

## Financial Services Litigation

### PRACTICE CONTACTS

- Jennifer Duncan Hackett
- James Robertson Martin

Zelle's financial services team has significant experience representing national financial services institutions, government entities, and investors on both the plaintiff and defense side in various complex litigation matters. We currently represent plaintiffs in antitrust litigation involving interest rate benchmarks against major commercial banks. We also represent investors as plaintiffs in cryptocurrency class actions. Our team regularly works with a team of economists to assist potential clients in determining the strength of their cases, and we specialize in evaluating claims to determine whether to opt out of class actions. On the defense side, we have successfully defended major corporate clients against class action claims including breach of fiduciary duty, breach of contract, and consumer claims. Our team has the breadth of experience and knowledge base to efficiently and skillfully represent clients in the most challenging financial services matters.

### REPRESENTATIVE MATTERS

*In re LIBOR-Based Financial Instruments Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 2262, No. 1:11-md-02262 (S.D.N.Y.).

Representing Freddie Mac and the FDIC as Receiver for 39 Closed Banks and serves as liaison counsel for more than two dozen DAPs). Freddie Mac and the FDIC allege, among other things, that defendants' horizontal conspiracy reduced product quality in the market for interest-rate benchmarks.

*Otto v. LeMahieu, et al*, 4:19-cv-00054 (N.D. Cal.)

Representing a putative class of investors asserting claims against a cryptocurrency issuer, certain of its top officials, and the issuer's partner cryptocurrency exchange alleging that the defendants failed to adopt adequate controls leading to the theft of \$170 million worth of investors' cryptocurrency holdings from their accounts with the exchange.

*Rozo v. Principal Life Insurance Co.* (S.D. Iowa).

Zelle is Co-Lead Counsel for a certified class of retirement plan investors in the Principal Fixed Income Option. Plaintiffs allege that Principal violated ERISA by retaining excessive compensation that, as a fiduciary, it was not entitled to retain. See *Rozo v. Principal Life Ins. Co.*, 949 F.3d 1071 (8th Cir. 2020) (reversing grant of summary judgment and holding Principal is a fiduciary).