



ONE HAVERFORD CENTRE
361 WEST LANCASTER AVENUE
HAVERFORD, PA 19041
PHONE: 610-642-8500
FAX: 610-649-3633

BENJAMIN F. JOHNS
BFJ@CHIMICLES.COM

May 21, 2020

VIA ECF

Honorable Robert B. Kugler
United States District Judge
for the District of New Jersey
Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse
4th & Cooper Streets
Camden, NJ 08101

Re: *Udeen, et al. v. Subaru of America, Inc.*,
Civil Action No. 1:18-cv-17334-RBK-JS (D.N.J.)

Dear Judge Kugler:

We hope this letter finds everyone safe during these extraordinary times. Along with my co-counsel, I represent the Plaintiffs in this case. I am writing in response to this Court's letter dated April 15, 2020 concerning our pending motion for final approval of the class action settlement (the "Settlement"). (Doc. No. 60).

First, this Court asked for additional information on the valuation of the various components of the Settlement for purposes of performing a percentage of recovery cross-check. The largest component of the Settlement is the Starlink-specific warranty extension, the value of which the parties previously estimated to be \$2.45 million. This number and the \$5 per vehicle figure were derived as follows:

- i. Subaru's warranty data was first used to identify the manifestation rates for each of the twelve Starlink issues alleged in Plaintiffs' Complaint.¹

¹ These issues were: Back Up Camera Freezes/Shuts Down, Head Unit Inoperable (Black/Blank/Freezes), System Lock Up, Error Message Displayed, Volume Won't Turn Down In Reverse - High, Volume After Reboot, Apple Carplay/Android Auto Functionality Issues, Black/Blank Display (But System Still Works), Head Unit Won't Shut Off, Loss Of Smart Phone Favorites, Random Head Unit Reboot, Unresponsive Touch Screen, and Bluetooth Connectivity Issues.

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 2

- ii. Each of these manifestation rates were multiplied by the number of (a) eligible class vehicles (then, 501,212) and (b) the expected cost of repairing each of these issues (\$44).² Adding these results for each of the twelve Starlink-issues resulted in a total expected repair cost of \$2,196,401.20.
- iii. The expected repair cost on a per vehicle basis was calculated by dividing the total estimated repair cost (\$2,196,401.20) by the number of then-eligible class vehicles (501,212), which equals \$4.38 per vehicle.
- iv. The \$4.38 per vehicle figure set forth above does not, however, reflect the actual “out-of-pocket” value of the Starlink-specific Extended Warranty to a customer. To obtain that value, this figure was increased to account for the difference between the average repair cost to Subaru and the average price paid by a vehicle owner. Applying that multiplier results in an implied value of the warranty extension of \$4.92 per vehicle. We and Subaru agreed to increase the amount that Settlement Class members who previously paid for an extended warranty could claim under this component to \$5.
- v. The total estimated value of the extended warranty was calculated by multiplying the implied value of the warranty extension per vehicle (\$4.92) by the Settlement Class vehicle population of 501,212, which amounts to a total of **\$2,467,866.52**.

These calculations are set forth in a chart, which was produced to us pursuant to the Discovery Confidentially Order by Subaru in August 2019 as part of the confirmatory discovery process. Certain information contained in that chart is protectable commercial information, but the parties will provide that chart to Court for *in camera* review if desired. Notably, since that time the number of Settlement Class vehicles eligible for the extended warranty increased as new cars were sold and leased. Ultimately, Subaru and the claims administrator identified records of 785,913 class members (comprised of 673,042 unique vehicles) that were eligible for the extended warranty consideration – either by filing a request for reimbursement or, in the case of those who still own or lease the vehicle, without having to do anything. *See* Doc. No. 57, ¶ 4. Multiplying this population of Settlement Class vehicles by the \$4.92 per vehicle value of the warranty extension equals **\$3,311,366.64**.

² This expected repair cost was determined based on the 0.4 labor hours assigned for Gen. 3.0 Harman head unit repair or replacement. As of April 1, 2019, the average national retailer warranty rate was \$111.11.

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 3

Regardless of which calculation is utilized, the value of this extended warranty to the Settlement Class is substantial. Courts within the Third Circuit that have assessed the value of extended warranties in this context have stated that “while a warranty ‘cost[s] a manufacturer nothing unless repairs are claimed,’ the mere ‘fact of coverage is its own benefit; for a price, a consumer can purchase certainty as to what repairs will cost if they are needed.’” *In re Shop-Vac Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, MDL No. 2380, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 170841, at *35 (M.D. Pa. Dec. 9, 2016) (quoting *In re Volkswagen & Audi Warranty Extension Litig.*, 89 F. Supp. 3d 155, 169 (D. Mass. 2015)). Courts have valued extended warranties by multiplying the market price of the warranty coverage by the number of beneficiaries. *See id.* at *36-37. *See also, In re LG/Zenith Rear Projection Television Class Action Litig.*, No. 06-5609 (JLL), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13568, at *24-25 (D.N.J. Feb. 18, 2009) (“...counsel argue that a conservative valuation of the warranty extension would be \$450, and aver that the class consists of more than 60,000 individuals....This calculation would indicate a total value to the class of \$27,000,000.”).

The other components of the Settlement were valued as follows:

- We estimated the value of the Settlement which compensates Class members for multiple Starlink repairs to be **\$1.75 million**. We arrived at that number by first identifying the number of Class members with (a) two qualifying complaints (who are entitled to \$150) and (b) three or more qualifying complaints (who are entitled to \$300).³ We then multiplied these two groups of eligible Class vehicles by the cash relief available for each, and added the sum. This analysis is summarized in the chart below:

	Eligible Vehicles	Cash Relief	Total Cash Available
Cars with Two Qualifying Complaints	8,900	\$150	\$ 1,335,000
Cars with Three or More Qualifying Complaints	1,390	\$300	\$ 417,000
		TOTAL	\$ 1,752,000

- Similarly, Subaru’s warranty data demonstrated that there were approximately 9,590 Class members who had to wait more than one day for a replacement head

³ All of these Class members would also be entitled, at their election, to two \$100 coupons for Subaru service or merchandise, or one \$400 coupon for the lease or purchase of a new Subaru. We did not utilize these figures for purposes of this analysis.

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 4

unit during the Backorder Period. The estimated value of this component was determined by multiplying that figure by both (a) the \$16 per day that could be claimed by these Class members and (b) the average number of days that these Class members had to wait (13.5 days). The resulting quotient is \$2,071,440.

Adding up the most conservative estimated values of the extended warranty component (\$2,467,866.52), the multiple Starlink repair component (\$1,752,000), and the backorder component (\$2,071,440) results in an estimated value of the benefits made available for the Class of \$6,291,306.52 for these three components alone. Using the larger extended warranty valuation to account for the additional eligible vehicles results in an estimated \$7,134,806.64. Neither one of these figures account for the various software updates issued by Subaru – about which Class members would not have received direct notification but for this Settlement. Nor does it include the \$90 that Class members could receive for unreimbursed out-of-pocket and ride hailing expenses; some \$84,071.13 has been claimed by Class members under that category.

Your Honor’s letter also asked for an estimate of the total amount of monetary compensation to be provided to the Class. A supplemental declaration from the claims administrator is attached hereto as Exhibit A (“Keough Decl.”). In sum, a total of 3,990 timely and eligible claim forms were submitted. Keough Decl. ¶ 7. 1,906 class members sought reimbursement of the \$5 they paid for an extended warranty. *Id.* ¶ 8. Notably, those class member members who did not purchase an extended warranty were not eligible to make a claim for the \$5 refund, but will nevertheless receive the benefit of the Starlink-specific extended warranty without the need to submit a claim form. *See* Docket Entry No. 44-1 at 2 (“Regardless of whether you return this form, however, you will automatically receive a warranty extension of the Settlement Class Vehicle’s New Vehicle Limited Warranty to 5 years or 100,000 miles...”). A total of 2,425 Class members sought compensation for multiple Qualifying Repairs for a total of \$489,950. Keough Decl. ¶ 8. A total of 913 claims sought a total of \$88,368 in backorder delay damages. *Id.* And, as noted above, 126 claims sought a total of \$76,033.40 for out-of-pocket damages, in addition to \$92 claims which sought \$8,037.73 for a rental vehicle or ride-hailing service.⁴ In sum, a total of \$671,919.13 has been claimed by class members.

⁴ Plaintiffs respectfully submit that, while these amounts are less than the parties’ initial estimates, this Court should use the value of the benefits made available to the class in performing its percentage of recovery (“POR”) cross-check. Judge Brody’s recent final approval opinion in *In re Comcast Corp. Set-Top Cable TV Box Antitrust Litig.*, 333 F.R.D. 364 (E.D. Pa. 2019) is instructive on this point. While that case involved a \$15.5 million

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 5

Finally, we also wanted to provide this Court with Class Counsel's most recent billable hour and expense figures for its lodestar analysis.⁵ These figures are current as of the end of April 2020:

FIRM	TOTAL HOURS	TOTAL LODESTAR	TOTAL EXPENSES
Chimicles Schwartz Kriner & Donaldson-Smith LLP	1,666.70	\$820,485.00	\$12,466.95
Wilentz, Goldman & Spitzer, P.A.	262.40	\$229,950.50	\$2,379.30
Motley Rice LLC	59.00	\$45,725.00	\$389.28
J. Llewellyn Mathews	14.00	\$4,900.00	\$0.00
TOTALS	2,002.10	\$1,101,060.50	\$15,235.53

* * * *

common fund created for the benefit of some 3.5 million consumers, mechanically it was a claims-made settlement whereby any unclaimed funds would be retained by the defendant. *Id.* at 386. Ultimately, and “[d]espite efforts to notify potential Class Members, only 20,262 individuals filed claims for a total of \$211,255.00 in cash payments plus an additional \$286,986.50 in in-kind relief.” *Id.* at 385. Yet, relying on Supreme Court and Third Circuit precedent, Judge Brody’s POR analysis calculated fees “based on the entire fund” because, among other reasons, class counsel had “adequately prioritized the direct benefit to the Class.” *Id.* at 387; *see also, Gray v. BMW of N. Am., LLC*, No. 13-cv-3417 (WJM), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 135593, at *12 (D.N.J. Aug. 24, 2017) (citing *Boeing Co. v. Van Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472, 478 (1980)) (“As Plaintiffs argue, however, the relevant measure is the value of benefits made available to the class as a whole, not the portion of benefits ultimately claimed by class members.”). While the results of this Settlement are hardly as extreme as those in *Comcast*, Class Counsel here have similarly prioritized getting as much of the Settlement’s monetary and non-monetary benefits to members of the Class as possible.

⁵ The numbers we cited in our fee petition were current as of January 24, 2020. *See* Doc. No. 52-2, at 26.

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 6

Second, you inquired about the nature of the work performed on this case by my Firm's Information Technology specialist, David W. Birch. I have reviewed Mr. Birch's billing records again, just as I did for all of my Firm's time and expense records when preparing our fee petition.⁶ As you note, Mr. Birch billed 15.60 hours for a total of \$4,680 in billable time.⁷ As with all of my Firm's time keepers, this was billed in six-minute increments.

All of Mr. Birch's time was dedicated to working on this case, and virtually all of it was performed at my request and under my supervision. Specifically, Mr. Birch billed for the following activities in this matter:

- Preparing and posting, on my Firm's website, various updates about the status of our investigation, the filing of the case, developments in the case (such as Magistrate Judge Schneider's March 12, 2019, Memorandum Opinion and Order permitting certain discovery to proceed⁸) and, subsequently, information about the Settlement. As part of that process, my Firm was contacted by approximately 1,530 Subaru consumers who inquired about this case.
- Created and distributed a detailed survey using the commercially available SurveyMonkey platform. This survey asked targeted questions about consumer's experiences with the Starlink system in Class vehicles, such as the nature of any problems observed, whether they had been satisfactorily resolved by a Subaru dealer, and the nature of potential damages. This survey was ultimately sent to 1,038 consumers who had contacted our Firm about the case at that time. Ultimately, we received 274 responses to the survey, which were helpful to us in both moving the case forward, preparing for the mediation sessions with Judge Cavanaugh, and in formulating the Settlement structure that ultimately resulted.
- Compiled a video of testimonials from consumers who sent us their firsthand accounts of their experiences with the Starlink system. We had prepared this in advance of our first mediation session with Judge Cavanaugh, although we

⁶ As part of that process, I used my judgment in eliminating or reducing certain categories of billable time. See Doc. No. 52-4, at ¶ 23.

⁷ While we have no objection to producing Mr. Birch's detailed time records should the Court request to see it, inasmuch as it does contain descriptions of internal work product, we respectfully submit that it be done for *in camera* review.

⁸ See <https://chimicles.com/court-rules-that-subaru-starlink-class-action-can-proceed-into-discovery/>

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 7

ultimately made the decision to not use it at that time. Nevertheless, this work helped us preparing for the mediation, and could have potentially been used had the case not settled.

- Performed IT-related work specific to this case, such as downloading and organizing the documents produced to us by Subaru, and establishing a dedicated e-mail address for all of the Plaintiffs' counsel working on this case. This category of Mr. Birch's time is very small in comparison to the other activities described above.

As alluded to in your April 15, 2020, letter, courts have approved requests for the payment of fees for IT work performed so long as it is directly related to the lawsuit. We respectfully submit that all of Mr. Birch's work was not only directly related to but also critical to Plaintiffs' counsels' prosecution of this action.

* * * *

Third, you raised a concern about the timing of the payment of attorneys' fees as it relates to the resolution and distribution of funds to Settlement Class members. Specifically, you asked for an explanation from any counsel who objects to the imposition of a provision that would delay the payment of attorneys' fees until all eligible Class members have been paid.

Respectfully, we object to imposing this requirement and have an alternative approach for the Court to consider. Preliminarily, the claims administrator has advised us that it has completed its initial review of all of the claims. As for those claims that did not appear to qualify for compensation from the initial review, the claims administrator is also prepared to accelerate the review process. Subaru has requested—because its offices, including the accounting department responsible for processing checks, continue to be closed due to the pandemic—that the Court extend the time within which Subaru may make the payments to class members to 90 days from execution of the Final Approval Order.

We understand that the Court has expressed concern about being ensured that Plaintiffs' counsel "remains invested in safeguarding the rights of the class members during the payout process . . ." Doc. 60 at 2. We think the best way to address this issue, rather than delaying the payment of fees in the midst of an economic crisis to Plaintiffs'

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 8

counsel who have handled this case on a contingency fee basis for the past 18 months,⁹ is to impose a post-distribution reporting requirement. Under this approach, we would be required to provide the Court with regular updates on a monthly basis as to the status of any disputed or appealed claims, until all of these claims have been paid or resolved.

Judges within this Circuit have previously adopted similar post-distribution requirements on Plaintiffs' counsel. For example, in awarding attorneys' fees in connection with another consumer protection class action settlement involving Subaru, Judge Simandle required "Subaru to file quarterly reports of settlement administration progress, which shall also be monitored by Plaintiffs' Class Counsel." *Yaeger v. Subaru of Am., Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-4490 (JBS-KMW), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117193, at *70 (D.N.J. Aug. 31, 2016). Among other things, these reports were to "summarize the numbers of claims for reimbursement received and pending . . . ; the numbers of claims granted in full, granted in part and denied; the number pending under the Second Review procedure . . . ; and the number of claims appealed to the Better Business Bureau Appeals process . . . , and the outcomes of such appeals." *Id.* at *72-73. Thereafter, approximately four such quarterly reports were filed with the Court. See *Yaeger v. Subaru of Am., Inc.*, No. 1:14-cv-4490 (JBS-KMW) (D.N.J.), ECF Nos. 113, 115, 117 & 119.

This is not the only Court to have imposed this kind of post-settlement reporting obligation. The United States District Court for the Northern District of California has recently issued Procedural Guidance for Class Action Settlements which, among other things, states that "[w]ithin 21 days after the distribution of the settlement funds and payment of attorneys' fees, the parties should file a Post-Distribution Accounting, which provides the following information: . . . the number and percentage of objections, the average and median recovery per claimant, the largest and smallest amounts paid to class members, [and] . . . the number and value of checks not cashed . . ." ¹⁰

We respectfully submit that the Court require the parties to submit reports on the status of the non-fully approved claims on a two-monthly or quarterly basis. We have conferred with counsel for Subaru, which does not object to this request. Finally, to reiterate from our final approval motion, not a single Settlement Class member has

⁹ Notably, the amount of the requested fee was agreed to at a mediation session with Judge Cavanaugh, and none of the attorneys general (or class members) who received notice of the settlement in accordance with the Class Action Fairness Act have objected to this term. The objection deadline was February 13, 2020.

¹⁰ <https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/forms/procedural-guidance-for-class-action-settlements/>

Honorable Robert B. Kugler

May 21, 2020

Page 9

objected to the timing of the payment of attorneys' fees - or to anything else related to the requested fee, for that matter.

* * * *

We appreciate being afforded the opportunity to respond to the Court's questions in advance of final approval hearing. Due to a scheduling conflict on June 16, counsel for the parties respectfully request that the final approval hearing be rescheduled for another date. Counsel for both Plaintiffs and Subaru are available on June 26, if that date is convenient for the Court. Of course, if there are any other matters that you would like us to address in writing, please do not hesitate to contact us. We and counsel for Subaru also wish to advise that, if the Court would prefer, we could make arrangements to conduct the final approval hearing telephonically or via videoconference.

Respectfully submitted,



Benjamin F. Johns

BFJ/klw

cc: All Counsel of Record (via ECF)

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

CHAD UDEEN, MARY JANE JEFFERY,
LYDIA RUNKEL, MICHAEL BOLICK,
GARY GILPIN, ALICIA SMITH, and
SUSAN WILLIAMS, on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SUBARU OF AMERICA, INC., and
SUBARU CORPORATION,

Defendants.

No. 1:18-cv-17334-RBK-JS

CLASS ACTION

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF JENNIFER M. KEOUGH REGARDING
SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION**

I, JENNIFER M. KEOUGH, declare and state as follows:

1. I am the Chief Executive Officer at JND Legal Administration LLC (“JND”). JND is a legal administration services provider with its headquarters located in Seattle, Washington. JND has extensive experience with all aspects of legal administration and has administered settlements in hundreds of class action cases.

2. JND is serving as the Settlement Administrator (“Administrator”) in the above-captioned litigation (“Action”) as ordered by the Court in its Order Granting Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement (“Order”) dated October 4, 2019. This Declaration is based on my personal knowledge, as well as upon information provided to me by experienced JND employees, and if called upon to do so, I could and would testify competently thereto.

3. This Supplemental Declaration is meant to supplement my Declaration dated March 2, 2020.

REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION

4. In my Declaration dated March 2, 2020, I provided that JND had received a total of 162 requests for exclusion, of which 154 were valid requests for exclusion. Since my Declaration, JND has identified an additional valid request for exclusion.

5. As of the date of this Declaration, JND has received a total of 163 requests for exclusion, of which 155 are valid requests for exclusion. A complete list of the names, cities, and states associated with the valid requests for exclusion is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

CLAIMS SUMMARY

6. As of the date of this Declaration, JND has received 4,081 timely Claim Form submissions.

7. On May 15, 2020, JND received a spreadsheet from Subaru of America, Inc. containing the last name, VIN, and payment information of Class Members who were previously reimbursed or compensated for their Starlink Malfunctions (“SOA Data”). JND identified 91 timely claims that were submitted by a Class Member in the SOA Data. These 91 claims were subsequently excluded from JND’s claims analysis and the final population of eligible claims at Subaru’s direction. A total of 3,990 timely and eligible claim submissions remained for claims analysis.

8. Of the 3,990 timely and eligible claims, JND has determined the following:
- a. 1,906 claims sought reimbursement for the proportionate value of a Subaru Added Security Plan concerning the Starlink Multimedia System. The total value of these claim selections is \$9,530.

- b. 2,425 claims sought compensation for multiple Qualifying Repairs of Qualifying Starlink Malfunctions. The total value of these claim selections is \$489,950.
- c. 913 claims sought compensation for delay in repair caused by Backorder. The total value of these claim selections is \$88,368.
- d. 126 claims sought reimbursement for out-of-pocket repair expenses. The total value of these claim selections is \$76,033.40.
- e. 92 claims sought reimbursement for a Rental Vehicle or Ride-Hailing Service. The total value of these claim selections is \$8,037.73.
- f. In sum, the total value of timely claim submissions is \$671,919.13.

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 21, 2020 at Seattle, WA.



JENNIFER M. KEOUGH

EXHIBIT A



Udeen, et al. v. Subaru of America, Inc., et al.
Valid Requests for Exclusion (Deadline: February 17, 2020)

	Name	City/State	Online Submission/ Postmark Date
1.	Paul Prevosto	Hackensack, NJ	01/04/2020
2.	David Petrak	Altoona, PA	01/04/2020
3.	Mary Petrak	Altoona, PA	01/04/2020
4.	Briana M Smith	Painted Post, NY	01/04/2020
5.	Richard Albright Tulowitzki	New Castle, DE	01/04/2020
6.	Chuck Mertz	Minneapolis, PA	01/05/2020
7.	Gabriel Archangelo	Wilmington, DE	01/06/2020
8.	Eve Archangelo	Wilmington, DE	01/06/2020
9.	Edna Holloway	Oakham, MA	01/06/2020
10.	Cheryl Venit	Swedesboro, NJ	01/06/2020
11.	Barbara M Wynkoop	Coopersburg, PA	01/06/2020
12.	Katherine Elizabeth Roberts	Weber City, VA	01/06/2020
13.	Denise Villani	Coconut Creek, FL	01/06/2020
14.	Nataliya Gurshman	Annandale, VA	01/06/2020
15.	Jordan Prause	New Milford, CT	01/06/2020
16.	Rickey T Miller	Inwood, WV	01/06/2020
17.	Mirela M Viditki	Dacula, GA	01/06/2020
18.	Kevin Dressler	Monroeville, PA	01/07/2020
19.	Elaine H. Burns	Rochester, NH	01/07/2020
20.	Bryan Grasso	Pennsburg, PA	01/07/2020
21.	Gary Yerkie	Front Royal, VA	01/07/2020
22.	David Lowell Fugate	Kingston, TN	01/07/2020
23.	Kyle Beckley	Ossining, NY	01/07/2020
24.	Cory Maffucci	Brooklyn, NY	01/07/2020
25.	Rose Brinker	Clark, NJ	01/07/2020
26.	Eduard Aviyants	Manchester, NH	01/07/2020
27.	Charlotte A Brunet	Rockland, MA	01/08/2020

28.	Philip Downs	Durham, NC	01/08/2020
29.	Ellen M Cox	Palm Harbor, FL	01/08/2020
30.	Brook Detterman	Arlington, MA	01/08/2020
31.	Alison Glasgow	Charlotte, NC	01/08/2020
32.	Paul J. Blank	New Kensington, PA	01/08/2020
33.	Jean-Marie Peterson	Littleton, NH	01/08/2020
34.	Evelyn T Wisselmann Petty	Winston Salem, NC	01/09/2020
35.	William M. Candless Petty, Jr.	Winston Salem, NC	01/09/2020
36.	Ralph Edward Given	Hopkinton, MA	01/09/2020
37.	Michael Angello	Manlius, NY	01/09/2020
38.	Margaret Mary Arico	Portland, CT	01/09/2020
39.	Shelley Coss	Arlington, VA	01/09/2020
40.	Charles Richard Kriesel	Montague, MI	01/09/2020
41.	Dennis Russell Fay	Columbia City, IN	01/09/2020
42.	Julianne Rachelle Melara	Moore, OK	01/10/2020
43.	Elijah Rainbolt	Hampton, TN	01/10/2020
44.	Margaret Mary Lloyd	Washington, DC	01/10/2020
45.	Charles D. Bates	Danville, IN	01/10/2020
46.	Ashley Barrett	Travelers Rest, SC	01/10/2020
47.	Gregory John Adams	Ballston Lake, NY	01/10/2020
48.	Jason Rohlfing	Castle Rock, CO	01/10/2020
49.	Cassandra Gerken	Keene, NH	01/10/2020
50.	Moya Neal	Chewelah, WA	01/10/2020
51.	Rose Coleman	Nampa, ID	01/10/2020
52.	David L. Aunkst	Carson City, NV	01/10/2020
53.	Michael Walter	Gardina, CA	01/11/2020
54.	James K Calvey	Lakewood, OH	01/11/2020
55.	Laura Munnelly	Longmont, CO	01/11/2020
56.	Norval Hermanson	Twin Peaks, CA	01/11/2020
57.	Jennifer R Davies	Westminster, CO	01/11/2020
58.	Donna Apidone	Sacramento, CA	01/11/2020
59.	James Carter	Klamath Falls, OR	01/11/2020
60.	Teresa L Walters	Los Angeles, CA	01/11/2020
61.	Jason Barney	Eugene, OR	01/11/2020
62.	Mary Ann Counsellor	Tukwila, WA	01/11/2020

63.	Donn Walter	Federal Way, WA	01/11/2020
64.	Rose Mary Morra	Sun Lakes, AZ	01/12/2020
65.	Mario Deguchi	Hanford, CA	01/12/2020
66.	Anneline Ruegg	Palm Desert, CA	01/12/2020
67.	Lawrence Jarcewski	Nottingham, MD	01/12/2020
68.	Cecile J Hawkins	Saint Peters, MO	01/12/2020
69.	Anna Kilmer	Campton, NH	01/13/2020
70.	Jeremy Momberg	Fargo, ND	01/13/2020
71.	Ronald J Wilkinson, Jr.	Sacramento, CA	01/13/2020
72.	Dennis Nickels	Chicago, IL	01/13/2020
73.	Kathryn Daniel Olson	St Joseph, MN	01/13/2020
74.	David Flowers	Spring, TX	01/13/2020
75.	Karen Anders	Kuna, ID	01/13/2020
76.	Bradley Anders	Kuna, ID	01/13/2020
77.	William J. Cook Jr.	Westminster, MD	01/13/2020
78.	Ian Patrick Hatlee	Colorado Springs, CO	01/14/2020
79.	Nicole L Allamon	Grindstone, PA	01/14/2020
80.	Candice Clark	Albany, OR	01/14/2020
81.	Wallace A Lay	Albany, OR	01/14/2020
82.	Jerold Meade	Monroe, NY	01/14/2020
83.	Dawn Davis	Frisco, TX	01/14/2020
84.	Carol Montgomery Brosnac	Long Beach, CA	01/14/2020
85.	Karyn Lyn Huryn-Selvar	Issaquah, WA	01/14/2020
86.	William Dolley	Columbia, SC	01/14/2020
87.	Vanessa Renay Weidenkeller	Evans, CO	01/15/2020
88.	Gary L Pearson	Farmington, MN	01/15/2020
89.	Caralee Detwiler	Omaha, NE	01/15/2020
90.	David R. Montgomery	Rapid City, SD	01/15/2020
91.	John Behuniak	Syracuse, NY	01/16/2020
92.	Sandra Daily	Mount Laurel, NJ	01/16/2020
93.	Shaun Gabriel Heath	Rochester, MN	01/16/2020
94.	Colleen Lynch	Champaign, IL	01/16/2020
95.	Stephen Francis Kovacs	Myrtle Beach, SC	01/16/2020
96.	Juli Ramm	Charlton, MA	01/16/2020
97.	David Reyer	Kinnelon, NJ	01/16/2020

98.	Neal E. Bossert	Quakertown, PA	01/17/2020
99.	Christian Mark Kaefer	Natick, MA	01/18/2020
100.	William Oscar Coffin	Charlottesville, VA	01/19/2020
101.	Jarred Vangelder	Orange, VA	01/20/2020
102.	Ronata Morgan	Butler, PA	01/21/2020
103.	Hugh Morgan	Butler, PA	01/21/2020
104.	Katherine Butcher	Aberdeen, WA	01/21/2020
105.	Darcy A Rollins	Hendersonville, NC	01/21/2020
106.	Elizabeth Szabo	Metuchen, NJ	01/22/2020
107.	Michael David Roach	Eau Claire, WI	01/22/2020
108.	Shane M McGrath	Wilton, NH	01/22/2020
109.	Cynthia J Hay	Hockessin, DE	01/23/2020
110.	Chih-Yuan Chang	Palo Alto, CA	01/23/2020
111.	Frances J Lacovara	Perryville, MD	01/23/2020
112.	Donna Rae Rohrbach	Topton, PA	01/24/2020
113.	Christina Bethencourt	North Hollywood, CA	01/24/2020
114.	Sharon L. Gary	Muskegon, MI	01/24/2020
115.	Stephanie Brooks	North Andover, MA	01/24/2020
116.	Marilyn F. Ayers	Owego, NY	01/25/2020
117.	James Chasey	Houston, TX	01/25/2020
118.	Barbara Jo Conn	Vanderbilt, PA	01/27/2020
119.	Eric Weisseg	Chicago, IL	01/27/2020
120.	Igor Salari	San Jose, CA	01/27/2020
121.	Deborah Edwards	Northridge, CA	01/28/2020
122.	Laura J Stearns	Colorado Springs, CO	01/28/2020
123.	Schrembeck Funeral Services LLC	Independence, OH	01/28/2020
124.	Axl Jon Dela Cruz	Irvine, CA	01/30/2020
125.	Faith Love Brightly	San Rafael, CA	01/31/2020
126.	Patricia Lynn Nielsen	Lancaster, CA	02/01/2020
127.	Keith Interrante	San Francisco, CA	02/02/2020
128.	Tommy Fredrik Magnus Fransson	Reston, VA	02/03/2020
129.	Isabelle Dehring	Cottonwood Heights, UT	02/03/2020
130.	Rose Marie Mcreynolds	Denver, CO	02/03/2020
131.	Deanna Jones	Chandler, AZ	02/03/2020
132.	Stephen E. Sullivan	Colorado Springs, CO	02/05/2020

133.	George Mccrae	Staten Island, NY	02/06/2020
134.	Jean E. Sereno	Westfield, PA	02/06/2020
135.	Allan Radawitz	Hubertus, WI	02/06/2020
136.	Gerda Sternfeld	Oxford, CT	02/07/2020
137.	Jordan M Lintt	Franklinton, NC	02/09/2020
138.	Matthew P Kaminski	Belleville, NJ	02/09/2020
139.	Charles E Tyra	Noblesville, IN	02/10/2020
140.	Samantha Arce	Renton, WA	02/11/2020
141.	Alfonso A Donato	Pico Rivera, CA	02/12/2020
142.	Benjamin Carrier	Moreno Valley, CA	02/13/2020
143.	Donna Miranda	Moreno Valley, CA	02/13/2020
144.	Janette Cuevas	Pacoima, CA	02/13/2020
145.	Rafael Cuevas	Pacoima, CA	02/13/2020
146.	Susan Mevey	East Northport, NY	02/13/2020
147.	Thomas Lyn Thompson	Tucson, AZ	02/13/2020
148.	Katy Eng Moy	Revere, MA	02/14/2020
149.	Kerry Clifford	Syracuse, NY	02/14/2020
150.	Kevin Alfred Savage	Monument, CO	02/14/2020
151.	Moli Becker	Fairfax, VA	02/15/2020
152.	Roger Boyd Wilcox	Eagle Mountain, UT	02/16/2020
153.	Joan Ann Wiese	Waterloo, IA	02/17/2020
154.	Taylor Bomely	Newington, CT	02/17/2020
155.	Matija Dreze	Princeton, NJ	02/17/2020