

**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: CHANGE HEALTHCARE,  
INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY  
BREACH LITIGATION**

**MDL No. 3108**

**CHANGE HEALTHCARE INC.'S RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR CONSOLIDATION  
AND TRANSFER UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	2
ARGUMENT .....	3
I. Centralization under Section 1407 would enhance efficiency and just resolution of the Actions filed nationwide. ....	3
II. The Middle District of Tennessee Is the Appropriate Transferee District.....	7
A. Change—the Victim of the Cyberattack—Is Headquartered in the Middle District of Tennessee and Much of the Evidence Is There. ....	8
B. The Middle District of Tennessee Is Convenient and Accessible for All Parties....	9
C. A Majority of the Cases Have Been Filed in the Middle District of Tennessee....	10
D. The Middle District of Tennessee Is Well-Equipped to Adjudicate a Complex Multi-District Litigation Related to a Cyberattack. ....	11
CONCLUSION.....	12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re 7-Eleven Franchise Antitrust Litig.</i> , 358 F. Supp. 286 (J.P.M.L. 1973).....	5
<i>In re Am. Med. Collection Agency, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , 410 F. Supp. 3d 1350 (J.P.M.L. 2019).....	5
<i>In re Anthem, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , 109 F. Supp. 3d 1364 (J.P.M.L. 2015).....	5
<i>In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litig.</i> , 908 F. Supp. 2d 1373, 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2012).....	4
<i>Castell v. Change Healthcare Inc., et al.</i> , No. 3:24-cv-00339 (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 25, 2024) .....	8
<i>In re Change Healthcare, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation</i> , MDL No. 3108.....	3
<i>In re Cmty. Health Sys., Inc. Customer Sec. Data Breach Litig.</i> , 84 F. Supp. 3d 1362 (J.P.M.L. 2015).....	5, 6
<i>Damocles et al. v. Mitsubishi Motors N. Am., Inc.</i> , No. 3:22-CV-0001 (M.D. Tenn.) .....	11
<i>In re Elec. Books Antitrust Litig.</i> , 846 F. Supp. 2d 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2011).....	7
<i>In re Fortra File Transfer Software Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , No. MDL 3090, 2024 WL 436478 (J.P.M.L. Feb. 5, 2024) .....	4
<i>Franchi v. SmileDirectClub, Inc., et al.</i> , No. 3:19-cv-00962 (M.D. Tenn.).....	11
<i>In re Hannaford Bros. Co. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , 559 F. Supp. 2d 1405 (J.P.M.L. 2008).....	9
<i>Herrick v. UnitedHealth Group Inc., et al.</i> , No. 3:24-cv-00293 (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 22, 2024) .....	8
<i>In re Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.</i> , 65 F. Supp. 3d 1398 (J.P.M.L. 2014).....	<i>passim</i>

*Mackey v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, et al.*,  
 No. 24-cv-00771 (D. Minn. Mar. 5, 2024) .....4

*In re Mednax Servs., Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 544 F. Supp. 3d 1371 (J.P.M.L. 2021).....5

*In re MOVEit Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 No. MDL 3083, 2023 WL 6456749 (J.P.M.L. Oct. 4, 2023) .....4, 5, 8

*Mt. Rainier Emergency Physicians, et al. v. Change Healthcare Inc., et al.*,  
 No. 3:24-cv-00323 (M.D. Tenn. March 28, 2024) .....3

*In re Perry Johnson & Assocs. Med. Transcription Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 No. MDL 3096, 2024 WL 436485 (J.P.M.L. Jan. 30, 2024).....4

*In re RealPage, Inc., Rental Software Antitrust Litig.*,  
 669 F. Supp. 3d 1372 (J.P.M.L. 2023).....6, 9, 11

*In re Schnuck Mkts., Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 978 F. Supp. 2d 1379 (J.P.M.L. 2013).....8

*In re Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 802 F. Supp. 2d 1370 (J.P.M.L. 2011).....5, 8, 9

*In re Supervalu, Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 67 F. Supp. 3d 1377 (J.P.M.L. 2014).....5, 6, 9

*In re T-Mobile Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 576 F. Supp. 3d 1373 (J.P.M.L. 2021).....6

*In re Target Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 11 F. Supp. 3d 1338 (J.P.M.L. 2014).....5, 8

*In re TJX Cos. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 493 F. Supp. 2d 1382 (J.P.M.L. 2007).....6, 7

*In re Uber Techs., Inc., Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 304 F. Supp. 3d 1351 (J.P.M.L. 2018).....5

*In re Zappos.com, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*,  
 867 F. Supp. 2d 1357 (J.P.M.L. 2012).....5, 8

**Statutes**

28 U.S.C. § 1407..... *passim*

28 U.S.C. § 1407(a) .....3

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.....5

**Other Authorities**

Change Healthcare Cyber Response, UnitedHealth Group,  
<https://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/ns/changehealthcare.html> (*last visited*  
April 2, 2024).....2, 8

Statistics Report—Distribution of Pending MDL Dockets (March 1, 2024),  
[https://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending\\_MDL\\_Dockets\\_By\\_District-March-1-2024.pdf](https://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending_MDL_Dockets_By_District-March-1-2024.pdf).....11

## **INTRODUCTION**

Change Healthcare Inc. (“Change”) supports the pending 28 U.S.C. § 1407 motion of Plaintiffs Jimmy Allen, Melissa Merry, Robert Reese, and Jennifer Stump to centralize and transfer the currently filed and subsequently filed actions (“Actions”) arising out of the cyberattack on Change (the “Cyberattack”). Change likewise agrees that for the convenience of the parties, the Panel should transfer the Actions to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Change’s home district.<sup>1</sup>

In February 2024, Change was the victim of a Cyberattack. Change has worked tirelessly over the last six weeks to restore systems and services to support individuals, customers, and other providers. All of the Actions include common factual and legal issues arising from the Cyberattack and assert substantially identical causes of action on behalf of overlapping putative nationwide and/or statewide classes. All of the Actions were filed in the last five weeks and are in the earliest stages of litigation. Centralization of these Actions in a single district is imperative to prevent duplicative discovery and inconsistent pretrial rulings, and to conserve the resources of the parties and the courts.

The Actions should be transferred to and centralized in the Middle District of Tennessee because that district has the strongest connection to this litigation and the litigation can be handled most efficiently there. Indeed, Change—the only common defendant in every Action and the entity that suffered the Cyberattack—is headquartered in Tennessee. Key custodians, witnesses, and evidence—including many Change corporate records, documents, and servers—are in Tennessee. This district also is home to the first-filed Action and over half of all associated Actions. Finally,

---

<sup>1</sup> UnitedHealth Group Incorporated (“UHG”), UnitedHealthcare, Inc. (“UHC”), and Optum, Inc. (“Optum”) (collectively with Change, the “Defendants”) are named in certain Actions and join in Change’s Response to Motion for Consolidation and Transfer Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

the Middle District of Tennessee and the judge assigned to most of that District's Actions, Judge Eli Richardson, are well-equipped—and have the docket conditions necessary—to adjudicate a complex multi-district litigation (“MDL”).

### **BACKGROUND**

Change, a subsidiary of UHG, works across the health system to make clinical, administrative, and financial processes simpler and more efficient for consumers, providers, and payers, supporting, for example, pharmacy claims transactions, provider claims processing, and provider payments. On February 21, 2024, Change detected that an unauthorized actor had gained access to the Change environment. Change took prompt action to contain the incident, and Defendants have invested extraordinary efforts to avoid harmful effects to individuals, providers, and payers as a result of the incident. Numerous Change systems are back online, and others will be restored in the coming days and weeks. By March 7, Change had restored 99% of Change pharmacy network services. On March 15, Change's electronic payments platform was restored. Change's largest clearinghouse was back online the weekend of March 23. What is more, Defendants have established numerous workarounds for providers to submit claims for reimbursement. Defendants also established a Temporary Funding Assistance Program and, to date, have advanced more than \$3.3 billion to care providers who need further assistance. *See* Information on the Change Healthcare Cyber Response, UnitedHealth Group, <https://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/ns/changehealthcare.html> (*last visited* April 2, 2024) (under “Relief Programs” and “Temporary Funding Assistance Program” and “Inquiries About Funding Support”).

On March 1, 2024, plaintiffs began filing putative class action suits against Defendants. Through April 2, 2024, 24 putative federal class actions have been filed against Change (and

various groupings of the Defendants) relating to the Cyberattack. Every complaint names Change, and every complaint alleges harms stemming from the Cyberattack. All of the Actions were filed within the past five weeks and are in their procedural infancy. Several Actions have not yet been served, and Defendants have not yet responded to any of the complaints. To promote efficiency, Defendants are seeking stays of the Actions pending this Panel’s decision.

### ARGUMENT

#### **I. Centralization under Section 1407 would enhance efficiency and just resolution of the Actions filed nationwide.**

The Panel has authority under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to transfer “civil actions involving one or more common questions of fact [that] are pending in different districts” to a single district for centralized pretrial proceedings. 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a). Centralization for pretrial proceedings is warranted when, like here, transfer “will be for the convenience of parties and witnesses and will promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions.” *Id.*

*First*, the Actions all involve overlapping issues of fact. All Actions have been filed against Change—or a combination of the Defendants—arising out of the Cyberattack.<sup>2</sup> Of the 24 putative class actions tagged arising from the Cyberattack: 13 were filed by individuals (the “Consumer Cases”); and 11 were filed by providers (the “Provider Cases”). *See* Associated Cases, *In re Change Healthcare, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation*, MDL No. 3108, last updated April 2, 2024 at 9 PM ET. While the core allegations in the complaints are similar, the Provider Cases generally allege that plaintiffs purportedly experienced a delay in receiving insurance claim payments while Change worked to restore its systems, and the Consumer Cases generally allege

---

<sup>2</sup> An Amended Complaint filed in *Mt. Rainier Emergency Physicians, et al. v. Change Healthcare Inc., et al.* names another Tennessee-based entity, Change Healthcare Solutions, LLC. Am. Compl., No. 3:24-cv-00323 (M.D. Tenn. March 28, 2024). Change Healthcare Solutions, LLC has not been served as of the date of this filing.

that plaintiffs' data "presumably" was impacted and they might now face an increased risk of future identity theft. Compl. at ¶¶ 5, 22, *Mackey v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, et al.*, No. 24-cv-00771 (D. Minn. Mar. 5, 2024), ECF No. 1.

Despite the slight differences in allegations depending on whether a case was filed by a provider or consumer, at bottom, all Actions are based on the incorrect and unfounded theory that, because a cyberattack occurred, Change's security must have been deficient and Plaintiffs must have been have harmed. As a result, all Actions should be centralized together to promote the "just and efficient conduct" of this litigation. See *In re MOVEit Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. MDL 3083, 2023 WL 6456749, at \*2 (J.P.M.L. Oct. 4, 2023).

These minor differences among the Provider and Consumer Complaints do not undermine the basis for centralization. It is black letter law from the Panel that a "complete identity of common factual issues is not a prerequisite to transfer under Section 1407, and the presence of additional facts or differing legal theories is not significant when the actions arise from a common factual core." *In re Home Depot*, 65 Supp. 3d 1398, 1399 (J.P.M.L. 2014) (citing *In re Blue Cross Blue Shield Antitrust Litig.*, 908 F. Supp. 2d 1373, 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2012)). Here, centralization will promote efficiency, consistency, and fairness as "discovery and motions concerning . . . data security practices, how the unauthorized access occurred, and the investigation into the breach" transpires. *In re Am. Med. Collection Agency, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 410 F. Supp. 3d 1350, 1353 (J.P.M.L. 2019).

Not only does the Panel frequently centralize related actions arising from a cyberattack or data breach,<sup>3</sup> but the Panel also regularly does so when there are unique factual issues across the

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., *In re Fortra File Transfer Software Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. MDL 3090, 2024 WL 436478, at \*1 (J.P.M.L. Feb 5, 2024); *In re Perry Johnson & Assocs. Med. Transcription Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, No. MDL 3096, 2024 WL 436485, at \*1 (J.P.M.L. Jan. 30, 2024); *In re*

related actions, so long as there are key overlapping questions of fact, as there are here. For example, in *In re AMCA*, the Panel found that even though there were multiple laboratory defendants that had contracted with the breached vendor, “common factual questions in all actions unquestionably [arose] from the same recently-disclosed breach . . . .” *In re Am. Med. Collection Agency, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 410 F. Supp. 3d 1350, 1353 (J.P.M.L. 2019) (creating a single, multi-defendant MDL and relying on the transferee judge to “accommodate any issues involving the different laboratories in a manner that ensures the just and efficient resolution of all cases”). Likewise, in the recent Transfer Order regarding the MOVEit cybersecurity vulnerability cases, the Panel found “share[d] common and complex factual questions” regarding the unauthorized access and emphasized its obligation to “consider the needs of all parties and view the litigation as a whole.”<sup>4</sup> *In re MOVEit Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 2023 WL 6456749, at \*2-3 (holding that all cases should be centralized in a single MDL, even though

---

*MOVEit*, 2023 WL 6456749, at \*3; *In re Mednax Servs., Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 544 F. Supp. 3d 1371, 1372 (J.P.M.L. 2021); *In re Am. Med. Collection Agency, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 410 F. Supp. 3d 1350, 1353 (J.P.M.L. 2019); *In re Uber Techs., Inc., Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 304 F. Supp. 3d 1351, 1355 (J.P.M.L. 2018); *In re Anthem, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 109 F. Supp. 3d 1364, 1365 (J.P.M.L. 2015); *In re Cmty. Health Sys., Inc. Customer Sec. Data Breach Litig.*, 84 F. Supp. 3d 1362, 1363 (J.P.M.L. 2015); *In re Supervalu, Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 67 F. Supp. 3d 1377, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2014); *In re Target Corp. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 11 F. Supp. 3d 1338, 1338 (J.P.M.L. 2014); *In re Home Depot, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 65 F. Supp. 3d 1398, 1399-400 (J.P.M.L. 2014); *In re Zappos.com, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 867 F. Supp. 2d 1357, 1358 (J.P.M.L. 2012); *In re Sony Gaming Networks & Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 802 F. Supp. 2d 1370, 1371 (J.P.M.L. 2011).

<sup>4</sup> That the putative class action complaints contain similar factual allegations regarding the Cyberattack demonstrates that there are “common questions” for purposes of consolidation and coordination under Section 1407 only. “The criteria for a class determination pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure are different from the criteria for transfer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407,” *In re 7-Eleven Franchise Antitrust Litig.*, 358 F. Supp. 286, 287 (J.P.M.L. 1973), and Defendants dispute that commonality, adequacy, typicality, predominance, or any other class certification requirement in Rule 23 is satisfied. Defendants reserve all rights, including but not limited to stating at the appropriate time that the requirements for class certification under Rule 23 are not satisfied.

defendants were differently situated—for example, some defendants were customer-facing and others were not).

*Second*, centralization of the Actions in a single district for pretrial proceedings will avoid the inefficiency, expense, and risk of inconsistent rulings that would result from separate litigation of substantially similar cases across the country. Without centralization, the Actions could proceed separately against Defendants in dozens of cases and at least 7 districts from New Jersey to California. *See, e.g., In re RealPage, Inc., Rental Software Antitrust Litig.*, 669 F. Supp. 3d 1372, 1373 (J.P.M.L. 2023) (“Centralization will eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings, particularly as to class certification; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary.”); *In re Cmty. Health Sys., Inc. Customer Sec. Data Breach Litig.*, 84 F. Supp. 3d at 1362 (finding that consolidation will “prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings on class certification and other issues”).

Further, because the Actions share the same core factual allegations and assert substantially identical legal claims, overlapping discovery will occur across the Actions if the cases are not consolidated. In particular, centralizing the pretrial proceedings will prevent duplicative written discovery, depositions, and expert discovery involving Change—the principal defendant across all Actions—the Cyberattack, Change’s security, the impacted data, services downtime and restoration, and the alleged harms. The parties also would have to litigate—and the courts resolve—the same discovery disputes and other legal issues multiple times which, as described above, could lead to inconsistent rulings. Centralization thus will greatly conserve judicial and party resources. *See, e.g., In re Supervalu*, 67 F. Supp. 3d at 1378 (finding that “[c]entralization will eliminate duplicative discovery” that “may be quite technical and contentious” and will “conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary”); *In re T-Mobile Customer*

*Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 576 F. Supp. 3d 1373, 1375 (J.P.M.L. 2021) (same); *In re Home Depot*, 65 F. Supp. 3d at 1399 (same); *In re TJX Cos. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1382, 1383 (J.P.M.L. 2007) (same).

*Third*, transfer and centralization are likewise appropriate because all of the Actions are in their procedural infancy. The Actions were filed within the last five weeks, and Defendants have not filed responses in any Action. Indeed, Defendants have not yet been served in several of the Actions. Because the transferor courts have not yet had to take any substantive actions in these cases, centralization will not result in the duplication of efforts by the transferee court or result in any prejudice to Plaintiffs. The Panel has granted centralization in instances where the underlying actions were in the early stages, finding that centralized proceedings would provide for efficiency and that transfer would not be disruptive. *See, e.g., In re Elec. Books Antitrust Litig.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d 1378, 1379 (J.P.M.L. 2011) (finding centralization appropriate where “[a]ll actions” had “not progressed beyond the filing of the complaints”).

Accordingly, the Panel should transfer and centralize the Actions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407.

## **II. The Middle District of Tennessee Is the Appropriate Transferee District.**

Defendants respectfully submit that the Middle District of Tennessee is the appropriate transferee district for these Actions.<sup>5</sup> In determining the most convenient and efficient forum for transfer, the Panel frequently considers the following factors: where the defendant is headquartered; where the plaintiffs are located; where actions and potential tag-along actions are pending; where non-party witnesses and evidence likely exist; whether the jurisdiction has

---

<sup>5</sup> If the Panel is not inclined to centralize the Actions in the Middle District of Tennessee, the District of Minnesota is the next most appropriate transferee district.

resources necessary to manage an MDL; and whether multiple parties agree on transfer to a given district. *See, e.g., In re Target Corp. Cust. Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 11 F. Supp. 3d 1338 (J.P.M.L. 2014); *In re Home Depot, Inc.* 65 F. Supp. 3d at 1400. These factors counsel in favor of centralization in the Middle District of Tennessee.

**A. Change—the Victim of the Cyberattack—Is Headquartered in the Middle District of Tennessee and Much of the Evidence Is There.**

In cyberattack litigation, the Panel has frequently concluded that the district in which the *core defendant* maintains its corporate headquarters is the appropriate transferee forum. *See, e.g., In re MOVEit Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 2023 WL 6456749, at \*3 (selecting the headquarters of the defendant that was the victim of the cyberattack as the most appropriate transferee district); *In re Home Depot*, 65 F. Supp. 3d 1398 at 1400 (same); *In re Target*, 11 F. Supp. 3d at 1339 (same); *In re Zappos.com*, 867 F. Supp. 2d at 1358 (same); *In re Schnuck Mkts., Inc. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 978 F. Supp. 2d 1379, 1381-82 (J.P.M.L. 2013) (same); *In re Sony Gaming Networks*, 802 F. Supp. 2d at 1371 (same); *In re TJX*, 493 F. Supp. 2d at 1383 (same). The core defendant here is Change. All 24 Actions name Change, and seven Actions name only Change. All complaints allege that Change suffered a ransomware attack and that Change services were disrupted. Even the allegations in Actions naming the other defendant entities make clear that Change—an only recently-acquired company of UHG—was the victim of the Cyberattack and therefore is the nucleus of Plaintiffs’ claims.<sup>6</sup> *See, e.g.,* First Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 89-92, *Herrick v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, et al.*, No. 3:24-cv-00293, (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 22, 2024), ECF No. 12 (alleging that Change suffered a “data breach event” where its systems

---

<sup>6</sup> Indeed, there is no indication that any UHG, UHC, or Optum systems were affected by the Cyberattack. *See* Information on the Change Healthcare Cyber Response, UnitedHealth Group, <https://www.unitedhealthgroup.com/ns/changehealthcare.html> (last visited April 2, 2024) (under “Frequently Asked Questions”).

were “accessed by cybercriminals”); Compl. at ¶ 85, *Castell v. Change Healthcare Inc., et al.*, No. 3:24-cv-00339 (M.D. Tenn. Mar. 25, 2024), ECF No. 1 (alleging the same).

The Panel’s focus on the location of the defendant that was the victim of the cyberattack makes sense where, as here, numerous witnesses who were involved in incident response and cybersecurity are based in or around that defendant’s headquarters. *See, e.g., In re Supervalu*, 67 F. Supp. 3d at 1378 (“[Defendant’s] corporate headquarters is located within the district, and therefore relevant documents and witnesses are likely to be located there.”); *In re Hannaford Bros. Co. Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 559 F. Supp. 2d 1405, 1406 (J.P.M.L. 2008) (same); *In re Sony Gaming Networks*, 802 F. Supp. 2d at 1371 (finding that “Sony employees who may have relevant knowledge of the breaches” may be found in the District where Sony was based). Indeed, here many relevant servers and many of the information technology and security personnel responding to the incident are based in Nashville.

**B. The Middle District of Tennessee Is Convenient and Accessible for All Parties.**

The Middle District of Tennessee also is convenient for the parties. In deciding where to centralize litigation, the Panel considers whether a transferee district is centrally located and easily accessible. As relevant here, the Panel has previously determined that the Middle District of Tennessee is convenient and “geographically central” for parties in putative nationwide class actions, even as compared to a jurisdiction in the middle of the country and when plaintiffs hailed from both the East and West Coasts. *See, e.g., In re RealPage, Inc.*, 669 F. Supp. 3d at 1373 (creating an MDL in the Middle District of Tennessee, where some parties advocated for consolidation in Washington, Texas, or Colorado, concluding that the “Middle District of Tennessee presents a geographically central, convenient, and accessible venue for this nationwide litigation”).

The Middle District of Tennessee also affords out-of-town parties and counsel easy and convenient access to the court through the Nashville International Airport, which is only 9 miles away from the district courthouse. All major U.S. airlines fly in and out of the Nashville International Airport, with approximately 400 daily departures to over 100 nonstop destinations per day. Out-of-town parties will easily find accommodations in Nashville, with over 13,000 hotel rooms available in downtown Nashville and over 58,000 rooms in the broader Nashville Metropolitan Area. The centrality and easy accessibility of the Middle District of Tennessee supports centralization of the Actions in that district.

**C. A Majority of the Cases Have Been Filed in the Middle District of Tennessee.**

The Middle District of Tennessee is also well-situated as the transferee forum because the greatest number of Actions have been filed there. 15 cases have been filed in the Middle District of Tennessee, representing over 60% of the Actions filed to-date. The Panel routinely considers where the majority of cases are pending in selecting a transferee forum. *See In re Home Depot*, 65 F. Supp. 3d 1398, 399-400 (finding the most appropriate transferee district was where 19 of the 31 actions were pending).

Jurisdiction	Number of Actions Pending
Middle District of Tennessee	15
District of Minnesota	3
District of New Jersey	2
Northern District of California	1
Eastern District of California	1
Northern District of Mississippi	1
Western District of Pennsylvania	1

While nine Actions have been filed in six other districts, none of those districts have stronger connections to the litigants or the allegations than the Middle District of Tennessee. Because 15 Actions have already been filed in the Middle District of Tennessee—more than any other jurisdiction—this factor weighs heavily in favor of transfer to the Middle District of Tennessee.

**D. The Middle District of Tennessee Is Well-Equipped to Adjudicate a Complex Multi-District Litigation Related to a Cyberattack.**

Centralization in the Middle District of Tennessee also is appropriate and beneficial because it “permits the Panel to assign this litigation to a less-utilized transferee forum with an experienced judge who has not yet overseen a multidistrict litigation”; here, Judge Richardson, who presides over the first-filed Action and the majority of the other Actions in the Middle District of Tennessee. *See In re RealPage, Inc.*, 669 F. Supp. 3d at 1373. There is currently only one MDL pending in the Middle District of Tennessee, yet the District has the resources to effectively manage a large, centralized action. *See* U.S. Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, MDL Statistics Report—Distribution of Pending MDL Dockets (March 1, 2024), [https://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending\\_MDLDockets\\_By\\_District-March-1-2024.pdf](https://www.jpml.uscourts.gov/sites/jpml/files/Pending_MDLDockets_By_District-March-1-2024.pdf) (listing *In re RealPage, Inc.*, MDL No. 3071, pending before Chief Judge Crenshaw). Judge Richardson, specifically, is an experienced jurist with the ability to steer this large and potentially complicated litigation on an efficient and prudent course. *See, e.g., Damocles et al. v. Mitsubishi Motors N. Am., Inc.*, No. 3:22-CV-0001 (M.D. Tenn.) (consolidated cases); *Franchi v. SmileDirectClub, Inc., et al.*, No. 3:19-cv-00962 (M.D. Tenn.) (same).

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Panel transfer the Actions for centralized pretrial proceedings and submit that the relevant factors weigh strongly in favor of transfer to the Middle District of Tennessee before Judge Richardson.

Dated: April 3, 2024

By: /s/ Allison M. Ryan  
Allison M. Ryan  
**HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**  
Columbia Square  
555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
T. (202) 637-5872  
F. (202) 637-5910  
allison.holt-ryan@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated., UnitedHealthcare, Inc., and Optum, Inc.*

**BEFORE THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL  
ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: CHANGE HEALTHCARE,  
INC., CUSTOMER DATA SECURITY  
BREACH LITIGATION**

**MDL No. 3108**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of April, 2024, the foregoing Change Healthcare Inc.'s Response to Motion for Consolidation and Transfer Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Panel through the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record, and that copies will be sent by U.S. Mail to any party unable to accept them via the electronic filing system, as indicated below.

Dated: April 3, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Allison M. Ryan

Allison M. Ryan

**HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**

555 13th Street NW

Washington, DC 20004

T. (202) 637-5600

F. (202) 637-5910

allison.holt-ryan@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Defendants Change Healthcare  
Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated,  
UnitedHealthcare, Inc., Optum, Inc.*

**SERVICE LIST**

<b><i>Melissa Merry v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00239-EJR-JSF (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b>	
<i>Counsel for Plaintiff Melissa Merry</i>	
J. Gerard Stranch, IV Michael C. Iadevaia Emily Schiller Stranch, Jennings & Garvey, PLLC 223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200 Nashville, TN 37203 <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a> <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a> Tel: (615) 254-8801	(via ECF)
Jeffrey Ostrow Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert 1 West Las Olas Blvd., Ste. 500 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301 <a href="mailto:ostrow@kolawyers.com">ostrow@kolawyers.com</a> Tel: (954) 332-4200 Fax: (954) 525-4300	(via ECF)
Kenneth J. Grunfeld Kopelowitz Ostrow Ferguson Weiselberg Gilbert 65 Overhill Road Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 <a href="mailto:grunfeld@kolawyers.com">grunfeld@kolawyers.com</a> Tel: (954) 525-4100 Fax: (954) 525-4300	
Lynn A. Toops Cohen & Malad, LLP One Indiana Square, Suite 1400 Indianapolis, IN 46204 <a href="mailto:ltoops@cohenandmalad.com">ltoops@cohenandmalad.com</a> Tel: (317) 636-2593	
<b><i>Robert Reese v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00240-WDC-BDH (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b>	
<i>Counsel for Plaintiff Robert Reese</i>	
J. Gerard Stranch, IV	(via ECF)

<p>Michael C. Iadevaia  Emily Schiller  Stranch, Jennings &amp; Garvey, PLLC  223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a>  Tel: (615) 254-8801</p> <p>Joseph P. Guglielmo  Amanda M. Rolon  Scott &amp; Scott Attorneys at Law  The Helmsley Building  230 Park Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  New York, NY 10169  <a href="mailto:jguglielmo@scott-scott.com">jguglielmo@scott-scott.com</a>  <a href="mailto:arolon@scott-scott.com">arolon@scott-scott.com</a>  Tel: (212) 223-4478</p> <p>Alfred G. Yates, Jr.  Yates Law Office of Alfred G. Yates, Jr., P.C  1575 McFarland Road, Suite 305  Pittsburgh, PA 15216  <a href="mailto:yateslaw@aol.com">yateslaw@aol.com</a>  Tel: (412) 391-5164  Fax: (412) 471-1033</p>	
<p><b><i>Nicolas Keriazis v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., Optum, Inc., Change Healthcare Inc., 0:24-cv-00751-PJS-DLM (D. Minn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Nicolas Keriazis</i></p> <p>E. Michelle Drake  Berger Montague PC  1229 Tyler Street NE, Suite 205  Minneapolis, MN 55413  Tel: (612) 594-5933  <a href="mailto:emdrake@bm.net">emdrake@bm.net</a></p> <p>Mark B. DeSanto  Berger Montague  1818 Market Street, Suite 3600  Philadelphia, PA 19103  <a href="mailto:mde santo@bm.net">mde santo@bm.net</a></p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>Tel: (215) 875-3046</p> <p>Norman E. Siegel          J. Austin Moore          Stefon J. David          Stueve Siegel Hanson LLP          460 Nichols Road, Suite 200          Kansas City, MO 64112          Tel: (816) 714-7100  <a href="mailto:siegel@stuevesiegel.com">siegel@stuevesiegel.com</a>  <a href="mailto:moore@stuevesiegel.com">moore@stuevesiegel.com</a>  <a href="mailto:david@stuevesiegel.com">david@stuevesiegel.com</a>          Tel: (816) 714-7100</p>	
<p><b><i>Jennifer Stump v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00255-WDC-AEN (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Jennifer Stump</i></p> <p>J. Gerard Stranch, IV          Michael C. Iadevaia          Emily Schiller          Stranch, Jennings &amp; Garvey, PLLC          223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200          Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a>          Tel: (615) 254-8801</p> <p>Lynn A. Toops          Cohen &amp; Malad, LLP          One Indiana Square, Suite 1400          Indianapolis, IN 46204  <a href="mailto:ltoops@cohenandmalad.com">ltoops@cohenandmalad.com</a>          Tel: (317) 636-2593</p> <p>Samuel J. Strauss          Raina Borrelli          Turke &amp; Strauss LLP          613 Williamson Street, Suite 201          Madison, WI 53703  <a href="mailto:sam@turkestrauss.com">sam@turkestrauss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:raina@turkestrauss.com">raina@turkestrauss.com</a>          Tel: (608) 237-1775          Fax: (608) 509-4423</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p><b><i>Robert Mackey v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., Optum, Inc., Change Healthcare Inc., 0:24-cv-00771-PJS-DLM (D. Minn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Robert Mackey</i></p> <p>Daniel E. Gustafson                  David A. Goodwin                  Joe E. Nelson                  Gustafson Gluek PLLC                  Canadian Pacific Plaza                  120 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600                  Minneapolis, MN 55402  <a href="mailto:dgustafson@gustafsongluek.com">dgustafson@gustafsongluek.com</a>  <a href="mailto:dgoodwin@gustafsongluek.com">dgoodwin@gustafsongluek.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jnelson@gustafsongluek.com">jnelson@gustafsongluek.com</a>                  Tel: (612) 333-8844</p> <p>Nicholas A. Migliaccio                  Jason S. Rathod                  Miglicaccio &amp; Rathod LLP                  412 H St NE, Suite 302                  Washington, DC 20002  <a href="mailto:nmigliaccio@classlawdc.com">nmigliaccio@classlawdc.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jrathod@classlawdc.com">jrathod@classlawdc.com</a>                  Tel: (202) 470-3520</p>	<p>(via mail)</p> <p>(via mail)</p>
<p><b><i>Jimmy Allen v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00263-WDC-JSF (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Jimmy Allen</i></p> <p>J. Gerard Stranch, IV                  Michael C. Iadevaia                  Emily Schiller                  Stranch, Jennings &amp; Garvey, PLLC                  223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 254-8801</p> <p>Gary M. Klinger                  Milberg Coleman Bryson                  Phillips Grossman LLC                  227 W. Monroe Street, Suite 2100                  Chicago, IL 60606  <a href="mailto:gklinger@milberg.com">gklinger@milberg.com</a></p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>Tel: (866) 252-0878</p> <p>William “Billy” Peerce Howard  The Consumer Protection Firm, PLLC  401 East Jackson Street, Suite 2340  Tampa, FL 33602  <a href="mailto:billy@TheConsumerProtectionFirm.com">billy@TheConsumerProtectionFirm.com</a>  Tel: 813-500-1500</p>	
<p><b><i>Sandra Groom v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., Optum, Inc., Change Healthcare Inc., 0:24-cv-00915-PJS-DLM (D. Minn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Sandra Groom</i></p> <p>E. Michelle Drake  Berger Montague PC  1229 Tyler Street NE, Suite 205  Minneapolis, MN 55413  <a href="mailto:emdrake@bm.net">emdrake@bm.net</a>  Tel: (612) 594-5933</p> <p>Sabita J. Soneji  Tycko &amp; Zavareei LLP  1970 Broadway, Suite 1070  Oakland, CA 94612  <a href="mailto:ssoneji@tzlegal.com">ssoneji@tzlegal.com</a>  Tel: (510) 254-6808</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Rebecca Medina v. Change Healthcare Inc., Optum, Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, 2:24-cv-00766-TLN-DB (E.D. Cal.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Rebecca Medina</i></p> <p>Steven Lopez  David M. Berger  Rosemary M. Rivas  Rosanne L. Mah  Gibbs Law Group LLP  1111 Broadway, Suite 2100  Oakland, CA 94607  <a href="mailto:sal@classlawgroup.com">sal@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:dmb@classlawgroup.com">dmb@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:rmr@classlawgroup.com">rmr@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:rlm@classlawgroup.com">rlm@classlawgroup.com</a>  Tel: (510) 350-9700</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>Fax: (510) 350-9701</p>	
<p><b><i>Sara Lemke, Revival Therapy, EA Health Holdings, Inc., and EA Health, LLC v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., Optum, Inc., 3:24-cv-00302-WDC-BDH (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiffs Sara Lemke, Revival Therapy P.C., EA Health Holdings, Inc., EA Health, LLC</i></p> <p>Thomas A. Zimmerman, Jr.                  Zimmerman Law Offices, P.C.                  77 W. Washington Street, Suite 1220                  Chicago, IL 60602  <a href="mailto:tom@attorneyzim.com">tom@attorneyzim.com</a>                  Tel: (312) 440-0020                  Fax: (312) 440-4180</p> <p>Brent S. Snyder                  DannLaw                  2125 Middlebrook Pike                  Knoxville, TN 37921  <a href="mailto:notices@dannlaw.com">notices@dannlaw.com</a>                  Tel: (865) 264-3328                  Fax: (865) 546-2777</p> <p>Brian D. Flick                  Marc E. Dann                  DannLaw                  15000 Madison Avenue                  Lakewood, OH 44107  <a href="mailto:notices@dannlaw.com">notices@dannlaw.com</a>                  Tel: (216) 373-0539                  Fax: (216) 373-0536</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Advanced Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology PC v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., Optum, Inc., Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00063-MPM-JMV (N.D. Miss.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Advanced Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology PC</i></p> <p>John W. (“Don”) Barrett                  Barrett Law Group, P.A.                  404 Court Square N, P.O. Box 927                  Lexington, MS 39095  <a href="mailto:dbarrett@barrettlawgroup.com">dbarrett@barrettlawgroup.com</a></p>	

<p>Tel: (662) 834-2488</p> <p>Richard R. Barrett                  Law Offices of Richard R. Barrett, PLLC                  2086 Old Taylor Rd., Suite 1011                  Oxford, MS 38655  <a href="mailto:rrb@rrblawfirm.net">rrb@rrblawfirm.net</a>                  Tel: (662) 380-5018</p> <p>Charles J. LaDuca                  Brendan Thompson                  Christian Hudson                  Cuneo Gilbert &amp; LaDuca, LLP                  4725 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Suite 200                  Washington, DC 20016  <a href="mailto:charlesl@cuneolaw.com">charlesl@cuneolaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:brendant@cuneolaw.com">brendant@cuneolaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:chudson@cuneolaw.com">chudson@cuneolaw.com</a>                  Tel: (202) 789-3960</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Bay Area Therapy Group A Marriage and Family Counseling Corp. v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, Optum, Inc., 3:24-cv-01682-AGT (N.D. Cal.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Plaintiff Bay Area Therapy Group A Marriage and Family Counseling Corp.</i></p> <p>Rosemary M. Rivas                  David M. Berger                  Rosanne L. Mah                  Gibbs Law Group LLP                  1111 Broadway, Suite 2100                  Oakland, CA 94607  <a href="mailto:rmr@classlawgroup.com">rmr@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:dmb@classlawgroup.com">dmb@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:rlm@classlawgroup.com">rlm@classlawgroup.com</a>                  Tel: (510) 350-9700                  Fax: (510) 350-9701</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Amherst Psychiatric Services v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00312-AAT (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Amherst Psychiatric Services</i></p> <p>J. Gerard Stranch, IV                  Michael C. Iadevaia                  Emily Schiller                  Stranch, Jennings &amp; Garvey, PLLC</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 254-8801</p> <p>Norman E. Siegel                  J. Austin Moore                  Stefon J. David                  Stueve Siegel Hanson LLP                  460 Nichols Road, Suite 200                  Kansas City, MO 64112  <a href="mailto:siegel@stuevesiegel.com">siegel@stuevesiegel.com</a>  <a href="mailto:moore@stuevesiegel.com">moore@stuevesiegel.com</a>  <a href="mailto:david@stuevesiegel.com">david@stuevesiegel.com</a>                  Tel: (816) 714-7100</p> <p>E. Michelle Drake                  Mark B. DeSanto                  Berger Montague PC                  1229 Tyler Street NE, Suite 205                  Minneapolis, MN 55413  <a href="mailto:emdrake@bm.net">emdrake@bm.net</a>  <a href="mailto:mdeanto@bm.net">mdeanto@bm.net</a>                  Tel: (612) 594-5933</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Michael O’Bradovich v. Change Healthcare Inc., Optum, Inc., and UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, 3:24-cv-00452 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Michael O’Bradovich</i></p> <p>Gary F. Lynch                  Lynch Carpenter, LLP                  1133 Penn Avenue, 5th Floor                  Pittsburgh, PA 15222  <a href="mailto:Gary@lcllp.com">Gary@lcllp.com</a>                  Tel: (412) 322-9243                  Fax: (412) 231-0246</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Apex Physical Rehabilitation &amp; Wellness PLLC v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., and Optum, Inc., 3:24-cv-00331 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Apex Physical Rehabilitation &amp; Wellness PLLC</i></p> <p>Christopher L. Ayers</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>Jennifer R. Scullion                  Justin M. Smigelsky                  Nigel Halliday                  Seeger Weiss LLP                  55 Challenger Road, 6th Floor                  Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660  <a href="mailto:cayers@seegerweiss.com">cayers@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jscullion@seegerweiss.com">jscullion@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com">jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:nhalliday@seegerweiss.com">nhalliday@seegerweiss.com</a>                  Tel: (973) 639-9100                  Fax: (973) 639-9393</p> <p>John Tate Spragens                  Spragens Law PLC                  311 22nd Ave. N.                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:john@spragenslaw.com">john@spragenslaw.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 983-8900                  Fax: (615) 682-8533</p>	
<p><b><i>Luxe Dental Spa, LLC v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., and Optum, Inc., 3:24-cv-04044 (D.N.J.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Luxe Dental Spa, LLC</i></p> <p>Christopher L. Ayers                  Jennifer R. Scullion                  Justin M. Smigelsky                  Nigel Halliday                  Seeger Weiss LLP                  55 Challenger Road                  6th Floor                  Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660  <a href="mailto:cayers@seegerweiss.com">cayers@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jscullion@seegerweiss.com">jscullion@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com">jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:nhalliday@seegerweiss.com">nhalliday@seegerweiss.com</a>                  Tel: (973) 639-9100                  Fax: (973) 639-9393</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>
<p><b><i>Matthew Herrick v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., and Optum, Inc., 3:24-cv-00293 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Matthew Herrick</i></p> <p>Christopher L. Ayers</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>Jennifer R. Scullion                  Justin M. Smigelsky                  Nigel Halliday                  Seeger Weiss LLP                  55 Challenger Road                  6th Floor                  Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660  <a href="mailto:cayers@seegerweiss.com">cayers@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jscullion@seegerweiss.com">jscullion@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com">jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:nhalliday@seegerweiss.com">nhalliday@seegerweiss.com</a>                  Tel: (973) 639-9100                  Fax: (973) 639-9393</p> <p>John Tate Spragens                  Spragens Law PLC                  311 22nd Ave. N.                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:john@spragenslaw.com">john@spragenslaw.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 983-8900                  Fax: (615) 682-8533</p>	
<p><b><i>Douglass Castell v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, UnitedHealthcare, Inc., and Optum, Inc., 3:24-cv-00339 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Douglass Castell</i></p> <p>Christopher L. Ayers                  Jennifer R. Scullion                  Justin M. Smigelsky                  Nigel Halliday                  Seeger Weiss LLP                  55 Challenger Road                  6th Floor                  Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660  <a href="mailto:cayers@seegerweiss.com">cayers@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jscullion@seegerweiss.com">jscullion@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com">jsmigelsky@seegerweiss.com</a>  <a href="mailto:nhalliday@seegerweiss.com">nhalliday@seegerweiss.com</a>                  Tel: (973) 639-9100                  Fax: (973) 639-9393</p> <p>John Tate Spragens                  Spragens Law PLC                  311 22nd Ave. N.</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:john@spragenslaw.com">john@spragenslaw.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 983-8900                  Fax: (615) 682-8533</p>	
<p><b><i>Be Well Integrative Health Partners, PLLC v. UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, Optum, Inc., Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00337 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Be Well Integrative Health Partners, PLLC</i></p> <p>Aubrey B. Harwell, III                  Charles F. Barrett                  Simon Levitsky                  Neal &amp; Harwell, PLC                  1201 Demonbreun Street, Suite 1000                  Nashville, TN 37203                  Tel: (615) 244-1713                  Fax: (615) 726-0573  <a href="mailto:tharwell@nealharwell.com">tharwell@nealharwell.com</a>  <a href="mailto:cbarrett@nealharwell.com">cbarrett@nealharwell.com</a></p>	<p>(via mail)</p>
<p><b><i>Therapy My Way and Thomas Franco Therapy and Consulting v. Change Healthcare Inc., Optum, Inc., and UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, 3:24-cv-00345 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Therapy My Way, Thomas Franco Therapy and Consulting</i></p> <p>David M. Berger                  Rosemary M. Rivas                  Rosanne L. Mah                  Gibbs Law Group LLP                  1111 Broadway, Suite 2100                  Oakland, CA 94607  <a href="mailto:sal@classlawgroup.com">sal@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:dmb@classlawgroup.com">dmb@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:rnr@classlawgroup.com">rnr@classlawgroup.com</a>  <a href="mailto:rlm@classlawgroup.com">rlm@classlawgroup.com</a>                  Tel: (510) 350-9700                  Fax: (510) 350-9701</p> <p>John Tate Spragens                  Spragens Law PLC                  311 22nd Ave. N.                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:john@spragenslaw.com">john@spragenslaw.com</a></p>	<p>(via mail)</p>

<p>Tel: (615) 983-8900                  Fax: (615) 682-8533</p>	
<p><b><i>Mt. Rainier Emergency Physicians, PLLC, River Rock Wellness, and Jenna Wolfson v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00323 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Mt. Rainier Emergency Physicians, PLLC, River Rock Wellness and Jenna Wolfson</i></p> <p>John A. Yanchunis                  Ronald Podolny                  Morgan &amp; Morgan (Tampa Office)                  201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor                  Tampa, FL 33602  <a href="mailto:jyanchunis@forthepeople.com">jyanchunis@forthepeople.com</a>  <a href="mailto:ronald.podolny@forthepeople.com">ronald.podolny@forthepeople.com</a>                  Tel: (813) 223-5505                  Fax: (813) 223-5402</p> <p>Kathryn E. Barnett                  Morgan &amp; Morgan (Nashville Office)                  810 Broadway, Suite 105                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:kbarnett@forthepeople.com">kbarnett@forthepeople.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 490-0943                  Fax: (615) 750-9251</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p> <p>(via mail)</p>
<p><b><i>Mary Shelor v. Change Healthcare Inc., 3:24-cv-00340 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Mary Shelor</i></p> <p>J. Gerard Stranch, IV                  Michael C. Iadevaia                  Emily Schiller                  Stranch, Jennings &amp; Garvey, PLLC                  223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200                  Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a>                  Tel: (615) 254-8801</p> <p>Jeffrey K. Brown                  Brett R. Cohen                  Leeds Brown Law, P.C.</p>	<p>(via ECF)</p>

<p>One Old Country Road, Suite 347          Carle Place, NY 11514  <a href="mailto:jbrown@leedsbrownlaw.com">jbrown@leedsbrownlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:bcohen@leedsbrownlaw.com">bcohen@leedsbrownlaw.com</a>          Tel: (516) 873-9550</p> <p>Charles E. Schaffer          Levin Sedran &amp; Berman, LLP          510 Walnut Street, Suite 500          Philadelphia, PA 19106  <a href="mailto:cschaffer@lfsblaw.com">cschaffer@lfsblaw.com</a>          Tel: (215) 592-1500          Fax: (215) 592-4663</p> <p>Jeffrey S. Goldenberg          Todd Naylor          Goldenberg Schneider, LPA          One West Fourth Street, 18th Floor          Cincinnati, OH 45202  <a href="mailto:jgoldenberg@gs-legal.com">jgoldenberg@gs-legal.com</a>  <a href="mailto:tnaylor@gs-legal.com">tnaylor@gs-legal.com</a>          Tel: (513) 345-8297          Fax: (513) 345-8294</p>	
<p><b><i>Karyn Nicholls, Soumendu Das, Rose Harris, Individually and on behalf of her minor child L.I. and Kelly Freeman v. Change Healthcare Inc., Optum Inc. and UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, 3:24-cv-00349 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Karyn Nicholls, Soumendu Das, Rose Harris, individually and on behalf of her minor child L.I., and Kelly Freeman</i></p> <p>J. Gerard Stranch, IV          Michael C. Iadevaia          Emily Schiller          Stranch, Jennings &amp; Garvey, PLLC          223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200          Nashville, TN 37203  <a href="mailto:gstranch@stranchlaw.com">gstranch@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:miadevaia@stranchlaw.com">miadevaia@stranchlaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:eschiller@stranchlaw.com">eschiller@stranchlaw.com</a>          Tel: (615) 254-8801</p> <p>Amber L. Schubert          Robert C. Schubert          Schubert Jonckheer &amp; Kolbe LLP</p>	<p>(via mail)</p>

<p>2001 Union St., Suite 200                  San Francisco, CA 94123  <a href="mailto:aschubert@sjk.law">aschubert@sjk.law</a>  <a href="mailto:rschubert@sjk.law">rschubert@sjk.law</a>                  Tel: (415) 788-4220</p>	
<p><b><i>Lonny David Matlick, D.B.A. Lonny D. Matlick D.O. v. Change Healthcare Inc., Optum Inc. and UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, 3:24-cv-04364 (D.N.J.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Lonny David Matlick, D.B.A.                  Lonney D. Matlick D.O.</i></p> <p>James E. Cecchi                  Carella Byrne Cecchi Brody &amp; Agnello, P.C.                  5 Becker Farm Road                  Roseland, NJ 07068  <a href="mailto:jcecchi@carellabyrne.com">jcecchi@carellabyrne.com</a>                  Tel: (973) 994-1700                  Fax: (973) 994-1744</p> <p>James S. Notis                  Meagan A. Farmer                  Gardy &amp; Notis, LLP                  150 East 52nd Street, 11th Floor                  New York, NY 10022  <a href="mailto:jnotis@gardylaw.com">jnotis@gardylaw.com</a>  <a href="mailto:mfarmer@gardylaw.com">mfarmer@gardylaw.com</a>                  Tel: (212) 905-0509</p> <p>Lee Squitieri                  Lee Squitieri &amp; Fearon LLP                  305 Broadway, 7th Floor                  New York, NY 10007  <a href="mailto:lee@sfclasslaw.com">lee@sfclasslaw.com</a>                  Tel: (212) 421-6492</p>	<p>(via mail)</p> <p>(via mail)</p> <p>(via mail)</p>
<p><b><i>Through the Forest Counseling Inc. v. Change Healthcare Inc., UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, 3:24-cv-00370 (M.D. Tenn.)</i></b></p>	
<p><i>Counsel for Through the Forest Counseling Inc.</i></p> <p>Adam E. Polk                  Jordan Elias                  Girard Sharp LLP                  601 California Street, Suite 1400</p>	<p>(via mail)</p>

<p>San Francisco, CA 94108 <a href="mailto:apolk@girardsharp.com">apolk@girardsharp.com</a> <a href="mailto:jelias@girardsharp.com">jelias@girardsharp.com</a> Tel: (415) 981-4800 Fax: (415) 981-4846</p> <p>Jerry E. Martin Matthew Edward McGraw Seth Marcus Hyatt Barrett Johnston Martin &amp; Garrison, LLC 200 31st Avenue North Nashville, TN 37203 <a href="mailto:jmartin@barrettjohnston.com">jmartin@barrettjohnston.com</a> <a href="mailto:mmcgraw@barrettjohnston.com">mmcgraw@barrettjohnston.com</a> <a href="mailto:shyatt@barrettjohnston.com">shyatt@barrettjohnston.com</a> Tel: (615) 244-2202 Fax: (615) 252-3798</p>	<p>(via mail)</p>
--	-------------------