

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

IN RE FOREIGN EXCHANGE
BENCHMARK RATES ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

No. 1:13-cv-07789-LGS

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ENTRY OF
AN ORDER APPROVING THE THIRD DISTRIBUTION OF THE
SETTLEMENT FUND**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

ARGUMENT 1

 I. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE THIRD DISTRIBUTION..... 1

 A. Background on the Claims Administration Process 1

 B. The Court Should Approve Epiq’s Final Administrative Determinations..... 3

 C. *Pro Rata* Option 1 and Option 2 Claims Should Be Paid Subject
 to a Holdback 4

 D. The Court Should Approve the Distribution Plan for the Third
 Distribution Claims 5

 II. STATUS REPORT ON REMAINING CLAIMS AND SETTLEMENT FUND 5

 A. Unauthorized Claims 6

 B. Pending Claims 7

CONCLUSION..... 8

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Since the Court’s November 29, 2021, Order (ECF No. 1633) approving the “Second Distribution” of \$435 million to pay 22,904 Authorized Claims, Class Counsel has continued to work with its claims administrator and settlement experts to analyze and process claims. Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court to authorize a “Third Distribution” of \$270,951,068.24 to pay 2,031 Authorized Claims (the “Third Distribution Claims”). The Court’s approval of the Third Distribution will bring the total number of approved claims to 51,872, which is 99.5% of claims expected to be paid.

Class Counsel continues to work diligently with the claims administrator and settlement experts to process the remaining 0.5% of claims (286 claims). These claims are largely complex, high-dollar claims that require additional scrutiny to protect the integrity of the claims process and avoid dilution of the Settlement Fund by inflated claim submissions. Plaintiffs aim to file a distribution motion seeking the Court’s approval to pay the remaining claims on September 21, 2022.

ARGUMENT

I. THE COURT SHOULD APPROVE THE THIRD DISTRIBUTION

A. Background on the Claims Administration Process

The Plan of Distribution provides claimants with two claim submission options – Option 1 and Option 2. Kovach Decl., ¶4.¹ Under Option 1, payment is calculated from transaction data produced by Settling Defendants. *Id.* Under Option 2, payment is calculated from transaction data

¹ “Kovach Decl.” refers to the Declaration of Loree Kovach in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Entry of Order of an Order Approving the Third Distribution of Settlement Fund, filed concurrently herewith.

produced by the claimant. *Id.* For Option 2 claims, Option 1 results are also calculated (where available), and the claimant’s payment is based on the greater of the two values. *Id.*, ¶7.

Processing Option 2 claims requires several steps. First, the “Settlement Experts” (Ankura and Velador) perform an algorithmic, trade-by-trade review of the claimant’s transaction data and calculate claim value. *Id.*, ¶31. The algorithms flag ineligible or erroneous transactions for further review and/or auditing. If there are no transaction-level deficiencies flagged by the algorithms, the claim is considered an “Authorized Claim” eligible for payment. *Id.* If there are deficiencies, the claimant is notified and has 30 days to cure by submitting additional information, and the claim is reprocessed. *Id.*, ¶32. Epiq then issues a final administrative determination, accepting the claim in full (if cured), in part (if partially cured), or rejecting the claim in its entirety (if uncured). *Id.*

The following deficiencies lead to partial or full rejections of Option 2 claims:

- Inclusion of trades that are ineligible under the Settlements, including trades with non-defendants, outside the class period, in non-FX products (*e.g.*, precious metals or interest rates), on ineligible venues, or outside of the United States (*i.e.*, non-U.S. domiciled claimant trading with non-U.S. desk of a defendant).²
- Submission of trades with invalid or missing mandatory fields, including ISO codes (standardized currency pair codes), contract codes (for futures), product type, base amounts, contra amounts, value dates, and/or trade rates. These are mandatory fields

² *In re Citigroup Inc. Sec. Litig.*, No. 09 MD 2070(SHS), 2014 WL 2445714, at *2-*3 (S.D.N.Y. May 30, 2014) (upholding claims administrator’s rejection of claims where claimants did not hold shares during the necessary time period and therefore “suffered no loss”); *In re Goldome Sec. Litig.*, No. 88 Civ. 4765 (JES), 1991 WL 113263, at *1, *3 (S.D.N.Y. June 20, 1991) (accepting claims administrator’s rejection of claims where “(1) the purchase took place outside the class period; (2) the claim showed no purchase of the stock; . . . (5) the claim submitted was duplicate of a previously filed claim; (6) the claimant failed to correct a deficiency in the documents provided to the claims administrator after being given notice; or (7) the claimant withdrew the claim”); *Blank v. Jacobs*, No. 03-cv-2111(JS)(WDW), 2013 WL 1310503, at *5 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2013) (approving decision to reject claims with no eligible transactions).

because the Plan of Distribution requires these data points to calculate claim value. Trades missing these fields are therefore rejected.³

- Where the trade rate supplied is materially different from the prevailing daily rate and the claimant has not substantiated the trade with third party documentation showing the trade is genuine.⁴
- Where the trade size supplied is unusual or implausible and the claimant has not substantiated the trade size with third-party documentation showing the trade is genuine.⁵

Kovach Decl., ¶36.

After a final administrative determination, a claimant is not permitted to resubmit its claims but may, within 20 days, request Court review of the administrative determination. *Id.*, ¶29. Class Counsel and Epiq review all requests for Court review and attempt to resolve objections. *Id.*

B. The Court Should Approve Epiq’s Final Administrative Determinations

This Motion seeks approval of Epiq’s final administrative determinations to accept 172 Option 1 claims and 1,859 Option 2 claims. Of the Option 2 claims, Epiq accepted 245 claims in part and 1,586 claims in full. Kovach Decl., ¶14, Ex. 4 (listing Partially Accepted Claims). All 2,031 Third Distribution Claims have completed the processing steps outlined above, and the period to submit additional information to cure or seek Court review of final administrative determinations

³ *Goldome*, 1991 WL 113263, at *1, *3 (accepting claims administrator’s rejection of claims where the claimant “failed to correct a deficiency in the documents provided to the claims administrator after being given notice”).

⁴ *Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of Am., Corp.*, No. 14-CV-7126 (JMF), 2020 WL 916853, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 26, 2020), *aff’d sub nom. Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Fortinbras Asset Mgmt. GmbH*, 835 F. App’x 647 (2d Cir. 2021) (accepting claims administrator’s decision to reject claim where claimant was unable to provide documentation proving that submitted transactions actually occurred); *Blank*, 2013 WL 1310503, at *5 (accepting claims administrator’s “decision to reject any claims not properly documented unless any of those claimants has been able to cure the deficiencies”); *Contant v. Bank of Am. Corp.*, No. 1:17-cv-3139-LGS-SDA, Order, ECF No. 531, at 1-2 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 16, 2021) (denying claim to the extent it lacked documentation to validate denied transactions).

⁵ *Id.*

has expired. Epiq has therefore determined that these claims are Authorized Claims eligible for payment. The following table shows a breakdown of the payment categories:

Total Third Distribution Claims by Payment Category	
Number of Claims	Payment Category / Kovach Ex. Number
172	Total Option 1 Third Distribution Claims
22	<i>De Minimis</i> (\$15) / Ex. 1
31	Automatic (\$150) / Ex. 2
119	<i>Pro Rata</i> (>\$150) / Ex. 3
1,859	Total Option 2 Third Distribution Claims
322	<i>De Minimis</i> (\$15) / Ex. 1
397	Automatic (\$150) / Ex. 2
1,140	<i>Pro Rata</i> (>\$150) / Ex. 3

Id., ¶¶11-13.

C. *Pro Rata* Option 1 and Option 2 Claims Should Be Paid Subject to a Holdback

The Court should also approve a 40% holdback on *pro rata* Third Distribution Claims (the “Reserve”).⁶ Class Counsel, in consultation with Ankura, who are experts in modeling claims participation and calculating holdbacks, recommends maintaining the holdback at the level the Court approved in connection with the Second Distribution (40%). The Reserve will allow for fluctuations in the participation rate by volume, as the value of the remaining 0.5% of claims (discussed in §II.B., below) has been conservatively estimated, but the precise amount may fluctuate.

Class Counsel will use the Reserve to pay for expenses incurred in connection with administering the Settlements and any contingencies that may arise after the distribution with respect to claims (including any appeals). Class Counsel will then equalize any payment differentials between the Initial Distribution and subsequent distributions and will distribute any

⁶ Because *de minimis* and automatic payments are not subject to proration, they will be paid in full.

remaining Reserve *pro rata* in subsequent distribution(s) to Authorized Claimants. *See Alaska Elec. Pension Fund*, 2020 WL 916853, at *2 (approving payment of claim subject to a holdback).

D. The Court Should Approve the Distribution Plan for the Third Distribution Claims

Claimants entitled to *de minimis* payments, automatic payments, or a single *pro rata* payment less than \$1,000 will receive a check. Kovach Decl., ¶37(d); Proposed Distribution Order, ¶3(c).⁷ Claimants entitled to a *pro rata* payment greater than \$1,000 will have the option of receiving a check or a wire. Kovach Decl., ¶37(d); Proposed Distribution Order, ¶3(c). Claimants who provide deficient wire instructions will be sent a check. *Id.*

To avoid the accumulation of uncashed checks, the checks will bear the notation “CASH PROMPTLY; VOID AND SUBJECT TO RE-DISTRIBUTION IF NOT NEGOTIATED BY [DATE 90 DAYS AFTER ISSUE DATE].” Kovach Decl., ¶37(e); Proposed Distribution Order, ¶3(d). Epiq will also communicate with Authorized Claimants holding uncashed checks as the 90-day period closes. Kovach Decl., ¶37(f). Authorized Claimants who have not cashed their distribution checks or have not provided valid wire information will forfeit their right to payment and will not be permitted to participate in future distributions. Any forfeited amounts will be allocated to Authorized Claimants in subsequent distributions. *Id.*; Proposed Distribution Order, ¶3(e).

II. STATUS REPORT ON REMAINING CLAIMS AND SETTLEMENT FUND

The following chart breaks down the 108,745 submitted claims:

Number of Claims	Category
108,745	Total Claims Submitted

⁷ “Proposed Distribution Order” refers to the [Proposed] Order Approving the Third Distribution of the Settlement Fund, filed concurrently herewith.

Number of Claims	Category
52,029	Estimated Authorized Claims ⁸
56,716	Unauthorized Claims
26,937	Authorized Claims in Initial Distribution
23,019	Option 1
3,918	Option 2
22,904	Authorized Claims in Second Distribution
6,882	Option 1
16,022	Option 2
2,031	Proposed Authorized Claims in Third Distribution
172	Option 1
1,859	Option 2
286	Pending Claims

The Court's approval of the Third Distribution will result in paying 2,031 Authorized Claims. Kovach Decl., ¶10. The remaining claims fall into two categories – Unauthorized Claims and pending claims. The discussion below addresses these remaining claims.

A. Unauthorized Claims

Epiq has determined that 56,716 of the submitted claims are likely to be rejected in full. Kovach Decl., ¶17. Almost 21,000 of the Unauthorized Claims are withdrawn claims.⁹ *Id.*, ¶20. Approximately 35,000 claims cannot receive payment because they were not eligible for Option 1, no Option 2 data was provided, or the claim calculated to \$0 value due to all trades being transacted fully outside the United States or outside of the class period. *Id.*, ¶¶21-26. Other Unauthorized Claims were rejected because they were duplicates, missing signatures or authorization documents, submitted by a person excluded from the Settlement Class, or did not

⁸ Estimated Authorized Claims are submitted claims, which based on their status have indicia that Epiq will likely be able to accept them in whole or in part as Authorized Claims. Estimated Authorized Claims includes the Initial Distribution Claims, Second Distribution Claims, Third Distribution Claims, and pending claims; it excludes claims that Epiq expects to reject in full as "Unauthorized Claims." Kovach Decl., ¶17.

⁹ Most of the withdrawn claims are due to a third-party agent improperly submitting claims under both Option 1 and 2 for all its clients. Epiq required each claimant to elect to proceed under only one option, and the other claim was withdrawn. *Id.*, ¶20.

pass foreign data privacy compliance. *Id.* All Unauthorized Claims have received at least one deficiency notice that was not cured within the time allotted. Some Unauthorized Claims have remained uncured for more than 400 days. *Id.*, ¶24.

B. Pending Claims

Two hundred eighty-six claims are pending (*i.e.*, they are not included in the Initial, Second, or Third Distribution and are not counted as Unauthorized Claims). Kovach Decl., ¶17.

The pending claims fall within the following categories:

- *Option 2 Claims subject to audit.* These are Option 2 claims being audited to confirm their validity. Claimants must submit, among other things, third-party documentation (*e.g.*, trade confirmations or broker statements) to verify some of the transactions. The audit process is ongoing.
- *Option 2 claims subject to Settlement Expert review.* These are high-value claims or improperly formatted claims not suitable for algorithmic assessment.
- *Claims converted from Option 1 to Option 2.* These claims, initially submitted under Option 1 and later converted to Option 2, are being processed as Option 2 claims.
- *Resubmitted Option 2 claims or claims with deficiency notices that are likely to be cured.* These claims were or will be resubmitted to cure deficiencies and are undergoing reprocessing.
- *Disputed claims.* These claims were rejected in a final administrative determination, and the claimant may seek Court review.

Id.

Given their complexity, size, and potential dollar value, processing the pending claims has been time- and expert-intensive. Many of the pending claims represent trillions of dollars of notional volume and therefore require heightened scrutiny and auditing. Most, if not all, the pending claims have received deficiency notifications and one (if not two or three) chances to cure. In addition, the parties are working to resolve some global issues relating to these claims, which

has delayed the process. If these global issues can be resolved, there will be fewer disputes requiring judicial intervention.

Plaintiffs anticipate filing a distribution motion covering the pending claims on September 21, 2022; however, Plaintiffs believe that some claimants may request judicial review of Epiq's claim determinations. Plaintiffs will move for approval of Epiq's determinations on the Unauthorized Claims and any disputed claims in connection with the next distribution motion. This sequencing is intended to minimize the number of disputes brought to the Court and to ensure that all disputes are presented in a single motion so that any appeals of the Court's determinations may be consolidated before the Second Circuit. Plaintiffs will propose a briefing schedule closer to the next distribution motion's submission date once Epiq has determined how many claimants intend to present their objections to the Court.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter the accompanying Proposed Order approving the Third Distribution and authorizing Epiq to implement the Distribution Plan.

Dated: June 30, 2022

SCOTT+SCOTT ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LLP

HAUSFELD LLP

s/ Christopher M. Burke

s/ Michael D. Hausfeld

CHRISTOPHER M. BURKE (CB-3648)
WALTER W. NOSS (WN-0529)
KRISTEN M. ANDERSON (*pro hac vice*)
KATE LV (*pro hac vice*)
600 W. Broadway, Suite 3300
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: 619-233-4565
Facsimile: 619-233-0508
cburke@scott-scott.com
wnoss@scott-scott.com
kanderson@scott-scott.com
klv@scott-scott.com

MICHAEL D. HAUSFELD
REENA A. GAMBHIR
TIMOTHY S. KEARNS
SARAH R. LAFRENIERE
888 16th Street NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-540-7143
Facsimile: 202-540-7201
mhausfeld@hausfeld.com
rgambhir@hausfeld.com
tkearns@hausfeld.com
slafreniere@hausfeld.com

-and-

SCOTT+SCOTT ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LLP

DAVID R. SCOTT (DS-8053)

JOSEPH P. GUGLIELMO (JG-2447)

DONALD A. BROGGI (DB-9661)

The Helmsley Building

230 Park Avenue, 17th Floor

New York, NY 10169

Telephone: 212-223-6444

Facsimile: 212-223-6334

david.scott@scott-scott.com

jguglielmo@scott-scott.com

dbroggi@scott-scott.com

-and-

HAUSFELD LLP

MICHAEL P. LEHMANN

BONNY E. SWEENEY

CHRISTOPHER L. LEBSOCK

600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: 415-633-1908

Facsimile: 415-358-4980

mlehmman@hausfeld.com

bsweeney@hausfeld.com

clebsock@hausfeld.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 30, 2022, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses denoted on the Electronic Mail Notice List.

s/ Christopher M. Burke
Christopher M. Burke