

alleged defect when it placed them into the stream of commerce; (b) whether Defendants have a duty to honor its warranty on the Class Vehicles; and, (c) whether Defendants, in refusing to honor the Class Vehicles' warranty, violated applicable federal and state consumer protection laws." *Id.* at 24. The Court finds that these common questions of law or fact predominate over any questions affecting only individual class members.

The Rule 23(b)(3) superiority requirement "asks the court to balance, in terms of fairness and efficiency, the merits of a class action against those of alternative available methods of adjudication." *In re Warfarin Sodium Antitrust Litig. ("Warfarin Sodium")*, 391 F.3d 516, 533-34 (3d Cir. 2004) (citations and quotations omitted). The Court looks at "(1) the interest of individual members of the classes in controlling the prosecution of the action, (2) the extent of litigation [*21] commenced elsewhere by class members, (3) the desirability of concentrating claims in a given forum, and (4) the management difficulties likely to be encountered in pursuing the class action." *Danvers Motor Co. v. Ford Motor Co.*, 543 F.3d 141, 149-50 (3d Cir. 2008).

Considering these factors, the again Court finds that a class action is the superior method of adjudicating N14 Class members' claims. The class action "offers prompt relief to the class members and averts the undue costs they would incur in prosecuting their claims individually." *Weissman*, 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8543, 2015 WL 333465 at *5. Out of the nearly 200,000 members of the N14 Class, over 5,000 submitted claims after receiving notice of the settlement. ECF No. 92 at 2. It is far more desirable to allow these Class members to obtain relief under the terms of the settlement in this district than to require them to file an additional 5,310 actions in courts across the country. And although Defendants admit that they faced some initial difficulties obtaining motor vehicle records and notifying Class members of the settlement, see ECF No. 88, the Court has no reason to doubt that "management difficulties" will prevent Defendants from processing Class members' claims.

Because the Court has found that the proposed class action satisfies the requirements [*22] of Rules 23(a) and (b), the Court will certify the Class defined in the parties' settlement agreement.

II. Class notice was proper

Members of a class certified under Rule 23(b)(3) must be provided with "the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). Due process requires that notice be "reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections." *In re National Football League Players Concussion Injury Litig.*, 821 F.3d 410, 435 (3d Cir. 2016) (quoting *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 314, 70 S. Ct. 652, 94 L. Ed. 865 (1950)). The notice must "clearly and concisely state in plain, easily understood language: (i) the nature of the action; (ii) the definition of the class certified; (iii) the class claims, issues, or defenses; (iv) that a class member may enter an appearance through an attorney if the member so desires; (v) that the court will exclude from the class any member who requests exclusion; (vi) the time and manner for requesting exclusion;

For internal use only