

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

**IN RE: SAMSUNG ELECTRIC RANGE
CONTROL KNOB INADVERTENT
ACTIVATION PRODUCTS LIABILITY
LITIGATION**

MDL No. _____

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION OF PLAINTIFF NORTH STAR
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY FOR TRANSFER OF ACTIONS TO THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1407**

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

For more than a decade, Samsung has sold slide-in electric ranges whose front and back-mounted range-top heating element energy regulators and infinite control switches contained within the knob (“Control Knob(s)”) can be turned on by a passing hip, a grocery bag, a leaning child, or a curious pet. Samsung has known about the hazard since at least 2013. By its own account to the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (“CPSC”), it received more than 300 reports of unintentional knob activation of range top heating elements by humans or pets, involving approximately 250 fires, at least 18 fires causing extensive property damage, approximately 40 injuries, and seven fires involving pet deaths. In 2019, Samsung told the United States Patent and Trademark Office that such cooking appliances “need[] to include a knob stopper for preventing an unintended operation of the knob assembly or a knob cap” to avert a “fire/burn” hazard. Yet it continued to ship ranges without those safeguards until August 8, 2024, when it recalled approximately 1,120,905 ranges and offered consumers free knob locks or covers.

The predictable result is a growing wave of federal lawsuits, brought by homeowners and their subrogated property insurers, filed by numerous law firms in various districts across the country. Each action presents the same core questions: whether Samsung’s Control Knob design and/or manufacture was defective; what Samsung knew and when; why it did not adopt the knob stoppers and caps it admitted were needed, or any other feasible alternative design; and whether its warnings were adequate. Samsung, for its part, has met nearly every action with the same playbook: removal to federal court; a Rule 12(b)(6) motion and contentious, repetitive and voluminous discovery. Since January 1, 2024, Samsung has filed such motions in at least twenty-one (21) of the thirty (30) federal actions, producing rulings that have already diverged. Some courts have sustained manufacturing and/or design-defect theories on substantially similar

allegations, while others have entered dismissal orders with leave to replead. Only one such pending action is in a dispositive motion posture, with the remaining twenty-nine being in pleadings or the discovery phase, with multiple open actions filed relatively recently where 12(b)(6) motions are anticipated.

This is the paradigm case for centralization under 28 U.S.C. § 1407. Instead of every court adjudicating these issues separately, a single transferee judge can oversee common discovery into Samsung's design, manufacture, testing, consumer complaints, and recall files; decide recurring pleading and *Daubert* issues once; and avoid the duplicative depositions of Samsung engineers and executives that will otherwise occur in each action. The Eastern District of Pennsylvania is the natural home for this MDL: it has three currently pending actions with only one other known Court having as many, it holds some of the oldest-filed actions, it is a short distance from SEA's headquarters in Ridgefield Park, New Jersey, and its bench has deep experience managing complex multidistrict litigation. Indeed, Samsung's own counsel recently represented to a court that Samsung's witnesses and documents are "available anywhere," conceding that the location of Samsung's evidence poses no obstacle to centralization in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. The Parties

Defendant SEC is a corporation organized under the laws of the Republic of Korea with its principal place of business in Suwon, Gyeonggi, Republic of Korea. Defendant SEA is a wholly owned affiliate of SEC with its principal place of business in Ridgefield Park, New Jersey. SEC manufactures the ranges; SEA distributes, markets, and sells them, and SEC relies on SEA to target the U.S. market for its appliances in every state.

Plaintiffs in the scheduled actions are homeowners and other persons injured by Samsung range fires, together with property insurers that paid their insureds' losses and are subrogated to

their rights against Samsung. Movant North Star Mutual Insurance Company is a Minnesota insurer with its principal place of business in Cottonwood, Minnesota, and is subrogated to the rights of its insured, Zach Boelkes.

B. The Samsung Range Control Knob Design

The ranges at issue are Samsung slide-in electric ranges equipped with front-mounted and/or back-mounted Controls Knobs for the range-top heating elements. The CPSC's recall covers 30 model numbers of front-mounted ranges in Samsung's NE58 and NE63 series, sold at Best Buy, Costco, The Home Depot, Lowe's, other appliance stores nationwide, and Samsung.com from May 2013 through August 2024, at prices between \$1,250 and \$3,050. [Ex. 1 – CPSC Recall] Samsung uses these same Control Knobs in numerous models of its sister ranges that contain back-mounted controls.

Plaintiffs allege that the Control Knob design is defective in several common respects. The controls are mounted within easy reach of foreseeable incidental contact by humans and pets. They are not effectively guarded against inadvertent activation, and they do not require two discrete actions at specified levels of force to activate a heating element, contrary to governing and generally accepted industry safety standards contained within UL 858. The ranges were sold in a defective condition and without adequate warnings of the latent fire hazard.

C. Inadvertent Activation and Samsung's Longstanding Notice

The mechanism of harm is the same across the litigation. A person or pet inadvertently brushes against or leans on a Control Knob; the knob rotates to an "on" position without the user's knowledge or intent; and the heating element ignites cookware, food, or combustible items resting on the cooktop. Samsung has received reports of unintentional activation of the front-mounted controls by humans or pets since 2013. Plaintiffs allege that, before the subject ranges were manufactured and sold, Samsung had been notified of hundreds, if not thousands, of essentially

identical incidents involving ranges with identical or substantially similar controls, which had caused hundreds of fires, dozens of burn injuries, and the deaths of household pets.

D. Samsung's 2019 Patent Admission

On September 27, 2019, SEC filed U.S. Patent Application No. 16/586,758 for the purposes of designing “a cooking appliance capable of preventing a user’s unintended rotation of a knob assembly[.]” [Ex. 2 – Samsung Patent No. 11,143,411 B2]. In it, SEC stated that, to avert the “fire/burn” hazard from unintentional activation of range-top controls, “when the user unintentionally pushes the knob assembly to turn it, a fire may be caused. Accordingly, the cooking appliance needs to include a knob stopper for preventing an unintended operation of the control assembly or a knob cap for opening and closing the knob assembly.” [Ex. 2, p., 17]. Notwithstanding that admission, Samsung continued to manufacture and sell ranges, including the 2020-manufactured range in the *Boelkes* action, and the ranges all Scheduled Actions, without knob caps, knob stoppers or any other similarly simplistic mechanism for preventing consumer homes from catching fire.¹ Because this admission predates the manufacture of many subject ranges, its meaning and significance, including the feasibility of the safer alternative design, is a central, common fact question in every action.

E. The August 2024 CPSC Recall

On August 8, 2024, and after receiving notice of hundreds, if not thousands of fires, Samsung announced a recall of approximately 1,120,905 slide-in electric ranges (CPSC Recall No. 24-335), describing the hazard as follows: “Front-mounted knobs on the ranges can be activated by accidental contact by humans or pets, posing a fire hazard.” The recall notice warns consumers using recalled ranges without locks or covers to keep children and pets away from the

¹ Prior to the Recall, Samsung introduced a “pinch to turn” mechanism that is a simplistic yet significant safety improvement over the recalled infinite switches.

knobs, to check that the knobs are off before leaving home or going to bed, and not to leave objects on the range. In addition to the design defect claims, Plaintiffs allege the remedy Samsung now offers was feasible when the subject ranges were manufactured and sold, and that Samsung acted only after years of notice of the hazard.

F. The Harm to Plaintiffs: The *Boelkes* Fire as Representative

The *Boelkes* action illustrates the common fact pattern. On or about June 18, 2023, a fire occurred at Zach Boelkes's home at 308 Adams Street, Rockwell, Iowa. The fire was caused by the inadvertent activation of one of the range-top heating elements on a Samsung Model NE58R9311SS electric range, Serial No. 0GJ57DCN201350T, a recalled model manufactured by Samsung in February 2020. The fire occurred after the range had last been used and its Control Knobs had been turned off. That evening, Mr. Boelkes returned from grocery shopping and placed groceries near, adjacent to, or on the range before going to bed. An occupant then unknowingly made incidental contact with a Samsung Control Knob, activating a heating element that ignited nearby combustible material. Mr. Boelkes awoke to discover the fire, which caused extensive damage to the home and its contents.

Plaintiffs in the other Scheduled Actions allege materially identical sequences: a range that was not intentionally in use or that was otherwise unattended; an inadvertently actuated Control Knob; and a resulting fire causing damages.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A. The Boelkes Action

On April 17, 2026, North Star filed its action against SEA in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa, Civil Action No. 3:26-cv-03015-MAR, invoking diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) and (2). The Complaint asserts (1) negligence, including negligent design and manufacture, failure to conform to industry safety standards, failure to equip

the range with knob caps or stoppers, continued sale after notice of the hazard, failure to provide adequate warnings, and failure to timely recall; and (2) strict liability, on the theory that the range's front-mounted controls did not perform as an ordinary consumer would expect and lacked adequate warnings and a reasonable alternative safer design. North Star also seeks punitive damages under Iowa Code § 668A.1.

Similar to most other Scheduled Actions, Samsung moved to dismiss the *Boelkes* Complaint on various grounds. The Court found the manufacturing-defect theory was adequately pled because the allegations that Samsung's own design called for two-factor knob mechanisms and knob stoppers or caps, which the subject range lacked, reasonably infer that the range departed from its intended design; the court observed that "[i]t is possible defendant manufactured many ranges contrary to the design." [Ex. 3 – *Boelkes* Order, p. 7]. The court sustained a negligent failure-to-warn theory, while agreeing that Iowa law does not recognize a strict-liability failure-to-warn claim. *Id.* at 8–9. It rejected Samsung's demand that the plaintiff plead who or what bumped the knob, finding the Complaint set out a "coherent and complete causal sequence" from defective knob to fire. *Id.* at 9. And it held that the allegations of approximately 250 prior fires, consumer complaints on Samsung's own website, knowledge of available protective measures, and more than a decade of inaction plausibly showed that Samsung "consciously continued to market and sell a defective and dangerous product despite its knowledge of the hazard," supporting punitive damages. *Id.* at 11. The court also noted that it would deny any challenge to the design-defect claims "for many similar reasons." *Id.* at 5 n.1. Discovery is in its incipient stages.

B. The Related Federal Actions

As set forth in the Schedule of Actions (Exhibit A), at least thirty (30) substantially similar actions are pending against Samsung in at least twenty-three (23) federal districts: the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, District of New Jersey, Eastern District of North Carolina, Eastern

District of Virginia, Southern District of Florida, Eastern District of Louisiana, Northern District of Texas, Eastern District of Texas, Northern District of Ohio, Southern District of Indiana, Northern District of Iowa, District of Colorado, District of New Mexico, District of Arizona, Northern District of Illinois, District of Utah, District of Connecticut, Middle District of Florida, Eastern District of Michigan, Western District of Washington, Western District of Tennessee, Southern District of California and Northern District of California. The actions were filed by many different plaintiffs' counsel and arise under the laws of numerous states, but each rests on the same alleged defect in the same family of Samsung Control Knobs.

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania has one of the largest concentration of these actions, with three (3) actions pending there, equal to any other leading district.

C. Samsung's Uniform Rule 12(b)(6) Strategy and Divergent Rulings

Samsung has filed at least one Rule 12(b)(6) motion in twenty-one (21) of the thirty (30) cases the search identified. The rulings have already diverged. As examples, in *National General Assurance Co. v. Samsung*, the District of Arizona rejected Samsung's challenge to a manufacturing-defect claim, reasoning that "[i]t is reasonable to infer a manufacturing defect at this juncture." [Schedule of Actions No. 21]. In *Travelers Personal Insurance Co. v. Samsung*, the Southern District of Indiana likewise denied Samsung's motion on substantially similar allegations as being sufficient to state claims. [Schedule of Actions No. 20]. By contrast, Samsung has obtained limited relief in orders granting motions to dismiss, which only resulted in the filing of amended complaints while wasting valuable judicial resources.

These conflicting outcomes on the same defense, involving the same product and the same alleged defect, are exactly the type of duplicative motions and inconsistent pretrial rulings that Section 1407 is designed to prevent.

D. Related State-Court Actions

Related actions are also pending in state courts, including at least five (5) actions pending in State courts that will likely be removed to federal court soon and would be ripe for adding to this transfer. There are also multiple actions pending in New Jersey state courts that Samsung cannot remove due to a lack of diversity jurisdiction.

E. Additional Actions are Anticipated

The scheduled actions are only the beginning. The recall covers approximately 1,120,905 units sold over more than eleven years, and Samsung has reported approximately 250 fires, none of which are known to include the fires giving rise to the actions identified in this Motion. Additional subrogation and personal-injury claims remain in pre-suit investigation, and Movant anticipates numerous tag-along actions will be filed.

IV. LEGAL STANDARD FOR TRANSFER UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1407

Section 1407 provides that “[w]hen civil actions involving one or more common questions of fact are pending in different districts, such actions may be transferred to any district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.” 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a). Transfer is appropriate when the Panel determines that it “will be for the convenience of parties and witnesses and will promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions.” *Id.* The presence of common factual questions supports transfer to prevent duplicative discovery and eliminate the possibility of inconsistent pretrial rulings. *In re E. Airlines, Inc. Flight Attendant Weight Program Litig.*, 391 F. Supp. 763, 764 (J.P.M.L. 1975). Section 1407 does not require a complete identity, or even a majority, of common factual issues as a prerequisite to transfer. *In re Rembrandt Techs., L.P., Patent Litig.*, 493 F. Supp. 2d 1367, 1369 (J.P.M.L. 2007); *In re Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 173 F. Supp. 2d 1377, 1379 (J.P.M.L. 2001).

In selecting a transferee forum, the Panel considers the convenience of the parties and witnesses; the relative progress of the pending actions; the location of parties, witnesses, and documents; the likelihood that a district's location will enhance cooperation among federal and state courts; and, where no clear choice emerges, the preference of the majority of parties. *In re Factor VIII or IX Concentrate Blood Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 853 F. Supp. 454, 455 (J.P.M.L. 1993); *In re N.M. Natural Gas Antitrust Litig.*, 482 F. Supp. 333, 337 (J.P.M.L. 1979).

V. ARGUMENT

A. The Actions Involve Common Questions of Fact

Every scheduled action alleges that a Samsung slide-in electric range with the same vintage of recalled range-top Control Knobs and was inadvertently activated by unintentional and incidental contact and caused a fire. The actions uniformly name SEA and sometimes name SEC, challenge the same design, and rely on the same body of corporate evidence. Common questions include, but may not be limited to:

- (a) Whether the range-top Control Knobs on Samsung's slide-in electric ranges are defectively designed because they are prone to inadvertent activation by foreseeable incidental contact by humans or pets;
- (b) Whether the control design complies with governing and generally accepted industry safety standards, including requirements that controls be guarded against inadvertent activation and require two discrete actions at specified levels of force to activate a heating element;
- (c) When and to what extent Samsung received notice of inadvertent-activation incidents, beginning no later than 2013, and how it investigated, tracked, and responded to them;
- (d) The meaning and significance of SEC's September 27, 2019 statement in U.S. Patent Application No. 16/586,758 that a knob stopper or knob cap was needed to prevent unintended operation and the attendant "fire/burn" hazard, and whether those safeguards were technically and economically feasible when the subject ranges were manufactured;
- (e) Whether the controls conformed to Samsung's and its control suppliers' design specifications and manufacturing tolerances, including the force and travel required to push and turn the knobs;

- (f) Whether Samsung's on-product warnings, manuals, and post-sale communications adequately warned of the latent fire hazard, and whether Samsung breached a duty to warn or recall earlier;
- (g) The timing of, reasons for, and adequacy of Samsung's August 8, 2024 recall and knob-lock remedy, including Samsung's communications with the CPSC; and
- (h) Whether Samsung's conduct, including continued sales after notice of the hazard, supports enhanced or punitive damages where available.

These questions will be answered by the same documents and witnesses in every case; including Samsung's design and engineering files, its supplier specifications, its incident and warranty databases, its regulatory submissions to the CPSC, its patent files, and the testimony of its engineers, product-safety personnel, and corporate designees. That the actions involve different recalled models, different loss dates, and the laws of different states does not defeat centralization. The transferee judge can address model-specific and case-specific issues through separate discovery and motion tracks. *See In re Soc. Media Adolescent Addiction/Pers. Inj. Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 637 F. Supp. 3d 1377, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2022). Nor does the subrogation posture of many actions matter: insurer and homeowner plaintiffs alike must prove the same defect, notice, and causation theories.

B. Centralization Will Serve the Convenience of the Parties and Witnesses

Absent centralization, Samsung's key witnesses, many located in Korea and the United States will be deposed repeatedly on the same topics in more than a dozen districts. Samsung will be required to respond to overlapping document requests and to produce, review, and log the same corporate documents again and again. Plaintiffs, represented by many different firms, will separately retain and prepare experts in range top heating element control design, human factors, and fire origin and cause to address identical liability questions. A single MDL proceeding allows common discovery to be conducted once, with Samsung fact and party expert depositions cross-

noticed and documents housed in a single repository, while case-specific fire-scene and damages discovery proceeds in parallel.

Samsung itself has confirmed that centralizing common discovery will impose no burden on it. On August 28, 2026, while supporting a forum *non conveniens* motion in a substantially identical inadvertent activation action, Samsung’s counsel told the Superior Court of New Jersey that Samsung’s corporate witnesses are within its control and that “I can produce them anywhere,” that “[t]he documents are electronic. I do these cases all over the country. I served our documents in the Eastern District of Virginia two days ago, it’s just a click,” and that “[m]y witnesses, my documents are available anywhere.” [Ex. 4 – Hearing Transcript from *Homesite Ins. Co. of the Midwest v. Samsung Elecs. Am., Inc.*, No. BER-L-5269-26, Hr’g Tr. 5:15–22, 6:2–8, 7:12–14 (N.J. Super. Ct. Law Div. Aug. 28, 2026)]. That Samsung is producing the same documents in cases “all over the country” confirms the duplication that centralization will eliminate. Per Samsung’s own account, its witnesses and documents can be produced in any forum, therefore convenience of Samsung’s witnesses weighs decisively in favor of a single proceeding rather than repeated productions and depositions dozens of districts. *Id.*

Movant’s firm, Cozen O’Connor, currently represents plaintiffs in thirteen (13) actions across twelve (12) districts. Samsung’s counsel is split almost entirely between the law firms of Greenberg Traurig and Wilson Elser; combined they represent Samsung in twenty-seven actions, and three other individual firms represent Samsung in three distinct actions. There are at least fifteen (15) other law firms representing the other plaintiffs. Informal coordination under 28 U.S.C. § 1404 or by agreement among counsel is not a realistic alternative. The actions are spread across at least the twenty-three (23) districts and are prosecuted by many unaffiliated firms. Section 1404 transfer would also require each plaintiff to commit to litigating through trial in a distant venue,

whereas Section 1407 transfer is limited to pretrial proceedings and preserves each plaintiff's chosen forum for trial.

C. Centralization Will Promote the Just and Efficient Conduct of the Litigation

Centralization will “eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel and the judiciary.” *In re Pradaxa (Dabigatran Etexilate) Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 883 F. Supp. 2d 1355, 1356 (J.P.M.L. 2012); accord *In re DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 753 F. Supp. 2d 1378, 1379 (J.P.M.L. 2010). Those benefits are especially pronounced here for four reasons.

First, the risk of inconsistent rulings has materialized. Samsung has filed Rule 12(b)(6) motions across the country challenging materially identical allegations, and district courts have reached conflicting results on whether the same manufacturing-defect theory is plausibly pleaded. Without centralization, that divergence will repeat at every stage, including discovery disputes over the scope of Samsung's incident and supplier files, privilege and confidentiality rulings, and *Daubert* challenges to the same liability experts. As one of the older actions is involved in a dispositive motion posture while others are involved in discovery, this presents a significant risk of divergence. A single transferee judge can resolve those recurring issues once. *See In re StarLink Corn Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 152 F. Supp. 2d 1378, 1380 (J.P.M.L. 2001).

Second, the *Boelkes* litigation and, upon information and belief, the Scheduled Actions aside from *Hrkach* action, No. 2:24-cv-06837 (*infra*) are at relatively early stages. Although motion practice has begun along with initial discovery disclosures, Movant is aware of no other scheduled action in which substantial merits discovery has been completed. Centralization now ensures that common discovery is structured efficiently from the outset and that no significant completed work will be wasted.

Third, the number of actions is substantial and growing. More than 1.1 million ranges were recalled, Samsung has acknowledged approximately 250 fires (as of its August 2024 recall), and new actions are being filed regularly. A MDL will provide a single, efficient mechanism for handling tag-along actions, a common protective order, a uniform ESI protocol, and, where appropriate, master and short-form complaints.

Fourth, centralization will facilitate coordinated resolution. A single transferee court with a comprehensive view of the litigation is best positioned to establish bellwether procedures, coordinate with state courts handling related actions, and promote global or inventory-based settlement discussions.

D. The Eastern District of Pennsylvania is the Most Appropriate Transferee Forum

Every relevant factor points to the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

1. The District has one of the largest concentration of pending actions and several of the oldest actions.

With three (3) actions, the Eastern District of Pennsylvania has one of the largest amount of pending actions than any other district. No other district has more than three scheduled actions, with the majority of districts having only one.

Notably, the *Hrkach* action, No. 2:24-cv-06837 was filed in 2024, earlier than the scheduled actions in other districts, and the judges of the Eastern District have already confronted Samsung's pleading challenges in this litigation. Though Movant notes that the *Hrkach* action is the only known action that has concluded discovery, is in a dispositive motion posture and may ultimately not be suited for aggregation, it is included for completeness. Nevertheless, this Eastern District's familiarity with the product, the alleged defect, and Samsung's defenses will allow the transferee court to move the litigation forward expeditiously.

2. The District is convenient to Samsung's U.S. headquarters, witnesses, and documents.

SEA's principal place of business is at Ridgefield Park, New Jersey, approximately eighty (80) miles from the James A. Byrne United States Courthouse in Philadelphia. SEA distributed, marketed, and sold the ranges in the United States and administered the recall; its U.S.-based witnesses and documents are therefore most likely located in or near New Jersey. Philadelphia is also a major transportation hub with an international airport and Amtrak service on the Northeast Corridor, making it readily accessible to the parties, counsel, and witnesses from across the United States and from Korea.

In furtherance of this District's selection, in the aforementioned New Jersey State Court-based action, the court found, on Samsung's own motion record, that SEA's corporate witnesses and records bearing on design, testing, marketing, warnings, and recall are alleged to be located at SEA's New Jersey headquarters under SEA's control, and that Samsung had not shown those witnesses "would be materially harder to produce" in New Jersey than in Pennsylvania. [Exhibit 4, pp. 13:7–15, 14:15–18]. The court also rejected the notion that the roughly 80 miles between Bergen County, New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania imposes any genuine hardship. *Id.* at 14:7–11. Samsung's counsel further conceded that "[m]y documents are anywhere. My witnesses are anywhere." *Id.* at 7:12–14.

Having represented that its witnesses and documents can be produced in any forum, Samsung cannot now claim that the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, a short distance from its long-time U.S. headquarters, is inconvenient. Both counsel with the largest number of plaintiffs, Cozen O'Connor, and for Samsung, Greenberg Traurig, have offices in Philadelphia, furthering the support for aggregation there.

3. The District has a sophisticated bench with extensive MDL experience.

The Eastern District of Pennsylvania is among the most experienced MDL courts in the country and has managed and currently manages numerous complex product-liability MDLs. Its judges, clerk's office, and local bar are well versed in the case-management tools, such as leadership appointments, master pleadings, bellwether programs, and common-benefit orders, that this litigation will require.

VI. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

For the foregoing reasons, Movant respectfully requests that the Panel enter an order: (1) transferring the actions listed on the Schedule of Actions, and any subsequently filed tag-along actions, to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407 for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings; and (2) granting such other relief as the Panel deems just and proper.

Dated: October 16, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

COZEN O'CONNOR

/s/ Cheri L. MacArthur _____

By: Cheri L. MacArthur
*Counsel for Plaintiff/Movant
North Star Mutual Insurance Company*

Cheri L. MacArthur
COZEN O'CONNOR
4601 DTC Boulevard, Suite 825
Denver, CO 80237
Ph: (720) 479-3900
cmacarthur@cozen.com

Jonathan M. Levy
COZEN O'CONNOR
123 North Wacker Drive, Suite 1800
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Ph: (312) 474-1637
jlevy@cozen.com