

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

**IN RE: HOTEL INDUSTRY SEX TRAFFICKING  
LITIGATION II**

**MDL No. 3104**

**RESPONSE OF RED ROOF DEFENDANTS IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR TRANSFER OF ACTIONS TO THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
(EASTERN DIVISION) PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407 FOR  
CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS**

In accordance with Rule 6.1(c) of the Rules of Procedure for the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (the “Panel” or “J.P.M.L.”), Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc., Red Roof Franchising, LLC, RRF Holding Company, LLC, and RRI West Management, LLC (collectively, “Red Roof” or the “Red Roof Defendants”) oppose the Motion for Transfer of Actions to the Southern District of Ohio (Eastern Division) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 for Consolidated Pretrial Proceedings (the “Motion” or “Motion for Transfer”) (ECF No. 1-1).

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This is the second time a motion for transfer involving the same claims has been brought before the J.P.M.L. The claims involve an alleged violation of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act (“TVPRA”),<sup>1</sup> attempting to hold hotels civilly liable for knowingly benefitting from victims’ alleged sexual exploitation on their premises. On February 5, 2020, the Panel held that these types of cases are not suitable for centralization, recognizing that the underlying claims necessarily turn on highly individualized questions of facts—*e.g.*, they involve different hotels, different alleged sex trafficking ventures, different hotel brands, different owners

---

<sup>1</sup> The TVPRA provides a civil remedy for victims of trafficking against both their traffickers, as well as “whoever knowingly benefits . . . from participation in a venture which that person knew or should have known has engaged in an act in violation of this chapter.” 18 U.S.C. § 1595(a).

and employees, different geographic locales, different witnesses, different indicia of sex trafficking, and different time periods. *In Re: Hotel Indus. Sex Trafficking Litig.*, 433 F. Supp. 3d 1353, 1355-56 (J.P.M.L. 2020).

As this litigation has progressed over the past four years, the Panel's original ruling has proved prophetic. During this time, a number of cases have progressed through fact discovery and summary judgment, and still others have reached resolution after final pretrial motion practice was completed. In each of these cases, numerous fact-specific questions have been raised which required individualized resolution just as this Panel predicted. And, tellingly, most federal judges who have been overseeing these cases for years agree: these cases are not properly suited for centralization into an MDL. In addition, the Panel's original concerns regarding centralization are even more pronounced now as the procedural postures of the cases plaintiffs seek to coordinate vary widely. While some of the cases are still at the pleading stage, others have progressed to summary judgment, and still others are in the midst of concluding fact and expert discovery.

As such, centralization of these actions would serve only to undermine the goals of coordination under Section 1407. Centralization of these cases would slow and complicate the litigation, exacerbate judicial inefficiencies, inconvenience witnesses, and increase expenditures of the parties.

For these reasons and those more fully explained below, centralization of these actions under Section 1407 is inappropriate and the Motion for Transfer should be denied.

## **II. ARGUMENT**

### **A. The Motion for Transfer is premature as informal coordination efforts have not been exhausted.**

As an initial matter, centralization would be premature as other informal coordination options have not been fully explored or utilized by the Movants. This is especially true, given that

the Panel has repeatedly instructed: “[C]entralization under Section 1407 should be the last solution after considered review of all other options.” *In re: Best Buy Co., Cal. Song-Beverly Credit Card Act Litig.*, 804 F. Supp. 2d 1376, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2011) (denying transfer in preference of pursuing other coordination options); *see also In re Bank of Am. Fraudulent Acct. Litig.*, 2023 WL 8538726, at \*2 (J.P.M.L. Dec. 6, 2023) (same); *In re Nelnet Servicing, LLC, Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.*, 648 F. Supp. 3d 1377, 1377-78 (J.P.M.L. 2022) (same); *In re U.S. Postal Servs. Next Generation Delivery Vehicle Acquisitions Program Rec. of Decision Litig.*, 640 F. Supp. 3d 1410, 1412 (J.P.M.L. 2022) (same). “Those options include cooperation and coordination among the parties and the involved courts to avoid duplicative discovery and inconsistent pretrial rulings.” *In re Nat’l Grid Tax Gross-Up Adder Litig.*, 2023 WL 2876091, at \*1 (J.P.M.L. Apr. 10, 2023) (citing *In re Eli Lilly & Co. (Cephalexin Monohydrate) Patent Litig.*, 446 F. Supp. 242, 244 (J.P.M.L. 1978); Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth, § 20.14 (2004)); *see also In re Bank of Am. Fraudulent Acct. Litig.*, 2023 WL 8538726, at \*2 (enumerating additional options to transfer under 28 U.S.C. §1407) (citing *In re Gerber Probiotic Prods. Mktg. & Sales Practices Litig.*, 899 F. Supp. 2d 1378, 1379-80 (J.P.M.L. 2012)).

Movants’ Motion for Transfer therefore flies in the face of the Panel’s well-settled guidance. While Movants focus on Judge Marbley “direct[ing]” them to file the instant Motion (ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 2), this assertion is overstated. Rather, Judge Marbley ordered Movants to circulate a draft Motion and then envisioned after that circulation and response thereto, the parties would meet and confer about possible alternatives or informal cooperation to streamline the cases before him prior to filing a motion with the Panel. Judge Marbley clarified this intent at a subsequent hearing:

THE COURT: . . . [D]id counsel meet and confer about potential case management options, including MDL litigation or multi-

district litigation, I should say, either on an industry-wide or defendant-by-defendant basis? Do you know, Mr. Babin, whether that happened?

MR. BABIN: I know that we talked to various counsel with respect to whether they would support an MDL. I know there has *not* been a call with all the faces I see here with respect to meeting and conferring about filing for the MDL.

Ex. A, Excerpts from *In re: Hotel TVPRA Litig.*, Nos. 2:21-cv-4933, et al. (S.D. Ohio) 1/23/24 Hr'g Tr. at 12:2-12 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 13:4-7, 18:14-18. Movants did not initiate a meet and confer and filed the request for an MDL earlier than Judge Marbley had ordered. Given the premature filing, the Parties did not have a chance to discuss informal procedures and cooperation before filing.

Moreover, the Red Roof Defendants have shown that informal cooperation during discovery is possible and functional. To be sure, the Red Roof Defendants have engaged in informal cooperation to streamline cases pending across the country to the extent possible. For example, the Red Roof Defendants have agreed to adopt similar (if not identical) protective orders across cases involving the same plaintiff's counsel. *E.g., compare J.M. v. Choice Hotels Int'l, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-0672 (E.D. Cal.) (ECF No. 90), with *S.C. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-00871 (N.D. Ohio) (ECF No. 123). Similarly, the Red Roof Defendants have agreed to adopt discovery across cases pending in Georgia federal court and have entered into an agreement with plaintiffs' counsel in the Ohio cases on the exchange of initial disclosures across cases. The Red Roof Defendants have also agreed to produce documents in a case pending in California following an order issued in a Northern District of Ohio case so that issue need not be re-litigated. In fact, each time a plaintiff's counsel has contacted counsel for the Red Roof Defendants regarding coordinated discovery, the Red Roof Defendants have entered good faith negotiations

to reach a resolution. To that end, the Red Roof Defendants agree to make similar strides as these cases proceed.

Additionally, because many of these cases involve similar—if not the same—plaintiffs’ firms, it is the Red Roof Defendants’ position that informal cooperation between the parties would be the most efficient avenue by which to litigate these cases. This is precisely why the Panel routinely denies centralization when informal cooperation is feasible. *See, e.g., In re: Louisiana-Pac. Corp. Trimboard Siding Mktg., Sales Pracs. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 867 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1347 (J.P.M.L. 2012) (denying centralization in favor of informal cooperation in light of the fact that same counsel involved in many of the cases); *In re Fresh Dairy Prods. Antitrust Litig.*, 856 F. Supp. 2d 1344, 1345 (J.P.M.L. 2012) (denying motion for transfer to centralized proceedings in part because the “[p]laintiffs in the consolidated actions share counsel, and at least some defendants . . . [were] represented by the same law firms”). And the Panel should again deny centralization under Section 1407 here.

In short, because informal cooperation has not been meaningfully pursued, and is feasible, in these cases, the Motion for Transfer is premature and should be denied.

**B. Federal judges across the country presiding over these cases generally agree that centralization is inappropriate.**

After filing the Motion to Transfer, Movants attempted to stay all cases against the Red Roof Defendants pending transfer to an MDL. In two instances so far, a stay was summarily denied and the judges presiding over those cases expressed significant concerns about the impropriety of centralization.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Several of the remaining motions to stay were resolved between meet and confer efforts of counsel, and a few are still pending before Judge Marbley.

In *S.C. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-00871, 2024 WL 308298, at \*1-2 (N.D. Ohio Jan. 27, 2024), Judge James S. Gwin, in the Northern District of Ohio, when ruling on Plaintiff's motion to stay, provided a thoughtful and pointed analysis on the factual dissimilarities he sees across these cases that make them ill-suited for centralization in an MDL. To begin his analysis, Judge Gwin examined the facts specific to Plaintiff S.C.'s case, noting:

[C]entralization seems unlikely. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a), the JPML centralizes actions only if those actions involve “one or more common questions of fact,” and if centralization would serve “the convenience of parties and witnesses” as well as “promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions.”

As S.C.'s own case demonstrates, this case presents only few common factual questions with other sex trafficking cases. According to S.C.'s complaint, she was trafficked at four different hotels: a Days Inn, a Comfort Inn, a Crowne Plaza, and a Red Roof Inn. Two Defendants (Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc. and Days Inns Worldwide, Inc.) are associated with the Days Inn. One Defendant (Choice Hotels International, Inc.) is associated with the Comfort Inn. Three Defendants (Six Continents Hotels Inc., Holiday Hospitality Franchising, LLC, and Crowne Plaza LLC) are associated with the Crowne Plaza. The remaining two Defendants (Red Roof Inns, Inc. and Red Roof Franchising, LLC) are associated with the Red Roof Inn.

There are no allegations that these four groups of Defendants ever cooperated with each other or even communicated about S.C.'s alleged trafficking. Even within the same case, the only common factual connection between the four sets of Defendants is Plaintiff and her traffickers.

Nothing suggests that S.C.'s traffickers are involved in any of the multitude of sex trafficking cases filed around the country.

*Id.* at \*1-2.

Judge Gwin also noted that centralization is inappropriate not just for Plaintiff S.C.'s individual case, but for all TVPRA cases pending against hotel defendants generally. He explained:

Zooming out to a broader perspective only emphasizes the lack of common factual questions. The hotel sex trafficking lawsuits that

Plaintiff proposes to centralize largely involve different hotels in different parts of the country and different plaintiffs preyed on by different sex trafficking ventures. In fact, the lawsuits proposed to be centralized involve fifty different defendants, including hotel parent companies, franchisors, franchisees, and other related corporate entities. And there are over fifty different plaintiffs involved.

Viewing Plaintiff's centralization request through the lens of a TVPRA claim further reinforces the lack of commonality. To make a TVPRA claim, a plaintiff must show that a defendant (1) knowingly benefited from (2) participating in a venture that (3) the defendant knew or should have known was engaged in sex trafficking. Each of these three elements is specific to the particular plaintiff and sex trafficking venture involved in a case.

Although there might be common factual questions about how much a given hotel group generally knows about sex trafficking problems in their hotels, such general knowledge is only minimally relevant to TVPRA claims. General knowledge can provide background context on whether a defendant should have recognized signs of sex trafficking, but ultimately it will be individual signs of sex trafficking that matter the most.

In any case, even general knowledge will only be common between defendants in the same hotel group—the defendants in the proposed multidistrict litigation represent many different hotel groups.

Because individualized fact issues will predominate, centralization in these hotel sex trafficking cases would not promote judicial efficiency. Due to the many individualized fact issues, very little discovery will overlap between the different cases. Nor will there be many issues that a transferee court can resolve across multiple cases with a single order.

*Id.* at \*2.

Similarly, in her order denying a stay, Judge Kimberly J. Mueller, Chief Judge of the Eastern District of California, referenced the impropriety of transferring the case pending in her court given the procedural posture of the case:

[T]his court has presided over this case for nearly two years, expending judicial resources on pretrial procedures, supervision of the Rule 16 schedule and motion practice. It has familiarized itself

with the underlying factual allegations and procedural history of this case and issued orders on two motions to dismiss. It is preparing to resolve defendant's pending motion for leave to file a third-party complaint. And as noted, fact discovery is about to close and expert discovery open, with dispositive motions due in less than four months. The time during which the court's judicial resources could have been conserved—the time Congress identified in the MDL statute as appropriate for designation of an MDL court—has mostly passed.

Ex. B, *J.M. v. Choice Hotels Int'l, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-0672 (E.D. Cal.), Order at p. 7 (ECF No. 106).<sup>3</sup>

While these decisions do not bind the Panel, the Red Roof Defendants offer these insightful analyses from federal judges with firsthand experience presiding over these cases for the Panel's consideration. For each of these reasons, the Motion to Transfer should be denied.

**C. Circumstances have not changed since the Panel's original ruling, and if anything, factors weigh more against instituting an MDL now.**

Even without these developments and federal judges voicing concerns about centralization, the reasoning underpinning the Panel's decision denying the original motion for transfer of these cases remains sound today. As the Panel made clear in its original decision denying transfer, the claims at issue in this litigation do not share common questions of fact and are therefore not suited for centralization under 28 U.S.C. § 1407:

The vast majority of actions involve different hotels[,] . . . different alleged sex trafficking ventures, different hotel brands, different owners and employees, different geographic locales, different witnesses, different indicia of sex trafficking, and different time periods. Thus, unique issues concerning each plaintiff's sex

---

<sup>3</sup> During the hearing on Plaintiff J.M.'s motion to stay, Judge Mueller voiced additional concerns about transferring this case to an MDL. Ex. C, *J.M. v. Choice Hotels Int'l, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-0672 (E.D. Cal.) 1/22/24 Hr'g Tr. at 20:6-13, 24:4-10. ("We have a duty to the geography that we serve as a federal trial court. And these cases matter. This case matters to the Central Valley of California, to the Eastern District of California. . . . I just wondered if there isn't a strong argument for [carving] this case out for the motion to transfer. . . . Single plaintiff, single hotel, Central Valley of California, a long way from the Southern District of Ohio.").



trafficking allegations predominate in these actions. Indeed, there is no common or predominant defendant across all actions, further indicating a lack of common questions of fact.

*In Re: Hotel Indus. Sex Trafficking Litig.*, 433 F. Supp. 3d 1353, 1355-56 (J.P.M.L. 2020).

None of these factors have changed since the Panel's ruling over four years ago. If anything, the passage of time and the workup to these cases to date have validated the Panel's initial concerns. Indeed, as the Panel correctly predicted in 2020, these cases have required extensive individual case-specific discovery, which the Red Roof Defendants do not see being aided in any way by MDL consolidation.

To illustrate this, a comparison of two cases that have—or have nearly—completed discovery demonstrates how unique these cases are:

- *Jane Does 1-4 v. Red Roof Inns, Inc.*, No. 1:21-cv-04278 (N.D. Ga.) (status: dismissed after final pretrial motion practice was completed): This case involved four plaintiffs who alleged they were trafficked at two Red Roof Inn branded hotels in Georgia. The plaintiffs sued various Red Roof Inn entities, as well as the franchisor who owned and controlled one of the two properties. The plaintiffs all alleged being trafficked at numerous other hotels, up to 13 different properties in Georgia and other southern states, but the Red Roof Inn defendants were the only defendants in this case. The plaintiffs all had different alleged trafficking periods between 2010 and 2017 with sometimes different and sometimes overlapping traffickers that were local to Georgia. There were fact witnesses that included security guards hired to monitor the property, hotel employees, alleged traffickers, and witnesses that were all local to Georgia. In plaintiffs' final witness list in their Pretrial Order, the plaintiffs identified over 55 witnesses for trial, many of whom were deposed in the case. Over 45 of those witnesses included the plaintiffs, the plaintiffs' experts, women who were allegedly trafficked with them at the same properties, property-specific employees (housekeepers, general managers, front desk employees, regional employees responsible for the property), franchisee owners and employees, property-specific security guards, the plaintiffs' family members, local ministries and sex trafficking advocacy agencies specific to Georgia, and local police officers.
- *S.C. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-00871 (N.D. Ohio) (status: pending, fact discovery almost complete, trial May 2024): The *S.C.* case involves one plaintiff who alleges she was trafficked at four different hotels in Northeast Ohio between 2009 and 2019. She sued four different hotel brands, but no franchisees. *S.C.*'s alleged traffickers are local to Northeast Ohio, and there is no

evidence that her traffickers had any connection with any other traffickers or outside Northeast Ohio generally. S.C. and her family live in Northeast Ohio and will be deposed in Northeast Ohio. Plaintiff also has a criminal history stemming out of Northeast Ohio, and various local law enforcement officers who encountered S.C. and the specific hotel locations at issue in this case will be deposed. Depositions of hotel staff will include local employees, including general managers and other hotel staff that reside in Northeast Ohio.

This comparison highlights only two cases of the over 50 cases at issue in this litigation. Examining more of these cases would only serve to further demarcate the stark differences at issue in each of these cases, as the Panel astutely enumerated in its original order denying consolidation. Very few of the plaintiffs' allegations in these cases occurred at the same hotel property, or even in the same state, let alone the same city, and sometimes even involve multiple hotel chains. The number of witnesses, employees at the property(ies), alleged traffickers, alleged "johns," and examinations of the property(ies) increases with each new case filed. As such, discovery in these cases would not be facilitated or streamlined were they coordinated into an MDL.

These cases are even more inappropriate for centralization now given how mature the litigation is. These cases are at extremely different procedural postures; while many are still at the pleading stage or early discovery, numerous others have completed or are nearing completion of fact discovery. Still others have summary judgment motions pending and are trial-ready. Centralization for pretrial purposes therefore would not advance judicial economy and would serve only to complicate court proceedings and slow the progress of these cases.

Another critical aspect that makes these cases ill-suited for consolidation in an MDL, which was not directly mentioned in the Panel's original ruling, is the need to interplead or file third-party complaints against hotel franchisee owners, which operate many of the properties that are subject of the plaintiffs' allegations or have indemnity agreements with the branded hotels, or security companies employed to monitor the hotel premises. *See generally In Re: Hotel Indus. Sex*

*Trafficking Litig.*, 433 F. Supp. 3d 1353. While some cases associated in this proceeding involve affiliate franchisee-owned Red Roof properties, many cases involve third party franchisee-run Red Roof locations. And still many others involve third-party security companies hired by the hotel to monitor the safety of their property. Yet virtually all of plaintiffs' complaints fail to name the franchisee or security company and the Red Roof Defendants have had to file motions to bring third-party complaints to bring them into various cases. Thus, a consolidated proceeding would necessarily entail myriad defendants—exponentially more than have already appeared in this litigation to date.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, there has been no marked increase in cases—or involvement of different counsel—over the past four years. The original motion to transfer involved nearly 40 cases. *See* Associated Case List for Ex. D, Associated Case List for MDL No. 2928, *In Re: Hotel Industry Sex Trafficking Litig.* The instant Motion relates to 53 cases. Despite Movants making reference to 1,700 plaintiffs (*see* ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 8), the number of cases has only increased at a rate of less than 4 per year, which is not significant. There has similarly been no marked increase in state-court proceedings. Moreover, most of the new cases have been filed by the same plaintiffs' firm in the same district and therefore informal cooperation in those cases should be easily

---

<sup>4</sup> Notably, not even counting the dozens, if not hundreds, of franchisees and hotel security companies that would need to be interpleaded, this litigation would already involve at least nine branded hotel chain defendants. *See infra* fn. 8 (discussing the number of potential individual brands involved in this litigation). This is yet another factor that has not changed, and is also a factor that weighs against instituting an MDL. *See, e.g., In re: Cordarone (Amiodarone Hydrochloride) Mktg., Sales Pracs. & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 190 F. Supp. 3d 1346, 1347 (J.P.M.L. 2016) (“Given the different defendants sued in these actions, centralization appears unlikely to serve the convenience of a substantial number of parties and their witnesses.” (internal footnote omitted)); *In re: Credit Card Payment Prot. Plan Mktg. & Sales Pracs. Litig.*, 753 F. Supp. 2d 1375, 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2010) (denying centralization of litigation involving “different defendants but also different products, marketing, cardholder agreements, and customer claim administration”).

achievable. *See supra* Section II.A (citing cases and discussing informal cooperation amongst similar or same counsel).

Considering the overwhelming evidence and guidance from federal judges presiding over these cases, which show these cases are still not suitable for centralization, it is unsurprising that the decisions Movants cite are entirely inapposite to the facts of this litigation. ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 4-5 (citing *In re Covidien Hernia Mesh Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 607 F. Supp. 3d 1356 (J.P.M.L. 2022) and *In re Plavix Mktg., Sales Practice & Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 923 F. Supp. 2d 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2013)). Specifically, while they cite two decisions where a motion for reconsideration was granted, the Panel's decisions to grant centralization in those cases were based largely on factors not at all present here. *Covidien Hernia Mesh*, 607 F. Supp. 3d at 1357-58 (granting centralization because of “the significantly larger number of actions, the credible prospect of additional actions, the increase in number of counsel (though small), the concomitant increase in burden on party and judicial resources, and the increased need for federal-state coordination—coupled with significant plaintiff support for centralization”); *Plavix*, 923 F. Supp. 2d at 1378-79 (“[A]t the time of our decision in *Plavix I*, we were aware of related state court litigation in only two states—New Jersey and New York. That number has at least doubled since then. The Miller Firm, which represents plaintiffs in a number of the constituent actions in this docket, states that it represents plaintiffs in ‘hundreds’ of cases filed in California and Illinois, and defendants assert that the total number of state cases exceeds 2,000. This dramatic increase in the number of related state court cases suggests that the number of related federal actions will increase as well.”). Put simply, the decisions on which Movants rely to support their renewed motion do nothing to advance their position or somehow demonstrate that consolidation is now appropriate.

As the Panel has made clear, reconsideration is granted “only rarely . . . where a significant change in circumstances has occurred.” *See Plavix*, 923 F. Supp. 2d at 1378. The changed circumstances in *Covidien Hernia Mesh* and *Plavix* are not present here. In fact, the circumstances here have not changed at all, and the Panel should deny reconsideration as it routinely has in similar situations. *In re: Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., Mortg. Corp. Force-Placed Hazard Ins. Litig.*, 959 F. Supp. 2d 1363, 1364 (J.P.M.L. 2013) (denying reconsideration of motion to transfer because “we do not find any new circumstances that warrant reconsideration” and noting that “the pending actions involve different originating lenders, mortgage agreements with materially different terms concerning force-placed insurance, and differing disclosures to borrowers at the time the force-placed insurance policies were placed. . . . [and] individualized discovery and legal issues still will be substantial”); *In re Cymbalta (Duloxetine) Prod. Liab. Litig. (No. II)*, 138 F. Supp. 3d 1375, 1376 (J.P.M.L. 2015) (denying reconsideration and noting, “All the factors that weighed against centralization then still are present today. These 41 cases are at substantially different procedural stages.”).

For the reasons enumerated above and those identified by the Panel in its original ruling in 2020, reconsideration should not be granted here. This litigation is not the “rare” instance contemplated by *Plavix* that warrants reconsideration of the Panel’s original denial of centralization.

**D. Movants’ arguments offer nothing to overcome the undeniable truth that these cases are not suitable for centralization.**

In their Motion to Transfer, Movants appear to make three arguments for reconsideration. ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 2-4.<sup>5</sup> Each fails.

---

<sup>5</sup> While Movants enumerate four reasons in their brief, the second and third regarding parent-hotel knowledge and discovery are interrelated and can be disposed of as one.

First, Movants argue that centralization would promote judicial economy and serve the convenience of the parties. *Id.* at 2-3. It would not. As explained above, these cases have been pending for years and are at varying procedural stages; centralization would therefore necessarily waste the judicial resources already expended in these cases, complicate court proceedings, and slow the progress of these cases. *See supra* at pp. 7-8 (discussing Judge Mueller’s concerns about transfer given the extensive resources and time she has invested in a case that has been pending before her court for almost two years) & p. 10 (discussing inefficiencies of centralization given how mature the litigation is and how judicial economy would therefore not be advanced).

Second, Movants attempt to argue that there are common issues of fact based on alleged knowledge of human trafficking coming from corporate parent hotels. ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 3-4. This argument is entirely backwards. The question in adjudicating TVPRA claims is not what the parent corporations knew or did not know about human trafficking generally; rather, it turns on whether there is knowledge of plaintiff’s individual alleged trafficking specifically. Indeed, federal judges have already considered Movants’ argument and rejected it. *See, e.g., S.C., 2024 WL 308298, at \*2* (“Although there might be common factual questions about how much a given hotel group generally knows about sex trafficking problems in their hotels, such ***general knowledge is only minimally relevant to TVPRA claims. General knowledge can provide background context on whether a defendant should have recognized signs of sex trafficking, but ultimately it will be individual signs of sex trafficking that matter the most.***” (emphasis added)). Therefore, there is no risk of duplicative discovery if the cases are not centralized as case-specific discovery will be required in each case given that knowledge necessarily would come from the employees working at the individual location, etc.

Lastly, Movants argue that, “without centralization, we know now that survivors cannot anticipate the rigors of enforcing their civil rights under the TVPRA.” ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 4. This argument is nonsensical. Not knowing “the rigors of enforcing [plaintiffs’] rights” is not a basis to seek centralization under Section 1407. Not knowing how judges will decide issues is naturally part of litigation.<sup>6</sup>

Movants’ first and last arguments merely demonstrate that they want to have their cake and eat it, too. On the one hand (their first argument), they are seeking centralization to promote judicial efficiency. On the other hand (their last argument, which has been clarified by statements Movants have made in open court), they are willing to have cases sit in an MDL for years before they are ever tried and consider that to be “a small price to pay for [their cases] to be combined with others” where they know “their litigation strategy” (*i.e.*, what the litigation will require of them) and that, in an “MDL, they have more support and ability to want to come forward.” Ex. C, *J.M. v. Choice Hotels Int’l, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-0672 (E.D. Cal.) 1/22/24 Hr’g Tr. at 7:2-6, 20:25-21:12; *see also* ECF No. 1-1, Mot. at 4 (arguing that, by being able to “anticipate” what litigation will require of their clients, plaintiffs will be “empowered with the ability to make more informed decisions as to whether seeking civil remedies is right for them”). This is precisely the perverse result that led Judge Clay D. Land, who presided over the Mentor Obtape Transobturator Sling

---

<sup>6</sup> To the extent Movants attempt to link this argument to not being able to receive adequate protection for their clients outside of a centralized proceeding, that argument too fails. Movants raised a similar argument and had it summarily rejected in the *J.M.* case. Specifically, the court noted that plaintiff had been afforded identity protection she requested and that counsel had not sought any other protections despite this case having been pending for nearly two years. Ex. C, *J.M. v. Choice Hotels Int’l, Inc.*, No. 2:22-cv-0672 (E.D. Cal.) 1/22/24 Hr’g Tr. at 18:18-19:5 (“Identity [protection] not at issue here; right? Identity protected. . . . I haven’t heard any [other] need for clarification of expectations [of discovery matters]. . . . [T]his Court has not heard there’s anything not afforded to J.M. in terms of protecting her from the rigors of litigation, while at the same time recognizing it’s a case she brought.”). Put another way, they have received all the protections asked for to date without centralization. This argument therefore is misleading.

MDL, to caution against instituting MDLs and is yet another reason why this litigation should not be centralized:

Although one of the purposes of MDL consolidation is to allow for more efficient pretrial management of cases with common issues of law and fact, the evolution of the MDL process toward providing an alternative dispute resolution forum for global settlements has produced incentives for the filing of cases that otherwise would not be filed if they had to stand on their own merit as a stand-alone action. . . . This phenomenon produces the perverse result that an MDL, which was established in part to manage cases more efficiently to achieve judicial economy, becomes populated with many non-meritorious cases that must nevertheless be managed by the transferee judge—cases that likely never would have entered the federal court system without the MDL.

*In re Mentor Corp. Obtape Transobturator Sling Prod. Liab. Litig.*, No. 4:08-MD-2004, 2016 WL 4705807, at \*1. Those incentives Judge Land warns of are even greater here given the sensitive nature of the allegations which plaintiffs’ counsel have already seized upon to avoid necessary fact discovery, including such routine tasks as deposing their clients, all under the guise of protecting them from retraumatization, even though they have chosen to bring these allegations.<sup>7</sup>

At bottom, Movants altogether fail to demonstrate that these cases are appropriate for centralization under Section 1407. This is because, as explained above (*see supra* Sections II.A-C), they are not.

**E. For these, and other reasons, a brand-specific MDL is also inappropriate.**

In addition, the Red Roof Defendants anticipate that certain Movants, or Interested Parties, may argue that, while complete centralization (*i.e.*, centralization of all TVPRA claims involving

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, a court order was required in the *S.C.* case to have the plaintiff’s deposition go forward on a date certain after plaintiff’s counsel’s numerous attempts to postpone the deposition. *See S.C.*, No. 1:23-cv-00871 (N.D. Ohio) (unnumbered docket entry between ECF Nos. 172 & 173: “Order [non-document] entered by Judge James S. Gwin on 1/10/24. The Court orders parties to schedule the deposition of plaintiff for January 22, 23 or 24. (T,A) (Entered: 01/10/2024)”).



all hotel defendants) is unwarranted, brand-specific centralization would be. This assertion is meritless and will not promote judicial efficiency—but the opposite. It would result in conflicting decisions, differing treatment of claimants, and potential infringement of the hotel defendants’ rights under the common law and TVPRA.

First, such consolidation would deter, not further, judicial economy. To be sure, such a procedure would likely require the creation of numerous separate MDLs for each hotel “brand.”<sup>8</sup> All MDLs would presumably be transferred to separate jurisdictions and handled by a differing transferee judge. But many of these cases involve claimants naming multiple hotel brands alleging defendants are responsible for Plaintiff’s injury (*i.e.*, damages from alleged sex trafficking).

Take the *S.C.* case, for example. In *S.C.*, Plaintiff named eight defendants including: Red Roof Franchising, LLC, Red Roof Inns, Inc., Days Inn Worldwide Inc., Choice Hotels International, Inc., Six Continents Hotels Inc., Holiday Hospitality Franchising, LLC, and Crowne Plaza, LLC. *S.C.*, No. 1:23-cv-00871 (N.D. Ohio) (ECF No. 9, Am. Compl.). Plaintiff *S.C.* alleges each defendant violated the TVPRA and is responsible for her damages that allegedly resulted from her alleged trafficking. Allowing a separate MDL for each hotel brand, or defendant, means *S.C.*’s case would need to be severed against each defendant and then transferred to separate MDLs where each defendant could receive different rulings on discovery and pretrial matters. These disparate rulings could range anywhere from the scope of discovery to the law that applies within the TVPRA. In other words, defendants in the same case, against the same plaintiff, alleging

---

<sup>8</sup> The Red Roof Defendants note that Judge Gwin asked the defendants in Opposition to Plaintiff’s motion to stay in *S.C.* to identify “unique defendants” that were proposed to be consolidated in an MDL. *S.C.*, No. 1:23-cv-00871 (ECF No. 180, PageID 2064-2066). That list identifies at least 51 Defendants named throughout the 53 cases proposed to be consolidated. Recognizing there are not 51 “brands,” the Red Roof Defendants still anticipate that brand specific consolidation could require at least nine “brand specific” MDLs and potentially more.

responsibility for the same injuries would be in different MDL's in front of different judges, in different jurisdictions, and subject to potentially different rulings. And not only that, but those plaintiffs would be forced to participate separately in each MDL and be subject to inconsistent rulings as well.

This does not promote efficiency. To the contrary, it would create deeply concerning procedural issues that deter—not further—the purposes of consolidation. *See, e.g., In re ARC Airbag Inflators Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 648 F. Supp. 3d 1378, 1380 (J.P.M.L. 2022) (finding “manufacturer-specific MDLs would unnecessarily complicate the litigation” when there were “nine different groups of vehicle manufacturer defendants, some only named in one action”); *In re Porsche “Clean Diesel” Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 158 F. Supp. 3d 1369, 1371 (J.P.M.L. 2016) (“A separate Porsche-only MDL would require retransfer of those claims to that separate MDL or coordination between two transferee judges as to discovery and motion practice. Either result would carry a heightened risk of inconsistent pretrial rulings and promises few efficiencies.”).

Second, even if brand-specific MDLs promoted some semblance of judicial efficiency (they do not), this procedure still suffers from the same fatal flaws outlined above. That is—claims under the TVPRA do not involve common factual questions. To be sure, no matter the “brand,” TVPRA claims involve separate hotels, separate hotel staff, separate franchisees, separate law enforcement, separate traffickers, separate claimants, and separate time frames. *See supra* Section II.C (comparing *S.C.* and *Jane Does 1-4* both involving the “Red Roof” brand but involving distinctly different facts that do not overlap). Thus, even if this procedure was viable, this procedure also fails to meet the requirements of consolidation.

**F. Even if centralization were proper—and it is not—the cases should be transferred to a district where the claims have proceeded through discovery and trial.**

One of the underlying goals of centralization is to preserve judicial resources and promote efficient pretrial management of cases. However, as stated above, this goal would not be advanced here, and as such, it is the Red Roof Defendants' position that these cases are not appropriate for centralization under Section 1407. Yet, in the unlikely event that these cases are centralized, it may be more judicially economical to transfer the cases to the Northern District of Ohio where two TVPRA cases are set for trial in May,<sup>9</sup> and where significant judicial resources and time have been invested in these matters.

**III. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Red Roof Defendants respectfully request that the Panel deny Plaintiffs' Motion for Transfer.

Dated: February 7, 2024

TUCKER ELLIS LLP

*/s/ Chelsea Mikula*

Chelsea Mikula

Attorneys for  
Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
Red Roof Franchising, LLC  
RRF Holding Company, LLC  
RRI West Management, LLC

---

<sup>9</sup> The *S.C.* case, as mentioned above, as well as *R.C. v. Choice Hotels Int'l, Inc.*, No. 5:2023-cv-00872 (N.D. Ohio)—both pending in the Northern District of Ohio—are less than three months away from the close of discovery and are set for trial in May 2024. Given this posture, the cases have and will have decisions on not only discovery and expert issues, but summary judgment and pretrial motions, as well as jury instructions by early spring.

# EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

IN RE: HOTEL TVPRA LITIGATION, ) CASE NOS. 2:21-cv-4933;  
) 2:21-cv-4934; 2:21-cv-4935;  
) 2:22-cv-1924; 2:22-cv-2682;  
) 2:22-cv-3185; 2:22-cv-3202;  
) 2:22-cv-3256; 2:22-cv-3258;  
) 2:22-cv-3416; 2:22-cv-3766;  
) 2:22-cv-3767; 2:22-cv-3768;  
) 2:22-cv-3769; 2:22-cv-3770;  
) 2:22-cv-3771; 2:22-cv-3772;  
) 2:22-cv-3773; 2:22-cv-3774;  
) 2:22-cv-3776; 2:22-cv-3778;  
) 2:22-cv-3782; 2:22-cv-3784;  
) 2:22-cv-3786; 2:22-cv-3787;  
) 2:22-cv-3788; 2:22-cv-3797;  
) 2:22-cv-3799; 2:22-cv-3811;  
) 2:22-cv-3837; 2:22-cv-3839;  
) 2:22-cv-3844; 2:22-cv-3845;  
) 2:22-cv-3846; 2:23-cv-1731  
)

TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS  
VIA ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALGENON L. MARBLEY  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, and  
THE HONORABLE ELIZABETH PRESTON DEAVERS  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
JANUARY 23, 2024; 4:00 P.M.  
COLUMBUS, OHIO

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

Babin Law, LLC

By: Steven C. Babin, Jr., Esq.

Penny L. Barrick, Esq.

Jennifer El-Kadi, Esq.

65 East State Street, Suite 1300

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Fibich Leebron Copeland Briggs

By: Sara J. Fendia, Esq.

1150 Bissonnet Street

Houston, Texas 77005

SHAWNA J. EVANS, FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER  
85 MARCONI BOULEVARD, COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215  
614-719-3316

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

Restore the Child, PLLC  
By: Susanna Southworth, Esq.  
2522 N Proctor Street, Suite 85  
Tacoma, Washington 98406

FOR THE PLAINTIFF H.C.:

Peiffer Wolf Carr Kane Conway & Wise LLP  
By: Tiffany R. Ellis, Esq.  
2229 Trumbull Street  
Detroit, Michigan 48216

FOR THE DEFENDANTS RED ROOF INNS, INC. AND  
RED ROOF FRANCHISING, LLC.:

Tucker Ellis LLP  
By: Chelsea R. Mikula, Esq.  
Joseph A. Manno, Esq.  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

Weston Hurd LLP  
By: Robert H. Stoffers, Esq.  
101 East Town Street, Suite 500  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Joseph A. Gerling, Esq.  
101 East Town Street, Suite 500  
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Young & Alexander Co., LPA  
By: Anthony V. Graber, Esq.  
130 West 2nd Street, Suite 1500  
Dayton, Ohio 45402

FOR THE DEFENDANT CHOICE HOTELS INTERNATIONAL, INC.:

Baker Donelson  
By: Sara M. Turner, Esq.  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 2600  
Birmingham, Alabama 35203

Ulmer and Berne  
By: Jennifer S. Heis, Esq.  
312 Walnut Street Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, Ohio 43215

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

FOR THE DEFENDANT WYNDHAM HOTELS AND RESORTS, INC.:

DLA Piper LLP

By: David S. Sager, Esq.

51 John F. Kennedy Parkway, Suite 120

Short Hills, New Jersey 07078

DLA Piper(US)

By: Melissa A. Reinckens, Esq.

4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100

San Diego, California 92121

Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP

By: Michael R. Reed, Esq.

65 East State Street, Suite 2500

Columbus, Ohio 43215

FOR THE DEFENDANT HOLIDAY HOSPITALITY FRANCHISING AND SIX  
CONTINENTS HOTELS INC.:

Holland & Knight

By: John M. Hamrick, Esq.

Regions Plaza, Suite 1800

1180 West Peachtree Street, N.W.

Atlanta, Georgia 30309

FOR THE DEFENDANT G6 HOSPITALITY, LLC:

DLA Piper LLP (US)

By: Whitney C. Cloud, Esq.

1650 Market Street, Suite 5000

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Roetzel & Andress

By: Patrick B. Healy, Esq.

625 Eden Park Drive, Suite 450

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

FOR THE DEFENDANT BEST WESTERN INTERNATIONAL, INC.:

Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith

By: Corey L. Shulman, Esq.

77 Water Street, Suite 2100

New York, New York 10005

FOR THE THIRD-PARTY DEFENDANT COLUMBUS HOTEL, INC.:

Joseph L. Piccin Co LLC

By: Joseph L. Piccin, Esq.

3010 Hayden Road

Columbus, Ohio 43235

- - -

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography,  
transcript produced by computer.



1 MR. BABIN: That's my understanding, yes.

2 THE COURT: And did counsel meet and confer about  
3 potential case management options, including MDL litigation or  
4 multi-district litigation, I should say, either on an  
5 industry-wide or defendant-by-defendant basis? Do you know,  
6 Mr. Babin, whether that happened?

7 MR. BABIN: I know that we talked to various counsel  
8 with respect to whether they would support an MDL. I know  
9 there has not been a call with all the faces I see here with  
10 respect to meeting and conferring about filing for the MDL.  
11 I'm not certain whether defense counsel has done that on their  
12 own.

13 We -- I did meet with a number of plaintiffs' counsel  
14 with respect to what would be filed here. I'm not sure if that  
15 is meet and confer. But those are the meetings that we've had,  
16 in essence, for what we intended to file.

17 THE COURT: And was that -- were all of the actions  
18 that you took consistent with the Court's order from that last  
19 conference, Mr. Babin, in your -- based on your understanding?

20 MR. BABIN: I think that they are consistent except  
21 for potentially the filing would have been anticipated to be at  
22 a later date. We had a belief that there was going to be a  
23 filing before ours, not from defense counsel here. And we read  
24 that docket entry a number of times and agreed that it was in  
25 compliance with the order. I think it directs us to provide an

1 opportunity for the defense counsel to join and that  
2 opportunity isn't lost based on what we filed. We filed briefs  
3 Monday or Tuesday, whatever date --

4 THE COURT: I want you to go back a minute, Mr. Babin,  
5 and explain in greater detail what led you to act in a manner  
6 that was not consistent with the scheduling order that the  
7 Court set forth.

8 MR. BABIN: So we had two things, essentially, Your  
9 Honor. One would be Mr. Hamrick's email that this would be  
10 distributed which was a concern of ours. The primary  
11 concern -- to be completely forthright here, we had a faction  
12 of other plaintiffs' attorneys who were not in line with us and  
13 we had an indication they were going to file before that filing  
14 timeline.

15 THE COURT: Stop right there and tell me what that  
16 indication was.

17 MR. BABIN: Talking to them on the phone after  
18 multiple conversations. And we were concerned we would not be  
19 in compliance with the Court's desire to have us file and  
20 approach the panel first. And there would be no prejudice to  
21 the --

22 THE COURT: Did other counsel tell you that they were  
23 going to file for an MDL elsewhere?

24 MR. BABIN: I think that -- hopefully they won't now,  
25 but there's still --

1 Other than that, was there any reason that you thought  
2 it was prudential to file before the 12th?

3 MR. BABIN: Well, other than just -- this is the same  
4 language, but the email from Mr. Hamrick indicating there was a  
5 desire to share this amongst individuals other than the clients  
6 and the lawyers in this action. And I didn't know what other  
7 interested parties may or may not want to do with respect to an  
8 MDL. I know first to file is going to put you in a position  
9 different than second to file.

10 THE COURT: In your calculus, did you give  
11 consideration to the fact that these were dates that had been  
12 agreed by the parties and had the imprimatur of the Court?

13 MR. BABIN: I did, Your Honor, and I --

14 THE COURT: Again, did you -- I'm just trying to  
15 understand how you would act in a manner that appears to be  
16 inconsistent with the Court's order which grew out of an  
17 agreement among and between the parties. That's what I'm  
18 trying to get to the bottom of.

19 MR. BABIN: We read the order multiple times, Your  
20 Honor, before filing, with multiple lawyers including the ones  
21 who signed the petition. And I don't think that we violated  
22 four, that we filed before. And I don't think that we violated  
23 three because they still have an opportunity to join. I can  
24 understand the discussion here, but I don't think --

25 THE COURT: Is that what the order says?

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Shawna J. Evans, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings before the Honorable Algenon L. Marbley, Judge, and Elizabeth Preston Deavers, Magistrate Judge, in the United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, on the date indicated, reported by me in shorthand and transcribed by me or under my supervision.

s/Shawna J. Evans \_\_\_\_\_  
Shawna J. Evans, RMR, CRR  
Official Federal Court Reporter

January 30, 2024

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

# EXHIBIT B

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

J.M., an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

Red Roof Inns, Inc.,

Defendant.

No. 2:22-cv-00672-KJM-JDP

ORDER

Plaintiff J.M. moves to stay proceedings pending a decision from the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (JPML) on whether this case will be transferred to a different court for a multidistrict litigation proceeding (MDL). The sole defendant, Red Roof Inns, Inc., opposes the motion. The court held a videoconference hearing on plaintiff’s motion on January 22, 2024, at which Jennifer El-Kadi and Penny Barrick appeared for plaintiff and Chelsea Mikula and Amanda Villalobos appeared for defendant. Mins., ECF No. 103. Having carefully considered the parties’ briefing and arguments at hearing, for the reasons set forth below, the court **denies** the motion to stay.<sup>1</sup>

//  
//

---

<sup>1</sup> The court denied the motion to stay in a minute order issued January 23, 2024. *See* Min. Order (Jan. 23, 2024), ECF No. 104. This order explains the reasons for the court’s denial.

1 **I. BACKGROUND**

2 **A. This Case**

3 In April 2022, plaintiff filed this case, initially suing both Red Roof Inns, Inc. and Choice  
4 Hotels International, Inc. *See generally* Compl., ECF No.1. This court held the initial Rule 16  
5 scheduling conference in October 2022, and issued a scheduling order immediately following that  
6 conference. Min. Order, ECF No. 36; Scheduling Order, ECF No. 37. The court has approved  
7 relatively minor modifications to the initial schedule; at this point fact discovery is scheduled to  
8 close on February 3, 2024, and expert discovery on April 12, 2024, with a dispositive motion  
9 cutoff of May 13, 2024. *See* Prior Order (July 18, 2023), ECF No. 83; Prior Order (Jan. 4, 2024),  
10 ECF No. 96. The parties confirmed at hearing that an independent medical examination of  
11 plaintiff is set for February 3, 2024, and they are in discussions regarding the setting of  
12 depositions. While defendants have filed a motion seeking leave to file a third-party complaint  
13 against its franchisee, *see* Mot. for Leave, ECF No. 97, defense counsel represented that if the  
14 motion is granted it will not require a full reopening of discovery, and plaintiff's counsel did not  
15 argue otherwise.

16 Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed Choice Hotels in February 2023, *see* Dismissal Notices,  
17 ECF Nos. 62, 65; Min. Order (Feb. 28, 2023), ECF No. 66, and since then the case has been  
18 proceeding against only Red Roof Inns, Inc. Plaintiff's current counsel, aside from local counsel,  
19 substituted into the case in July 2022, ECF Nos. 21, 22, 23, with one attorney appearing in  
20 November 2023. ECF No. 94.

21 **B. JPML Proceedings**

22 In 2020, before plaintiff filed this case, the JPML denied a motion to centralize  
23 approximately three dozen cases brought by sex trafficking survivors against hotel brand  
24 franchisors, franchisees, and related entities alleging violations under the Trafficking Victims  
25 Protection Reauthorization Act (TVPRA), 18 U.S.C. § 1595(a). *See In re Hotel Indus. Sex*  
26 *Trafficking Litig.*, 433 F. Supp. 3d 1353 (U.S. Jud. Pan. Mult. Lit. 2020). The JPML denied the  
27 motion based on the "unique issues concerning" the allegations in each of these actions. *Id.* at  
28 1356. As this case has been proceeding, several new TVPRA actions have been filed across the

1 country, many of them filed by plaintiff’s current counsel. *See* Mot. At 1–2, ECF No. 98;  
2 Transcript at 11, Mot. Ex. A, ECF No. 98-1; *see also* Mot. To Transfer, *IN RE: Hotel Industry*  
3 *Sex Trafficking Litigation (No. II)*, No. 3104 (U.S. Jud. Pan. Mult. Lit. Jan. 9, 2024), ECF No. 1.<sup>2</sup>

4 On January 9, 2024, plaintiff’s counsel filed a motion before the JPML seeking  
5 reconsideration of that panel’s prior order denying the creation of an MDL. *See* Mot. At 1–2.  
6 Plaintiff’s counsel represents to this court that it filed the motion for reconsideration at the  
7 direction of the Chief Judge of the Southern District of Ohio. *See* Mot. At 2; *see also* Min. Order,  
8 *L.G. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al.*, No. 22-1924 (S.D. Ohio Dec. 6, 2023), ECF No. 52. That Chief  
9 Judge is presiding over a number of TVPRA cases, filed between March 2019 and May 2023.  
10 Mot. At 3; *see, e.g.*, Compl., *S.R. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. et al.*, No. 23-1731 (S.D.  
11 Ohio May 23, 2023), ECF No. 1; Compl., *M.A. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. et al.*,  
12 No. 19-849 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 8, 2019), ECF No. 1.

13 Not quite a week after filing the motion for consideration with the JPML, on a federal  
14 holiday, plaintiff’s counsel filed their request to stay here, setting the motion for a date not  
15 available on the court’s calendar. *See* Mot. Defendant opposes the motion. Opp’n, ECF  
16 No. 101. As noted, the court heard the motion by videoconference, specially setting a hearing  
17 date given that time is of the essence. *See* Mins.

## 18 **II. APPLICABLE RULES**

### 19 **A. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**

20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1 provides that the civil rules “should be construed,  
21 administered, and employed by the court and the parties to secure the just, speedy, and  
22 inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. To that end,  
23 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 provides for a court to schedule “one or more pretrial  
24 conferences” for the purposes, among others, of “expediting disposition of the action,”  
25 “establishing early and continuing control so that the case will not be protracted because of lack

---

<sup>2</sup> A court may take judicial notice of undisputed matters of public record, including publicly available court records. *See United States v. Raygoza-Garcia*, 902 F.3d 994, 1001 (9th Cir. 2018).



1 of management,” and “discouraging wasteful pretrial activities.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(a)(1), (2), (3).  
2 The court “must issue” a scheduling order “as soon as practicable,” and no later than “90 days  
3 after any defendant has been served with the complaint or 60 days after any defendant has  
4 appeared.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(2). Once the court sets a schedule it “may be modified only for  
5 good cause and with the judge’s consent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4).

### 6 **B. JPML Statutory Authority and Rules**

7 The JPML is authorized to transfer “civil actions involving one or more common  
8 questions of fact,” which “are pending in different districts . . . to any district for coordinated or  
9 consolidated pretrial proceedings.” 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a). Rule 2.1(d) of the Judicial Panel on  
10 Multidistrict Litigation Rules of Procedure states the pendency of a motion before the panel  
11 brought under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 “does not affect or suspend orders and pretrial proceedings in  
12 any pending federal district court action and does not limit the pretrial jurisdiction of that court.”

13 A putative transferor court does not automatically issue a stay when a motion to transfer is  
14 pending before the JPML. *See Stuart v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.*, No. 08-0632, 2008 WL  
15 11388470, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2008). Instead, when considering a motion to stay  
16 proceedings, a court considers the following three factors: “(1) potential prejudice to the non-  
17 moving party; (2) hardship and inequity to the moving party if the action is not stayed; and (3) the  
18 judicial resources that would be saved by avoiding duplicative litigation if the cases are in fact  
19 consolidated.” *Rivers v. Walt Disney Co.*, 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Cal. 1997). The party  
20 moving for a stay, here the plaintiff, “bears the burden of establishing its need.” *Clinton v. Jones*,  
21 520 U.S. 681, 708 (1997) (internal citation omitted). As the Supreme Court has prescribed, “if  
22 there is even a fair possibility that the stay . . . will work damage to some one else,” then the party  
23 seeking the stay “must make out a clear case of hardship or inequity.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*,  
24 299 U.S. 248, 255 (1936). The court examines each of these factors in turn.

## 25 **III. DISCUSSION**

### 26 **A. Prejudice to Non-Moving Party**

27 Plaintiff argues defendant, the non-moving party, would not be prejudiced if the court  
28 issues a temporary stay. Mot. at 5. Plaintiff asserts any delay would be minimal and suggests

1 defendant would even benefit from first allowing the JPML to issue its decision, in that all parties  
2 might benefit from a saving of time and effort if the panel orders consolidation, or tailor litigation  
3 practice following any panel decision. *Id.* In response, defendant argues it “would be severely  
4 prejudiced if a stay is entered,” given that the fact discovery cutoff of February 3, 2024, is now  
5 less than two weeks away. Opp’n at 4. Specifically, defendant contends it has expended  
6 significant resources in preparing for plaintiff’s deposition and independent medical examination,  
7 both set to occur within the next two weeks by the fact discovery cutoff. *Id.* at 3–4; Amanda  
8 Villalobos Decl. ¶¶ 4–5, 7, ECF No. 101-1. Additionally, defendant states it has retained experts  
9 who are in the process of finalizing their reports due on February 7, 2024. Opp’n at 4; Villalobos  
10 Decl. ¶ 6. If the court grants a stay, defendant argues it would have to have its “experts pause on  
11 their expert reports . . . hold off for 2-3 months and then re-familiarize themselves with the facts  
12 of the case all over again at a significant cost to [defendant].” Opp’n at 4. Given the very late  
13 date of plaintiff’s motion to stay, filed so close to the fact discovery cutoff and start of expert  
14 discovery, the court finds a stay of proceedings at this stage would prejudice the defendant.  
15 Plaintiff’s counsel has not met plaintiff’s burden to show otherwise. This factor weighs heavily  
16 against granting the motion to stay.

17 **B. Hardship and Inequity to Plaintiff**

18 In the brief seeking a stay, plaintiff’s counsel asserts if a stay is not granted this “would  
19 cause significant hardship to plaintiff.” Mot. at 5. However, as defendant notes, plaintiff’s brief  
20 focuses solely on hardship to plaintiff’s counsel rather than plaintiff herself. *See* Opp’n at 4–5.  
21 For example, plaintiff’s brief states, “plaintiff’s counsel should be permitted to focus on the  
22 centralization process, which was ordered from another court” as “it would be inequitable for  
23 them to be forced to litigate on both fronts.” Mot. at 6. While counsel acknowledges the  
24 significant work underway to meet the deadlines set by this court in the Rule 16 scheduling order,  
25 *id.*, they provide no meaningful or supporting declaration to support their conclusory statement  
26 that plaintiff will suffer hardship and inequity.

27 While plaintiff’s counsel argued to the court during hearing that plaintiff J.M. would  
28 suffer hardship and inequity, the arguments took the form of generalized statements about the

1 potential for a plaintiff in a case of this kind to experience retraumatization if forced to relive the  
2 kind of experiences alleged in the complaint. *See* Second Am. Compl., ECF No. 52, ¶¶ 20, 56–64  
3 (alleging specific sex trafficking of plaintiff at defendant’s Stockton property in 2012). The  
4 complaint does note the sensitive nature of plaintiff’s allegations, and requests that plaintiff be  
5 able to proceed under a pseudonym, *id.* ¶ 15, which the court has allowed, *see* Prior Order  
6 (Sept. 7, 2023), ECF No. 90 (approving parties’ stipulation protecting plaintiff’s identity). The  
7 complaint does not include allegations of retraumatization through litigation, and plaintiff’s  
8 counsel has not otherwise moved for additional protective orders to shield plaintiff from  
9 unnecessarily intrusive or harmful discovery. Given the nature of the case, the court will remain  
10 alert to practices and procedures that may be needed to address issues of trauma if counsel raises  
11 them with proper support. But counsel’s arguments have no support in the record currently  
12 before the court and are insufficient to meet plaintiff’s burden. This factor too weighs against  
13 granting a stay.

#### 14 C. Judicial Resources

15 Lastly, the court considers whether a stay would advance judicial economy. Plaintiff  
16 argues “[c]ontinued litigation until the JPML rules would be an unnecessary use of this [c]ourt’s  
17 resources.” *Id.* at 7. In support of this argument, plaintiff cites a court decision from the Eastern  
18 District of Louisiana, which found the judicial economy factor weighed in favor of granting a  
19 motion to stay. *Louisiana Stadium & Exposition Dist. v. Financial Guar. Ins. Co.*, No. 09-235,  
20 2009 WL 926982 (E.D. La. Apr. 2, 2009). In that case, the motion to stay was filed a month after  
21 the case was filed, and the presiding court reasoned it would have had to spend significant time  
22 and energy early in the case familiarizing itself with allegations involving complex financial  
23 transactions, especially given a forthcoming motion to dismiss. *Id.*; Compl., *Louisiana Stadium*  
24 *& Exposition Dist. V. Financial Guar. Ins. Co.*, No. 09-235 (E.D. La. Jan. 22, 2009), ECF No. 1;  
25 Mot. to Stay, *Louisiana Stadium & Exposition Dist. V. Financial Guar. Ins. Co.*, No. 09-235  
26 (E.D. La. Feb. 20, 2009), ECF No. 7.

27 Plaintiff also cites a Northern District of Texas case in which the presiding judge granted a  
28 stay in part because he found “its pretrial procedures w[ould] be wasted” if the JPML granted the

1 motion to transfer. *U.S. Bank v. Royal Indem. Co.*, No. 02-0853, 2002 WL 31114069, at \*2 (N.D.  
2 Tex. Sept. 23, 2002). This case too is distinguishable. In *U.S. Bank*, the motion to stay was filed  
3 just over a month after the court issued the scheduling order. Scheduling Order, *U.S. Bank v.*  
4 *Royal Indem. Co.*, No. 02-853 (N.D. Tex. June 14, 2002), ECF No. 11; Mot. to Stay, *U.S. Bank v.*  
5 *Royal Indem. Co.*, No. 02-853 (N.D. Tex. July 23, 2002), ECF No. 11. Here, in contrast to both  
6 the *Louisiana Stadium* and *U.S. Bank* cases, this court has presided over this case for nearly two  
7 years, expending judicial resources on pretrial procedures, supervision of the Rule 16 schedule  
8 and motion practice. It has familiarized itself with the underlying factual allegations and  
9 procedural history of this case and issued orders on two motions to dismiss. See Prior Order  
10 (Oct. 17, 2022), ECF No. 42; Prior Order (May 12, 2023), ECF No. 70. It is preparing to resolve  
11 defendant's pending motion for leave to file a third-party complaint. Mot. for Leave. And as  
12 noted, fact discovery is about to close and expert discovery open, with dispositive motions due in  
13 less than four months. See Prior Order (July 18, 2023); Prior Order (Jan. 4, 2024). The time  
14 during which the court's judicial resources could have been conserved—the time Congress  
15 identified in the MDL statute as appropriate for designation of an MDL court—has mostly  
16 passed.

17 The judicial economy factor also does not weigh in favor of granting a stay; rather it  
18 weighs heavily against a grant.

19 Two of the factors informing whether to grant plaintiff's motion to stay weigh heavily  
20 against doing so, and plaintiff's counsel has not met plaintiff's burden with respect to the third  
21 factor. The court will deny the motion to stay.

#### 22 **IV. CONCLUSION**

23 For the reasons set forth above, the court **denies** plaintiff's motion to stay.

24 This order resolves ECF No. 98.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 DATED: January 24, 2023.

27   
28 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

# EXHIBIT C

**CERTIFIED COPY**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE  
KIMBERLY J. MUELLER, DISTRICT JUDGE PRESIDING

---

J.M., an individual, ) Case No: 2:22-cv-0672-KJM-JDP  
 )  
Plaintiff, ) Motion Hearing  
 )  
v. ) Monday, January 22, 2024  
 )  
CHOICE HOTELS INTERNATIONAL, )  
INC.; and RED ROOF INNS, INC., )  
 )  
Defendants. )

---

**REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

Pages 1 through 25

---

OFFICIAL REPORTER: Abigail R. Torres, CSR, RPR/RMR, FCRR  
CSR No. 13700  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of California  
501 I Street, Suite 4-100  
Sacramento, California 95814

*Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.*

1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiff: BABIN LAW, LLC  
3 10 West Broad Street  
4 Suite 900  
5 Columbus, Ohio 43215  
6 By: JENNIFER J. EL-KADI, PHV.  
7 By: PENNY L. BARRICK, PHV.

8 For the Defendants: TUCKER ELLIS, LLP  
9 515 South Flower Street  
10 42nd Floor  
11 Los Angeles, California 90071  
12 By: AMANDA VILLALOBOS, ESQ.  
13 -oOo-  
14 TUCKER ELLIS, LLP  
15 950 Main Avenue  
16 Suite 1100  
17 Cleveland, Ohio 44113  
18 By: CHELSEA R. MIKULA, ESQ.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, JANUARY 22, 2024; 2:00 P.M.

2 -oOo-

3 THE CLERK: Calling Civil Case No. 22-0672, *J.M. v.*  
4 *Choice Hotels International, Inc., et al.* This is on for  
5 Plaintiff's motions to stay, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.

7 Appearances, please, for plaintiff, lead counsel  
8 first.

9 MS. EL-KADI: Jennifer El-Kadi for the plaintiff, Your  
10 Honor. Lead counsel.

11 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. And also  
12 appearing for plaintiff.

13 MS. BARRICK: Penny Barrick, Your Honor, on behalf of  
14 plaintiff.

15 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to you.

16 For the defense Red Roof Inns.

17 MS. MIKULA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

18 Chelsea Mikula on behalf of the defendant.

19 THE COURT: Good afternoon to you.

20 And also appearing?

21 MS. VILLALOBOS: Amanda Villalobos on behalf of  
22 defendant, Your Honor.

23 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.

24 Someone else was trying to appear from an airplane.  
25 And I'm sorry. I denied that person access to the hearing.



1 I don't know that that complies with FAA rules. Let  
2 alone, what this Court expects.

3 So, first, there's no question about my jurisdiction  
4 to decide a motion to stay, or any other motion, for that  
5 matter, until the MDL panel makes a decision, right,  
6 Ms. El-Kadi.

7 MS. EL-KADI: That is correct, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Ms. Mikula?

9 MS. MIKULA: Yes, you have jurisdiction. Just side  
10 issue, yes.

11 THE COURT: So I'm looking at the factors related to  
12 the question of how they're not -- the matter here should be  
13 stayed, prejudice to the nonmoving party, prior to -- inequity  
14 to the nonmoving party, and preservation of judicial resources.

15 And here, there's a lot of water under the bridge  
16 since the MDL last considered this matter. And I've looked  
17 back at the docket. I'm clear on the calendar. I do have  
18 questions related to that.

19 Let me just ask, Ms. El-Kadi, initially, what is your  
20 focused response to the defense saying it would be severely  
21 prejudiced, given your arguments that, well, the defense would  
22 not be? Why would the defense not be, given this case was  
23 filed April of 2022? There's been discovery. We're closing in  
24 on a fact discovery cutoff, expert cutoff in April, and a  
25 dispositive motion cutoff in the fairly near future.

1 MS. EL-KADI: Yes, Your Honor. So plaintiff's counsel  
2 believes that there is no or little to no prejudice with  
3 respect to the defendants in this case because should the JPML  
4 grant the MDL motion or even deny it, there would only be a  
5 minimum of a two- to three-month stay, so it -- we would pick  
6 right back up where we left off.

7 Right now, we have continued with litigation,  
8 presuming that, you know, the stay would not get granted, so we  
9 are making sure that we're meeting those deadlines, but we  
10 believe that there is not prejudice to the defendants here  
11 at -- so much that there would be to the plaintiff in this  
12 case, given that she is a survivor of human trafficking, and  
13 putting her through litigation where the panel could grant this  
14 or continuing -- we have her deposition scheduled for  
15 January 31st.

16 Her DME is scheduled for, I believe, February 5th, and  
17 so we are proceeding, but to have her endure that right now,  
18 and given that the panel potentially could grant this MDL,  
19 would cause severe retraumatizing to the client.

20 THE COURT: Your briefing doesn't say anything  
21 about -- the defense is correct. The briefing, there's nothing  
22 before me that addresses prejudice to the plaintiff, so you're  
23 arguing that now.

24 Well, what supports that besides your bare argument?

25 MS. EL-KADI: I would say -- and I apologize, Your

1 Honor. I would say the hardship to the plaintiff is more so  
2 the element. With respect to the prejudice to the defendant,  
3 it would just be that this case would be put on stay for at  
4 minimum two to three months pending the decision from the JPML  
5 panel and courts have routinely allowed for that, given when a  
6 motion is pending before the JPML.

7 THE COURT: Well, the courts made recent decisions.  
8 In some of the cases you cite, it's when preliminary  
9 proceedings have not even gone forward. That's not -- this  
10 case has a history. This Court has decided motions to dismiss  
11 and scheduled the matter.

12 So I think this -- I don't know if this is an unusual  
13 posture. Well, let's just talk about the plaintiff. Again,  
14 you're arguing hardship. You didn't say anything -- all of the  
15 request to stay was supported by the inconvenience to counsel,  
16 so I understand generally -- generally the issues that you're  
17 raising. But, again, there's nothing in the record -- is J.M.  
18 herself telling me she wants me to stay this case because there  
19 would be hardship and inequity to her -- assuming this is a  
20 her. Maybe I've got that wrong -- but J.M.

21 Ms. El-Kadi.

22 MS. EL-KADI: Yes, Your Honor. J.M. herself is  
23 stating that this stay would be beneficial to her, herself,  
24 and -- I apologize if it wasn't articulated in the briefing.  
25 It is with respect to J.M. herself, given the retraumatizing

1 that these cases have.

2 And when you have numerous plaintiffs, like we do  
3 in -- across the country, spread across jurisdictions, if the  
4 panel does grant that MDL, they have more support and ability  
5 to want to come forward and tell their story. Right now, there  
6 is, like, significant fear for the client --

7 THE COURT: Where is that in the record? How do I --  
8 you know, it's an argument. But what in that reference  
9 supports that? Because I could be thinking, as the local trial  
10 judge, no matter that this district is a burdened district, we  
11 know how to prioritize. And this case -- this case would -- if  
12 it stayed on track -- would get to resolution long before  
13 anything that goes to the MDL.

14 I can tell you when we send cases -- I mean, we don't  
15 get to choose, ultimately. But when our cases go to the MDLs,  
16 they come back here six years later, eight years later, so  
17 that's a long period of time when you're thinking about someone  
18 like J.M. And I just -- what allows me to think about the  
19 impacts of the case on the plaintiff given what happens with  
20 these -- these MDLs, which are kind of like octopuses.

21 MS. EL-KADI: Well, certainly, Your Honor. And if it  
22 would benefit the Court, I would absolutely be more than happy  
23 to have my client produce an affidavit in support of that  
24 argument, if that would be what the Court would request.

25 THE COURT: Well, I'm not necessarily requesting it.

1 I'm pointing out to you the absence of anything in the record  
2 that supports the argument you are now making, you know.

3           So my questions are: Has J.M. been told, "Okay. If  
4 the MDL grants this request" -- which another trial judge is  
5 arguing for -- geographically inconvenient and probably a long  
6 time until her case is resolved, does that -- does J.M.  
7 understand that and with that understanding --

8           MS. EL-KADI: Yes --

9           THE COURT: -- does J.M. says the hardships and the  
10 inequity weigh in favor of moving the case?

11           MS. EL-KADI: Yes, Your Honor. We have explained to  
12 J.M. what would happen should an MDL be granted, and the  
13 potential that her case might not even be chosen for one of the  
14 first trials. And she understands that her position was that  
15 if there are others and numerous individuals that are also  
16 coming forward, it gives her the ability to want to continue  
17 and to move forward with the case.

18           She still is willing to move forward with the case  
19 now, as having the additional support with the panel, and she  
20 understands -- you know, she -- she was trafficked in 2012.  
21 And so it has taken her time to heal, and she still is not  
22 fully healed to even speak on her trauma. And so even the  
23 additional time for her is helpful and beneficial in that sense  
24 of helping her cope through the emotions.

25           THE COURT: Well, she brought the case. She's got the

1 IME, as you mentioned, for February 3rd. That's set; right?

2 MS. EL-KADI: Yes, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Fact discovery set to close February 3rd  
4 with the end of fact discovery.

5 For Ms. Mikula, just given what Ms. El-Kadi is saying,  
6 if that were supported by evidence in the record, does that not  
7 weigh heavily in favor of the -- the second factor?

8 MS. MIKULA: We do not believe it does, Your Honor.  
9 To the point that you just made, she made the decision to file  
10 the lawsuit, and she made the decision to file the lawsuit in  
11 2022. We take the allegations very seriously. But with all  
12 due respect to Ms. El-Kadi, the burden to the moving party that  
13 the Courts look at is not simply, Does she have to undergo a  
14 deposition?

15 That is a requirement of the mere fact of filing a  
16 lawsuit. We have gone back for months and months to get this  
17 deposition scheduled. We incurred significant time and expense  
18 in collecting her medical records, getting ready for this  
19 deposition. We have multiple experts. They are days away from  
20 finishing their expert reports. It's not as simple as pausing  
21 the case for three months or six years and picking up where you  
22 left off.

23 That's an extreme prejudice to us, and you can't  
24 ignore -- I'm not saying you would, but plaintiff can't ignore  
25 the cost that is associated with that. They made the decision

1 to file this case that is on track. Even if it went to the  
2 MDL, it would be sent back to this court for trial proceedings.

3 We need two more weeks to finish discovery. That's  
4 all we've asked for. It's set. We see no reason to take this  
5 off calendar on the hope that maybe the MDL would change its  
6 decision. This decision was before the MDL four years ago, and  
7 it said that these cases are not appropriate for an MDL.

8 There have been no change in circumstances, from our  
9 opinion, that the MDL is going to change its mind. Frankly, we  
10 feel -- we have chased plaintiff's counsel for this deposition  
11 date. We feel that they are behind, and they need more time to  
12 prepare their case, and that is not a sufficient basis for this  
13 Court to grant a stay.

14 THE COURT: All right. And I understand that  
15 argument.

16 On the other factors related to the plaintiff, J.M. is  
17 the only -- she has -- J.M. has only one case, and it's only  
18 one hotel, right, not multiple hotels? Ms. El-Kadi?

19 MS. EL-KADI: That is correct, Your Honor. And with  
20 respect to the filing, she did have a statute approaching,  
21 which is also why we did speak with the client and indicate to  
22 her, you know, if she did want to preserve her claim, we did,  
23 in fact, need to file the case. And she had agreed at that  
24 time that she wanted to file rather than not file and lose the  
25 potential of having her case.

1 THE COURT: But you haven't set up a protective order  
2 to delay discovery to take account of what you're describing is  
3 her ongoing traumatization; right?

4 MS. EL-KADI: No, Your Honor. I have not.

5 THE COURT: And this Court can't know if J.M.'s case  
6 would be available with her -- I mean, what are -- are  
7 plaintiff's counsel saying they're going to argue for this case  
8 being bellwether, given how much time has been put in?

9 MS. EL-KADI: I would not know, Your Honor, given that  
10 that -- although we did file, there could be a potential with  
11 the bellwether committee to decide whether or not that her case  
12 would be. We would probably try. And, obviously, because of  
13 the length of time ahead we've had with this case, we would  
14 potentially try and have it be a bellwether case, given how far  
15 along it is.

16 THE COURT: Of all the other cases, how -- where is  
17 this one in line in terms of filing date?

18 MS. EL-KADI: With respect to our Southern District of  
19 Ohio cases, they have been -- the main issue -- with respect to  
20 Southern District of Ohio, they're probably -- we have one case  
21 that is very far along that potentially is going to trial, but  
22 the Court did just order a Court-appointed mediation.

23 Our Northern District of Ohio cases are set for trial  
24 in April. We have a case in Texas and Pennsylvania that are  
25 very early on, and in new Mexico that are very early on. So I



1 would say that this case is probably, though, about the same,  
2 given the fact that we have been having to relitigate issues  
3 with the same counsel in cases across the country.

4 So, you know, we did just get a supplemental  
5 production from defendants just last week. We've been having  
6 issues with discovery --

7 THE COURT: In this case?

8 MS. EL-KADI: Yes.

9 THE COURT: In this case.

10 MS. EL-KADI: Yes, Your Honor. And that is also -- I  
11 will acknowledge that the -- plaintiff's counsel should have  
12 brought scope issues to the Court sooner. I think we were  
13 trying to resolve those issues without the Court's involvement.  
14 But we are at the point where it -- should the Court deny the  
15 stay, we will proceed with discovery. We will -- we have  
16 ordered up depositions for quality assurance. We will take  
17 30(b)(6) depositions. But we -- as mentioned, with respect to  
18 scope and getting the documents that we need, we got a  
19 production late in November, and we served discovery in August,  
20 and we didn't get a supplemental production until just last  
21 week.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 MS. MIKULA: So Your Honor --

24 THE COURT: Quick question -- I'm sorry.

25 MS. MIKULA: Go ahead.

1 THE COURT: Ms. Mikula.

2 MS. MIKULA: I was simply going to say there are no  
3 outstanding or pending meet-and-confer issues in this case. We  
4 had a meet-and-confer process. That issue was resolved. We  
5 did supplement a production in response to that letter, but  
6 there are no outstanding meet-and-confer letters or issues to  
7 defendant's knowledge.

8 MS. BARRICK: Your Honor, may I --

9 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Well, I like to stick with the  
10 lead counsel, but okay.

11 MS. BARRICK: Just one thing. We got an e-mail from  
12 Ms. Mikula and Ms. Villalobos just an hour ago, asking us if  
13 February -- for a date to bring our -- our current discovery  
14 dispute before this Court. And they asked if the February date  
15 would be fine. We have a dispute about social media. We have  
16 had decisions from Chief Judge Marbley and from Judge Gwen in  
17 the Northern District of Ohio on these discovery issues with  
18 regard to social media.

19 We are at an impasse. We have gotten inconsistent  
20 decisions from the two courts in Ohio. And now the defendants  
21 are going to bring this same issue before this Court. And our  
22 discovery dispute is going to be calendared before this Court  
23 in -- sometime here in the next two weeks.

24 So although discovery has been ongoing, it is not  
25 nearly as far along as defendants or this Court, I think,

1 thinks it is. We have been -- I'm not saying that defendants  
2 are not engaging in good-faith efforts. Both sides are. But  
3 many of the issues are being relitigated and relitigated, and  
4 we are getting inconsistent decisions.

5           Your Honor's decision out of -- for a motion to  
6 dismiss. We see that this Court understands -- understands  
7 deeply and sophisticatedly the issues before it. And it's not  
8 that we don't want to litigate before this Court. We would  
9 move the MDL and put it before this Court. It's just that we  
10 are relitigating over on many different fronts.

11           And if we stay in front of this Court, great, we will  
12 do it. In a few months -- it's a few months. I understand --  
13 we all have costs with regard to litigation. I understand  
14 defendants' point, but it's not nearly as prejudicial as  
15 requiring our client to go through a deposition that may not  
16 even matter because if -- even if we wanted to keep it before  
17 this Court, Chief Judge Marbley has ordered us to go to the  
18 panel. We went to the panel upon his order. And if the panel  
19 does rehear it, we go through all of this again. And --

20           THE COURT: I understand that. But what -- I'm a  
21 chief judge. I'm a presiding judge in this case. Could I  
22 order you to tell the MDL not to include this case in that  
23 batch of cases, given how much longer under the bridge it's  
24 here? I just --

25           MS. BARRICK: Maybe --

1 THE COURT: I don't know. There's something not right  
2 here.

3 MS. BARRICK: You could --

4 THE COURT: You have a fact discovery cutoff of  
5 February 3rd. So you can tell me there's not that much  
6 discovery, but your cutoff for fact discovery is February 3rd.

7 So I don't know if everyone has been assuming I'm just  
8 going to rubber stamp a motion to stay. But I mean, when I  
9 look at the docket here and the issues, I just -- it troubles  
10 me, which is why I'm having this discussion with you right now.

11 MS. BARRICK: Your Honor, we should have brought this  
12 issue to you before this. We literally got discovery -- we  
13 just got discovery last week. We are not -- we -- we have --  
14 we have gone through it, and we made discovery requests in  
15 September. And defendant is calling it a rolling production,  
16 but it's actually just not meeting the date that they were  
17 required to give it to us.

18 We have been diligently trying with defense counsel to  
19 move forward in discovery. It is not -- we are not dragging  
20 our feet. We understand that this Court's deadlines mean  
21 something. They absolutely do. But we did not -- right when  
22 we didn't get the production on the date that it was due, we  
23 could have. And I love that your court docket -- how you  
24 require the court -- us to come before you, so that you can  
25 make a decision before any motion to compel is filed. And we

1 should have done that, but we didn't.

2           And we're in a position now where we are just -- we  
3 have just got documents that have to do with what we need for  
4 our 30(b)(6) deposition and the plaintiffs -- and Your Honor,  
5 if the Court -- if the panel denies it, we come back before  
6 you. And --

7           THE COURT: Well, I get all that. Let me just ask --  
8 I'm sorry. Am I pronouncing your name correctly? Is it  
9 Mikula?

10           MS. MIKULA: Yep. That is correct.

11           THE COURT: Okay. Sorry. I wasn't listening  
12 carefully earlier.

13           Anything to say based on what you just heard --

14           MS. MIKULA: So --

15           THE COURT: Based on supplemental discovery, what's  
16 the likelihood that you stipulate to extend the discovery  
17 cutoff? There's also that motion you have out there. I was  
18 going ask. I haven't -- I'm not going to prejudge it, but  
19 would that lead to reopening discovery?

20           MS. MIKULA: It should not. That is a document and a  
21 party that they have been in possession of for months now.  
22 They know that this property is owned by third-party  
23 franchisee. This is an issue we see in all of our cases. This  
24 counsel has chosen not to name the franchisee in their cases.

25           We, as a matter of course, bring them in, because if

1 there is someone responsible for plaintiff's actions, which we  
2 deny, we are not in control of the day-to-day operations of the  
3 hotel. And so that is an issue that will need to be decided.

4 But Ms. Barrick said, you know, there's plaintiff's  
5 social media that is going to be before the Court on  
6 February 1st. Yes, we have been diligent. We have been  
7 pressing the social media. That is a deficiency in  
8 plaintiffs's production.

9 It was a minimal supplemental production that was made  
10 last week. They've had the majority of our documents for  
11 months now. I'm not making up that we don't have a  
12 meet-and-confer letter stating deficiencies that we have.

13 We -- they asked us not -- there's no notice for a  
14 30(b) deposition at all. There were two fact witness  
15 depositions that they asked us for. We provided dates. We  
16 said, "Please renotice it, and let us know if these dates work  
17 for you."

18 Just today, we heard, "Are these going forward in two  
19 days from now?" I said, "We heard nothing. We'll have to  
20 check with the witnesses." "Are you still available in two  
21 days?" To which they said no. They would need dates next  
22 week. Those aren't 30(b).

23 I mean, I don't know how they're planning on doing all  
24 of this that they're saying in the next two weeks. We would  
25 work with them to extend discovery by a small period of time,

1 yes, if they need to do so. But it's like they're just  
2 starting to litigate the case now.

3 THE COURT: All right. Let me ask a different  
4 question. And this is based on -- I am taking notice of the  
5 briefing before the MDL, because I'm trying to figure out what  
6 the right thing to do here is. And so I'm looking at  
7 plaintiff's motion for transfer to Southern District of Ohio,  
8 and there's an argument for centralization that talks about  
9 this issue of survivors, and the experience of going through  
10 litigation.

11 And so I'm quoting: "We know now that survivors  
12 cannot anticipate the rigors of enforcing those civil rights  
13 under the TBBPRA." Courts, you know, can be equipped. "A  
14 survivor seeking justice benefits from consistency in knowing  
15 what the judicial process will afford them in the way of  
16 identity protection, what to expect from discovery, avoidance  
17 of unreasonable delays."

18 Identity production not an issue here; right?  
19 Identity protected. Ms. El-Kadi, is -- so identity protected.  
20 "Expectations from discovery." This Court has had a clear  
21 schedule in place. I haven't heard any need for clarification  
22 of expectations.

23 And then "avoidance of unreasonable delays," well, the  
24 way to avoid delays, it would seem to me, is to keep this case  
25 on track, and so the suggestion that it's going to start all

1 over in front of a new judge when it comes to scope of  
2 discovery, I don't think -- this Court has not heard there's  
3 anything not afforded to J.M. in terms of protecting her from  
4 the rigors of litigation, while at the same time recognizing  
5 it's a case she brought.

6 Am I missing something there? I mean, I can afford  
7 her -- I keep saying "her." I can afford J.M. all the  
8 protections that J.M. needs to be able to litigate the case,  
9 vindicating her rights, if they can be vindicated; right?

10 Ms. Barrick, you're going to take this?

11 MS. BARRICK: Do you mind, Your Honor?

12 THE COURT: That's fine.

13 MS. BARRICK: Thank you.

14 Yes, it's not just protection from J.M. in discovery.  
15 It's a protection for J.M. getting inconsistent decisions in  
16 discovery. Just using social media as a small example, Judge  
17 Gwen ordered one year before and two years after of the social  
18 media download.

19 Judge Marbley said, "No download." Defendants in this  
20 case want one year before all the way to present. She was  
21 trafficked in 2012, so that would be about a decade full of it.

22 So in order for us to prep our client of what she  
23 needs to be protected -- to be prepared to provide in order to  
24 litigate her case, we can say to our client, in front of Chief  
25 Judge Marbley, "You will not have to provide this."



1           But now, we don't know what you're going to order for  
2 her to provide, so it's the rigors of the unknowing of what's  
3 coming in this litigation. So I think that answers your  
4 question.

5           Was there more, Your Honor?

6           THE COURT: I don't think so. I just -- I just  
7 wondered if there isn't a strong argument for covering this  
8 case out for the motion to transfer.

9           MS. BARRICK: Well, Your Honor --

10          THE COURT: Single plaintiff, single hotel, Central  
11 Valley of California, a long way from the Southern District of  
12 Ohio, well on its way -- she wouldn't face inconsistent -- J.M.  
13 would not face inconsistent ruling if it's this judge.

14          MS. BARRICK: Your Honor, the defendants have that  
15 opportunity to move the panel to do that, and we could, as  
16 well, but I just want -- we are an MDL firm, and we're -- the  
17 last MDL that we were on was hair relaxer, and we had a case  
18 that was going to trial in two weeks. And we asked the panel  
19 to not include it, and the panel included all of them.

20          So whether the panel does or does not include it, I  
21 think is something that's difficult for us to hang our hat on.  
22 We could certainly ask, Your Honor --

23          THE COURT: I mean, you're moving to transfer every  
24 case.

25          MS. BARRICK: That's correct. That's correct. We

1 believe that that is in the best interest of our client, to  
2 have all the cases combined, even though it will take some time  
3 for J.M.'s case to get to trial in the event that it is MDL in  
4 front of another judge.

5 But that is a small price to pay for her to be  
6 combined with others and for the litigation strategy to be  
7 able -- for us to say to her, "J.M., this is what you -- what  
8 you're going to have to be prepared to do at your -- for your  
9 discovery -- you know, for your social media. This is what  
10 you're going to have to" -- and, also, Your Honor, with regard  
11 to scope, we should have brought more, and we do plan to bring  
12 more disputes about the scope of discovery.

13 We've gotten scope issues from different judges across  
14 the country, and we did get more. Ms. Mikula was quite  
15 generous with us with regard to this case and gave us some.  
16 But it is very difficult for us to provide -- to prepare for a  
17 30(b)(6) deposition with the documents we have.

18 So, yes, we will be vigorously litigating this over  
19 the next few weeks. Yes -- I think that answers your question.

20 THE COURT: Just a couple of other questions for  
21 Ms. Mikula. I do see a footnote someplace that says Judge  
22 Marbley has jurisdiction over all the Red Roof cases. But Red  
23 Roof is headquartered in Ohio.

24 MS. MIKULA: That's exactly --

25 THE COURT: What does that mean for the analysis here?

1 MS. MIKULA: I don't believe it has any -- any bearing  
2 on this analysis. It's plaintiff's, if they so chose to file  
3 in the Southern District of Ohio, because Red Roof is  
4 headquartered in Columbus. I don't think it has a bearing on  
5 the motion to stay.

6 THE COURT: Agreed.

7 Ms. Barrick, no bearing?

8 MS. BARRICK: I believe that it -- I believe that we  
9 had two defendants when this case was brought, Your Honor. And  
10 one defendant was --

11 THE COURT: Dismissed.

12 MS. BARRICK: -- no longer with us.

13 THE COURT: Dismissed.

14 MS. BARRICK: Yes. So that was why, because we  
15 didn't -- the Court in Ohio did not have jurisdiction over  
16 both, and we wanted to -- so that's why we brought it in  
17 California.

18 If the case were in the posture it is in today, the  
19 case would have been brought in front of Chief Judge Marbley  
20 because he does have jurisdiction over it. You know, we  
21 didn't -- over it the way that it stands now. We didn't want  
22 to inappropriately not bring a case against the hotel at which  
23 she was trafficked just so we could have jurisdiction in the  
24 Southern District of Ohio.

25 But if it had been procedurally the way it is right

1 now, we would have brought it there, so I do think it has some  
2 bearing on it, Your Honor. I think that all of the -- the  
3 reason that the Court in Ohio has jurisdiction over Red Roof  
4 Inn are for many reasons. And for -- the Court made decisions  
5 about the convenience for the parties and all of that, and why  
6 he has jurisdiction. So does that answer your question?

7 THE COURT: Well, I -- just no choice when it tells us  
8 it was dismissed in February of 2023, quite some time ago. So  
9 there was plenty of time to do something about that.

10 MS. BARRICK: Yes, Your Honor, but we didn't want a  
11 forum shop. I mean, we really didn't. We had, you know --  
12 you -- that's how we felt about it.

13 THE COURT: All right. I don't have any other  
14 questions, really. The -- I have looked -- not just for this  
15 case but in other matters, I have studied the MDL rules. I  
16 understand Judge Marbley is saying he's going to send a letter  
17 to the panel. There's nothing providing for that. Nothing  
18 preventing it, I suppose. It's the parties that have the  
19 power.

20 I just -- I just don't know what to think about, you  
21 know, one judge ordering a party to bring a motion. I can't  
22 say that -- that it makes sense for me to issue such an order.  
23 I don't tend to operate that way, but I do intend to contact  
24 the panel. Maybe it's my own letter expressing my concerns  
25 about the timing in this case of the possibility of it being

1 transferred out. Not my call; ultimately, their call. But I  
2 do have grave concerns, given the amount of time, the time this  
3 Court has spent.

4           And I know a lot of folks say, "Oh, that overburdened  
5 Eastern District of California. We're helping them out by  
6 taking cases away." But that's not how we think about things  
7 here. We have a duty to the geography that we serve as a  
8 federal trial court. And these cases matter. This case  
9 matters to the Central Valley of California, to the Eastern  
10 District of California.

11           And when plaintiffs get transferred out, I -- I  
12 regularly worry about whether or not they're going into black  
13 holes. We may say it's a protective black hole, but it sure  
14 looks like a black hole when we don't get a case back for six  
15 to eight years, if that.

16           You're in a better position to assess whether or not  
17 J.M. would get better leverage. I don't know. You know,  
18 that's for you to decide. You've made representations here  
19 today subject to Rule 11. Again, nothing in the record that  
20 really addresses hardship or inequity. I understand the  
21 burdens issue. So that's what I'm thinking about. So if  
22 there's any final words you want to have at this point, you  
23 can, and then I'll issue an order on the motion to stay.  
24 Ms. Mikula first and then plaintiffs can go last.

25           MS. MIKULA: Nothing further, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: All right. Anything further, Ms. El-Kadi?  
2 Ms. Barrick?

3 MS. EL-KADI: Nothing further, Your Honor.

4 MS. BARRICK: Thank you.

5 THE COURT: All right. Matter is submitted then.

6 Thank you.

7 (The proceedings concluded at 2:35 p.m.)

8 **C E R T I F I C A T E**

9 I, Abigail R. Torres, certify that I am a duly  
10 qualified and acting Official Court Reporter for the United  
11 States District Court; that the foregoing is a true and  
12 accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken by me in the  
above-entitled matter on January 22, 2024; and that the format  
used complies with the rules and requirements of the United  
States Judicial Conference.

13 DATED: January 31, 2024, San Diego  
14 /S/ABIGAIL R. TORRES

15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 U.S. Official Court Reporter  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

# EXHIBIT D

2/7/24, 9:22 AM

CM/ECF for JPML (LIVE)

<a href="#">Query</a>	<a href="#">Reports</a>	<a href="#">Utilities</a>	<a href="#">Help</a>	<a href="#">Log Out</a>
-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------

**MDL No. 2928** IN RE: Hotel Industry Sex Trafficking Litigation**Date filed:** 12/09/2019**Date terminated:** 02/05/2020**Date of last filing:** 02/14/2020**Associated Cases**

MDL	Civil Action	Start Date	End Date
<a href="#">MDL No. 2928</a>	<a href="#">CAN/3:2019-cv-08252</a> K.R. v. G6 Hospitality, LLC et al (No Action Taken)	01/08/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">CAN/4:2020-cv-00155</a> J.C. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc. et al (No Action Taken)	01/16/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">CAN/5:2020-cv-00656</a> B.M. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. et al (No Action Taken)	01/30/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">CO/1:2019-cv-03713</a> J.L. v. Best Western International, Inc. et al (No Action Taken)	01/13/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">FLM/3:2019-cv-01412</a> C.K. v. Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc. et al (No Action Taken)	01/08/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">FLM/6:2019-cv-02414</a> Doe v. Rickey Patel, LLC et al (No Action Taken)	12/26/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">GAN/1:2019-cv-03840</a> Jane Doe 1 v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">GAN/1:2019-cv-03841</a> Jane Doe 2 v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">GAN/1:2019-cv-03843</a> Jane Doe 3 v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">GAN/1:2019-cv-03845</a> Jane Doe 4 v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">GAN/1:2019-cv-04859</a> H.M. v. Red Lion Hotels Corporation et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">MA/1:2019-cv-11192</a> Doe C.D., an Individual v. R-Roof Asset, LLC et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">ME/2:2020-cv-00014</a> RT v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc., et al. (No Action Taken)	01/16/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">MIE/4:2019-cv-13622</a> H.G. v. Marriott International, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">MN/0:2020-cv-00227</a> M.M. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. et al (No Action Taken)	01/16/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">NH/1:2019-cv-01213</a> B. v. Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">NM/1:2019-cv-00963</a> Doe v. G6 Hospitality Property LLC et al (No Action Taken)	12/27/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">NYE/1:2019-cv-06071</a> S.J. v. Choice Hotels Corporation et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">NYN/1:2019-cv-01520</a> V. G. v. G6 Hospitality, LLC (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">OHS/2:2019-cv-00755</a> H.H. v. G6 Hospitality LLC et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">OHS/2:2019-cv-00849</a> M.A. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020



2/7/24, 9:22 AM

CM/ECF for JPML (LIVE)

	<a href="#">OHS/2:2019-cv-01194</a> Doe S.W. v. Lorain-Elyria Motel, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">OHS/2:2019-cv-02970</a> T.S. v. Intercontinental Hotels Group et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">OHS/2:2019-cv-04965</a> A.C. v. Red Roof Inns Inc et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">OHS/2:2019-cv-05384</a> C.T. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">OR/3:2019-cv-01992</a> A.B. v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">PAE/2:2019-cv-05770</a> A.B. v. MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL, INC. (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">SC/3:2019-cv-03442</a> H. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc. (No Action Taken)	01/21/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">TXN/3:2019-cv-02901</a> F. M. v. Best Western International Inc et al (No Action Taken)	01/03/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">TXN/3:2020-cv-00050</a> ES v. Best Western International Inc et al (No Action Taken)	01/17/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">TXS/4:2019-cv-04172</a> W. v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc. et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">TXS/4:2019-cv-04993</a> Doe #6 v. Choice Hotels International, Inc. d/b/a Comfort Inn (No Action Taken)	12/27/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">TXS/4:2019-cv-05016</a> Doe #9 v. Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc. d/b/a La Quinta Inn and Suites et al (No Action Taken)	12/27/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">TXS/4:2019-cv-05018</a> Doe (JW) v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc. (No Action Taken)	01/06/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">VAE/4:2019-cv-00120</a> A.D. v. Wyndham Hotels and Resorts, Inc. (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">VAW/3:2019-cv-00076</a> J.F. v Hospitality International, Inc., et al (No Action Taken)	01/16/2020	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">WAW/3:2019-cv-06153</a> M.L. v. craigslist Inc et al (Denied)	12/09/2019	02/05/2020
	<a href="#">WAW/3:2020-cv-05075</a> A.T. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts Inc et al (No Action Taken)	01/30/2020	02/05/2020

**BEFORE THE PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION**

**IN RE: HOTEL INDUSTRY SEX TRAFFICKING  
LITIGATION II**

**MDL No. 3104**

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that, pursuant to Panel Rule 4.1, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on February 7, 2024 on the following via the CM/ECF system, via regular mail, or via electronic mail:

**Jane Doe (A.M.L.) v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., C.A. No. 8:23-cv-1554**

Christopher Moze Cowper  
Cowper Law LLP  
12301 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 303  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
877-529-3707  
Email: mcowper@cowperlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe**

Patrick M. Barrett  
Provost Umphrey Law Firm  
4205 Hillsboro Pike, Suite 303  
Nashville, TN 37207  
615-466-4000  
Email: pbarrett@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe**

Annie McAdams Annie McAdams PC  
2200 Post Oak, Suite 1000, 11th Floor,  
PNC Tower Houston, TX 77056  
713-785-6262  
Fax: 866-713-6141  
Email: annie@mcadamspc.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe**

David S. Sager  
DLA Piper LLP US  
51 John F. Kennedy Parkway, Suite 120  
Short Hills, NJ 07078  
973-520-2570  
Fax: 973-215-2604  
Email: david.sager@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts**

Bryan O. Blevins , Jr.  
Provost Umphrey Law Firm LLP  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-838-8858  
Fax: 409-813-8610  
Email: bblevins@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe**

Kyle T. Orne  
DLA Piper LLP  
2525 East Camelback Road, Suite 1000  
Suite 1000  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-4231  
480-606-5172  
Fax: 480-606-5527  
Email: [kyle.orne@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:kyle.orne@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts**

Edward D. Fisher  
Provost Umphrey Law Firm LLC  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-838-8859  
Fax: 409-813-8682  
Email: efisher@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Jane Doe**

Melissa Anne Reinckens  
DLA Piper US  
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100  
San Diego, CA 92121  
858-677-1400  
Fax: 858-677-1401  
Email: melissa.reinckens@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts**

Oscar M Orozco-Botello  
DLA Piper LLP North Tower  
2000 Avenue of the Stars Suite 400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
310-595-3000  
Fax: 310-595-3300  
Email: oscar.orozco-  
botello@us.dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts**

Frank A Weiser  
Law Offices of Frank Weiser  
3460 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 1212  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
213-384-6964  
Fax: 213-383-7368  
Email: maimons@aol.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Patsiko, Inc.**

**J.M. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. E.D. C.A. No. 2:22-cv-00672**

Steven C. Babin, Jr. Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Penny L. Barrick  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: steven.babin@babinlaws.com;  
jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
penny.barrick@babinlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff J.M.**

Amanda Villalobos  
Tucker Ellis, LLP  
515 S. Flower Street 42nd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Fax: 213-430-3409  
Email: amanda.villalobos@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

Kristina Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
65 East State Street  
Suite 1300  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff J.M.**

Chelsea R. Mikula Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Ave., Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: [chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com](mailto:chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

Raymond Paul Boucher  
Amanda J. G. Walbrun  
Boucher, LLP  
21600 Oxnard Street, Suite 600  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
818-340-5400  
Fax: 818-340-5401  
Email: ray@boucher.la  
650-609-2148  
213-430-3400  
Email: walbrun@boucher.la  
**Counsel for Plaintiff J.M.**

Nicholas V. Janizeh  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
515 South Flower St., 42nd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071 213-430-3320  
Fax: 213-430-3409  
Email: [nicholas.janizeh@tuckerellis.com](mailto:nicholas.janizeh@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

**W.K., E.H., M.M., R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc., et al., N.D. Georgia, C.A. No. 1:20-cv-5263**

Amanda Kay Seals  
Bondurant Mixson & Elmore, LLP  
1201 West Peachtree Street, N.W. Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3417  
404-881-4147  
Email: seals@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

John Earl Floyd  
Bondurant Mixson & Elmore, LLP  
1201 West Peachtree Street, N.W. Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3417  
404-881-4100  
Email: floyd@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Jonathan Tonge  
Andersen, Tate & Carr, PC One Sugarloaf  
Centre 1960 Satellite Blvd.  
Suite 4000  
Duluth, GA 30097  
770-822-0900  
Email: jtonge@atclawfirm.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Manoj Sam Varghese  
Bondurant Mixson & Elmore, LLP  
1201 West Peachtree Street, N.W. Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3417  
404-881-4100  
Email: varghese@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Michael Rosen Baumrind Bondurant Mixson  
& Elmore, LLP  
1201 West Peachtree Street, N.W. Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3417  
404-881-4195  
Fax: 404-788-5617  
Email: baumrind@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Patrick J. McDonough Andersen, Tate & Carr,  
P.C.  
One Sugarloaf Centre  
1960 Satellite Boulevard  
Suite 4000  
Duluth, GA 30097  
770-822-0900  
Email: [pmcdonough@atclawfirm.com](mailto:pmcdonough@atclawfirm.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Tiana Scogin Mykkeltvedt Bondurant Mixson  
& Elmore, LLP  
1201 West Peachtree Street, N.W. Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3417  
404-881-4100  
Email: mykkeltvedt@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Amanda Bradley  
Bondurant Mixson & Elmore LLP  
1201 West Peachtree St NW  
Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-881-4100  
Email: bradley@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Juliana Mesa  
Bondurant Mixson & Elmore LLP  
1201 West Peachtree St NW  
Ste 3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-881-4100  
Fax: 404-881-4111  
Email: mesa@bmelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiffs W.K., E.H., M.M.,  
R.P., M.B., D.P., A.F., C.A., R.K., K.P., T.H**

Carolyn Ashley Saferight  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth C. Arko  
Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis, LLP -C. OH Suite 1100  
950 Main Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-3864; 216-696-2476; 216-696-2481;  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: ashley.saferight@tuckerellis.com;  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com;  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.,  
FMW RRI NC, LLC, Red Roof  
Franchising, LLC, RRI West Management,  
LLC, & RRI III, LLC**

Sandra Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis, LLP-MO  
100 South 4th Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.,  
FMW RRI NC, LLC, Red Roof  
Franchising, LLC, RRI West Management,  
LLC, & RRI III, LLC**

Marcella Coladangelo Ducca Greenberg  
Traurig, LLP - Atl  
Terminus 200, Suite 2500  
3333 Piedmont Road, NE  
Atlanta, GA 30305  
678-553-7375  
Fax: 678-553-2212  
Email: duccam@gtlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.,  
FMW RRI NC, LLC, Red Roof  
Franchising, LLC, RRI West Management,  
LLC, RRI III, LLC)**

**T.S. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., D. Minnesota, C.A. No. 0:23-cv-02530**

Annie McAdams Annie McAdams PC  
2200 Post Oak, Suite 1000 11th Floor  
PNC Tower Houston, TX 77056  
713-785-6262  
Fax: 866-713-6141  
Email: annie@mcadamspc.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.S.**

Erica H MacDonald  
Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
2200 Wells Fargo Center  
90 South Seventh Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3901  
612-766-7000  
Fax: 612-766-1600  
Email: erica.macdonald@faegredrinker.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. formerly known as Wyndham Worldwide Corporation doing business as Super 8**

Darren Brown  
Provost Umphrey Law Firm  
490 Park Street  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-838-8881  
Fax: 409-813-8630  
Email: dbrown@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.S.**

Kacie Jo Phillips Tawfic  
Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath  
2200 Wells Fargo Center  
90 South Seventh Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-766-1722  
Email: kacie.tawfic@faegredrinker.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc. formerly known as Wyndham Worldwide Corporation doing business as Super 8, Wyndham Hotel Group, LLC, Super 8 Worldwide, Inc.**

Jeffrey M Montpetit  
Sieben Carey  
901 Marquette Avenue, Suite 500  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-333-4500  
Fax: 612-333-5970  
Email:  
jeffrey.montpetit@knowyourrights.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.S.**

Christopher R Morris  
Bassford Remele  
100 South 5th Street Suite 1500  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-376-1627  
Fax: 612-746-1227  
Email: cmorris@bassford.com  
**Counsel for Sarah Hospitality, Inc. doing business as Super 8 Brooklyn Center**

Matthew Matheny  
Provost Umphrey 350 Pine St  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-838-8826  
Email: mmatheny@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.S.**

Peggah Navab  
Bassford Remele PA  
Fifth Street Towers, 100 South 5th Street  
Suite 1500  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-376-1612  
Fax: 612-333-8299  
Email: pnavab@bassford.com  
Counsel for Sarah Hospitality, Inc. doing  
business as Super 8 Brooklyn Center



**A.F. v. G6 Hospitality, LLC, D. New Mexico, C.A. No. 1:23-cv-00879**

Bridget J Hazen  
Weems Law Firm New Mexico  
108 Wellesley Dr SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106  
505-247-4700  
Email: [bridget@weemslaw.com](mailto:bridget@weemslaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.F.**

Angela Christine Agrusa  
DLA Piper LLP  
2000 Avenue of the Stars  
Suite 400 North Tower  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4704  
310-500-3591  
Email: [angela.agrusa@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:angela.agrusa@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

Dathan Weems  
Dathan L Weems Attorney at Law  
108 Wellesley Dr., SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106  
505-247-4700  
Fax: 866- 492-7692  
Email: [dathan@weemslaw.com](mailto:dathan@weemslaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.F.**

Shannon E. Dudic  
DLA Piper LLP  
2000 Avenue of the Stars  
Suite 400 North Tower  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4704  
310-595-3078  
Fax: 310-595-3478  
Email: [shannon.dudic@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:shannon.dudic@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

Alex Cameron Walker  
Modrall, Sperling, Roehl, Harris & Sisk, P.A.  
500 Fourth St NW Suite 1000  
Albuquerque, NM 87102  
505-848-1861  
Fax: 505-848-1882  
Email: [Awalker@modrall.Com](mailto:Awalker@modrall.Com)  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

**J.C. v. G6 Hospitality, LLC, N.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 1:23-cv-00867**

Penny L. Barrick  
Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff J.C.**

Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff J.C.**

Ashley G. Parisi  
Roetzel & Andress - Columbus 21st Floor  
Huntington Center  
41 South High Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-699-3858  
Fax: 614-463-9792  
Email: aparisi@ralaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

Patrick B. Healy  
Roetzel & Andress – Cincinnati  
Ste. 450  
625 Eden Park Drive Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-361-8298  
Fax: 513-361-0335  
Email: phealy@ralaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

Whitney Cloud  
DLA Piper – Philadelphia  
Ste. 5000  
One Liberty Place  
1650 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7300  
215-656-2440  
Fax: 215-606-3340  
Email: whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

**S.C. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., N.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 1:23-cv-00871**

Penny L. Barrick Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff S.C.**

Elise K. Yarnell  
Michael R. Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks – Columbus  
Ste. 2500  
65 East State Street  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc. & Days Inn Worldwide, Inc.**

Melissa A. Reinckens  
DLA Piper (US) - San Diego Ste. 1100  
4365 Executive Drive  
San Diego, CA 92121  
619-699-2798  
Fax: 619-764-6624  
Email: melissa.reinckens@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Jennifer S. Heis  
Ulmer & Berne - Cincinnati  
Ste. 1400  
312 Walnut Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

Christopher B. Donovan DLA Piper (US) -  
Houston  
Suite 3800  
845 Texas Avenue  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8449  
Fax: 713-300-6040  
Email: christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Sara Marie Turner  
Baker Donelson – Birmingham  
Ste. 2600  
1901 Sixth Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: [smtturner@bakerdonelson.com](mailto:smtturner@bakerdonelson.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

David S. Sager  
DLA Piper (US) - Short Hills  
Suite 120  
51 John F. Kennedy Parkway  
Short Hills, NJ 07078  
973-520-2570  
Email: david.sager@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Wyndham Hotel**

Steven A. Chang  
Reminger Co. – Columbus  
Ste. 800  
200 Civic Center Drive  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-232-2446  
Fax: 614-232-2410  
Email: schang@reminger.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC**

Cynthia G. Burnside  
Holland & Knight – Atlanta  
Suite 1800  
1180 West Peachtree Street NW  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3407  
404-817-8568  
Fax: 404-881-0470  
Email: [cynthia.burnside@hklaw.com](mailto:cynthia.burnside@hklaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**

William N. Shepherd  
Holland & Knight - West Palm Beach  
Ste. 1900 West Tower  
777 South Flagler Drive  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
561-650-8338  
Fax: 561-650-8399  
Email: william.shepherd@hklaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC**

John M. Hamrick  
Holland & Knight – Atlanta  
Ste. 1800  
Regions Plaza  
1180 West Peachtree Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-817-8500  
Email: john.hamrick@hklaw.com  
**Counsel for  
Defendants Six Continents Hotels, Inc.,  
and Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis - St. Louis  
Ste. 600  
100 South Fourth Street  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth C. Arko  
Giuseppe W. Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis - Cleveland Ste. 1100  
950 Main Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
Joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs  
Ste. 1700  
1375 East 9th Street  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**R.C. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc. N.D. Ohio, C.A. 5:23-cv-00872**

Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
[Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com](mailto:Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com)  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff R.C.**

Ryan J. Cavanaugh  
Constantine P. Venizelos  
Edward J. Kelley, III  
Constant Legal Group  
737 Bolivar Road, Ste. 440  
Cleveland, OH 44115  
216-333-4119  
Email: [ryan@constantllp.com](mailto:ryan@constantllp.com)  
[dean@constantllp.com](mailto:dean@constantllp.com)  
[ed@constantllp.com](mailto:ed@constantllp.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff R.C.**

Jennifer S. Heis  
Ulmer & Berne - Cincinnati  
Ste. 1400  
312 Walnut Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Kaeanna K. Wood Dzialo  
Ulmer & Berne – Cincinnati  
Ste. 1400  
312 Walnut Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-4029  
513-698-5130  
Fax: 513-698-5131  
Email: kdzialo@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Sara Marie Turner  
Baker Donelson – Birmingham  
Ste. 2600  
1901 Sixth Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: smturner@bakerdonelson.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Anne M. Markowski  
Kenneth A. Calderone  
Hanna, Campbell & Powell  
Ste. 100  
3737 Embassy Parkway  
Akron, OH 44333  
330-670-7601; 330-670-7324  
Fax: 330-670-0977  
Email: amarkowski@hcplaw.net  
kcalderone@hcplaw.net  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**

Amanda M. Leffler  
Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick-Akron  
Ste. 575  
121 South Main Street  
Akron, OH 44308  
330-572-7322  
aleffler@shumaker.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**

John M. Hamrick  
Holland & Knight – Atlanta  
Ste. 1800  
Regions Plaza  
1180 West Peachtree Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-817-8500  
Email: [john.hamrick@hklaw.com](mailto:john.hamrick@hklaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Choice Hotels  
International, Inc. Six Continents Hotels,  
Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**

Cynthia G. Burnside  
Holland & Knight – Atlanta  
Suite 1800  
1180 West Peachtree Street NW  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3407  
404-817-8568  
Fax: 404-881-0470  
Email: [cynthia.burnside@hklaw.com](mailto:cynthia.burnside@hklaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**

Sara Marie Turner  
Baker Donelson –Birmingham  
Ste. 2600  
1901 Sixth Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 513-698-5131  
Email: [kdzialo@ulmer.com](mailto:kdzialo@ulmer.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

Joseph Cole  
Shumaker Loop & Kendrick-Toledo  
1000 Jackson Street  
Toledo, OH 43604  
419-321-1264  
Email: [jcole@shumaker.com](mailto:jcole@shumaker.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc.**

Michael J. Class  
Black, McCuskey, Souers & Arbaugh  
Ste. 200  
4505 Stephen Circle NW  
Canton, OH 44718  
330-430-5040  
Email: [mclass@bmsa.com](mailto:mclass@bmsa.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**

William N. Shepherd  
Holland & Knight - West Palm Beach Ste.  
1900 West Tower  
777 South Flagler Drive West Palm Beach, FL  
33401 561-650-8338  
Fax: 561-650-8399  
Email: [william.shepherd@hklaw.com](mailto:william.shepherd@hklaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc., Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC & Crowne Plaza, LLC**



**T.P. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:21-cv-4933**

Steven Charles Babin , Jr.  
Jennifer Jana El-Kadi  
Penny L. Barrick  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Gregory M. Zarzaur  
2332 2nd Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205.983.7985  
Email: gregory@zarzaur.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Christopher Tisi  
Levin, Papantonio, Rafferty, Proctor,  
Buchanan, O'Brien,  
316 S. Baylen Street Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-435-7123  
Fax: 850-436-6123  
Email: ctisi@levinlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Kathryn L Avila  
Levin Papantonio  
316 S. Baylen Street  
Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-436-6247  
Fax: 850-436-6347  
Email: kavila@levinlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Denise Wiginton  
The Zarzaur Law Firm 2332 2nd Avenue  
North Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-983-7985  
Email: denise@zarzaur.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Kelsie Overton  
The Zarzaur Law Firm  
2332 2nd Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205.983.7985  
Email: kelsie@zarzaur.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Emanuella J. Paulos  
Levin Law Firm  
316 South Baylen Street Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-435-7107  
Email: epaulos@levinlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Kimberly Lambert Adams  
Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell,  
Rafferty & Proctor, PA  
316 S Baylen St - Ste 600  
PO Box 12308  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850/435-7057  
Fax: 850/435-7020  
Email: kadams@levinlaw.com\  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Morgan G. Harper  
Babin Law, LLC  
65 E. State Street, Suite 1300  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: Morgan.Harper@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.P.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St.  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

Judd R Uhl  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
250 E. Fifth Street  
Ste 2000  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-808-9911  
Fax: 513-808-9912  
Email: [judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

Christopher B. Donovan  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
845 Texas Avenue  
Ste 3800  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8449  
Fax: 713-300-6040  
Email: christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

Melissa A. Reinckens  
DLA Piper (US)  
4365 Executive Drive  
Ste 1100  
San Diego, CA 92121 858-677-1400  
Fax: 858-677-1401  
Email: [melissa.reinckens@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:melissa.reinckens@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

David S Sager  
DLA Piper LLP  
51 John F. Kennedy Pkwy Suite 120  
Short Hills, NJ 07078 973-520-2570  
Fax: 973-215-2604  
Email: david.sager@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

Nathan Heller  
DLA PIPER US LLP  
One Liberty Place  
1650 Market St., Ste. 4900  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7300  
215-656-3372  
Fax: 215-606-3372  
Email: [nathan.heller@dlapiper.com](mailto:nathan.heller@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotels  
and Resorts, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: [giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com](mailto:giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: [joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com](mailto:joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: [chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com](mailto:chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP 950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: [Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com](mailto:Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street  
Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: [Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com](mailto:Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns, Inc.**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: [wfalen@bdblaw.com](mailto:wfalen@bdblaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof Inns**

Corey Lee Shulman  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
77 Water Street  
Ste 2100  
New York, NY 10005 646-783-1720  
Fax: 212-232-1399  
Email: [Corey.Shulman@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Corey.Shulman@lewisbrisbois.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western International, Inc.**

Judd R Uhl  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
250 E. Fifth Street  
Ste 2000  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-808-9911  
Fax: 513-808-9912  
Email: [judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western International, Inc.**

Karen L Campbell  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP  
Suite 2100  
77 Water Street  
New York, NY 10005 212-232-1391  
Fax: 212-232-1399  
Email: karen.campbell@lewisbrisbois.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western  
International, Inc.**

Joseph L Piccin  
Joseph L Piccin Co LLC  
3010 Hayden Road  
Columbus, OH 43235  
614-659-9616  
Fax: 614-798-1935  
Email: JLP@joepiccin.com  
**Counsel for Third-party Defendants  
Columbus Hotel, Inc. dba Best Western  
North and 888 Dublin Investment, LLC  
dba Best Western North formerly known  
as Neuman Investment, LLC**

**A.W. v. Best Western International, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:21-cv-4934**

Steven Charles Babin , Jr.  
Jennifer Jana El-Kadi  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Gregory M. Zarzaur  
2332 2nd Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205.983.7985  
Email: gregory@zarzaur.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Christopher Tisi  
Levin, Papantonio, Rafferty, Proctor,  
Buchanan, O'Brien,  
316 S. Baylen Street Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-435-7123  
Fax: 850-436-6123  
Email: ctisi@levinlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Kimberly Lambert Adams  
Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell,  
Rafferty & Proctor, PA  
316 S Baylen St - Ste 600  
PO Box 12308  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850/435-7057  
Fax: 850/435-7020  
Email: kadams@levinlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Denise Wiginton  
Kelsie Overton  
The Zarzaur Law Firm  
2332 2nd Avenue North Birmingham, AL  
35203  
205-983-7985  
Email: denise@zarzaur.com  
kelsie@zarzaur.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Penny L. Barrick  
Babin Law, LLC.,  
10 West Broad Street  
Ste 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Emanuella J. Paulos  
Levin Law Firm  
316 South Baylen Street  
Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-435-7107  
Email: [epaulos@levinlaw.com](mailto:epaulos@levinlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.W.**

Judd R Uhl  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
250 E. Fifth Street  
Ste 2000  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-808-9911  
Fax: 513-808-9912  
Email: [judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Best Western International, Inc. and G6 Hospitality, LLC**

Corey Lee Shulman  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
77 Water Street  
Ste 2100  
New York, NY 10005 646-783-1720  
Fax: 212-232-1399  
Email: [Corey.Shulman@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:Corey.Shulman@lewisbrisbois.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western International, Inc.**

Angela C Agrusa  
1100 Glendon Avenue 14th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90024-3503  
310-500-3500  
Fax: 310-500-3501  
Email: [angela.agrusa@dlapiper.com](mailto:angela.agrusa@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants G6 Hospitality, LLC & G6 Franchising, LLC**

Karen L Campbell  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP  
Suite 2100  
77 Water Street  
New York, NY 10005  
212-232-1391  
Fax: 212-232-1399  
Email: [karen.campbell@lewisbrisbois.com](mailto:karen.campbell@lewisbrisbois.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western International, Inc.**

Patrick Brendan Healy Roetzel & Andress  
250 East Fifth Street Ste 310  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-361-8298  
Fax: 513-361-0335  
Email: [phealy@ralaw.com](mailto:phealy@ralaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants G6 Hospitality, LLC & G6 Franchising, LLC**

M Jason Finds  
Gallagher, Gams, Tallan, Barnes & Littrell  
L.L.P.  
471 East Broad Street, 19th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-228-5151  
Email: [jfinds@ggtbl.com](mailto:jfinds@ggtbl.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants G6 Hospitality, LLC & G6 Franchising, LLC**

Whitney C. Cloud  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
1650 Market Street  
Suite 5000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-656-2440  
Fax: 215-606-3340  
Email: [whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants G6 Hospitality, LLC & G6 Franchising, LLC**

Alexis Burgess  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
2000 Avenue of the Stars Suite 400  
North Tower  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4704  
(310) 595-3132  
Fax: (310) 595-3363  
Email: [alexis.burgess@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:alexis.burgess@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants G6 Hospitality,  
LLC & G6 Franchising, LLC**

Joseph L Piccin  
Joseph L Piccin Co LLC  
3010 Hayden Road  
Columbus, OH 43235  
614-659-9616  
Fax: 614-798-1935  
Email: [JLP@joepiccin.com](mailto:JLP@joepiccin.com)  
**Counsel for Third Party Defendant  
Columbus Hotel, Inc.**

Steven Charles Babin , Jr.  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: [steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
Counsel for Third Party Plaintiff T.P.

888 Dublin Investment, LLC  
DAVID DOUGLAS  
503 S. FRONT STREET  
COLUMBUS OH 43215

**A.R. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:21-cv-4935**

Steven Charles Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Morgan G. Harper  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: [steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
[enny.barrick@babinlaws.com](mailto:enny.barrick@babinlaws.com)  
[morgan.harper@babinlaws.com](mailto:morgan.harper@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.R.**

Kathryn L. Avila  
Domnick Cunningham & Yaffa  
2401 PGA Blvd.  
Suite 140  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410  
561-229-0394  
Email: [kavila@levinlaw.com](mailto:kavila@levinlaw.com)

Christopher Tisi  
Levin, Papantonio, Rafferty, Proctor,  
Buchanan, O'Brien,  
316 S. Baylen Street Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-435-7123  
Fax: 850-436-6123  
Email: [ctisi@levinlaw.com](mailto:ctisi@levinlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.R.**

Emanuella J. Paulos  
Levin Law Firm  
316 South Baylen Street  
Suite 600  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
850-435-7107  
Email: [epaulos@levinlaw.com](mailto:epaulos@levinlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.R.**

Denise Wiginton  
Kelsie Overton  
Martin Zarzaur Gregory  
The Zarzaur Law Firm  
2332 2nd Avenue North  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-983-7985  
Email: [denise@zarzaur.com](mailto:denise@zarzaur.com)  
[kelsie@zarzaur.com](mailto:kelsie@zarzaur.com)  
[gregory@zarzaur.com](mailto:gregory@zarzaur.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.R.**

Jennifer Jana El-Kadi  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street  
Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: [jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com](mailto:jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.R.**



Kimberly Lambert Adams  
Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell,  
Rafferty & Proctor, PA  
316 S Baylen St - Ste 600PO Box 12308  
Pensacola, FL 32502 850/435-7057  
Fax: 850/435-7020  
Email: [kadams@levinlaw.com](mailto:kadams@levinlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.R.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St.  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: [eyarnell@hahnlaw.com](mailto:eyarnell@hahnlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: [mreed@hahnlaw.com](mailto:mreed@hahnlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Melissa A. Reinckens  
DLA Piper (US)  
4365 Executive Drive  
Ste 1100  
San Diego, CA 92121  
858-677-1400  
Fax: 858-677-1401  
Email: [melissa.reinckens@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:melissa.reinckens@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Christopher B. Donovan  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
845 Texas Avenue  
Ste 3800  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8449  
Fax: 713-300-6040  
Email: [christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com](mailto:christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Nathan Heller  
DLA PIPER US LLP  
One Liberty Place  
1650 Market St., Ste. 4900  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7300  
215-656-3372  
Fax: 215-606-3372  
Email: [nathan.heller@dlapiper.com](mailto:nathan.heller@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

David S Sager DLA Piper LLP  
51 John F. Kennedy Pkwy Suite 120  
Short Hills, NJ 07078 973-520-2570  
Fax: 973-215-2604  
Email: [david.sager@dlapiper.com](mailto:david.sager@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

**L.G. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-01924**

Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff L.G.**

Kathryn L. Avila  
Domnick Cunningham & Yaffa  
2401 PGA Blvd.  
Suite 140  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410  
561-229-0394  
Email: [kavila@levinlaw.com](mailto:kavila@levinlaw.com)

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: [chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com](mailto:chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdbl.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**G.P. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-02682**

Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
[Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff G.P.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Christopher B. Donovan  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
845 Texas Avenue, Ste 3800  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8449  
Fax: 713-300-6040  
Email: christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

David S Sager  
DLA Piper LLP  
51 John F. Kennedy Pkwy, Suite 120  
Short Hills, NJ 07078 973-520-2570  
Fax: 973-215-2604  
Email: david.sager@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St.  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc., Super 8 Worldwide, Inc., and Travelodge Hotels, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdbl.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**T.E. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:22-cv-03185**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
[Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.E.**

Christopher B. Donovan  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
845 Texas Avenue  
Ste 3800  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8449  
Fax: 713-300-6040  
Email: christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St.  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

David S Sager  
DLA Piper LLP  
51 John F. Kennedy Pkwy, Suite 120  
Short Hills, NJ 07078  
973-520-2570  
Fax: 973-215-2604  
Email: [david.sager@dlapiper.com](mailto:david.sager@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Mark Engling  
Freund Freeze and Arnold  
1 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
Dayton, OH 45402  
937-222-2424  
Fax: 937-222-5369  
Email: mengling@ffalaw.com  
**Counsel for Intervenor Liberty Mutual  
Fire Insurance Company**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC, and Third-  
Party Defendant AP Hotels, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph Anthnoy Gerling  
101 East Town Street  
Suite 500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-280-1123  
Fax: 614-280-0204  
Email: jgerling@westonhurd.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Red Roof  
Franchising, LLC**

**B.D.G. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:22-cv-3202**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
[Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff B.D.G**

Sara M. Turner Baker Donelson  
1901 Sixth Avenue North Suite 2600  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: smturner@bakerdonelson.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

Jennifer Snyder Heis  
Ulmer & Berne, LLP  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

**A.K.W. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:22-cv-3256**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.K.W.**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**



William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**M.H. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:22-cv-3258**

Joseph Corey Asay  
HKM Employment Attorneys LLP  
312 Walnut Street  
Suite 1600  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-318-4496  
Email: casay@hkm.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff M.H.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Jennifer Jana El-Kadi  
Steven Charles Babin, Jr.  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff M.H.**

Joseph A. Manno  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Kenneth T Fibich  
Fibich Leebron Copeland Briggs  
1150 Bissonnet  
Houston, TX 77005  
713-751-0025  
Fax: 713-751-0030  
Email: tfibich@fibichlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff M.H.**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sara J Fendia  
1150 Bissonnet Street  
Houston, TX 77005  
713-751-0025  
Fax: 713-751-0030  
Email: sfendia@fibichlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff M.H.**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**H.C. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3416**

Steven C. Babin, Jr. Penny L. Barrick Jennifer  
J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff H.C.**

Tiffany R. Ellis Peiffer Wolf 2229 Trumbull  
St  
Detroit, MI 48216  
313-210-1559  
Email: tellis@peifferwolf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff H.C**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo Tucker Ellis  
LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno 950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdbl.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**G.G. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3766**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff G.G**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street  
Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: [Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com](mailto:Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: [wfalen@bdblaw.com](mailto:wfalen@bdblaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Anthony Graber  
Jonathan L. Beck  
Young & Alexander Co., L.P.A.  
130 West Second St.  
Ste 1500  
Dayton, OH 45402  
937-224-9291  
Email: [tgraber@yandalaw.com](mailto:tgraber@yandalaw.com)  
[jbeck@yandalaw.com](mailto:jbeck@yandalaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc., & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

David A. Goldstein  
David A. Goldstein Co., L.P.A.  
511 S. High Street  
Suite 200  
Columbus, OH 43215  
615-222-1889  
Fax: 614-222-1899  
Email: [dgoldstein@dgoldsteinlaw.com](mailto:dgoldstein@dgoldsteinlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**A.Y.S. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3767**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street  
Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
[Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.Y.S**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street  
Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**



William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**A.Y. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3768**

Steven C. Babin, Jr  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.Y.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street  
Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**K.L. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3769**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff K.L.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**R.C.C. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3770**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff R.C.C.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave., Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**N.B. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3771**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff N.B.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**



**C.B. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3772**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff C.B**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**K.R.L. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3773**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff K.R.L**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**R.H. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3774**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff R.H.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email:  
Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com **Counsel  
for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red  
Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**J.B. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3776**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff J.B.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Joseph A. Manno  
950 Main Ave.  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-4465  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-696-3964  
Email: Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**



**H.S. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3778**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Aiad-Toss Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff H.S.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
50 Main Avenue Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**R.K. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3782**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Aiad-Toss Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff R.K.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
50 Main Avenue Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**R.Z. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3784**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Aiad-Toss Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff R.Z.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
50 Main Avenue Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**D.K. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3786**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Aiad-Toss Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff D.K.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
50 Main Avenue Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**K.D. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3787**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Aiad-Toss Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
Kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff K.D.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
50 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street  
Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdbl.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**G.M. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3788**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
[kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff G.M.**

Jennifer Snyder Heis  
Ulmer & Berne, LLP  
312 Walnut Street  
Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Sara M. Turner  
Baker Donelson  
1901 Sixth Avenue North Suite 2600  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: [smturner@bakerdonelson.com](mailto:smturner@bakerdonelson.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St., Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd., Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**A.M. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3797**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.M.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street, Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St., Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdbl.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd., Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**



Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: [Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com](mailto:Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**C.C. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3799**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina Lynee Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
[kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff C.C.**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP  
65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St., Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

David S Sager  
DLA Piper LLP  
51 John F. Kennedy Pkwy, Suite 120  
Short Hills, NJ 07078 973-520-2570  
Fax: 973-215-2604  
Email: [david.sager@dlapiper.com](mailto:david.sager@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd., Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Christopher B. Donovan  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
845 Texas Avenue, Ste 3800  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8449  
Fax: 713-300-6040  
Email: christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street  
Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**E.C. v. Choice Hotels International Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3811**

Steven C. Babin, Jr.  
Penny L. Barrick  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff E.C.**

Kathryn L Avila  
Domnick Cunningham & Yaffa  
2401 PGA Blvd., Suite 140  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410  
561-229-0394  
Email: kathryn@pbglaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff E.C.**

Jennifer Snyder Heis  
Ulmer & Berne, LLP  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdbl.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sara M. Turner  
Baker Donelson  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 2600  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: [smturner@bakerdonelson.com](mailto:smturner@bakerdonelson.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd., Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: [sheridan@carsonllp.com](mailto:sheridan@carsonllp.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Whitney C. Cloud DLA Piper LLP (US)  
1650 Market Street, Suite 5000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-656-2440  
Fax: 215-606-3340  
Email: [whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: [wfalin@bdblaw.com](mailto:wfalin@bdblaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Patrick Brendan  
Healy Roetzel & Andress  
250 East Fifth Street, Ste 310  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-361-8298  
Fax: 513-361-0335  
Email: [phealy@ralaw.com](mailto:phealy@ralaw.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality, LLC**

**T.D.P. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:22-cv-3837**

Steven C. Babin, Jr  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina L. Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff T.D.P.**

Sara M. Turner  
Baker Donelson  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 2600  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: [smtturner@bakerdonelson.com](mailto:smtturner@bakerdonelson.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

Jennifer Snyder Heis  
Ulmer & Berne, LLP  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels  
International, Inc.**

**K.F. v. Choice Hotels International, Inc., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3839**

Steven C. Babin, Jr  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina L. Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff K.F.**

Jennifer Snyder Heis  
Ulmer & Berne, LLP  
312 Walnut Street, Suite 1400  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-698-5058  
Fax: 513-698-5059  
Email: jheis@ulmer.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Sara M. Turner Baker Donelson  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 2600  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
205-250-8316  
Fax: 205-488-3716  
Email: [smtturner@bakerdonelson.com](mailto:smtturner@bakerdonelson.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Choice Hotels International, Inc.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102  
314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd., Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**



**D.T. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3844**

Steven C. Babin, Jr  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina L. Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
[kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff D.T.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblawn.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**K.W. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3845**

Steven C. Babin, Jr  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina L. Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
[kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com](mailto:kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff K.W.**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Robert Henry Stoffers  
Weston Hurd LLP  
Ohio  
101 East Town Street  
Suite 500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-280-0200  
Fax: 614-280-0204  
Email: rstoffers@westonhurd.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**A.S. v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:22-cv-3846**

Steven C. Babin, Jr  
Penny L. Barrick  
Jennifer J. El-Kadi  
Kristina L. Aiad-Toss  
Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
Steven.babin@babinlaws.com  
kristina.aiad-toss@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.S.**

Carrie Sheridan  
Carson LLP  
301 W. Jefferson Blvd.  
Suite 200  
Fort Wayne, IN 46802  
260-423-9411  
Email: sheridan@carsonllp.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Giuseppe William Pappalardo  
Joseph A. Manno  
Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
216-592-5000  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: giuseppe.pappalardo@tuckerellis.com  
joseph.manno@tuckerellis.com  
chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

William H. Falin  
Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC  
1375 East 9th Street, Ste 1700  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
216-621-5300  
Fax: 216-621-5440  
Email: wfalin@bdblaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns,  
Inc. & Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

Sandra J. Wunderlich  
Tucker Ellis LLP  
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 600  
St. Louis, MO 63102 314-256-2544  
Email: Sandra.wunderlich@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
& Red Roof Franchising, LLC**

**S.R. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:23-cv-1731**

Steven C. Babin, Jr. Penny L. Barrick Jennifer  
J. El-Kadi Babin Law, LLC  
10 W. Broad Street, Suite 900  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
614-761-8800  
Email: penny.barrick@babinlaws.com  
Jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
[Steven.babin@babinlaws.com](mailto:Steven.babin@babinlaws.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff S.R.**

John M. Hamrick  
Holland & Knight  
Regions Plaza -- Suite 1800  
1180 West Peachtree Street, N.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404-817-8500  
Email: john.hamrick@hklaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc. & Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC, and Crowne Plaza, LLC**

Michael R Reed  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP 65 E. State Street  
Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5165  
Email: mreed@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Patrick Brendan Healy  
Roetzel & Andress  
250 East Fifth Street, Ste 310  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-361-8298  
Fax: 513-361-0335  
Email: phealy@ralaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

Elise Kraft Yarnell  
Hahn Loeser & Parks  
65 E. State St., Ste 2500  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-233-5196  
Email: eyarnell@hahnlaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel &  
Resorts, Inc.**

Whitney C. Cloud  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
1650 Market Street, Suite 5000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-656-2440  
Fax: 215-606-3340  
Email: whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality,  
LLC**

Steven A. Chang  
Michael Kent Hushion  
Reminger, Co., LPA  
200 Civic Center Dr., Suite 800  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-228-1311  
Fax: 614-232-2410  
Email: schang@reminger.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Six Continents  
Hotels, Inc. & Holiday Hospitality  
Franchising, LLC, and Crowne Plaza, LLC**

Craig G Pelini  
Pelini, Campbell & Ricard  
8040 Cleveland Ave., NW  
Suite 400  
North Canton, OH 44720 330-305-6400  
Email: cgp@pelini-law.com  
**Counsel for Intervenor Erie Insurance  
Exchange**



**Doe (R.A.) v. Best Western International, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:23-cv-03459**

Lisa Marie Zaring  
George Demetrios Jonson  
Montgomery Jonson LLP  
600 Vine Street, Suite 2650  
Cincinnati, OH 45202-4452  
513-768-5207  
Fax: 513-768-9244  
Email: lzaring@mojolaw.com  
gjonson@mojolaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe R.A.**

Annie McAdams  
Annie McAdams, PC  
1150 Bissonnet  
Houston, TX 77005  
(713) 785-6262  
Fax: (866) 713-6141  
Email: annie@mcadamspc.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe R.A.**

Guy G. Fisher  
Provost Umphrey Law Firm LLP  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
(409) 835-6000  
Fax: (409) 813-8625  
Email: gfisher@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe R.A.**

Michael Hamilton  
Provost Umphrey Law Firm  
2021 Richard Jones Road, Suite 300  
Nashville, TN 37215  
615-242-0199  
Fax: 615-256-5922  
Email: mhamilton@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe R.A.**

Judd R Uhl  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
250 E. Fifth Street, Ste 2000  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-808-9911  
Fax: 513-808-9912  
Email: judd.uhl@lewisbrisbois.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western International, Inc.**

Corey Lee Shulman  
Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith  
77 Water Street, Ste 2100  
New York, NY 10005 646-783-1720  
Fax: 212-232-1399  
Email: Corey.Shulman@lewisbrisbois.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Best Western International, Inc.**

Edward A Proctor  
Kim & Associates LLC  
4100 Embassy Parkway, Ste 200  
Akron, OH 44333  
330-396-7900  
Fax: 330-396-7901  
Email: eproctor@kimassociateslaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendants Extended Stay America, Inc., ESA P Portfolio, LLC, and ESH Hospitality, Inc.**

**Doe (A.M.G.) v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:23-cv-04195**

Bryan O. Blevins , Jr.  
Colin Moore  
Guy G. Fisher  
Matt Matheny  
Provost & Umphrey  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-835-6000  
Email: bblevins@pulf.com  
cmoore@pulf.com  
gfisher@pulf.com  
mmatheny@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.M.G.**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Emily Rose Grace  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
emily.grace@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Red Roof Inns, Inc., Red Roof Franchising, LLC, RRI West Management, LLC, FMW RRI II LLC, FMW RRI OPCO, LLC, and RRF Holding Company, LLC**

George Demetrios Jonson  
Lisa Marie Zaring Montgomery Jonson  
600 Vine Street, Suite 2650  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-768-5220  
Fax: 513-768-9244  
Email: gjonson@mojolaw.com  
lzaring@mojolaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.M.G.**

Kelley Bogusevic  
Kenneth T. Fibich  
Sara J Fendia  
Fibich, Leebron, Copeland & Briggs  
1150 Bissonnet Street  
Houston, TX 77005  
713-751-0025  
Fax: 713-751-0030  
Email: kbogusevic@fibichlaw.com  
tfibich@fibichlaw.com  
sfendia@fibichlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.M.G.**

**Doe (D.E.G.) v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. 2:23-cv-04256**

Annie McAdams  
Annie McAdams PC  
2200 Post Oak, Suite 1000  
11th Floor, PNC Tower  
Houston, TX 77056  
713-785-6262  
Fax: 866-713-6141  
Email: annie@mcadamspc.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff D.E.G.**

Bryan O. Blevins , Jr.  
Colin Moore  
Guy G. Fisher  
Matt Matheny  
Provost & Umphrey  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-835-6000  
Email: bblevins@pulf.com  
cmoore@pulf.com  
gfisher@pulf.com  
mmatheny@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff D.E.G.**

George Demetrios Jonson  
Lisa Marie Zaring  
Montgomery Jonson  
600 Vine Street, Suite 2650  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-768-5220  
Fax: 513-768-9244  
Email: gjonson@mojolaw.com  
lzaring@mojolaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff D.E.G.**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Emily Rose Grace  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
emily.grace@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Red Roof Inns, Inc., Red Roof Franchising, LLC, RRI West Management, LLC, and RRF Holding Company, LLC**

*Counsel for G6 Hospitality, LLC & Motel 6 Operating LLC have not made an appearance, but consistent with previous other representation, service will be done on the following:*

Whitney C. Cloud  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
1650 Market Street  
Suite 5000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
215-656-2440  
Fax: 215-606-3340  
Email: whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality, LLC & Motel 6 Operating, LLC**



**Doe (C.M.G.) v. Red Roof Inns, Inc. et al., S.D. Ohio, C.A. No. 2:23-cv-04258**

Annie McAdams  
Annie McAdams PC  
2200 Post Oak, Suite 1000  
11th Floor, PNC Tower  
Houston, TX 77056  
713-785-6262  
Fax: 866-713-6141  
Email: annie@mcadamspc.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff C.M.G.**

Chelsea R. Mikula  
Elisabeth Catherine Arko  
Emily Rose Grace  
950 Main Avenue, Suite 1100  
Cleveland, OH 44113-7213  
216-696-2476  
Fax: 216-592-5009  
Email: chelsea.mikula@tuckerellis.com  
Elisabeth.arko@tuckerellis.com  
emily.grace@tuckerellis.com  
**Counsel for Red Roof Inns, Inc., Red Roof Franchising, LLC, RRI West Management, LLC, RRF Holding Company, LLC, R-Roof V, LLC, RRI, LLC, RRI III, LLC, and RRI OPCO, LLC**

Bryan O. Blevins , Jr.  
Colin Moore  
Guy G. Fisher  
Matt Matheny  
Provost & Umphrey  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-835-6000  
Email: bblevins@pulf.com  
cmoore@pulf.com  
gfisher@pulf.com  
mmatheny@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff C.M.G.**

George Demetrios Jonson  
Lisa Marie Zaring  
Montgomery Jonson  
600 Vine Street, Suite 2650  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-768-5220  
Fax: 513-768-9244  
Email: gjonson@mojolaw.com  
lzaring@mojolaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff C.M.G.**

**A.B. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc., et al., E.D. Pennsylvania, C.A. No. 2:23-cv-03902**

Jennifer Jana El-Kadi Babin Law, LLC  
10 West Broad Street Suite 900  
Columbus, OH 43215  
614-761-8800  
Fax: 614-706-1775  
Email: jennifer.elkadi@babinlaws.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.B.**

Nathan P. Heller  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
One Liberty Place 1650 Market Street  
Suite 5000  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7300  
215-656-3372  
Fax: 215-606-3372  
Email: nathan.heller@dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Prince P. Holloway Stampone Law PC 500  
Cottman Ave  
Cheltenham, PA 19012  
215-663-0400  
Email: pholloway@stamponelaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.B.**

OM SRI SA, Inc.  
d/b/a Howard Johnson by Wyndham  
Bartonsville/Poconos Area  
BABU M PATEL  
RT 611 & I80 EXIT 46B BARTONSVILLE  
PA 18321

**N.J. v. G6 Hospitality Property, LLC et al., D. South Carolina, C.A. No. 2:22-cv-3180**

Belle-Anne B Cooper  
Matthew Britt Stoddard  
The Stoddard Firm  
1534 N Decatur Road NE  
Atlanta, GA 30307  
470-467-2200  
Fax: 470-467-1300  
Email: ba@legalhelpga.com  
matt@legalhelpga.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff N.J.**

Ellen E Dew  
DLA Piper LLP (MD)  
The Marybury Building  
6225 Smith Avenue  
Baltimore, MD 21209  
410-580-4127  
Fax: 410-580-3127  
Email: ellen.dew@us.dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendants G6 Hospitality  
Property, LLC d/b/a Motel 6-Charleston  
North & G6 Hospitality Property, LLC  
d/b/a Motel 6-Columbia**

Justin Simon Kahn  
Kahn Law Firm  
PO Box 31397  
Charleston, SC 29417  
843-577-2128  
Fax: 843-577-3538  
Email: jskahn@kahnlawfirm.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff N.J.**

James B Hood  
Hood Law Firm  
PO Box 1508  
Charleston, SC 29402  
843-577-4435  
Fax: 843-722-1630  
Email: james.hood@hoodlaw.com  
Counsel  
for Defendants G6 Hospitality Property, LLC  
d/b/a Motel 6-Charleston North & G6  
Hospitality Property, LLC d/b/a Motel 6-  
Columbia

**(IES) v. G6 Hospitality, LLC, et al., E.D. Texas, C.A. No. 1:23-cv-00464**

Kenneth T Fibich  
Fibich Leebron Copeland Briggs  
1150 Bissonnet  
Houston, TX 77005  
713-751-0025  
Fax: 713-751-0030  
Email: tfibich@fibichlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff IES**

*Counsel for G6 Hospitality, LLC have not made an appearance, but consistent with previous other representation, service will be done on the following:*

Patrick B. Healy  
Roetzel & Andress - Cincinnati Ste. 450  
625 Eden Park Drive Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513-361-8298  
Fax: 513-361-0335  
Email: phealy@ralaw.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality, LLC**

Whitney Cloud  
DLA Piper - Philadelphia  
Ste. 5000  
One Liberty Place  
1650 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7300  
215-656-2440  
Fax: 215-606-3340  
Email: whitney.cloud@us.dlapiper.com  
**Counsel for Defendant G6 Hospitality, LLC**

Sara J Fendia  
Fibich & Associates PC  
1150 Bissonnet Street  
Houston, TX 77005  
713-751-0025  
Fax: 713-751-0030  
Email: sfendia@fibichlaw.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff IES**

**G6 Hospitality IP, LLC; G6 Hospitality Property, LLC; G6 Hospitality Property, LLC; G6 Hospitality Franchising, LLC; Motel 6 Operating, L.P.; G6 Hospitality Purchasing, LLC**

c/o Cogency Global Inc.  
1601 Elm Street, Suite 4360, Dallas, TX  
75201-4234  
**Sonsvic LLC**  
Bhakta, Ruchir  
1860 Bowles Ave, Fenton MO 63026

**A.S. v. Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc., S.D. Texas, C.A. No. 4:23-cv-01969**

Kenneth T Fibich  
Sara J Fendia  
Fibich Leebron Copeland Briggs  
1150 Bissonnet  
Houston, TX 77005  
713-751-0025  
Fax: 713-751-0030  
Email: [tfibich@fibichlaw.com](mailto:tfibich@fibichlaw.com)  
[sfendia@fibichlaw.com](mailto:sfendia@fibichlaw.com)  
**Counsel for Plaintiff A.S.**

Jason Michael Hopkins  
DLA Piper LLP  
1900 N. Pearl Street  
Suite 2200  
Dallas, TX 75201  
214-743-4500  
Email: [jason.hopkins@dlapiper.com](mailto:jason.hopkins@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

Christopher Bryan Donovan  
DLA Piper LLP (US)  
845 Texas Avenue  
Suite 3800  
Houston, TX 77002  
713-425-8400  
Email: [christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com](mailto:christopher.b.donovan@dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

David S Sager  
DLA Piper LLP  
51 John F Kennedy Pkwy, Ste 120  
Short Hills, NJ 09078-2704  
973-520-2570  
Email: [david.sager@us.dlapiper.com](mailto:david.sager@us.dlapiper.com)  
**Counsel for Defendant Wyndham Hotel & Resorts, Inc.**

**Doe v. ESA P Portfolio LLC, et al., W.D. Washington, C.A. No. 3:23-cv-06038**

Annie McAdams  
Annie McAdams PC  
2200 Post Oak, Suite 1000  
11th Floor, PNC Tower  
Houston, TX 77056  
713-785-6262  
Fax: 866-713-6141  
Email: annie@mcadamspc.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe also known as  
S.A.S.**

Christopher T Byrd  
Patrick B Moore  
Shubhra R Mashelkar  
Weinberg Wheeler Hudgins Gunn & Dial  
3344 Peachtree Rd NE, Ste 2400  
Atlanta, GA 30326  
404-876-2700  
Fax: 404-875-9544  
Email: cbyrd@wwhgd.com  
pmoore@wwhgd.com  
smashelkar@wwhgd.com  
**Counsel for Defendant ESA P Portfolio  
LLC**

Bryan O. Blevins, Jr.  
Edward D Fisher  
Patrick M Barrett  
Provost & Umphrey  
350 Pine Street, Suite 1100  
Beaumont, TX 77701  
409-835-6000  
Email: bblevins@pulf.com  
efisher@pulf.com  
pbarrett@pulf.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe also known as  
S.A.S.**

Christopher J Drotzmann  
Nicole M Rhoades  
Davis Rothwell Earle & Xochihua  
200 SW Market St  
Ste 1800  
Portland, OR 97201  
503-222-4422  
Email: cdrotzmann@davisrothwell.com  
nrhoades@davisrothwell.com  
**Counsel for Defendant ESA P Portfolio  
LLC**

Patricia E Anderson  
Luvera Law Firm  
701 5th Ave, Ste 6700  
Seattle, WA 98104  
206-467-6090  
Fax: 206-467-6090  
Email: patricia@luveralawfirm.com  
**Counsel for Plaintiff Doe also known as  
S.A.S.**

Allison McQueen  
Bethany Biesenthal  
Jones Day  
110 N Wacker Dr  
Ste 4800  
Chicago, IL 60606  
312-269-1541  
Email: amcqueen@jonesday.com  
bbiesenthal@jonesday.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Hilton Domestic  
Operating Company, Inc.**

Nicole Perry  
Jones Day  
717 Texas  
Ste 3300  
Houston, TX 77002  
832-239-3791  
Email: nmperry@jonesday.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Hilton Domestic  
Operating Company, Inc.**

Hilton Franchise Holding, LLC; Hilton  
Worldwide Holdings, Inc.  
c/o CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY  
251 LITTLE FALLS DRIVE,  
WILMINGTON, DE, 19808

Hilton Management, LLC; Hilton Resorts  
Corporation  
c/o CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY  
1090 VERMONT AVE. NW, Washington,  
District of Columbia, 20005

Dated: February 7, 2024

Aaron Brecher  
Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe  
401 Union St,  
Ste 3300  
Seattle, WA 98101  
206-839-4332  
Email: abrecher@orrick.com  
ddunne@orrick.com  
**Counsel for Defendant Hilton Domestic  
Operating Company, Inc.**

Parks Hotels & Resorts, Inc.  
c/o UNITED STATES CORPORATION  
COMPANY  
300 DESCHUTES WAY SW STE 208 MC-  
CSC1, TUMWATER, WA, 98501, UNITED  
STATES

HLT Operate DTWC LLC  
c/o CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY  
251 LITTLE FALLS DRIVE,  
WILMINGTON, DE, 19808

TUCKER ELLIS LLP

/s/ Chelsea Mikula

Chelsea Mikula

Attorneys for  
Red Roof Inns, Inc.  
Red Roof Franchising, LLC  
RRF Holding Company, LLC  
RRI West Management, LLC