



## MELISSA L. YEATES

### PARTNER

D 484.270.1409

F 610.667.7056

[myeates@ktmc.com](mailto:myeates@ktmc.com)

#### FOCUS AREAS

Consumer Protection

Securities Fraud

Data Privacy & Cyber Security

#### EDUCATION

Syracuse University

B.A. *magna cum laude*, Phi Beta Kappa

University of Pennsylvania Law School

J.D. *cum laude*, Order of the Coif

#### ADMISSIONS

Pennsylvania

New York

Delaware

United States Court of Federal Claims

USCA, Fifth Circuit

USCA, Fourth Circuit

USDC, Eastern District of Michigan

USDC, District of Delaware

Melissa L. Yeates is a Partner in the Firm's Fiduciary, Consumer Protection, and Antitrust Group. Ms. Yeates' practice is focused on class action litigation with an emphasis on litigating consumer fraud and deceptive trade practices, data breach and privacy, Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), and antitrust matters. She also focuses her time on case evaluation and development and is an active member of the Firm's Human Resources Committee. Ms. Yeates received her law degree, Order of the Coif, cum laude, from the University of Pennsylvania Law School and her Bachelor of Arts, Phi Beta Kappa, magna cum laude, from Syracuse University. Prior to joining the firm, Ms. Yeates worked for several large defense firms and clerked for the Honorable Stanley S. Brotman in the District of New Jersey. She is licensed to practice in Pennsylvania, New York, and Delaware.

Ms. Yeates is a mother of four and a seasoned litigator with over two decades of experience litigating in federal courts nationwide. She has played a leading role in Kessler Topaz's successful litigation of claims against numerous corporations accused of defrauding consumers and engaging in anticompetitive conduct, recovering hundreds of millions of dollars on behalf of injured parties. Ms. Yeates has been named a Lawdragon 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyer for the past five years.

Ms. Yeates serves as Co-Chair of the Local Government and School District Committee in the multidistrict litigation, *In re Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation*, No. 4:22-md-03047 (N.D. Cal.). In this role, she represents local

governments and school districts from across the nation seeking to hold the largest social media companies accountable for designing and marketing addictive social media platforms to minors and causing the youth mental health crisis in schools and communities. She also serves as Co-Lead Counsel for the TPP PBM track in the multidistrict litigation, *In re Insulin Pricing Litigation*, No. 2:23-md-03080 (D.N.J.), representing a putative class of third-party payors asserting RICO and Robinson-Patman Act claims against insulin manufacturers and pharmacy benefit managers for engaging in an unlawful kickback scheme to artificially increase the price for insulin and derive secret profits from rebates and fees.

In addition, Ms. Yeates is class counsel for a class of health and welfare funds that recently won a \$185 million judgment against the U.S. government based on the government’s wrongful seizure of funds in *Electrical Welfare Trust Fund v. United States*, No. 1:19-cv-00353 (Fed. Cl.). Other recent litigations in which Ms. Yeates served as class and/or settlement counsel have resulted in substantial settlements, including *In re Volkswagen Timing Chain Product Liability Litigation*, No. 2:16-cv-2765 (D.N.J.) (\$50 million value); *Seeligson v. Devon Energy Production Company, L.P.*, No. 3:16-cv-00082 (N.D. Tex.) (\$28 million); and *In re Zinc Antitrust Litigation*, No. 2:14-cv-3728 (S.D.N.Y.) (\$9.8 million). She currently serves on the *Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee in Speerly v. General Motors, LLC*, No. 2:19-cv-11044 (E.D. Mich.) and *Battle v. General Motors, LLC*, No. 2:22-cv-10783 (E.D. Mich.). Ms. Yeates also served as class trial counsel in *Cardenas v. Toyota Motor Corporation*, No. 1:18-cv-22798-FAM (S.D. Fla.), one of the rare class actions litigated through jury verdict.

**Current Cases**

- Netflix, Inc. & Hulu, LLC

<b>CASE CAPTION</b>	<i>Borough of Longport and Township of Irvington v. Netflix, Inc. and Hulu, LLC</i>
<b>COURT</b>	United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
<b>CASE NUMBER</b>	21-cv-15303-SRC
<b>JUDGE</b>	Honorable Stanley R. Chesler
<b>PLAINTIFF</b>	Borough of Longport and Township of Irvington
<b>DEFENDANTS</b>	Netflix, Inc. and Hulu, LLC

Kessler Topaz represents two New Jersey municipalities, the

Borough of Longport and the Township of New Jersey, in a putative class action against Netflix and Hulu seeking to recover unpaid franchise fees under the Cable Television Act. Under that Act, cable television companies are required to pay New Jersey municipalities a mandatory franchise fee equal to 2% of their subscriptions in the municipality's jurisdiction. As more and more people "cut the cord" and move from traditional cable television subscriptions to streaming services offered by companies like Netflix and Hulu, New Jersey municipalities have been deprived of the franchise fees that they have collected from traditional cable television companies and relied upon for decades.

Plaintiffs filed their Class Action Complaint on August 13, 2021, asking the Court to order that Netflix and Hulu abide by the Cable Television Act and pay what they owe to New Jersey municipalities. On May 20, 2022, after briefing on defendants' motions to dismiss, the District Court held that the Cable Television Act did not confer a private right of action and that only the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities (the "BPU") had the right to assert such claims. Plaintiffs have appealed the District Court's decision to the Third Circuit. The appeal is fully briefed and awaiting a decision.

- Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability

**CASE  
CAPTION**

*In re Social Media  
Adolescent  
Addiction/Personal  
Injury Products  
Liability Litigation*

**COURT**

United States  
District Court for  
the Northern  
District of  
California

**CASE  
NUMBER**

22-cv-03047-YGR

**JUDGE**

Honorable  
Yvonne Gonzalez  
Rogers

**PLAINTIFFS**

City of Providence  
and District  
Attorney Kevin  
Steele of  
Montgomery

County, PA

Meta Platforms,  
Inc., Facebook  
Holdings, LLC,  
Facebook  
Operations, LLC,  
Meta Payments  
Inc., Siculus, Inc.,  
**DEFENDANTS** Instagram, LLC,  
Snap, Inc., TikTok,  
Inc., ByteDance  
Inc., TikTok Inc.,  
TikTok Pte. Ltd.,  
ByteDance Ltd.,  
Google LLC,  
YouTube LLC

Kessler Topaz partners Joseph H. Meltzer and Melissa L. Yeates are currently serving in court-appointed leadership positions, representing school districts and local government entities nationwide (the “Local Government Entity Plaintiffs”), seeking redress for the youth mental health crisis caused by social media companies in a large multi-district litigation.

The Local Government Entity Plaintiffs allege that social media companies including Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, TikTok, and YouTube, have deliberately designed, developed, produced, operated, promoted, distributed, and marketed their social media platforms to increase revenue at the expense of the nation’s minors. Allegations include that the social media companies use design mechanisms, such as algorithms, feeds, and filters to maximize minors’ screen time and addict adolescent users, which in turn has caused a youth mental health crisis. This youth mental health crisis has been highlighted by various authorities, including the U.S. Surgeon General, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, and the Children’s Hospital Association. While Defendants profit off their harmful conduct, which keeps young users glued to their social media platforms, school districts and local communities have been forced to expend, divert, and increase human and financial resources to address the harmful consequences of Defendants’ conduct in causing the youth mental health crisis. After local communities and school districts filed lawsuits seeking to hold social media companies responsible for their actions in courts across the country, these cases were consolidated for pre-trial proceedings before the Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers in the Northern District of California. The Local Government Entity Plaintiffs filed a Master Complaint on December 18, 2023.

Defendants' response to the Master Complaint is due on February 5, 2024.

### Settled

- Devon Energy Production Company, L.P.

#### CASE CAPTION

*In re Seeligson v. Devon Energy Production Company, L.P.*

#### COURT

United States District Court  
for the Northern District of  
Texas

#### CASE NUMBER

3:16-cv-00082

#### JUDGE

Honorable Ed Kinkeade

#### PLAINTIFFS

Henry Seeligson, John M.  
Seeligson, Suzanne Seeligson  
Nash, and Sherri Pilcher

#### DEFENDANT

Devon Energy Production  
Company, L.P.

#### CLASS PERIOD

January 1, 2008 through  
February 28, 2014

On October 24, 2014, Plaintiffs brought this class action to recover damages for Devon Energy Production Company, L.P.'s ("DEPCO") unlawful calculation and intentional underpayment of millions of dollars in royalties owed to Plaintiffs and other lessors for the extraction of oil and gas from their Texas properties that was moved, gathered, transported and/or processed through the Bridgeport Gas Processing Plant. Specifically, DEPCO breached its duty to market by selling the raw, unprocessed gas to its corporate affiliate, Devon Gas Services, LP ("DGS"), at the wellheads at a price impacted by an unreasonably high processing fee. DEPCO then passed this processing fee on to the royalty owners. As a result, DEPCO imposed hidden fees on Plaintiffs and Class members that were not related to actual or reasonable costs, which were pocketed by its corporate affiliate. In fact, DEPCO imposed artificially inflated fees as high as 17.5% of the price of the gas flowing through the Bridgeport Plant.

The Parties engaged in significant discovery and Plaintiffs moved to certify the action as a class action on June 11, 2015. The Court first granted class certification on May 4, 2016, and DEPCO appealed that decision to the Fifth Circuit. The Fifth Circuit affirmed most of the Court's findings, including, without limitation, that (i) the Class was ascertainable, (ii) all of the class leases imposed the same duty to market on DEPCO, and (iii) Plaintiffs could demonstrate that

DEPCO breached its implied duty to market by basing its price on a higher processing fee than the fee that a reasonably prudent operator would have received at the wellhead. *Seeligson v. Devon Energy Prod. Co., L.P.*, 761 F. App'x 329, 334, 336-37 (5th Cir. 2019). But, the Fifth Circuit remanded on a narrow issue related to predominance.

Plaintiffs moved again for class certification on May 7, 2019. On February 11, 2020, after a full-day evidentiary hearing, the Court certified a Class, including all persons or entities who, between January 1, 2008 and February 28, 2014, (i) are or were royalty owners in Texas wells producing natural gas that was processed through the Bridgeport Gas Processing Plant by DGS; (ii) received royalties from DEPCO on such gas; and (iii) had oil and gas leases on the following forms: Producers 88-198(R) Texas Paid-Up (2/93); MEC 198 (Rev. 5/77); Producers 88 (Rev. 10-70 PAS) 310; Producers 88 Revised1-53—(With Pooling Provision); Producers 88 (2-53) With 640 Acres Pooling Provision; Producers 88 (3-54) With 640 Acres Pooling Provision; Producers 88 (4-76) Revised Paid Up with 640 Acres Pooling Provision; Producers 88 (7-69) With 640 Acres Pooling Provision; and Producers 88 (Rev. 3-42) With 40 Acres Pooling Provision (the "Class Lease Forms"). DEPCO again sought leave to appeal the class certification decision, but on May 15, 2020, the Fifth Circuit denied DEPCO's request.

Following an October 7, 2020 mediation, the Parties reached an agreement in principle to resolve the matter on a classwide basis, and informed the Court of such in a Joint Mediation Report, filed on October 16, 2020. Under the Settlement, DEPCO was required to pay \$28 million into a Settlement Fund to be distributed among eligible Class Members in accordance with a plan of allocation approved by the Court. On December 30, 2020, Plaintiffs moved for Preliminary Approval, which the Court granted on January 14, 2021. The Court then granted final approval on June 16, 2021. Distribution of Class Notice and payment of Settlement Funds to Class Members took place in 2021.

- Ranbaxy Generic Drug Application Antitrust Litigation

**CASE CAPTION**

*In re Ranbaxy Generic Drug Application Antitrust Litigation*

**COURT**

United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts

**CASE NUMBER**

MDL No. 2878

**JUDGE**

Honorable Nathaniel M. Gorton

**PLAINTIFFS**

Meijer, Inc. and Meijer Distribution, Inc.

**DEFENDANTS**

Ranbaxy Inc., Ranbaxy Laboratories LTD., Ranbaxy USA, Inc. and Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, LTD.

KTMC was counsel for direct purchasers alleging that generic drug manufacturer, Ranbaxy, Inc., violated the racketeering laws by recklessly submitting grossly inadequate generic drug applications to the FDA for generic versions of Nexium, Diovan and Valcyte; and intentionally deceiving the FDA into granting tentative approval to secure statutory exclusivities for each application. These improperly obtained approvals gave Ranbaxy the power to exclude other generic manufacturers' versions of these drugs while its own applications floundered. Had Ranbaxy not made blatant misrepresentations to the FDA, the FDA would not have granted Ranbaxy the tentative approvals and resulting exclusivities, and other companies would have entered the market with generic versions of each drug several years earlier. As a result of Ranbaxy's unlawful conduct, purchasers paid significantly higher prices for these drugs than they otherwise would have.

After several years of hard-fought litigation, Judge Nathaniel M. Gorton certified three separate classes of direct purchasers of each drug and denied Ranbaxy's motion for summary judgment. On the eve of trial, Plaintiffs negotiated a \$340 million settlement on behalf of the three classes of direct purchasers.

- Zetia Antitrust Litigation

**CASE CAPTION**

*In re Zetia Antitrust Litigation*

**COURT**

United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia

**CASE NUMBER**

18-md-2836

**JUDGE**

Honorable Rebecca Beach Smith

**PLAINTIFFS**

Direct Purchasers

**DEFENDANTS**

Merck & Co., Inc., Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp., Schering-Plough Corp., Schering Corp., MSP Singapore Co., LLC, Glenmark Pharmaceuticals LTD., and Glenmark Generics, Inc.

KTMC was counsel for direct purchasers alleging that brand

company Merck & Co., and generic company Glenmark Pharmaceuticals, entered into an anticompetitive pay-for-delay agreement over the drug Zetia (“ezetimibe”). Following Glenmark’s submission of its application to the FDA for approval of a generic version of Zetia, Merck sued Glenmark alleging it had infringed Merck’s patents covering Zetia. Glenmark was the first generic company to seek FDA approval and had secured the right to a 180-day period without competition from other generic companies.

Merck however had the right to launch its own generic version of Zetia (an “authorized generic”) during the 180-day period of Glenmark’s exclusivity. In order to resolve its patent infringement case against Glenmark, Merck entered into an unlawful reverse payment settlement with Glenmark in 2010 to delay generic entry until 2016. In exchange for this significant delay, Merck agreed not to launch an authorized generic to compete with Glenmark’s generic Zetia during the first 180 days Glenmark’s product was on the market. The direct purchasers paid significantly higher prices as a result of delayed generic entry and the absence of competition from an authorized generic.

During several years of litigation, direct purchasers achieved a number of significant victories leading up to trial. For example, Judge Rebecca Beach Smith granted the purchasers’ motion for summary judgment as to market power and held that “Simply put, on this record, no reasonable juror could remain faithful to controlling precedent and cast the relevant market as broadly as Defendants suggest. Stretching the ambit to include non-ezetimibe drugs would blunt the procompetitive purpose of antitrust law and render the market power analysis inconsequential.” In addition, the Court denied Defendants’ motion for summary judgment finding there were disputes of material fact about on several key issues in the case.

On the eve of jury selection, a global settlement for all plaintiff groups (including the indirect purchaser class and several large retailers) of over \$600 million was negotiated.

- Zinc Antitrust Litigation

**CASE CAPTION**

*In re Zinc Antitrust Litigation*

**COURT**

United States District Court for the Southern District of New York

**CASE NUMBER**

14-cv-3728-PAE

**JUDGE**

Honorable Paul A. Engelmayer

**PLAINTIFFS**

Oklahoma Steel and Wire Co., Inc.; Iowa Steel and Wire Co.; Southwestern Wire, Inc.; and



**DEFENDANTS**

Jasper Materials, Inc.

Glencore Ltd. and Access World  
LLC (f/k/a Pacorini Metals USA,  
LLC)**CLASS PERIOD**September 14, 2010 through  
February 11, 2016

In *In re Zinc Antitrust Litigation*, Plaintiffs alleged that after Glencore—one of the worlds' largest multinational trading houses—acquired Access World, they engaged in a scheme to monopolize the market for Special High-Grade Zinc and artificially raised the price of physical zinc and related zinc premiums in the United States. Plaintiffs further alleged that Glencore and Access World engaged in anticompetitive conduct to carry out the monopolization scheme, including: (i) manipulating rules set by the London Metal Exchange—the global hub of metals trading, on which 85% of global exchange traded metals futures, including 90% of zinc, is traded, (ii) shuttling Zinc between warehouses for no reason other than to cause and exacerbate anticompetitive effects; (iii) making incentive arrangements to hoard zinc in warehouses in relatively inconvenient locations; (iv) engaging in shadow warehousing and strategically delisting warehouses to manipulate perceived supply; and (v) falsifying shipping records for zinc that never actually left warehouses. As a result, Plaintiffs paid artificially inflated price premiums.

Kessler Topaz's lawsuit was consolidated with others, and on July 24, 2014, and Kessler Topaz was appointed as interim co-lead counsel on behalf of a class of direct purchasers of zinc. After successfully overcoming Defendants' motion to dismiss in January 2016, Plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint in February 2016. Defendants then filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. During this time, the parties were also engaged in substantial discovery. Based on information learned from documents produced by Defendants during discovery, plaintiffs sought leave to file a third amended complaint, which was filed in January 2020. The parties engaged in settlement negotiations over the course of several months, agreeing to resolve the case for a \$9,850,000 to be distributed to direct purchasers of zinc. On February 16, 2022, Judge Paul A. Engelmayer approved the settlement agreement, providing an excellent recovery for Plaintiffs and the class they were appointed to represent.

**News**

- March 31, 2022 - Kessler Topaz is Proud to Recognize and Honor Women's History Month by Profiling our Female

Partners and Recognizing the Amazing Work They Do | Melissa Troutner, Partner

- February 23, 2022 - New York Federal Court Approves Settlement in Zinc Market Manipulation Antitrust Case

### **Awards/Rankings**

- Lawdragon 500 Leading Plaintiff Financial Lawyer, 2019-2021
- Law Clerk for The Honorable Stanley S. Brotman, United States District Court for the District of New Jersey

### **Memberships**

- American Bar Association
- Delaware Bar Association

### **Community Involvement**

Melissa has a strong commitment to pro bono work and has volunteered for the Office of the Child Advocate, Philadelphia Reads and Delaware Volunteer Legal Services. She is an active supporter of the Make-A-Wish Foundation and Story Changers, an organization which helps African children receive an education, daily meals, medical aid and emotional support.