

RECEIVED FEB 13 2017

*Pamela L. Behrend
1800 Willow Oak Dr
Wexford, PA 15090-2506*

February 10, 2017

Settlement Administrator
WEN Class Settlement Objections
c/o Dahl Administration
P.O. Box 3614,
Minneapolis, MN 55403-0614

Re: AMY FRIEDMAN and JUDI MILLER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. GUTHY-RENKER, LLC and WEN BY CHAZ DEAN, INC., Defendants. Case No. 2:14-cv-06009-ODW(AGRx)

Dear Settlement Administrator,

I am a member of the settlement class described on page 3 of the Longform Settlement Notice. Between November 1, 2007 and September 19, 2016 I purchased one or more of the Wen products listed in the paragraph in the longform notice titled "Who is in the settlement?"

As a resident of the State of Pennsylvania I am writing to object to the proposed settlement; specifically with regard to the fact that Pennsylvania, along with 8 other states, has an unfair and deceptive trade practices act that provides for statutory minimum damages. In the case of Pennsylvania that amount is \$100, 4 times the amount of the proposed tier 1 class-wide flat rate claim amount of \$25.

The third amended class action complaint shows that plaintiff's Friedman, Henry-McArthur and Lisa Rogers are all residents of the State of Florida; which does not have statutory minimum damages in its unfair and deceptive trade practices act. Additionally plaintiff Miller is a resident of the State of Maryland; which also does not have statutory minimum damages in its unfair and deceptive trade practices act.

I understand from my husband, who is a Pennsylvania lawyer, that the named plaintiffs' claims have to be typical of the claims of all the other class members. Clearly this isn't true regarding the class members from Alaska, Colorado or Indiana, whose state law provides for \$500 in statutory damages. Nor is it true with regard to residents of Ohio and Oregon, whose state law provides for \$200 in statutory damages, or Pennsylvania and New Mexico state law provides for \$100. The eighth state, Massachusetts, provides for \$25 in statutory damages.

Therefore, it seems clear that the claims of Friedman, Henry-McArthur, Rogers and Miller are not typical of the claims of class members from any of the aforesaid 8 states.

Also, paragraph 9 of the notice regarding Tier 1 Class-wide Flat Rate Claims caps the total amount of claims at \$5 million. That's all well and good if 200,000 or less people file claims. However, the problem is that a 5 million or more people file claims, they will each get one dollar less. At the fairness hearing next June I would like the Court to ask how many people have filed tier 1 claims so that it can determine whether those class members are actually getting anything from this proposed settlement. I believe it would be facially unfair for class members in the 8 states to provide for statutory damages to receive little or nothing for their claims.

In closing I also object to the attorney's fee as being unreasonable and excessive. There are several reasons for this objection including the fact that Tier 1 class members like me are not being treated fairly or adequately by this proposed settlement.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Pamela Behrend". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Pamela L. Behrend