quinn emanuel
quinn emanuel urquhart & sullivan, llp

Antitrust & Competition

A Leader in Antitrust and Competition Disputes, on Both Sides of the "v.": Quinn Emanuel has one of the world's leading antitrust practices, with unique experience, capabilities, and resources to successfully represent both plaintiffs and defendants in antitrust and competition disputes in the U.S. and abroad.

When representing antitrust plaintiffs, we have recovered billions of dollars in both class actions and representations of plaintiffs in private litigation and "opt-out" cases. In 2015 alone, we recovered over $2.5 billion for antitrust plaintiffs. Courts frequently appoint Quinn Emanuel to serve as lead or co-lead plaintiffs' counsel in some of the most significant antitrust class actions, and leading corporations have turned to Quinn Emanuel for the pursuit of antitrust damages and injunctive relief. On the defense side, we have achieved victories for companies, in a range of industries, accused of antitrust and competition law violations. We have won dismissals by motion, and we have negotiated excellent settlements for our clients, including several settlements not requiring any monetary payment. But we are also a firm with the genuine ability to take antitrust cases to trial, and we have done so with frequent success, including a defense jury verdict for our client Micron in a multi-billion-dollar case that was perhaps the most significant U.S. antitrust jury trial of the past decade.

We find that our experience, stature, and relationships in the plaintiffs' antitrust bar help us provide the most effective representation on the defense side and vice versa. We can bring to bear our unique insight into the plaintiffs' and defendants' bar. We know the strategies they employ. We know their approaches to settlement.

Quinn Emanuel's antitrust practice is not comprised of general litigators who know a bit about competition law or antitrust transactional lawyers who have done a bit of litigation. Our antitrust lawyers are accomplished courtroom advocates with a deep understanding of competition law.

The *Global Competition Review* named our antitrust and competition practice among the "25 Global Elite 2023,' and number five in their list of the world's top 10 competition litigation practices. In 2012 and 2015, *Law360* recognized our antitrust practice as one of the top five in the U.S. *The Recorder* selected Quinn Emanuel as one of the "Leading Antitrust Litigation Departments of the Year 2015."

A TRULY GLOBAL NETWORK FOR ANTITRUST AND COMPETITION MATTERS

Quinn Emanuel is at the forefront of antitrust and competition matters that are increasingly complex and often multi-jurisdictional. Global antitrust issues require a global strategy. Quinn Emanuel's worldwide resources – from the United States to Europe, the United Kingdom, the Asia-Pacific and Australia – enable us to execute comprehensive global strategies, taking account of the differences of national laws, efficiently because we do so as a single law firm.

- **Brussels:** Quinn Emanuel's rapidly expanding, multilingual and diverse Brussels office focuses primarily on complex antitrust/competition law related disputes and investigations involving the European Commission, the EFTA Surveillance Authority, the EU national competition authorities, and associated litigation (whether before the EU Courts in Luxembourg or in the member states, as well as the United Kingdom). Having been involved in many of the major investigations of the last 30 years, the team has particular expertise in handling multi-jurisdictional and EU cartel investigations and associated litigation, abuse of dominance claims, mergers and joint ventures, State aid, advise to corporations in relation to the Digital Markets Act and the Digital Services Act, and matters relating to cross-border trade/EU internal market issues. There is a particular focus on high-tech, IP related

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

matters, especially those involving standard essential patents, pharma, and transportation.

- **London:** Quinn Emanuel has become a go-to firm for the range of contentious competition law services, acting on both sides of competition law disputes, as well as providing advice and representation in respect of investigations involving the European Commission and national competition authorities – including launching the first mass consumer collective action in the UK's new Competition Appeal Tribunal. Our London office is particularly active in follow-on claims arising from cartels in the technology and financial services sectors.

- **Germany:** Our German antitrust team has broad experience in litigation and investigations, representing clients before courts and regulators (including the European Commission, the German Federal Cartel Office and the German Financial Supervisory Authority). This expertise covers all aspects of German and European competition law, including abuse of dominance cases – with particular experience at the intersection of IP and competition law. Our German team recently helped a major U.S.-based corporation with business in Germany recover just under €40 million from companies that had participated in an international cartel.

- **Asia-Pacific:** Our competition practice draws on the experienced and well-connected lawyers in Quinn Emanuel's offices in Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Australia.

ANTITRUST AND COMPETITION MATTERS ACROSS A FULL RANGE OF INDUSTRIES

Quinn Emanuel has achieved success in both cartel and monopolization/abuse of dominance matters across a broad range of industries and businesses. The firm has broken ground in competition and market manipulation cases involving the **financial services industry**, developing major collusion claims against the world's largest banks – often without the benefit of regulatory settlements or criminal guilty pleas. The $1.87 billion settlement the firm achieved in the credit default swaps antitrust case is one of the largest in antitrust history. In the ISDAfix antitrust case, the firm negotiated more than $500 million in settlements.

Quinn Emanuel has experience and achieved major victories in the full range of industries. Examples of those successes include:

- **Manufacturing.** The firm won over $430 million in settlements in the Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation; the firm has secured over $400 million in settlements for a major U.S. manufacturer that was the victim of a worldwide bid-rigging cartel; and, on the defense side, the firm obtained a dismissal for **Mattel** of a monopolization suit brought by a competitor seeking $3 billion in alleged damages;

- **Agriculture.** The firm has played a lead role in securing over $100 million in settlements in the Egg Products Antitrust Litigation, and the firm obtained groundbreaking class certification and recovery in bankruptcy court in the Tomato Products Antitrust Litigation;

- **Pharma.** The firm obtained dismissal of all claims against Gilead in an antitrust suit brought by a generic pharmaceutical manufacturer;

- **Transportation.** The firm serves as court-appointed co-lead counsel in the pending major class action alleging collusion by the major U.S. railroads in connection with their freight fuel surcharge program;

- **Securities-related businesses.** The firm secured voluntary dismissal of all claims against client Rabobank, without any payment, in the multi-district antitrust litigation concerning municipal derivatives;

- **Product distribution.** The firm secured dismissal of all claims against client Honeywell by a

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

disgruntled former distributor of Honeywell fire safety systems for office buildings;

- **Technology products.** The firm won perhaps the most significant antitrust jury trial of recent years, defeating Rambus' multi-billion dollar claims against our client **Micron**; the firm won voluntary dismissal of all claims against client IBM, without any payment, in multidistrict antitrust litigation alleging collusion in the sale of SRAM memory chips; and the firm, on behalf of client Samsung, defeated class certification in two price-fixing actions brought by direct and indirect purchasers of NAND flash memory. Importantly, in 2022 the firm won a landmark case and secured an unprecedented and final victory for long-standing client Qualcomm, when the EU General Court annulled fully a 2018 EC decision alleging that Qualcomm's baseband chipset supply arrangement with Apple infringed Article 102 and imposing a EUR 1 billion fine.

- **Sports.** The firm secured dismissal of antitrust claims against our client **FIFA, the world soccer organization,** alleging that FIFA engaged in a conspiracy to force individuals who wished to attend the 2014 World Cup to purchase more-expensive hospitality packages instead of face-value tickets; the firm won summary judgment on behalf of clients **Haymon Sports** and its CEO, **Alan Haymon**, the prominent boxing manager, in a $300 million antitrust lawsuit by Oscar De La Hoya and his Golden Boy promotion companies; and the firm defended Madison Square Garden and the New York Rangers in an antitrust case alleging that the NHL and other parties conspired to inflate prices for television and internet broadcast of NHL games.

- **Energy, Oil & Gasoline.** The firm currently represents Vitol Inc., the American subsidiary of the world's largest independent energy trader, in defense of antitrust lawsuits brought by the California Attorney General and more than a dozen consumer class actions related to trading in the California gasoline spot market.

INTERSECTION OF ANTITRUST AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

We have been pioneers in dealing with issues at the intersection of intellectual property and competition. We have represented clients in some of the most significant IP cases in history, including recently what the press has called "the Smart Phone Wars." As a direct result, Quinn Emanuel has been at the cutting edge of disputes involving standard setting, FRAND commitments, monopolization of newly developed technologies and related patent abuse, ITC proceedings, transnational antitrust enforcement, and Hatch-Waxman antitrust. Our lawyers have also worked with intellectual property rights owners in protecting their rights in the face of competition and free movement claims in the EU and in front of national competition authorities and courts. We also have significant expertise in the application of competition law to the pharmaceutical sector, including novel "improper listing" cases, and in the numerous EU and UK "pay for delay" patent settlement competition law infringement cases.

INTERSECTION OF ANTITRUST AND BANKRUPTCY

We have pioneered antitrust and competition claims against companies that declare bankruptcy. Working with our market leading bankruptcy disputes practice, Quinn Emanuel has been at the forefront of pursuing plaintiffs' rights against competition law infringers that subsequently declare bankruptcy. By bringing together teams comprising our antitrust and bankruptcy lawyers, we obtained a pioneering certification of a class of antitrust claimants in U.S. bankruptcy court, and through negotiation with the bankruptcy trustee arranged for the class to receive a portion of the proceeds awarded to creditors in the bankruptcy proceedings. We also recently won an important ruling that a party emerging from bankruptcy could be jointly and severally liable for the damages caused by an antitrust conspiracy (even during the period prior to bankruptcy) based on post-bankruptcy participation in the conspiracy.

INVESTIGATIONS

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

We understand the importance of investigations and the consequences that follow in terms of civil claims. Competition investigations and the resultant decisions and plea agreements often spawn multiple civil damages actions, particularly in the U.S. and Europe. The damages exposure in these civil claims can often be far greater than the financial penalties imposed by the competition authorities. Accordingly, companies making an immunity or leniency application and/or facing a competition authority investigation need advisers who can not only effectively advise on the global risks and benefits of making an immunity or leniency application, and defend the investigation, but also prepare the company for any subsequent litigation and how to manage the process strategically from start to finish. Quinn Emanuel is perfectly positioned to handle both of those critical roles.

Our lawyers have represented clients in both civil and criminal antitrust investigations initiated by the Department of Justice, the FTC, the CFTC in the U.S. and DG Comp in the EU, Competition and Markets Authority in the UK and its equivalent in other countries. We have over 20 former U.S. federal prosecutors, many with extensive experience in antitrust-related matters. One of our partners has served as National Co-Chair of the American Bar Association's Criminal Antitrust Committee. Lawyers in our European offices have been involved in some of the most significant investigations by the European Commission and national competition authorities.

We believe our firm's disputes-only model gives our clients an advantage as compared to companies that are represented by other firms in contested investigations. Many full-service firms consider their relationships with the competition authorities an asset – particularly when those firms are regularly representing companies in transactions such as mergers and acquisitions. These firms are understandably not keen on compromising their relationships. But it is often critical to take tough stands with the authorities in competition investigations. We are fully committed to aggressively protecting our clients' positions in negotiations with the authorities, who know we will go to trial or appeal if a reasonable outcome cannot be reached.

PURSUING COMPETITION CLAIMS WITH THE AUTHORITIES

We also regularly represent clients who are the victims of anticompetitive conduct before the competition authorities (especially the European Commission). We know how to persuade the authorities to investigate such conduct. We know how to communicate with the Department of Justice, the European Commission, and EU national competition authority lawyers when appropriate.

RECENT REPRESENTATIONS

- We represented **WP Engine** in a plaintiff-side, bet-the-company case against their competitor Automattic and its CEO Matt Mullenweg, the founder of WordPress, whose software powers more than 40% of the internet, and obtained a major interim antitrust victory. After initially dismissing our antitrust claims, the court reversed course and sustained them in full, finding that WP Engine had plausibly alleged single-brand aftermarkets tied to the WordPress software and that, on direct evidence alone, the defendants held market power in every asserted market. The ruling builds on the sweeping injunction we secured in December 2024, which remains in place, and opens a path to significant damages and mandatory attorneys' fees and costs.

- We scored an unprecedented victory by defeating certification of a proposed class of cattle ranchers seeking $3 billion in damages from **JBS**, a large meatpacking company, and its co-defendants. The victory defies a decade of class cert grants in the multitude of antitrust cases brought against meatpackers and poultry processers that are sometimes referred to as the

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

"protein" antitrust cases.

- We secured four consecutive injunction victories in five months for **Applied Systems**, one of the leading providers of insurance agency management software, in litigation arising from a competitor's fraudulent access to Applied's Epic platform. Acting both offensively and defensively across three actions in Delaware Chancery Court and the Northern District of Illinois, we defeated Comulate's TRO application in Delaware after extensive argument, won Applied's own preliminary injunction by turning Comulate's Delaware submissions into admissions of breach, and defeated two further PI motions, with the court finding that Comulate had no shown a likelihood of success on its antitrust claims.

- We secured dismissal with prejudice of sweeping monopolization and attempted-monopolization counterclaims asserted against **GL Homes** by rival developer Akel Homes, eliminating hundreds of millions of dollars in potential exposure before any discovery commenced. Judge Aileen M. Cannon agreed with Quinn Emanuel's challenges to the foundational elements of Akel's antitrust theories, finding that Akel's proposed markets were "vague and ambiguous" and appeared to create a "fictitious market" through improper "pleading maneuvers."

- We represented **TVision** in a patent infringement lawsuit brought by Nielsen, in which Nielsen alleged that TVision's core audience-measurement technology infringed a patent covering automatic content recognition (ACR) technology. After stepping in shortly before trial to replace existing litigation counsel, our team secured a complete defense verdict in which the jury rejected Nielsen's infringement claim. The result is particularly significant given the broader context of Nielsen's filing several other patent suits against TVision as part of what TVision contends was a campaign to stifle competition in the audience-measurement industry. The verdict eliminates a damages claim of $23 million.

- We filed an antitrust class action on behalf of **Amazon consumers** attacking Amazon's MFN provisions, which require third-party sellers on Amazon's platform to not offer their products for less elsewhere. After Quinn Emanuel defeated Amazon's aggressive legal challenges, including two motions to dismiss and 700+ pages of opposition to the Firm's motion for class certification, Judge Chun granted Quinn Emanuel's motion for class certification on August 6, 2025 (released publicly on September 2, 2025), in a detailed fifty-page order that validates our comprehensive legal strategy. The class is composed of over 200 million American consumers—likely one of the largest classes ever certified in United States history. In addition, Quinn Emanuel represents two other related classes in this historic litigation against Amazon.

- Representing **a putative class of game publishers**, we filed an antitrust class action against Valve, which provides Steam, long the most dominant PC desktop gaming platform, to the public. Valve imposes various price restraints on PC desktop games throughout the U.S., which prevents publishers from promoting competition that would lower Valve's 30% commission for PC game sales, and pushes up consumer prices. Our lawsuit seeks damages for game publishers. The Court denied Valve's motion to dismiss, and Quinn Emanuel subsequently won class certification for approximately 30,000 computer game publishers harmed by Valve's anticompetitive behavior.

- We successfully defended **Vizgen, Inc.** in a biotechnology patent lawsuit brought by 10x Genomics and Harvard University challenging Vizgen's MERSCOPE technology, which enables massively multiplexed, genome-scale nucleic acid imaging for tissue-scale research and translational medicine. Vizgen brought antitrust counterclaims alleging that 10x and Harvard conspired to monopolize the market by obstructing Vizgen's ability to compete globally. The case proceeded to trial and settled mid-trial.

- We represented **Total Vision**, a private equity-backed group of optometry practices, in an antitrust case against VSP, the dominant vision insurance provider in the country. Despite facing a seemingly binding settlement agreement, we successfully argued that the agreement was part of

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

VSP's broader anticompetitive scheme and unenforceable. After thoroughly outmatching the opposition at every stage of litigation, we secured an exceptional settlement for Total Vision, the exact details of which are confidential.

- We represented **Qualcomm** in a complex abuse of dominance case concerning alleged exclusivity and have secured an unprecedented and final victory, achieving the reversal of a c. EUR 1 billion fine, and the recovery of litigation costs (Case T 235/18, *Qualcomm v Commission*).

- We represented **Qualcomm** in an £480 million ($650 million) opt-out class action brought before the UK Tribunal by Consumers' Association Which?, acting as the Class Representative to an estimated 29 million UK consumers who purchased Long-Term Evolution("LTE")-enabled Apple and Samsung mobile phones. The claim alleged that Qualcomm leveraged a dominant position in the supply of baseband chipsets to extract supra-competitive royalties in connection with the sale of certain Apple and Samsung mobile phones in the UK. Following a grueling five-week trial in London – and after five years of litigation in which we shaped every aspect of Qualcomm's defence – Which? announced its decision to abandon the proceedings in their entirety, subject to approval by the Tribunal. In doing so, the Class Representative publicly acknowledged that the Tribunal would have found in Qualcomm's favor on all key issues, confirming that Qualcomm's licensing and chipset practices did not infringe competition law and did not lead to inflated consumer prices.

- We also represent **Qualcomm** in an abuse of dominance case involving alleged predatory pricing before the Court of Justice of the European Union (Case C-819/24, *Qualcomm v Commission*).

- We also represented **Qualcomm** in the proposed acquisition of Alphawave (2025), Autotalks (2024), Veoneer (2021), and NXP (2016-2017).

- We provided EU and UK merger control advice to **eBay** regarding of the sale of its ticketing platform **StubHub** to viagogo.

- We represented **StubHub** in relation to the CMA's investigation of the *viagogo/StubHub* merger.

- We represented **Air Canada** in the Airfreight cartel case (Case T-326/17 *Air Canada v Commission*) and are now representing the client in the appeal before the EU Court of Justice seeking the annulment of the General Court's judgment (Case C-367/22 P *Air Canada v Commission*).

- We provide antitrust advice to platforms and online operators, including **Webgroup**, on the Digital Markets Act and the Digital Services Act, from compliance, strategic advice, all the way to potential litigation.

- We secured a $110 million antitrust verdict in the case of *Pacific Steel Group v. Commercial Metals Co. et al., C.A*. No. 4:20-cv-07683 in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. After less than three hours of deliberation, the unanimous nine-member jury delivered a verdict favoring our client, **Pacific Steel Group**, a San Diego-based steel fabricator, awarding significant damages for lost profits and other economic harms. The litigation centered on Commercial Metals Company's anticompetitive agreement with the steel mill supplier Danieli Corp., which precluded Pacific Steel Group from establishing its own steel mill in California.

- We represented **36 German sawmills** in a bundled standalone cartel damages action in connection with the round timber cartel operated by the German federal State of Baden-Württemberg since 1978. We obtained a judgment establishing liability before the Stuttgart Court of Appeals, setting a significant precedent in the private enforcement of EU competition law in Germany.

- We represented **ATL** in a case against CosMX involving three ATL patents covering lithium ion battery technology. A TL is the world's leading innovator of lithium ion batteries for consumer products and CosMX also manufacturer's lithium ion batteries. The jury found CosMX guilty of

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

willful patent infringement and awarded ATL a running royalty on critical technology. We also beat back a $148 million antitrust counterclaim from CosMX. On April 26, 2024, the court entered final judgment in the case, finding CosMX's willful infringement warranted a 27% enhancement of the compensatory damages owed, upon Quinn's motion to award enhanced damages. For QE, this win adds to our growing battery practice and reputation with Chinese tech companies.

- We successfully represented **IPCom** in defending against a claim for damages brought by Deutsche Telekom alleging anti-competitive discrimination following a patent license agreement concluded by the parties in 2013. The Court of Appeal affirmed the District Court's decision to dismiss the complaint, upholding the distribution of risk contractually agreed upon by the parties.

- We represent a **plaintiff class of FX platform customers** against an FX trading platform company (Currenex) and certain market makers that were active on Currenex (State Street, Goldman Sachs, and HC Technologies). Plaintiffs allege that Currenex conspired with State Street, Goldman Sachs, and HC Technologies to secretly give them superpriority privileges, ensuring that their orders were unfairly prioritized over normal customers, resulting in damages to other users of the Currenex platform. We moved for class certification on November 18, 2025, seeking classwide damages ranging into the multiple billions of dollars before trebling.

- Quinn Emanuel represented **IQVIA Inc.** and **IMS Software Services, Ltd.** ("IQVIA") against Veeva Systems Inc. ("Veeva") in a closely-watched dispute at the intersection of antitrust and intellectual property law. The parties compete in the provision of data and software offerings to pharmaceutical companies. In January 2017, IQVIA brought claims against Veeva for misappropriation/misuse of trade secrets in the District of New Jersey. Veeva counterclaimed, alleging that IQVIA's refusal share its intellectual property with Veeva was an antitrust violation. In a second closely related lawsuit, IQVIA sought a declaration that declining to expand Veeva's access was not unlawful under the antitrust laws, while Veeva claimed that IQVIA's refusal was part of a campaign to monopolize various software markets. After years of litigation, the parties settled their long-running legal battle in 2025.

- We represented **SalMar ASA and Scottish Sea Farms Ltd**. ("SSF") in direct and indirect purchaser antitrust class actions in the Southern District of Florida alleging that a group of salmon producers conspired to fix prices for salmon products, as well as in a parallel DOJ antitrust investigation. We convinced both the direct and indirect purchaser plaintiffs to dismiss SSF as a defendant, with no monetary payment. We then negotiated settlements for SalMar resolving both the direct and indirect purchaser claims, which were approved in September 2022 and February 2023, respectively. The DOJ also closed its investigation earlier this year.

- We represented **Citadel Securities** in a multi-district litigation involving a purported conspiracy to restrict trading in "meme stocks" such as GameStop and AMC as part of an alleged anticompetitive agreement in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act. Following several rounds of motion to dismiss briefing and amended complaints, Chief Judge Altonaga of the Southern District of Florida granted Citadel Securities' motion to dismiss with prejudice, finding that Plaintiffs failed to plausibly allege either the existence of an agreement to restrict trade or any unreasonable restraint of trade. We then represented Citadel Securities in connection with plaintiffs' appeal to the Eleventh Circuit, which unanimously affirmed the dismissal in favor of our client, finding that plaintiffs failed to allege anticompetitive effects in a relevant market.

- Quinn Emanuel **represented various plaintiffs in claims arising from major banks' manipulation of the London Interbank Offered Rate (Libor)**. Defendants are Libor panel banks, and include BofA, Barclays, Citi, Credit Suisse, Deutsche Bank, JPMorgan, RBC, RBS, and UBS. Plaintiffs allege that defendants deliberately suppressed Libor, which reduced the payments on and value of investments tied to Libor. Plaintiffs allege that defendants' manipulation of Libor constituted fraud, breached the terms of certain contracts, interfered with others, and violated the Sherman Act. Our clients' common law claims were upheld in part by the district court. The plaintiffs' group, including our firm,

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

also succeeded in convincing the Second Circuit to partially overturn the prior dismissal of the antitrust claims, putting the potential for treble damages back on the table. Since then, Quinn Emanuel has reached confidential settlements with all of the defendant banks on favorable terms.

- We represented **Entergy Mississippi and affiliates** in defending a suit by the Mississippi Attorney General alleging that these Defendants intentionally purchased electricity from their own allegedly expensive power plants rather than from allegedly cheaper third-party sources, allegedly harming Entergy Mississippi's customers by forcing them to pay higher electricity rates. We assembled a factual defense that Entergy Mississippi and its affiliates needed to use their power plants to provide flexible electricity to match fluctuating demand for electricity, and that the third-party plants did not offer or provide the requisite flexibility. But we won summary judgment on the legal ground that this case is effectively a challenge to decisions made under standards set forth in the Entergy System Agreement, which is a federal tariff approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the violation of which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of that agency rather than any federal or state court.

- The firm represented **Express Scripts** in a breach of contract and antitrust action in the Eastern District of Missouri in connection with Express Scripts' termination of compounding pharmacies from its network. Plaintiffs sought over $120M in damages. This was only the second case that Express Scripts took to trial in the history of the company—in the first case, Quinn Emanuel obtained a jury verdict in Express Scripts' favor. In the lead-up to trial, Quinn Emanuel moved for and obtained what were effectively case-terminating sanctions for Plaintiffs' discovery violations; the Court awarded Express Scripts $360,000 in monetary sanctions, struck Plaintiffs' damages expert, and invited supplemental summary judgment briefing. Four days before the start of trial, the Court granted summary judgment in Express Scripts' favor on all of Plaintiffs' claims to be tried and held that Plaintiffs were liable on Express Scripts' counterclaims, leaving only the amount of Express Scripts' damages for the jury to decide. Following the Court's decision and during jury selection, Plaintiffs agreed to a $20M consent judgment, the full amount of damages sought by Express Scripts. This completed a string of victories that QE obtained for Express Scripts in five antitrust cases after taking over their defense from prior counsel.

- We represented **Google, Alphabet, and several of its senior executives** in a case involving 13 claims, including RICO violations, securities fraud, antitrust, and breach of contract, arising out of plaintiff's termination from Google's AdSense program. The case was originally filed in New York, where plaintiffs reside, and we first successfully moved to transfer the case to California. We then moved to dismiss the case for failure to join the real party in interest, which the Court granted without prejudice. Once the amended complaint came in, we immediately moved to dismiss on statute of limitations grounds, arguing plaintiffs did not get the benefit of tolling or relation back. The Court agreed, granting our motion with prejudice.

- We achieved a favorable settlement for our clients **Yan Li, Hua Zhong, Zhenzhe Kou, and Eric Huo**, ending a lawsuit brought by plaintiffs UCAR Inc. and UCAR Technology (USA) Inc., alleging trade secret misappropriation, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and violations of the computer fraud and abuse act.

- We successfully represented **CDC** as an intervenor in a case centering on the time limitation of Cartel Damages Claims. Under a statute only repealed in 2005, cartel damages claims were subject to a 10 year limitation period that expired regardless of the (potential) plaintiff's knowledge about its claim. This long-stop limitation period was inherently unfair as cartels are typically covert operations where injured parties lack actionable insights. Accordingly, the German parliament repealed that long-stop date in 2005 introducing a law, under which limitation periods are tolled during the pendency of cartel investigations by the competent authorities (at EU or national level). The question now answered in the affirmative by the German Supreme Court was whether the new tolling statute applied to cartel damages claims that were unexpired when the tolling statute took effect. Relying on century-old precedents, the Court found that all unexpired claims are vulnerable

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

to subsequent statute of limitations changes. The German Supreme Court's ruling will apply to dozens of cartels, sometimes dating back to the early 2000s.

- We represented sofa manufacturer **Sofa Brands International Limited** and four of its subsidiaries in a claim for damages against Carpenter and Vita following-on from the European Commission's settlement decision establishing a cartel in the market for the supply of polyurethane foam (a key component of sofas) that sought to coordinate prices and allocate customers. The claim was resolved at a very early stage without the need for protracted litigation.

- We defended **Haymon Sports** and its CEO, **Alan Haymon**, the most prominent boxing manager in the sport today, in a $300 million antitrust lawsuit by Oscar De La Hoya and his Golden Boy promotion companies. The plaintiffs alleged that Haymon attempted to monopolize the market for promotion of Championship-Caliber Boxers through a "tie-out" clause in their management contracts, as well as a series of exclusive contracts with free network television and basic cable networks. On summary judgment, we demonstrated to the Court that Golden Boy's claims were factually and legally meritless, and the Court agreed, dismissing all antitrust claims with prejudice and throwing the case out.

- We successfully represented **a market leading online travel** agency against a contracting partner asserting various abuse of dominance claims.

- We represented **FIFA** in a federal antitrust class action whereby plaintiffs alleged that FIFA and its co-defendants engaged in a conspiracy to force individuals who wished to attend the 2014 World Cup to purchase more-expensive hospitality packages instead of face-value tickets in order to drive up profits. At stake was not only hundreds of millions of dollars, but also FIFA's reputation as the leader of the World Cup, the world's most elite soccer event. In less than a year, not only did we get this action kicked out of court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, but the court issued a scathing opinion finding that "plaintiffs engaged in a number of questionable actions," and stating that "a competent attorney" would not have brought this action.

- We represented client **J.G. Wentworth** in a case involving the acquisition of its largest competitor, Peach Holdings, LLC, in 2011. The plaintiff, a competitor in the structured settlement market, alleged that the acquisition resulted in an illegal monopoly and that J.G. Wentworth's subsequent use of Google AdWords to advertise both J.G. Wentworth and Peachtree to consumers was anticompetitive because it excluded other competitors from appearing in the most coveted positions on search engine results pages, diverted sales from other competitors, reduced the vigor of the competitive process, and caused consumer confusion as to the joint ownership of the two brands. The plaintiff also alleged claims of false advertising under the Lanham Act and unfair competition under California law. The Honorable Beverly Reid O'Connell, Central District of California, twice gave the plaintiff leave to amend before dismissing all claims with prejudice on the pleadings.

- We represented **Despegar.com** in a false advertising lawsuit brought by American Airlines. Just before initiating suit, American withdrew its tickets from all of Despegar's websites throughout the world. In addition to mounting a vigorous defense against American's claims, we brought an antitrust counterclaim on behalf of Despegar's U.S.-based subsidiary relating to American's anticompetitive air fare distribution scheme. On the eve of depositions, we obtained a favorable settlement agreement which paved the way for Despegar to resume selling American tickets.

- We represented **TransWeb** in the defense of patent infringement claims asserted by 3M and the pursuit of antitrust claims against 3M. After a two-and-half-week trial, we obtained a unanimous jury verdict that 3M's asserted patent claims were invalid, not infringed, and (in an advisory capacity) unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. The jury also found that 3M violated the antitrust laws by attempting to enforce fraudulently obtained patents against TransWeb and awarded lost profits and attorneys' fees as antitrust damages, resulting in an approximately $26

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

million judgment. The district court subsequently adopted the jury's advisory verdict that 3M had committed inequitable conduct rendering the asserted patents unenforceable. On appeal by 3M, the Federal Circuit issued a unanimous and precedential decision affirming the judgments entered below, including specifically the finding of inequitable conduct before the Patent and Trademark Office and the award of trebled attorneys' fees as antitrust damages pursuant to the *Walker Process* fraud claim.

- We represented **DIRECTV** in obtaining summary judgment on antitrust claims under the Cartwright Act brought by Basic Your Best Buy, a terminated retailer. Summary judgment was affirmed on appeal. The Plaintiff alleged that DIRECTV entered into a horizontal conspiracy with its other retailers through coercion not to bid on Basic's sales leads so that DIRECTV could acquire them at a below market price. We successfully argued that DIRECTV's restrictions on its retailers were vertical restraints on intrabrand competition subject to the rule of reason and that Basic could not establish essential elements to prove its claim, including an anticompetitive purpose or effect, a relevant market, or antitrust injury. The Court of Appeal affirmed.

- We successfully represented **Honeywell International** in defense of federal antitrust claims that it conspired with certain distributors to foreclose competition in the market for distribution of Honeywell fire safety systems for office buildings. We obtained a dismissal of all claims on the first motion to dismiss, having earlier won a stay of all discovery pending a ruling on the motion to dismiss.

- We successfully represented **IBM** in defense of price-fixing class action claims related to the market for Static Random Access Memory, and persuaded the class action plaintiffs to drop IBM as a defendant with prejudice.

- We successfully persuaded plaintiffs to voluntarily dismiss the claims against **Rabobank**, in the federal multidistrict Municipal Derivatives antitrust litigation – and secured this relief without any monetary payment and before any substantial discovery.

- In the ***In re Flash Memory Antitrust Litigation*** **(N.D. Cal.)**, we represented **Samsung** in two price-fixing class actions, brought by direct and indirect purchasers of NAND flash memory. Although classes had been certified in similar cases in the same district, we successfully defeated class certification motions in both actions, causing the direct purchaser representative to agree to a voluntary dismissal of all claims.

- We represent **Daimler AG** and its **Mercedes-Benz** subsidiaries in *In re German Automotive Antitrust Litigation* (N.D. Cal.), in which we convinced the district court to dismiss with prejudice a putative multi-billion dollar antitrust class action. That decision was then affirmed by the Ninth Circuit.

- We recently secured an important strategic victory for our client **Daimler AG** in an interlocutory hearing in the Roll-On, Roll-Off maritime shipping services cartel case. The Defendants applied to have nine out of the 14 years of Daimler's claim struck out, or alternatively stayed pending a preliminary reference to the Court of Justice. While the High Court did make a reference to the Court of Justice, the Defendants were unsuccessful on their main strategic aims of narrowing the claim or slowing it down, with Daimler resisting both strike out and stay, ensuring the case will proceed with no delay and with the entire duration of the claim intact.

- We recently brought an action in the U.K. Competition Appeal Tribunal against **Meta** for a proposed class of **44 million Facebook users**, seeking damages of at least £2.3 billion arising from Facebook's dominance and control of its users' valuable and extensive personal data.

- In late 2022, we along with co-counsel filed a complaint against two major pesticides manufacturers, Syngenta and Corteva. The complaint alleges that the manufacturers' respective "loyalty" programs violate federal and state antitrust laws. In early 2023, we were appointed co-

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

lead counsel after a leadership battle that involved many different firms vying for roles in the set of actions that had been consolidated before the same judge.

- We have secured important interlocutory victories for our clients, Allianz, Brevan Howard and other significant investment management firms, in the U.K. Competition Appeal Tribunal in litigation against multiple global banks relating to claims that those banks colluded to manipulated the foreign exchange market between 2003 and 2013.

- We obtained settlements of over $500 million against the defendants in our **ISDAfix case**, which concerned the rigging of a financial benchmark used to determine the settlement value of certain financial derivatives. The case was brought on behalf of investors such as insurance companies, pension funds, hedge funds, and other sophisticated actors. We built the case from the ground-up after noticing anomalies in the data, before the government even acted. The successful settlement and then certification of the class was the result of years of dogged, groundbreaking work. We had to find traders explicitly admitting they were interested in manipulating the benchmark. We then had to match that admission to can actual trade by the right person, at the right time, in the right direction. We then had to demonstrate we could show that those acts damaged class members, some of whom may have only traded hours or even days later. The Court said that this was the "the most complicated case" he ever faced, and that he could "not really imagine" how much more complicated "it would have been if I didn't have counsel who had done as admirable a job in briefing it and arguing it as" we did.

- We obtained a preliminary injunction in the Southern District of New York for **trueEX**, LLC, a fintech start-up platform for execution of interest rate swaps. The injunction blocks the defendant MarkitSERV, a unit of IHS Markit, from terminating the parties' services agreement pending determination of the action. Although MarkitSERV had a contractual right to terminate the agreement, we filed a complaint against MarkitSERV, asserting a monopolization claim under Section 2 of the Sherman Act based on MarkitSERV's unilateral refusal to deal with trueEX. We alleged that MarkitSERV was a monopolist in the market for post-trade swap services and that MarkitSERV could not terminate our client if its motive was to harm competition. The Court agreed, and entered the preliminary injunction preventing MarkitSERV from barring TrueEx's access to certain of MarkitSERV's technology and software. This victory is notable both becayse Section 2 claims based on a defendant's unilateral refusal to deal with a rival are very challenging following the Supreme Court's decision in *Verizon v. Trinko*, and because, without injunctive relief, trueEX would have faced the prospect of a shutdown, leaving almost 60 people unemployed.

- We are co-lead class counsel in this **consumer class action** seeking remuneration for artificially-inflated, supra-competitive surcharges at bank-owned ATMs throughout the country. In late 2021, we and our co-counsel obtained certification for a class of consumers that used major bank ATMs during the class period, which then went up on interlocutory appeal. After extensive briefing that we led, we obtained a full affirmance from the D.C. Circuit and a subsequent denial of a writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court. Then, in late March of 2024, we secured a $197.5 million settlement from Visa and Mastercard, which is on top of $66 million in previous settlements with three bank defendants, for a combined $264 million in settlements for the certified class. That result is approximately 25% of the best case single damages for the class period from October 2007 through the present.

- We recovered settlements of over $150 million as co-lead counsel for a class of investors, including numerous hedge funds, related to alleged manipulation of the benchmark price for gold known as the "**London Gold Fix**." This massive class action in the Southern District of New York was brought against a group of banks for their involvement in manipulating the gold market. The Defendants were Deutsche Bank, HSBC, The Bank of Nova Scotia, Barclays Bank plc, HSBC Bank plc, Société Générale SA, and UBS.

- We represented numerous major asset managers, hedge funds, pension funds, and other

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

institutional investors—over 1,300 entities in total—in their claims that multiple banks manipulated FX prices, benchmarks, and bid-ask spreads. Our clients, including **Allianz Global Investors**, **BlackRock, Brevan Howard**, and **PIMCO**, opted out of a related class action, and our investigation allowed them to file their own complaint with more than 90 pages of original allegations, showing how the banks should be liable for a conspiracy much broader than being pursued in the class action. Following several judicial rulings in our clients' favour, including an English Court of Appeal judgment, the proceedings were settled by the parties on a global basis pursuant to the terms of a confidential settlement agreement. The claims were subsequently withdrawn in May 2023.

- Quinn Emanuel represents several public and private pension and investment funds as co-lead counsel on behalf of the class who entered into stock loan transactions with six major banks that serve as prime brokers of stock loans. Plaintiffs allege that the six defendants conspired to overcharge investors and wrongfully control the $1.7 trillion **stock loan market**, obstructing competition that would benefit both stock lenders and borrowers. In August 2018, Judge Katherine Polk Failla denied the defendants' motions to dismiss in their entirety. On June 30, 2022, Magistrate Judge Sarah Cave recommended certification of the proposed class. In the meantime, in mid-2023 we settled with all of the bank defendants except Bank of America. The total settlement value is $581 million plus several important market and structural reforms of the kind rarely seen in private settlements (as opposed to settlements with the DOJ or SEC). The structural reforms are likely to be valued in excess of an additional $100 million.

- We filed a class action against **Live Nation and Ticketmaster** on behalf of consumers, alleging Live Nation and Ticketmaster unlawfully monopolized, attempted to monopolize, and restrained trade in the markets for primary and secondary ticketing services in the United States from 2010 to the present. This builds on our earlier action against Live Nation and Ticketmaster on behalf of Songkick (a competitor), where we defeated Live Nation and Ticketmaster's motion for summary judgment – an unprecedented result – and obtained a $110M settlement on the eve of trial. On August 10, 2023, we defeated Live Nation and Ticketmaster's motion to compel arbitration – another unprecedented result – based on a finding that Live Nation and Ticketmaster's updated Terms of Use selecting a new arbitration provider (New Era ADR) with new arbitration procedures is extremely procedurally unconscionable and also substantively unconscionable, allowing the class action to proceed in federal court. We understand this is the first and only time in the past decade that plaintiffs have been able to circumvent Live Nation and Ticketmaster's arbitration provisions.

- We represented **LIV Golf and certain professional golfers** in a litigation against the PGA Tour. Plaintiffs sued the PGA Tour for antitrust violations based on the Tour's efforts to exclude LIV from elite professional golf event markets. The Tour counterclaimed for intentional interference with contracts. Trial was set for May 2024. On June 6, 2023, the Tour and the Public Investment Fund announced an agreement to grow the game of golf. As part of the game-changing agreement, LIV and the Tour stipulated to voluntary dismissal of their claims, and the LIV players can reapply for membership with the Tour. On June 20, the Court approved the stipulation.

- We are co-lead counsel in an antitrust **class action against major banks** that act as re-marketing agents of variable rate, tax-exempt bonds ("VRDOs"). The complaint, based on our independent investigation, alleges that the banks conspired to keep VRDO rates artificially high. In June 2022, the District Court for the Southern District of New York largely denied Defendants' latest motion to dismiss. Class certification and related Daubert motions were fully briefed and were subject to oral argument in August 2023. Just over a month later, Judge Furman of the Southern District of New York denied Defendants' motions to exclude Plaintiffs' experts in full, and granted the request to certify the class in full. The Court then quickly approved our plan for notifying class members of this victory, and thus their opportunity to participate, or opt-out, of the now-certified class. The Second Circuit affirmed the class certification. Following notification of the class, the case will now proceed to summary judgment and then trial, with the class seeking classwide damages of over $4 billion before trebling.

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

- Quinn Emanuel filed an antitrust class action in the Southern District of New York, alleging a wide-ranging anticompetitive and fraudulent scheme on one of the largest foreign exchange platforms, **Currenex**. Our firm built the claims from scratch after an extensive pre-complaint investigation, and our case eventually attracted XTX Markets Limited, one of the world's largest FX traders, to join us as a named Plaintiff. Our operative complaint alleges that in operating its FX trading platform, Currenex conspired to give superpriority privileges to certain market makers, including State Street (Currenex's parent company), Goldman Sachs, HC Technologies, and John Doe Defendants. These privileges ensured that the market makers' orders were matched ahead of others regardless of when the orders were submitted, resulting in increased spreads, reduced competition, and potentially billions of dollars of damages to other users of the Currenex exchange.

- We represented **Salix Capital U.S. Inc.**, and were appointed lead counsel for a class of investors in credit default swaps ("CDS"), including pension funds, university endowment funds, hedge funds, insurance companies, corporate treasuries, fiduciary and depository institutions, small banks, and money managers. The defendants were twelve major Wall Street banks, including Bank of America, Goldman Sachs, and JPMorgan, as well as Markit, a financial services firm, and the International Swaps and Derivatives Association ("ISDA"). The case involved allegations that the banks, Markit, and ISDA, engaged in a multi-year conspiracy to limit transparency and boycott exchange trading in the market for CDS. We achieved a **historic settlement of over $1.86 billion plus injunctive relief**, one of the largest private antitrust settlements in history. The settlement is particularly noteworthy because two separate governmental investigations—by the Department of Justice and the European Commission—failed to result in any penalties for any of the defendants.

- Acting for **The Home Depot**, we had a central role in persuading the Second Circuit to overturn a $7.25 billion class-action settlement in an antitrust suit against Visa and MasterCard arising out of wrongfully inflated credit card swipe fees. In exchange for the cash payment and certain injunctive relief, the settlement required more than 12 million merchants to release *all* current and future claims against Visa and MasterCard—without permitting merchants to opt out of that release. The district court approved the settlement, but we persuaded the Second Circuit that the class had been inadequately represented in violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4) and that the settlement violated class members' due process rights because the relief was insufficient and merchants were unable to opt out of the release. Quinn Emanuel pursued an opt-out suit (seeking damages) against Visa and Mastercard for The Home Depot. The parties subsequently settled on confidential terms.

- We represent **Intuit and Block** in two opt-out cases against Visa and Mastercard in connection with the *Interchange Fee Antitrust Litigation*. The complaints seek damages based on the billions of dollars of interchange fees paid by Intuit and Block which were allegedly inflated by Visa and Mastercard's rules and practices, including the Honor All Cards Rules.

- In March 2022, the District of Connecticut appointed Quinn Emanuel interim co-lead class counsel on behalf of a **class of engineers harmed by a "no poach" conspiracy among the largest aerospace engineering firms** based in the United States that design, manufacture, and service aerospace products for civil and military applications. Plaintiffs alleged a nearly ten-year conspiracy beginning in 2011 among Pratt & Whitney and five outsourcing defendants: Agilis Engineering, Inc., Belcan Engineering Group, LLC, Cyient, Inc., Parametric Solutions, Inc., and Quest Global Services-NA, Inc. The complaint also names several individual defendants, all senior executives of the corporate defendants: Mahesh Patel (Pratt & Whitney), Harpreet Wasan (Quest), Gary Prus (Parametric), Frank O'Neill (Agilis), Steven Houghtaling (Belcan), Robert Harvey (QuEST), and Thomas Edwards (Cyient). In January 2023, the Court denied Defendants' motions to dismiss. Plaintiffs subsequently reached settlements with all Defendants, totaling $60.5 million.

- We represent **JBS USA**, one of the largest meat producers in the U.S., in two significant antitrust MDLs proceeding in the District of Minnesota. Specifically, we are defending JBS USA in multiple cases alleging that pork packers conspired to limit the supply of hogs and pork and thereby raise

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

pork prices in the United States. In 2019, the Court dismissed the complaints with leave to amend, but then largely denied the second round of motions to dismiss in 2020. Quinn Emanuel then negotiated favorable "ice-breaker" settlements with all three proposed classes, which were significantly more favorable than the other settlements that the class plaintiffs later reached with a different defendant. We are continuing to defend JBS in the lawsuits filed by direct action plaintiffs, including major retail chains that purchased pork from the Defendants.

- We are also defending various **JBS companies** in a separate MDL alleging that beef packers conspired to limit the slaughter of beef, thereby raising prices in the United States. In 2020, the Court dismissed the complaints with leave to amend. In 2021, the Court denied the second round of motions to dismiss the federal antitrust claims but granted the motions to dismiss certain state law claims. Quinn Emanuel then negotiated a favorable "ice-breaker" settlement with the direct purchaser class. We are continuing to defend JBS against lawsuits filed by direct action plaintiffs.

- We represent **JBS company Pilgrim's Pride** in connection with an antitrust lawsuit in which Plaintiffs allege that Pilgrim's Pride their co-conspirators conspired to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price of broilers chicken (i.e., chicken bread and raised for meat production), beginning at least as early as January 1, 2008. We defeated one of Plaintiffs' primary claims in summary judgment. Pilgrim's Pride has settled with all class and Direct Action Plaintiffs except one, Associated Wholesale Grocers. A jury trial for the remaining claims along with dozens of other plaintiffs and defendants will begin September 12, 2023 and is estimated to go until mid-December 2023.

- As court-appointed co-lead counsel for direct purchaser plaintiffs in ***In re Flexible Polyurethane Foam Antitrust Litigation*** **(N.D. Ohio)**, we won certification of a national class of direct purchasers, defeated the defendants' effort to have the certification decision reversed on appeal, and defeated those same defendants' motions for summary judgment. As a result of this representation, we **achieved over $430 million in settlements** for the class from nine different defendants. We have also successfully pursued claims on behalf of bedding companies in the English courts against the polyurethane foam cartelists, successfully resolving the claims without needing to serve proceedings.

- We were retained by **Samsung** after its claim that Panasonic had conspired with Toshiba and SanDisk to fix prices (through a licensing entity called SD-3C) for the right to manufacture or sell secure digital (SD) memory cards was dismissed by the district court dismissed on statute of limitations grounds. On appeal, Quinn Emanuel obtained a unanimous reversal in the Ninth Circuit, which issued a significant antitrust precedent applying the "continuing conspiracy" doctrine to the antitrust statute of limitations for the first time since 1997. The Ninth Circuit decision clarified that the continuing conspiracy doctrine remains a powerful vehicle for bringing complaints against long-running anticompetitive conduct. Following remand, Samsung filed an amended complaint, and the district court denied Panasonic and SD-3C's motion to dismiss. The parties subsequently settled on confidential terms.

- We **achieved a settlement for $130 million** plus even more valuable non-monetary relief (in the form for prospective changes to the defendants' practices) in ***Universal Delaware v. Comdata Corporation*** **(E.D. Pa.)**, concerning alleged monopolization and anticompetitive collusion in the markets for the truck fleet credit cards used at highway truck stops. We served as court-appointed co-lead counsel for a proposed class of over 4,000 independent truck stops. Defendants included Comdata (the leading issuer of trucker fleet payment cards) and three national truck stop chains

- We represented **a global telecommunications company**, the world's largest manufacturer of mobile cellular handsets, in a case against Qualcomm before the European Commission, in which our client alleged that Qualcomm's licensing practices were anticompetitive. This was related to various other matters we handled against Qualcomm, in what was probably the largest intellectual property dispute in the world. We achieved a global settlement for our client on the eve of trial.

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

- We represented **Avery Dennison** in an antitrust case against 3M, asserting claims regarding (i) 3M's monopolization of markets for retroreflective sheeting used in highway signage, and (ii) 3M's anticompetitive practices before a standards-setting committee and in connection with bidding on contracts to supply sheeting to government agencies. The case settled on confidential terms.

- In ***EcoDisc Technology AG v. DVD Format/Logo Licensing Corporation et al.,*** we won a significant ruling dismissing all claims against our client **The DVD Forum**. The court held that a trademark licensor's cease and desist notices to licensees were protected activity under the Noerr-Pennington Doctrine. The case also held that the activities of a Tokyo-based international standards organization did not provide a sufficient basis for establishing personal jurisdiction to pursue antitrust and false advertising claims in the United States.

- We acted for **Qualcomm Inc** as intervener in *Unwired Planet International Ltd and anor v Huawei Technologies (UK) Co Ltd and anor*, the leading judgment given by the U.K. Supreme Court on matters relating to Standard Essential Patents and Fair, Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory terms.

"The best litigation team in the world. Hands down."

Client Testimonial, ***Legal 500***

Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.