

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
5 **WESTERN DIVISION**

6 HALIE BLOOM, *et al.*, and all others
7 similarly situated.

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 ACT, INC., a corporation, and DOES 1-
11 100.

12 Defendant.

13 JAQUEL PITTS, an individual, and all
14 others similarly situated,

15 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

16 v.

17 ACT, INC., a corporation, and DOES 1-
18 100.,

19 Defendant.

Case No.: CV 18-6749-GW-KSx
District Judge George H. Wu;
Magistrate Judge Karen L. Stevenson

FINAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Date: April 1, 2021
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm.: 9D

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

21 Plaintiffs' Motion for (1) Final Approval of Class Action Settlement Under
22 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), (2) for Approval of Award of Attorney's Fees and Costs, and
23 (3) for Approval of Class Representative Service Awards came on for hearing
24 before this Court on April 1, 2021, at 8:30 a.m.. The Court held a fairness hearing
25 under Rule 23(e)(2) on April 1, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. After full consideration of the
26 matter, this Court finds as follows:

27 1. Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms shall have the
28 same meaning ascribed to them in the Settlement Agreement.

1 of Civil Procedure 23(e)(2).

2 6. For purposes of this order, settlement, and judgment, ACT does not
3 admit or concede any liability or wrongdoing whatsoever to any other Party or class
4 member and expressly denies any such liability or wrongdoing.

5 7. The Court therefore GRANTS final approval of the Settlement.

6 **FINDINGS ON SETTLEMENT CLASS CERTIFICATION**

7 8. The Court certifies the following California Settlement Classes for
8 purposes of judgment on the proposed Settlement under the Rule 23(b)(3):

9 *California Disclosure Subclass*: All individuals who meet all of the following
10 criteria in connection with any single administration of the ACT Test according to
11 ACT’s records:

12 (a) took an ACT Test on or after September 1, 2002, and on or
13 before August 2, 2020;

14 (b) resided in California at the time they took the ACT Test or took
15 the ACT Test in California; and

16 (c) satisfies at least one of the following criteria: (i) such individual
17 provided an Eligible SPS Question 8 Response or (ii) such individual was
18 administered the exam through Special Testing.

19 *California EOS Subclass*: All individuals who meet the following criteria in
20 connection with any single administration of the ACT Test according to ACT’s
21 records:

22 (a) took an ACT Test through Special Testing on or after September
23 1, 2007, and before August 2, 2020;

24 (b) resided in California at the time they took the ACT Test or took
25 the ACT Test in California; and

26 (c) left the response to the EOS Opt-In Query blank on the Special
27 Testing answer folder for at least one exam.
28

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

1 9. The Court certifies the following Settlement Class for purposes of
2 judgment on the proposed Settlement under the Rule 23(b)(2):

3 *Injunctive Relief Class:* All individuals in the United States who meet either
4 of the following criteria:

- 5 (a) Took the ACT Test through Special Testing at any time, or
- 6 (b) Provided an Eligible SPS Question 8 response at any time.

7
8 10. The Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the requirements of
9 Rule 23(a) are satisfied.

10 11. Rule 23(a)(1) is satisfied because the California Disclosure Subclass
11 consists of 56,049 unique individuals, the California EOS Subclass consists of at
12 least 9,699 unique individuals, and the Injunctive Relief Class consists of at least
13 56,049 unique individuals.

14 12. Rule 23(a)(2) is satisfied because there are common issues of fact and
15 law, including the following:

- 16 a. Does or did ACT have a policy of annotating college score
17 reports with information indicating that the examinee has a disability or a need for
18 testing accommodations?
- 19 b. Would the aforementioned policy be or have been unlawful
20 under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Unruh Act, California’s Unfair
21 Competition Law, or California’s constitutional right to privacy?
- 22 c. Does or did ACT have a policy of requiring Special Testing
23 examinees to complete an additional burden to enroll in the EOS program? Does
24 ACT operate a place of public accommodation?
- 25 d. Would the aforementioned policy be or have been unlawful
26 under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Unruh Act, California’s Unfair
27 Competition Law, or California’s constitutional right to privacy?
- 28 e. Would statutory tolling under the discovery rule or fraudulent

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

1 concealment toll the statute of limitations for class members as to each of the
2 alleged policies challenged?

3 13. The Court further finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Class
4 Representatives’ claims are typical of those of Settlement Class Members and that
5 the Class Representatives will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the
6 Settlement Class; therefore Rule 23 (a)(3) and (4) are satisfied.

7 14. Additionally, the Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the
8 requirements of Rule 23(b)(2) are satisfied as to the Injunctive Relief Class, as ACT
9 is alleged to have acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally to the class,
10 so that final injunctive relief is appropriate respecting the class as a whole;

11 15. Additionally, the Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the
12 requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are satisfied as to the California Settlement Classes,
13 as the questions of law or fact common to the Settlement Class predominate over
14 individual questions, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the
15 fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

16 16. The Court confirms its appointment of:

17 a. All Plaintiffs as Class Representatives of the Injunctive Relief
18 Class.

19 b. Halie Bloom, Devon Linkon, Jaquel Pitts, M.B., Jane Doe, A.C.,
20 and John Doe as Class Representatives for the California Disclosure Subclass.

21 c. Halie Bloom, Devon Linkon, M.B., Jane Doe, A.C., and John
22 Doe as Class Representatives for the California EOS Subclass.

23 **NOTICE AND ADMINISTRATION**

24 17. The Court finds that the Parties have satisfactorily implemented the
25 procedures for individual notice to the California Settlement Classes pursuant to the
26 Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order.

27 18. The Court finds that the Notice satisfied the requirements of due
28 process and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and provided the best notice

PANISH SHEA & BOYLE LLP
11111 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90025
310.477.1700 phone • 310.477.1699 fax

1 practicable under the circumstances. The Court confirms that the Notice and plan for
2 its dissemination were reasonably calculated to apprise members of the California
3 Settlement Classes of the nature of this litigation, the scope of the California
4 Settlement Classes, a summary of the class claims, that a Class Member may enter
5 an appearance through an attorney, that the Court would grant timely exclusion
6 requests, the time and manner for requesting exclusion, and the binding effect of
7 final approval.

8 19. The Court find no objections have been submitted by Class Members.

9 20. The Court finds that two Class Members submitted requests for
10 exclusion from the California Subclasses. Those persons, whose identities have
11 been provided to Class Counsel and defense counsel, are excluded from the
12 California Subclasses and are not bound by the Settlement (other than to the extent a
13 member of the Injunctive Relief Class).

14 **CONSENT DECREE**

15 21. The Consent Decree attached hereto as Exhibit A is part of this Final
16 Order and Judgment, binding on the parties to which it applies, and is effective as of
17 the Effective Date of the Settlement.

18 **ATTORNEY'S FEES AND EXPENSES**

19 22. Class Counsel are hereby awarded attorneys' fees in the amount of
20 \$3,921,365.77, representing approximately 24.5% of the Settlement Amount, and
21 \$78,634.23 in litigation expenses. Attorney's Fees and Expenses will be paid from
22 the Settlement Amount in accordance with the manner of payment set forth in the
23 Settlement Agreement.

24 23. The Court finds the award of attorney's fees and expenses to be fair and
25 reasonable. In making this finding, the Court has considered and found that:

26 a. Upon the Effective Date, the Settlement will create a common
27 fund consisting of \$16 million in cash that will be funded into an Escrow Account
28 under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and the Class Members will benefit

