

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

SAYED ABUBAKER and MAGDALYNE  
HILLIARD, individually and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DOMINION DENTAL USA, INC., DOMINION  
DENTAL SERVICES USA, INC., DOMINION  
DENTAL SERVICES, INC., DOMINION  
NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY,  
DOMINION DENTAL SERVICES OF NEW  
JERSEY, INC, AVALON INSURANCE  
COMPANY, CAPITAL ADVANTAGE  
INSURANCE, and CAPITAL BLUECROSS,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:19-cv-01050-LMB-  
MSN

**ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION  
SETTLEMENT AND AWARDING FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES, AND SERVICE  
AWARDS**

This matter came before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Final Approval Motion") and Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for an Award of Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Expenses, and for Plaintiff Service Awards. Dkts. 150 and 155. All capitalized terms not otherwise defined have the meanings set forth in the Settlement Agreement (Dkt. 146-1) ("Settlement").

**BACKGROUND**

This case arises from an alleged nearly decade-long data breach announced by Dominion National on June 21, 2019 that potentially exposed the personal information of about 3 million insurance subscribers.

Following this announcement, multiple plaintiffs filed claims related to the data breach, individually and on behalf of others similarly situated, in this Court. Plaintiffs Sayed Abubaker, Magdalayne Hilliard, Daniel Cho and Joseph Cardiff filed the first complaint on August 9, 2019. Dkt. 1. Plaintiff Matthew Slate filed a complaint on August 14, 2019 (Case No. 1:19-cv-01063-LMB-MSN) and Plaintiff Mark Bradley filed a complaint on September 17, 2019 (Case No. 1:19-cv-01199-LMB-MSN). On October 2, the parties stipulated to consolidate all three actions under this cause number. Dkt. 38. On November 1, 2019, the Court appointed Kim D. Stephens and Barrett J. Vahle as interim co-lead counsel and Bernard J. DiMuro as Plaintiffs' liaison counsel, and appointed Swathi Bojedla, Thiago M. Coelho, Andrew N. Friedman, Mark S. Goldman, and Matthew D. Schultz to the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee ("PSC"). Dkt. 75.

On November 22, 2019, Plaintiffs filed a Consolidated Amended Complaint asserting claims for, *inter alia*, negligence, breach of contract, and violations of multiple states' consumer protection statutes. Dkt. 89. On December 13, 2019, Defendants filed motions to dismiss under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). Dkts. 106, 109. Following a hearing on these motions, this Court granted the motion filed by Defendant Providence Health Care and granted in part and denied in part the motion filed by the Dominion and Capital Defendants. Dkt. 131.

Plaintiffs Slate and Bradley appealed the Court's ruling to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on January 19, 2020. Appeal No. 20-1102 (Dkt. 24, 19-cv-1063), and Appeal No. 20-1103 (Dkt. 11, 19-cv-1199). On February 7, 2020, the parties moved jointly to stay the proceedings and requested entry of final judgment pursuant to Rule 54(b) as to the Plaintiffs the Court held lacked Article III standing. Dkt. 134. The Court granted the motion on February 18, 2020. Dkt. 137. On February 18, 2020, Plaintiffs Cardiff and Cho appealed as well. Appeal No.

20-1180. The appeals were consolidated under Appeal No. 20-1102. Briefing on appeal was complete on August 3, 2020.

During the pendency of the appeal, the parties engaged in settlement negotiations. Initially, the parties were assisted by Fourth Circuit mediator, Cynthia Mabry-King. Although mediation before Ms. Mabry-King was not successful, the parties continued settlement discussions, which ultimately culminated in an agreement and execution of a letter of intent on March 8, 2021. As a result of a settlement, which was reached days before the scheduled Fourth Circuit oral argument, the parties requested that the argument be cancelled. The Fourth Circuit cancelled the oral argument and remanded the case for the limited purpose of considering the parties settlement under Rule 23(e). *Id.*

The parties finalized the Settlement Agreement and notice documents for presentation to the Court, and Plaintiffs filed their unopposed motion for preliminary approval and issuance of notice on May 18, 2021. Dkt. 144. This Court granted the motion on May 20, 2021, finding that the Court would likely approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate and that it would likely certify the Settlement Class for purposes of judgment. Dkt. 149. The Court appointed Barrett J. Vahle of Stueve Siegel Hanson LLP and Kim D. Stephens of Tousley Brain Stephens PLLC as interim Class Counsel pursuant to Rule 23(g), appointed Angeion Group as claims administrator, approved the parties' proposed form, content, and method of providing notice to the Class, set deadlines for Class Members to object to or exclude themselves from the Settlement, and set a Final Approval Hearing for November 19, 2021. Dkt. 149, ¶ 12.

In accordance with the Court's order, direct mail and email notice to Class Members began on July 2, 2021. The notice informed Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, including instructions for submitting a claim for cash reimbursement for out-of-pocket losses and time spent

addressing issues related to the data breach. The notice further informed Class Members of the deadline to submit an objection to the Settlement or to opt out from the Settlement and that Class Counsel would seek attorneys' fees of up to \$1,000,000 and costs and expenses of up to \$75,000, and service awards of \$1,500 for each of the Named Plaintiffs.

On September 10, 2021, Class Counsel filed their motion for attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses seeking \$1 million in attorneys' fees, \$65,627.38 in expenses, and \$1,500 service awards for each Named Plaintiffs. Dkt. 150. That motion and accompanying exhibits was posted on the Settlement Website the same day.

**Final Approval and Judgment**

Nothing has occurred that would alter the Court's initial analysis that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. In fact, the response of the class members to the Settlement (only 83 requests for exclusion and no objections out of a directly noticed class containing 2,964,778 class members) further underscores that the Settlement is, in fact, fair, reasonable, and adequate. Therefore, the Court, having reviewed the Settlement Agreement and Release, including the exhibits attached thereto (together, the "Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement"), the arguments and authorities presented by the parties and their counsel, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing, hereby grants final approval of the class action settlement.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

**1. Class Certification for Settlement Purposes Only.**

The Settlement Agreement provides for a Settlement Class defined as follows:

All individuals notified by or on behalf of Dominion National regarding the Security Incident<sup>1</sup>. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (1) the Judge presiding over the Litigation, and members of her family; (2) the Defendant, its subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which the Defendant or its parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers and directors; (3) persons who properly execute and submit a request for exclusion on or before the Opt-Out Date; and (4) the successors or assigns of any such excluded Persons.

For the following reasons, the Court affirms that it is proper to certify, and hereby does finally certify, for settlement purposes only, the Settlement Class pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3).

a. **Numerosity:** Rule 23(a)(1) requires that a proposed settlement class be “so numerous that joinder of all class members is impracticable.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). Here, there are over 2,900,000 Settlement Class Members and numerosity is not in question.

b. **Commonality:** Rule 23(a)(2) requires that there be “questions of law or fact common to the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). Here, the Settlement Class Members are joined by the common questions of law and fact that arise from the same alleged event—the data breach. The common questions include: whether Dominion National’s uniform data security practices were sufficient to protect Settlement Class Members’ personal information; whether Defendants knew or should have know of Dominion National’s susceptibility to a data breach; whether Defendants failed to implement reasonable and adequate security procedures and practices; whether Dominion National’s security measures to protect its systems were reasonable in light known legal requirements; whether Defendants’ efforts to ensure the security of members’ Personal Information provided to Dominion National were reasonable in light of known legal requirements; whether Defendants owed a duty to Plaintiff and Class Members to protect their

---

<sup>1</sup> Security Incident is defined as the data security incident that Dominion National publicly disclosed on or around June 21, 2019.

Personal Information; whether Defendants breached their duty to protect the Personal Information of Plaintiff and Class Members; whether Defendants' conduct, including their failure to act, resulted in or was the proximate cause of the breach of Dominion National's systems and/or the loss of the Personal Information of Plaintiffs and Class Members; and whether Defendants' conduct amounted to violations of state consumer protection statutes.

c. **Typicality:** Rule 23(a)(3) requires that "the claims or defenses of the representative parties [be] typical of the claims or defenses of the class." Typicality under Rule 23(a)(3) requires an inquiry into the "representative parties' ability to represent a class...." *Deiter v. Microsoft Corp.*, 436 F.3d 461, 466 (4th Cir. 2006). "The premise of the typicality requirement is simply stated: as goes the claim of the named plaintiff, so go the claims of the class." *Broussard v. Meineke Disc. Muffler Shops, Inc.*, 155 F.3d 331, 340 (4th Cir. 1998) (quoting *Sprague v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 133 F.3d 388, 399 (6th Cir. 1998)). In other words, the "plaintiff's claim cannot be so different from the claims of absent class members that their claims will not be advanced by plaintiff's proof of his own individual claim." *Deiter*, 436 F.3d at 466-67. Representative Plaintiffs Abubaker and Hilliard satisfy the typicality requirement because their claims arise from the same factual nexus and are based on the same legal theories as the claims of members of the Settlement Class. Like the Representative Plaintiffs, other Settlement Class members were subject to the alleged data breach and have suffered the same types of injuries.

d. **Adequacy of Representation:** The adequacy requirement is satisfied when "the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). The Court finds that the proposed Settlement Class Representatives have fulfilled their responsibilities on behalf of the Settlement Class. The Court further finds that Plaintiffs' Counsel

have prosecuted the case vigorously and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. Adequacy of representation is satisfied.

e. ***Predominance and Superiority***: Rule 23(b)(3) requires that “questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that class treatment is “superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Where, as here, a court is “[c]onfronted with a request for settlement-only class certification, a district court need not inquire whether the case, if tried, would present intractable management problems.” *Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 620 (1997). The predominance requirement “tests whether proposed classes are sufficiently cohesive to warrant adjudication by representation.” *Id.* at 623. Predominance does not require that all questions of law or fact be common, but rather that the “‘qualitatively overarching issue’ in the litigation is common.” *Soutter v. Equifax Information Servs., LLC*, 307 F.R.D. 183, 214 (quoting *Ealy v. Pinkerton Gov’t Servs., Inc.*, 514 Fed. Appx. 299, 305 (4th Cir. 2013)). Common liability issues often predominate where class members “all assert injury from the same action.” *Gray v. Hearst Commc’ns, Inc.*, 444 F. App’x 698, 701–02 (4th Cir. 2011); *see also Stillmock v. Weis Markets, Inc.*, 385 F. App’x 267, 273 (4th Cir. 2010) (finding common issues predominated where class members were exposed to “the identical risk of identity theft in the identical manner by the repeated identical conduct of the same defendant.”). The many common questions of fact and law that arise from the alleged data breach and Defendants’ alleged conduct predominate over any individualized issues.

Finally, class resolution is superior to other available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the claims in this case. Here, potential damages suffered by individual class members are relatively low-dollar amounts and would be uneconomical to pursue on an individual

basis given the burden and expense of prosecuting individual claims. Moreover, there is little doubt that resolving all class members' claims jointly, particularly through a class-wide settlement negotiated on their behalf by counsel well-versed in class action litigation, is superior to a series of individual lawsuits and promotes judicial economy.

**2. Plaintiffs' Counsel and Settlement Class Representatives.**

The Court concludes that Barrett J. Vahle of the firm of Stueve Siegel Hanson LLP and Kim D. Stephens of the firm Tousley Brain Stephens PLLC have fairly and adequately represented the interests of the Settlement Class Members. Plaintiffs' Counsel have substantial experience in consumer class action litigation, and in particular data breach and privacy litigation, and were able to negotiate a well-informed Settlement that provides meaningful relief to Plaintiffs and the Class. The Court previously appointed Mr. Vahle and Mr. Stephens as interim Class Counsel and now appoints them as Class Counsel pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(g).

The Court further concludes that the Plaintiffs Sayed Abubaker and Magdalyne Hilliard have fairly and adequately represented the interests of the Settlement Class Members and now appoints them as Settlement Class Representatives.

**3. Jurisdiction.**

The Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2), and personal jurisdiction over the parties before it. Additionally, venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

**4. Findings Concerning Notice.**

The Court finds that the Notice Program has been implemented by the Settlement Administrator and the parties in accordance with the requirements of the Settlement Agreement, and that such Notice Program, including the utilized forms of Notice, constitutes the best notice

practicable under the circumstances and satisfies due process and the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court finds that the Settlement Administrator and parties have complied with the directives of the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Directing Notice of Proposed Settlement and the Court reaffirms its findings concerning notice as set forth in paragraph 9 thereof.

**5. Findings Concerning Claims Process.**

The Court finally approves the Claims Process as a fair and reasonable method to allocate the Settlement benefits among Settlement Class Members. The Court directs that the Settlement Administrator continue to effectuate the Claims Process according to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

**6. Requests for Exclusion and Objections to the Settlement.**

Out of over 2,900,000 Settlement Class Members, only 83 timely requested exclusion from the Settlement (.0028%) and none objected. This indicates strong support for the Settlement by the Settlement Class Members and weighs strongly in favor of final approval.

**7. Findings Concerning the Fairness, Adequacy and Reasonableness of the Settlement.**

The Court finds that this Settlement reflects an outstanding result for the Class in a case with a significant level of risk. The Settlement provides significant monetary benefits to compensate consumers for out-of-pocket losses and attested time spent dealing with issues related to the alleged data breach and important commitments by Dominion National as to its future data security practices. This relief compares very favorably to settlements in other data breach class actions.

**a. *The Settlement Class Representatives and Plaintiffs' Counsel Have Adequately Represented the Class.***

The Court finds that the Settlement Class Representatives Abubaker and Hilliard and Plaintiffs' Counsel have provided excellent representation to the Settlement Class. They diligently investigated their claims against the Defendants and were able to efficiently identify alleged security deficiencies in Dominion National's systems. Plaintiffs' Counsel negotiated a multi-faceted settlement that was well received by the Class, as evidenced by the lack of objections. Plaintiffs' Counsel's view that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class, supports approval of the Settlement in light of their experience in this field.

In addition, the Court finds the Settlement Class Representatives have adequately represented the class. Each of them provided detailed information of the circumstances of the fraud they each experienced and their relationship with Defendants that was vital to Counsel's investigation and litigation of the class's claims. Furthermore, each of them has remained active in the case, communicating with Plaintiffs' Counsel during subsequent phases of the case, and, in particular, reviewing and approving the terms of the Settlement as being in the best interests of the class.

**b. *The Settlement was Negotiated at Arm's Length.***

The Parties reached the Settlement after months arm's length negotiations, including through the experienced Fourth Circuit mediator, Cynthia Mabry-King. The parties exchanged preliminary discovery during this time that allowed Plaintiffs' Counsel to effectively value the Plaintiffs' claims and the Settlement. The circumstances surrounding the parties' negotiations, including their reliance on a neutral mediator experienced in complex litigation, indicate the Settlement is fair, and that it should be approved. *See* Comment to December 2018 Amendment to

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) (“[T]he involvement of a neutral or court-affiliated mediator or facilitator in those negotiations may bear on whether they were conducted in a manner that would protect and further the class interests.”).

**c. *The Relief Provided for the Class is Meaningful.***

The Settlement provides multiple beneficial forms of relief to the Settlement Class, including reimbursement for out-of-pocket losses, reimbursement for attested time spent dealing with the alleged data breach, and business practices changes by Dominion National. Recovery for time spent dealing with the data breach, in particular, is highly beneficial to data breach victims, who often have little in the way of out-of-pocket loss, but who are required to spend substantial amounts of time dealing with the effects of a data breach. This Settlement allows class members to be reimbursed for up to 5 hours at \$20 per hour. This relief, in comparison to the likely costs, risks and delay of trial and appeal, warrants approval of the Settlement. In addition, the Court finds that the claims process and method of distributing relief to the class supports approval of the Settlement. The Court finds that the claim form and claims process is simple and easy to understand. The claims process is ongoing and the deadline to submit a claim is January 15, 2022. The Court finds that the face value of the claims currently submitted, though not reviewed or approved by the Claims Administrator, supports approval of the Settlement. In addition, as discussed more fully below, the Court finds the terms of the proposed attorneys’ fee award support approval.

**d. *The Settlement Treats Class Members Equitably Relative to Each Other.***

Each class member has the same opportunity to claim benefits under the Settlement in relation to the harm they have suffered. The Settlement Class Representatives, likewise, are entitled to the same opportunities as the rest of the class, with the addition of the modest service

awards Class Counsel has sought on their behalf for their important and necessary contribution to this litigation. This factor supports approval of the Settlement.

8. **Final Approval Hearing.** The Court held a Final Approval Hearing on November 19, 2021. Following argument from the parties, the Court concludes as follows: (a) this matter is certified as a class action for settlement purposes pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) and (e); the Settlement is approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and finally approved pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e); (c) the Plaintiffs' Complaints are dismissed with prejudice pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement; and (d) Settlement Class Members, except those who timely excluded themselves, are bound by the releases set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

9. **Releases.** As of the Effective Date, the Releases (Dkt. 146-1, ¶¶ 1.22, 6.1–6.2) shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Order and the Final Judgment shall have, fully and irrevocably released and forever discharged the parties from all released claims as more fully set forth in Section VI of the Settlement Agreement.

10. **Final Judgment.** There is no just reason to delay entry of this Order and Final Judgment. For the reasons set forth herein, the Court hereby (1) certifies the Settlement Class pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3) and (e); and (2) grants final approval of the Settlement. The Court will separately enter a Final Judgment in the form agreed to by the Parties in connection with the Settlement Agreement. The Parties provided the list of timely submitted Class Member opt-outs at the Final Approval Hearing, which will be Exhibit A to the Final Judgment. The parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement as provided in the Settlement Agreement.

**Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses and Named Plaintiff Service Awards**

For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds that an attorneys' fee award in the amount of \$1,000,000 is fair and reasonable, along with litigation expense reimbursement in the amount of \$65,627.38 and service award payments to each of the six Named Plaintiffs in the amount of \$1,500. Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

**1. Attorneys' Fees:**

Class Counsel seek an award of attorneys' fees of \$1,000,000. Here, where Dominion National has agreed to pay up to \$2 million in money claims, separately pay for administrative costs, and separately pay approved attorneys' fees, but there is no "settlement fund," it is appropriate to evaluate the reasonableness of attorneys' fees using the lodestar method. *Brown v. Transurban USA, Inc.*, 318 F.R.D. 560, 575 (E.D. Va. 2016).

Class Counsel worked a collective 2,257 hours pursuing the results achieved for the class for a total lodestar of \$1,600,084. This lodestar reflects the time, labor, and skill reasonably required to prosecute this complex action to a successful resolution. The Court finds that the hourly billing rates and time spent by Class Counsel were reasonable and appropriate. Accordingly, Class Counsel's request for \$1 million in fees is reasonable and appropriate. Class Counsel's lodestar is 1.6 times greater than its requested fee and the requested fee represents a negative multiplier of 0.625 on Class Counsel's lodestar.

The Court further finds that the requested fee is reasonable and appropriate under a "percentage of recovery" cross-check. Although there is no common settlement fund, the Court can evaluate the reasonableness of the fee by considering the total class benefit. Based on current statistics from the Claims Administrator, it is likely that Dominion National will end up paying

most, if not all, of the \$ 2 million maximum in claims. Additionally, Dominion National has agreed to pay \$1.1 million in administration costs, including class notice, and implement non-monetary relief in the form of business practice changes with an estimated cost to Dominion National of \$2,679,500. The requested \$1 million in fees is just 17.3% of the total class benefit. If the Court factors in the attorneys' fees, which Dominion National has agreed to pay, the fee award would represent less than 15% of the total class benefit. This percentage is substantially lower than what courts typically award. Empirical data demonstrates that class action percentage awards typically fall between 20% and 30%. *See Applying the Percentage Method—Reasonableness of Percentage—Empirical Data on Percentages Awarded*, 5 Newberg on Class Actions § 15:83 (5th ed.).

The Court further finds that the requested attorneys' fee is reasonable in light of (1) the amount involved and the excellent results obtained for the Class, as discussed above; (2) the absence of objections by Class Members to the settlement terms and/or fees requested by Class Counsel; (3) the requisite skill required and the experience, reputation and ability of Class Counsel; (4) the complexity and duration of the litigation and the amount of time devoted to the case by Class Counsel; (5) litigation risks and opportunity costs to Class Counsel for pursuing this litigation; and (6) the awards in other similar cases. *See Barber v. Kimbrell's, Inc.*, 577 F.2d 216, 226, n. 28 (4th Cir. 1978) (applying *Johnson* factors test); *Gunter v. Ridgewood Energy Corp.*, 223 F.3d 190, 195 n.1 (3d Cir. 2000); *Galloway v. Williams*, No. 3:19-CV-470, 2020 WL 7482191, at \*5 (E.D. Va. Dec. 18, 2020) (applying both *Johnson* and *Gunter* factors).

**2. Litigation Costs and Expenses:**

Class Counsel has requested \$65,627.38 in litigation expenses incurred prosecuting this case. There is no objection to the reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses and the Court



**Exhibit A**

Candace E Bonos

Charles T Bonos III

Carsen Bower

Deanna Bower

Ian Bower

Jadon Bower

Christopher G Brown

Peter Butzer

Charlotte M Carr

Kailey E Carr

Lauren C Carr

Michael S Carr

Stephanie A Carr

Christopher Carvalho

Alyssa M Chiado

Anthony T Chiado

Edward J Chiado

Frances L Chiado

Belen Coleman (Mairin)

Damon Coleman

Jason Coleman

Kenneth W Downing

Mary M Dreel

Priscilla E Eckert

Terry Eckert

Robert C Fargher

Ruth Ann Fargher

Erin Fitzgerald

Jennifer Fitzgerald

Kevin Fitzgerald

Shane Fitzgerald

Dora J Funk

Robert H Funk

Ana Henriques

Conner Henriques

Sergio Henriques

Taylor Henriques

Sandra V Henry

Liliana L Inkpen

Rita S Inkpen

Santino S Inkpen

Shannon Todd Inkpen

Amanda Jodon

Avalyn Jodon

Elizabeth A Kasprzyk

Emily N Kasprzyk

John F Kasprzyk III

Mary M Kasprzyk

David Kiefer

Ruth Kiefer

Cheryl D E McBride

Norman L McBride

Margaret L McClain

Joan McGowan

Paul A McGowan

Davin McNally

Brooke Miller

Emily A Miller

William G Miller

Milinda A O'Reilly

Frances O'Reilly

Thomas F O'Reilly

Patricia A O'Reilly

Clifford Parris

Margaret S Robinson

Megan K Robinson

Audrey J Satterlee

Elmer T Sealy

Shirley H Sealy

Donna Searle-Rittle

Donna Shannon

Nancy H Skinner

Carolyn Smalkowski

Adeline Jensen Smith

Jesse Tyler Smith

Colin Eugene Sweeney

Carol Tay

Barbara A Wilkerson

Anthony O Williams

Janice Wolfe

Louis Wolfe

Peixin Yan

Jinying Yao