compatibility of DVD+RW disks written by HP 100i with DVD players and other optical storage devices. A settlement was obtained, which provided full relief to class members, including among other benefits, the replacement of defective HP 100i with its more current, second generation DVD writer, the HP 200i, and/or refunds the \$99 it had charged some consumers to upgrade from the HP 100i to the HP 200i prior to the settlement.
- *In re: Alexia Foods, Inc. Litigation*, Case No. 4:11-cv-06119 (N.D. Cal. 2011). The firm represented a proposed class of all persons who purchased certain frozen potato products that were deceptively advertised as “natural” or “all natural.” A settlement was obtained, providing class members with a cash refunds up to \$35.00 and requiring defendant to cease using a synthetic chemical compound in future production of the products.
- *Loreto v. Coast Cutlery Co.*, Case No. 11-3977 SDW-MCA (D.N.J. 2011). The firm represented a proposed nationwide class of people who purchased stainless steel knives and multi-tools that were of a lesser quality than advertised. A settlement was obtained, providing class members with a full refund of the purchase price.

In addition, Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP and its partners are currently serving as lead or co-lead counsel in the following class action cases:

- *Dei Rossi et al. v. Whirlpool Corp.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-00125-TLN-JFM (E.D. Cal. 2012) (representing a proposed class of people who purchased mislabeled KitchenAid brand refrigerators from Whirlpool Corp.)
- *In re: Scotts EZ Seed Litigation*, Case No. 7:12-cv-04727-VB (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (representing a proposed class of purchasers of mulch grass seed products advertised as a superior grass seed product capable of growing grass in the toughest conditions and with half the water.)
- *In re Sinus Buster Products Consumer Litig.*, Case No. 1:12-cv-02429-ADS-AKT (E.D.N.Y. 2012) (representing a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of assorted cold, flu and sinus products.)
- *Forcellati et al., v Hyland’s, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-01983-GHK-MRW (C.D. Cal. 2012) (representing a certified nationwide class of purchasers of children’s cold and flu products.)
- *Avram v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 2:11-cv-06973 KM-MCA (D.N.J. 2011) (representing a proposed nationwide class of persons who purchased mislabeled refrigerators from Samsung Electronics America, Inc. for misrepresenting the energy efficiency of certain refrigerators.)
- *Dzielak v. Whirlpool Corp., et al.*, Case No. 12-CIV-0089 SRC-MAS (D.N.J. 2011) (representing a proposed nationwide class of purchasers of mislabeled Maytag brand washing machines for misrepresenting the energy efficiency of such washing machines.)
- *Rodriguez v. CitiMortgage, Inc.*, Case No. 1:11-cv-04718-PGG-DCF (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (representing a proposed nationwide class of military personnel against CitiMortgage for illegal foreclosures.)
- *In re: Shop-Vac Marketing and Sales Practices Litigation*, Case No. 4:12-md-02380-YK (M.D. Pa. 2012) (representing a proposed nationwide class of persons who purchased vacuums or shop vac’s with overstated horsepower and tank capacity specifications.)
- *In re: Oreck Corporation Halo Vacuum And Air Purifiers Marketing And Sales Practices Litigation*, MDL No. 2317 (the firm was appointed to the executive committee, representing a proposed nationwide class of consumers who purchased vacuums and air purifiers that were deceptively advertised effective in eliminating common viruses, germs and allergens.)



EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES LITIGATION

Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP is a recognized leader in protecting the rights of employees. The firm's Employment Practices Group is committed to protecting the rights of current and former employees nationwide. The firm is dedicated to representing employees who may not have been compensated properly by their employer or who have suffered investment losses in their employer-sponsored retirement plan. The firm also represents individuals (often current or former employees) who assert that a company has allegedly defrauded the federal or state government.

Faruqi & Faruqi represents current and former employees nationwide whose employers have failed to comply with state and/or federal laws governing minimum wage, hours worked, overtime, meal and rest breaks, and unreimbursed business expenses. In particular, the firm focuses on claims against companies for (i) failing to properly classify their employees for purposes of paying them proper overtime pay, or (ii) requiring employees to work "off-the-clock," and not paying them for all of their actual hours worked.

In prosecuting claims on behalf of aggrieved employees, Faruqi & Faruqi has successfully defeated summary judgment motions, won numerous collective certification motions, and obtained significant monetary recoveries for current and former employees. In the course of litigating these claims, the firm has been a pioneer in developing the growing area of wage and hour law. In *Creely, et al. v. HCR ManorCare, Inc.*, C.A. No. 3:09-cv-02879 (N.D. OH), Faruqi & Faruqi, along with its co-counsel, obtained one of the first decisions to reject the application of the Supreme Court's Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 certification analysis in *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes et. al.*, 131 S. Ct. 2541 (2011) to the certification process of collective actions brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 ("FLSA"). The firm, along with its co-counsel, also recently won a groundbreaking decision for employees seeking to prosecute wage and hour claims on a collective basis in *Symczyk v. Genesis Healthcare Corp. et al.*, No. 10-3178 (3d Cir. 2011). In *Symczyk*, the Third Circuit reversed the district court's ruling that an offer of judgment mooted a named plaintiff's claim in an action asserting wage and hour violations of the FLSA. Notably, the Third Circuit also affirmed the two-step process used for granting certification in FLSA cases. The *Creely* decision, like the Third Circuit's *Genesis* decision, will invariably be relied upon by courts and plaintiffs in future wage and hour actions.

Some of the firm's notable recoveries include *Bazzini v. Club Fit Management, Inc.*, C.A. No. 08-cv-4530 (S.D.N.Y. 2008), wherein the firm settled a FLSA collective action lawsuit on behalf of tennis professionals, fitness instructors and other health club employees on very favorable terms. Similarly, in *Garcia, et al., v. Lowe's Home Center, Inc., et al.*, C.A. No. GIC 841120 (Cal. Sup. Ct. 2008), Faruqi & Faruqi served as co-lead counsel and recovered \$1.6 million on behalf of delivery workers who were unlawfully treated as independent contractors and not paid appropriate overtime wages or benefits.



The firm's Employment Practices Group also represents participants and beneficiaries of employee benefit plans covered by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"). In particular the firm protects the interests of employees in retirement savings plans against the wrongful conduct of plan fiduciaries. Often, these retirement savings plans constitute a significant portion of an employee's retirement savings. ERISA, which codifies one of the highest duties known to law, requires an employer to act in the best interests of the plan's participants, including the selection and maintenance of retirement investment vehicles. For example, an employer who administers a retirement savings plan (often a 401(k) plan) has a fiduciary obligation to ensure that the retirement plan's assets (including employee and any company matching contributions to the plan) are directed into appropriate and prudent investment vehicles.

Faruqi & Faruqi has brought actions on behalf of aggrieved plan participants where a company and/or certain of its officers breached their fiduciary duty by allowing its retirement plans to invest in shares of its own stock despite having access to materially negative information concerning the company which materially impacted the value of the stock. The resulting losses can be devastating to employees' retirement accounts. Under certain circumstances, current and former employees can seek to hold their employers accountable for plan losses caused by the employer's breach of their ERISA-mandated duties.

The firm's Employment Practices Group also represents whistleblowers in actions under both federal and state False Claims Acts. Often, current and former employees of business entities that contract with, or are otherwise bound by obligations to, the federal and state governments become aware of wrongdoing that causes the government to overpay for a good or service. When a corporation perpetrates such fraud, a whistleblower may sue the wrongdoer in the government's name to recover up to three times actual damages and additional civil penalties for each false statement made. Whistleblowers who initiate such suits are entitled to a portion of the recovery attained by the government, generally ranging from 15% to 30% of the total recovery.

False Claims Act cases often arise in context of Medicare and Medicaid fraud, pharmaceutical fraud, defense contractor fraud, federal government contractor fraud, and fraudulent loans and grants. For instance, in *United States of America, ex rel. Ronald J. Streck v. Allergan, Inc. et al.*, No. 2:08-cv-05135-ER (E.D. Pa.), Faruqi & Faruqi represents a whistleblower in an un-sealed case alleging fraud against thirteen pharmaceutical companies who underpaid rebates they were obliged to pay to state Medicaid programs on drugs sold through those programs.

Based on its experience and expertise, the firm has served as the principal attorneys representing current and former employees in numerous cases across the country alleging wage and hour violations, ERISA violations and violations of federal and state False Claims Acts.



ATTORNEYS INVOLVED IN THE AGGRENOX CASE

PETER KOHN

Mr. Kohn is a partner in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's Pennsylvania office.

Prior to joining the firm, Mr. Kohn was a shareholder at Berger & Montague, P.C., where he prepared for trial several noteworthy lawsuits under the Sherman Act, including *In re Buspirone Patent & Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1410 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$220M settlement), *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litigation*, No. 99-MD-1278 (E.D. Mich.) (\$110M settlement), *Meijer, Inc. v. Warner-Chilcott*, No. 05-2195 (D.D.C.) (\$22M settlement), *In re Relafen Antitrust Litigation*, No. 01-12239 (D. Mass.) (\$175M settlement), *In re Remeron Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, No. 03-cv-0085 (D.N.J.) (\$75M settlement), *In re Terazosin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litigation*, No. 99-MDL-1317 (S.D. Fla.) (\$72.5M settlement), and *In re Tricor Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litig.*, No. 05-340 (D. Del.) (\$250M settlement). The court appointed him as co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs in *In re Pennsylvania Title Ins. Antitrust Litig.*, No. 08cv1202 (E.D. Pa.) (pending action on behalf of direct purchasers of title insurance alleging illegal cartel pricing under § 1 of the Sherman Act).

A sampling of Mr. Kohn's reported cases in the antitrust arena includes *Delaware Valley Surgical Supply Inc. v. Johnson & Johnson*, 523 F.3d 1116 (9th Cir. 2008) (issue of direct purchaser standing under *Illinois Brick*); *Babyage.com, Inc. v. Toys "R" Us, Inc.*, 558 F. Supp.2d 575 (E.D. Pa. 2008) (denying defendants' motion to dismiss following the Supreme Court's decisions in *Twombly* and *Leegin*, and for the first time in the Third Circuit adopting the Merger Guidelines method of relevant market definition); *J.B.D.L. Corp. v. Wyeth-Ayerst Laboratories, Inc.*, 485 F.3d 880 (6th Cir. 2007) (affirming summary judgment in exclusionary contracting case); and *Babyage.com, Inc. v. Toys "R" Us, Inc.*, 458 F. Supp.2d 263 (E.D. Pa. 2006) (discoverability of surreptitiously recorded statements prior to deposition of declarant).

Mr. Kohn is a 1989 graduate of the University of Pennsylvania (B.A., English) and a 1992 *cum laude* graduate of Temple University Law School, where he was senior staff for the *Temple Law Review* and received awards for trial advocacy. Mr. Kohn was recognized as a "recommended" antitrust attorney in the Northeast in 2009 by the Legal 500 guide (www.legal500.com) and was chosen by his peers as a "SuperLawyer" in Pennsylvania in 2009, 2010, and 2011. In 2011, Mr. Kohn was selected as a Fellow in the Litigation Counsel of America, a trial lawyer honorary society composed of less than one-half of one percent of American lawyers. He is a member of the bars of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (1992-present), the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (1995-present), the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan (2010-present), the United States Court of Appeals



for the Third Circuit (2000-present), the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (2005-present), and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (2011-present).

JOSEPH T. LUKENS

Mr. Lukens is a partner in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's Pennsylvania office.

Mr. Lukens was a shareholder at the Philadelphia firm of Hanglely Aronchick Segal Pudlin & Schiller, where he represented large retail pharmacy chains as opt-out plaintiffs in numerous lawsuits under the Sherman Act. Among those lawsuits were *In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation* (MDL 897, N.D. Ill.), *In re Terazosin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litigation* (MDL 1317, S.D. Fla.), *In re TriCor Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation* (05-605, D. Del.), *In re Nifedipine Antitrust Litigation* (MDL1515, D.D.C.), *In re OxyContin Antitrust Litigation* (04-3719, S.D.N.Y), and *In re Chocolate Confectionary Antitrust Litigation* (MDL 1935, M.D. Pa.). While the results in the opt-out cases are confidential, the parallel class actions in those matters which are concluded have resulted in settlements exceeding \$1.1 billion.

Earlier in his career, Mr. Lukens concentrated in commercial and civil rights litigation at the Philadelphia firm of Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis. The types of matters that Mr. Lukens handled included antitrust, First Amendment, contracts, and licensing. Mr. Lukens also worked extensively on several notable *pro bono* cases including *Commonwealth v. Morales*, which resulted in a rare reversal on a second post-conviction petition in a capital case in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

Mr. Lukens graduated from LaSalle University (B.A. Political Science, *cum laude*, 1987) and received his law degree from Temple University School of Law (J.D., *magna cum laude*, 1992) where he was an editor on the *Temple Law Review* and received several academic awards. After law school, Mr. Lukens clerked for the Honorable Joseph J. Longobardi, Chief Judge for the United States District Court for the District of Delaware (1992-93). Mr. Lukens is a member of the bars of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania (1992-present), the United States Supreme Court (1996-present); the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (1993-present), the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (1993-present), and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of New Jersey (1994-present).

Mr. Lukens has several publications, including: *Bringing Market Discipline to Pharmaceutical Product Reformulations*, 42 Int'l Rev. Intel. Prop. & Comp. Law 698 (September 2011) (co-author with Steve Shadowen and Keith Leffler); *Anticompetitive Product Changes in the Pharmaceutical Industry*, 41 Rutgers L.J. 1 (2009) (co-author with Steve Shadowen and Keith Leffler); *The Prison Litigation Reform Act: Three Strikes and You're Out of Court — It May Be Effective, But Is It Constitutional?*, 70 Temp. L. Rev. 471 (1997); *Pennsylvania Strips The Inventory Search Exception From Its Rationale – Commonwealth v. Nace*, 64 Temp. L. Rev. 267 (1991).



ADAM STEINFELD

Adam Steinfeld is a partner in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's New York office. He practices in the area of antitrust litigation with a focus on competition in the pharmaceutical industry.

Mr. Steinfeld has litigated successfully with significant contributions in *In re Buspirone Patent & Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1410 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$220M settlement); *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litigation*, No. 99-MD-1278 (E.D. Mich.) (\$110M settlement); *In re Relafen Antitrust Litigation*, No. 01-12239 (D. Mass.) (\$175M settlement); *In re Remeron Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation*, No. 03-cv-0085 (D.N.J.) (\$75M settlement); *In re Terazosin Hydrochloride Antitrust Litigation*, No. 99-MDL-1317 (S.D. Fla.) (\$72.5M settlement); *In re Tricor Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litig.*, No. 05-340 (D. Del.) (\$250M settlement); and *Mylan Pharms., Inc. v. Warner Chilcott*, No. 12-cv-3824 (E.D. Pa.) (\$12 million settlement).

Prior to joining Faruqi & Faruqi, Mr. Steinfeld was associated with Grant and Eisenhofer, P.A. (2011-2015) and a partner at Garwin, Gerstein and Fisher, LLP, New York (1997-2009).

Mr. Steinfeld is the author of *Nuclear Objections: The Persistent Objector and the Legality of the Use of Nuclear Weapons*, 62 Brooklyn L. Rev. 1635 (winter, 1996).

Mr. Steinfeld received his law degree from Brooklyn Law School (J.D., 1997) where he was an editor on the Brooklyn Law Review and received several academic awards. Mr. Steinfeld is a member of the bars of the States of New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts; and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the District New Jersey, Eastern District of New York, Southern District of New York, and Western District of New York. Mr. Steinfeld graduated from Brandeis University (B.A., Politics, 1994).

NEILL CLARK

Mr. Clark is an associate in Faruqi and Faruqi, LLP's Pennsylvania office.

Before joining the firm, Mr. Clark was an associate at Berger & Montague, P.C. where he was significantly involved in prosecuting antitrust class actions on behalf of direct purchasers of brand name drugs and charging pharmaceutical manufacturers with illegally blocking the market entry of less expensive competitors.

Eight of those cases have resulted in substantial settlements totaling over \$950 million: *In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.* settled in November 2002 for \$110 million; *In re Buspirone Antitrust Litig.* settled in April 2003 for \$220 million; *In re Relafen Antitrust Litig.* settled in February 2004 for \$175 million; *In re Platinol Antitrust Litig.* settled in November 2004 for \$50 million; *In re Terazosin Antitrust Litig.* settled in April 2005 for \$75 million; *In re Remeron Antitrust Litig.* settled in November 2005 for \$75 million; *In re*



Ovcon Antitrust Litig. settled in 2009 for \$22 million; and *In re Tricor Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litig.* settled in April 2009 for \$250 million.

Mr. Clark was also principally involved in a case alleging a conspiracy among hospitals and the Arizona Hospital and Healthcare Association to depress the compensation of per diem and traveling nurses, *Johnson et al. v. Arizona Hospital and Healthcare Association et al.*, No. CV07-1292 (D. Ariz.).

Mr. Clark was selected as a "Rising Star" by Pennsylvania Super Lawyers and listed as one of the Top Young Lawyers in Pennsylvania in the December 2005 edition of Philadelphia Magazine. Two cases in which he has been significantly involved have been featured as "Noteworthy Cases" in the NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL articles, "The Plaintiffs' Hot List" (*In re Tricor Antitrust Litig.* October 5, 2009 and *Johnson v. Arizona Hosp. and Healthcare Ass'n.*, October 3, 2011).

Mr. Clark graduated cum laude from Appalachian State University in 1994 and from Temple University Beasley School of Law in 1998, where he earned seven "distinguished class performance" awards, an oral advocacy award and a "best paper" award.

DAVID CALVELLO

David Calvello is an Associate in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's New York office where his focus is litigating Antitrust matters.

Mr. Calvello graduated from the University of Richmond (B.S., 2011) with a double major in Finance and Political Science and Pace Law School (J.D., *magna cum laude*, 2014). He is licensed to practice law in New York and New Jersey and is admitted to practice before the United States District Court for New Jersey.

Prior to joining Faruqi & Faruqi, Mr. Calvello was as an Associate at Kaufman Borgeest & Ryan, LLP where he focused primarily on insurance coverage matters with respect to Directors & Officers (D&O), Errors & Omissions (E&O), and Professional Liability lines of coverage. In law school, Mr. Calvello served as an editor on the Pace International Law Review and received the New Rochelle Bar Association Award upon graduation. He was also very active in moot court competitions, and competed in the Willem C. Vis International Commercial Arbitration Moot held in Vienna, Austria.

ANTHONY RUGGERI

Anthony Ruggeri was an Associate in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's New York office where his focus was on litigating Antitrust matters.

Prior to joining F&F, Anthony gained litigation experience during law school as a law clerk for a New York firm where he assisted on construction and real estate disputes. He also gained experience through internships with the Chambers of the Honorable Judge Vincent Briccetti of the Southern District of



New York, and the Honorable Judge Jeffery Cohen of the New York Appellate Division, Second Department. Anthony served as a senior articles editor for the Pace Law Review.

Anthony graduated, *magna cum laude*, from Pace Law School, 2015. Anthony received his B.A. in Political Science, *magna cum laude*, from Marist College, 2012. His New York State Bar Admission is pending.

RICHARD SCHWARTZ

Richard Schwartz was an associate in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's Pennsylvania office.

Mr. Schwartz graduated from the University of Washington (B.A.) and the University of Chicago in 2004 (J.D.). While in law school, Mr. Schwartz served as a law clerk at the MacArthur Justice Center in Chicago and as a summer associate with the Chicago law firm Robinson Curley & Clayton P.C. Since law school, Mr. Schwartz has been a commercial litigator in New York and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Schwartz is a member of the bars of the State of New York (2005-present), Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (2010-present), the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (2006-present), the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (2007-present), the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York (2008-present), the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (2010-present) and the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania (2011-present).

ELIZABETH A. SILVA

Elizabeth A. Silva was an associate in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's New York office.

Prior to joining the firm, Ms. Silva was a litigation associate at Crosby & Higgins LLP where she represented institutional and individual investors in securities arbitrations before FINRA and counseled corporate clients in a variety of intellectual property and complex commercial disputes in federal court. Additionally, Ms. Silva gained further litigation experience in law school through internships at the Kings County District Attorney's Office and as a law clerk at a criminal defense firm.

Ms. Silva graduated in *cursu honorum* from Fordham University (B.A. in Comparative Literature and Italian Studies, *cum laude*, 2009) and New York Law School (J.D., *magna cum laude*, 2012). While at New York Law School, Ms. Silva served as a Notes and Comments Editor of the New York Law School Law Review and was an associate in the Institute for Information Law and Policy. Ms. Silva is licensed to practice law in the State of New York and is admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.



SARAH A. WESTBY

Sarah A. Westby was an associate in Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP's New York office.

Ms. Westby graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Delaware (B.A. in Psychology, *magna cum laude*, 2008) and Brooklyn Law School (J.D., *cum laude*, 2011).

While at Brooklyn Law School, Ms. Westby was an Executive Editor of the Brooklyn Journal of International Law. Her note on comparative consumer class action law was selected as the winning submission in the 2010 Trandafir International Business Writing Competition and was published in the University of Iowa Journal of Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems. She also received awards in Trial Advocacy and International Economic Law. Ms. Westby gained experience during law school through internships for U.S. Magistrate Judge Ramon E. Reyes, Jr. in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, the New York City Law Department and as a law clerk for an antitrust and consumer class action firm.

Ms. Westby is licensed to practice law in New York and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Eastern and Southern District of New York.

A. LUKE SMITH

A. Luke Smith became associated part-time with Faruqi & Faruqi, LLP in May 2010 while studying for the bar exam and was a full-time associate beginning in August of 2010. Mr. Smith focused on complex antitrust class actions, primarily on behalf of drug purchasers who have been overcharged by branded pharmaceutical companies that unlawfully extend patent exclusivity to delay generic competition.

Mr. Smith worked as a law clerk at Berger & Montague, PC, where he assisted with matters encompassing a range complex litigation including antitrust class actions, mass tort, securities fraud and national data breach cases. Mr. Smith was also a student attorney at the Penn State Dickinson School of Law Family Law Clinic, as well as an intern for Judge Joseph A. Greenaway of the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, the New Jersey Office of the Public Defender, and the Pennsylvania Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection.

In August 2008, Mr. Smith transferred from the University of Pittsburgh School of Law to the Pennsylvania State University Dickinson School of Law where he earned his law degree in May 2010. As a law student, Mr. Smith was certified as a Miller Center Public Interest Advocate in recognition of his service to the indigent community and also competed in the American Constitution Society Constance Baker Motley National Moot Court Competition. He earned a degree in Business Management from Cheyney University of Pennsylvania in May 2007 (*summa cum laude*). Mr. Smith is licensed to practice



law in Pennsylvania and New Jersey and is admitted to practice before the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and District of New Jersey.

ANDREW COYLE

Andrew Coyle's practice is focused on anti-trust litigation. Andrew was an associate in the firm's New York office.

Prior to joining F&F, Andrew served the Hon. Deborah A. Kaplan, Justice New York Supreme Court, as Assistant Law Clerk. Upon law school graduation, Andrew was Law Clerk for the Hon. Gabriel W. Gorenstein, Magistrate Judge, Southern District of New York (2012-2013).

Andrew received his J.D., magna cum laude, from Brooklyn Law School (2012). While at Brooklyn Law School, Andrew was associate managing editor on the Brooklyn Law Review. His Note, Finding a Better Analogy for the Right of Publicity, 77 Brook L. Rev. 1133 (2012) was published in the Brooklyn Law Review. Andrew received his Bachelor of Science from Cornell University (2008).

Andrew is licensed to practice law in New York and New Jersey.