

1 Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607)  
2 Kelly M. Dermody (State Bar No. 171716)  
3 Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260)  
4 Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 199643)  
5 Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 250298)  
6 Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255928)  
7 Lisa J. Cisneros (State Bar No. 251473)  
LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &  
BERNSTEIN, LLP  
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3339  
Telephone: 415.956.1000  
Facsimile: 415.956.1008

8 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
9 Lisa J. Leebove (State Bar No. 186705)  
10 James G. Dallal (State Bar No. 277826)  
11 JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.  
12 505 Montgomery, Suite 625  
13 San Francisco, CA 94111  
14 Telephone: 415.500.6800  
15 Facsimile: 415.395.9940

16 *Co-Lead Class Counsel*

17 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
19 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
20 SAN JOSE DIVISION

21 IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE  
22 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

23 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
24 ALL ACTIONS

Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK

**CLASS ACTION**

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS  
ACTION SETTLEMENTS; MEMORANDUM  
OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT THEREOF**

Judge: Hon. Lucy S. Koh  
Courtroom: 8, 4th Floor  
Date: October 3, 2013  
Time: 1:30pm

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION .....  | 1           |
| MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION.....   | 2           |
| I.    INTRODUCTION .....   | 2           |
| II.   PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....  | 3           |
| III.  SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS .....  | 6           |
| IV.  TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENTS.....   | 6           |
| A.   The Class.....  | 7           |
| B.   Settlement Sums and Additional Consideration .....                                      | 7           |
| C.   Monetary Relief To Class Members .....  | 8           |
| D.   Release of All Claims Against the Settling Defendants and<br>Reservation of Rights..... | 8           |
| E.   Attorneys’ Fees and Costs.....  | 9           |
| F.   Class Representative Service Payments.....  | 9           |
| A.   Class Member Privacy .....  | 10          |
| V.   LEGAL ARGUMENT .....  | 11          |
| A.   Class Action Settlement Procedure.....  | 11          |
| B.   Standards For Preliminary Settlement Approval .....                                     | 11          |
| C.   The Proposed Settlements Are Within The Range Of<br>Reasonableness .....                | 13          |
| D.   The Proposed Settlement Class Satisfies Rule 23.....                                    | 13          |
| E.   Co-Lead Class Counsel Should be Confirmed As Settlement Class<br>Counsel.....           | 16          |
| VI.  PROPOSED PLAN OF NOTICE .....   | 16          |
| VII. ALLOCATION AND USE OF SETTLEMENT FUNDS.....   | 18          |
| VIII. THE COURT SHOULD SET A FINAL APPROVAL HEARING<br>SCHEDULE.....                         | 20          |
| IX.  CONCLUSION.....   | 20          |

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

2 **Page**

3 **CASES**

|    |   |        |
|----|---|--------|
| 4  | <i>Amchem Prods. Inc. v. Windsor</i> ,  |        |
| 5  | 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....  | 14, 16 |
| 6  | <i>Churchill Village, LLC v. General Elec.</i> ,                                    |        |
| 7  | 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004).....   | 12     |
| 8  | <i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> ,  |        |
| 9  | 955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992).....  | 12, 13 |
| 10 | <i>Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs., Inc.</i> ,   |        |
| 11 | 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2007), <i>aff'd</i> , 331 Fed. Appx. |        |
| 12 | 452 (9th Cir. 2009).....  | 10     |
| 13 | <i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> ,   |        |
| 14 | 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1988).....  | 12     |
| 15 | <i>In re Airline Ticket Comm'n Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                               |        |
| 16 | 953 F. Supp. 280 (D. Minn. 1997).....   | 18     |
| 17 | <i>In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                       |        |
| 18 | Case No. 94 C 897, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16658 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 18, 1994) .....      | 15, 20 |
| 19 | <i>In re Cal. Micro Devices Sec. Litig.</i> ,                                       |        |
| 20 | 965 F. Supp. 1327 (N.D. Cal. 1997) .....  | 19     |
| 21 | <i>In re Citric Acid Antitrust Litig.</i> ,   |        |
| 22 | 145 F. Supp. 2d 1152 (N.D. Cal. 2001) .....   | 18     |
| 23 | <i>In re Corrugated Container Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                                |        |
| 24 | Case No. M.D.L. 310, 1981 WL 2093 (S.D. Tex. June 4, 1981).....                     | 9, 13  |
| 25 | <i>In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                 |        |
| 26 | No. 02-md-01486, Dkt. No. 1315 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 2007) .....                      | 19     |
| 27 | <i>In re High Pressure Laminates Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                             |        |
| 28 | No. 00-MD-1368, Dkt. No. 215 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2004).....                          | 19     |
|    | <i>In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> ,  |        |
|    | 213 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 2000).....   | 9      |
|    | <i>In re Mid-Atlantic Toyota Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                                 |        |
|    | 564 F. Supp. 1379 (D. Md. 1983) .....   | 13     |
|    | <i>In re Oracle Sec. Litig.</i> ,   |        |
|    | 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21593 (N.D. Cal. June 18, 1994) .....                         | 18     |
|    | <i>In re Pacific Enters. Sec. Litig.</i> ,  |        |
|    | 47 F.3d 373 (9th Cir. 1995).....  | 12     |
|    | <i>In re Static Random Access (SRAM) Antitrust Litig., No. C07-01819 CW</i> ,       |        |
|    | 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107523 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2008) .....                       | 15     |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| <i>In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.</i> ,<br>No. 07-01827, Dkt. No. 2474 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2011).....  | 19          |
| <i>Mendoza v. United States</i> ,<br>623 F.2d 1338 (9th Cir. 1980).....   | 18          |
| <i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm’n</i> ,<br>688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982), <i>cert. denied sub nom. Byrd v. Civil Serv.</i><br><i>Comm’n</i> , 459 U.S. 1217 (1983) .....             | 12          |
| <i>Rodriguez v. W. Publ’g Corp.</i> ,<br>563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009).....  | 10          |
| <i>Staton v. Boeing Co.</i> ,<br>327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003).....  | 10          |
| <i>Sullivan v. DB Investments, Inc., et al.</i> ,<br>667 F.3d 273 (3d Cir. 2011) (en banc), <i>cert. denied, Murray v. Sullivan</i> , No.<br>11-1111, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 2656 (Apr. 2, 2012) ..... | 14, 15      |
| <i>Valentino v. Carter-Wallace, Inc.</i> ,<br>97 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 1996).....   | 15          |
| <i>Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.</i> ,<br>529 F.2d 943 (9th Cir. 1976).....  | 12          |
| <i>Van Vranken v. Atl. Richfield Co.</i> ,<br>901 F. Supp. 294 (N.D. Cal. 1995) .....   | 10          |

**STATUTES**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Cartwright Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, <i>et seq.</i> ..... | 4 |
| Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 .....                                      | 4 |

**RULES**

|                          |        |
|--------------------------|--------|
| Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 ..... | passim |
|--------------------------|--------|

**TREATISES**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| 4 <i>Newberg on Class Actions</i> (4th ed. 2002).....  | 11, 13, 16 |
| Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Mary Kay Kane, <i>Federal Practice and</i><br><i>Procedure: Civil Procedure</i> § 1781 at 254-55 (3d ed. 2004) ..... | 15         |
| <i>Manual for Complex Litigation</i> , Fourth (2004) .....   | 13, 14, 19 |

25  
26  
27  
28

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

**TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 3, 2013 at 1:30pm, or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard in Courtroom 8 of the above-entitled court, Plaintiffs Michael Devine, Mark Fichtner, Siddharth Hariharan, Brandon Marshall and Daniel Stover (collectively “Plaintiffs” or “Named Plaintiffs”) hereby move, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e), for entry of an Order:

1. Certifying a settlement class;
2. Preliminarily approving the settlement agreement reached with: (a) both Lucasfilm Ltd. and Pixar (the “Lucas/Pixar Settlement,” attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Joseph R. Saveri in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements (“Saveri Decl.”)); and (b) Intuit Inc. (the “Intuit Settlement,” attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Kelly M. Dermody in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements (“Dermody Decl.”)) (collectively, the “Settlements”);
3. Directing distribution of notice of the Settlements to the class;
4. Appointing Heffler Claims Group as the claims administrator; and
5. Scheduling a hearing for final approval of the Settlements.

This motion is made on the grounds that the Settlements are the product of arm’s-length, good-faith negotiations; are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Class; and should be preliminarily approved, as discussed in the attached Memorandum.

This motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Unopposed Motion, the supporting Memorandum of Points and Authorities (below), the accompanying Declarations of Joseph R. Saveri and Kelly M. Dermody, and exhibits attached thereto, the argument of counsel, and all papers and records on file in this matter.

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION****I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiffs Michael Devine, Mark Fichtner, Siddharth Hariharan, Brandon Marshall and Daniel Stover (collectively, “Plaintiffs” or “Named Plaintiffs”) respectfully seek certification of a settlement class and request that the Court grant preliminary approval of the Settlements reached with: (a) both Lucasfilm Ltd. and Pixar (the “Lucas/Pixar Settlement,” attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Joseph R. Saveri in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements (“Saveri Decl.”)); and (b) Intuit Inc. (the “Intuit Settlement,” attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Kelly M. Dermody in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements (“Dermody Decl.”)) (collectively, the “Settlements”).

The Settlements will resolve all of the claims of the proposed class of technical employees, as that Class has been defined by Plaintiffs in their Supplemental Motion for Class Certification<sup>1</sup> (the “Class” or “Technical Class”), for settlement purposes and only as against Intuit, Pixar, and Lucasfilm (the “Settling Defendants”). In other words, the proposed settlement Class includes the same members as the proposed litigation Class. Plaintiffs’ claims against the other four Defendants—Adobe, Apple, Google, and Intel (the “Non-Settling Defendants”)—on behalf of the same Class will proceed. The Settlements preserve Plaintiffs’ right to litigate against the Non-Settling Defendants for the entire amount of Plaintiffs’ damages based on joint and several liability under the antitrust laws. The Lucas/Pixar Settlement creates an all-cash fund of \$9,000,000 and the Intuit Settlement creates an all-cash fund of \$11,000,000, for a total of \$20,000,000 (the “Settlement Fund”) for the benefit of the Class. As a point of reference, Intuit, Lucasfilm, and Pixar together account for less than 8% of Class members, and together account for approximately █% of total Class compensation. (Oct. 1, 2012 Leamer Rpt. at p.23; Dkt. 190.)

Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendants reached the Settlements through hard-fought, arm’s-

---

<sup>1</sup> See Supp. Mot. at iii (Dkt. 418); Oct. 1, 2012 Expert Report of Edward Leamer, App. B (Dkt. 190).

1 length negotiations after more than two years of litigation, including: substantial investigation by  
2 Class Counsel; briefing, argument, and denial of Defendants' motions to dismiss (Apr. 18, 2012  
3 Order; Dkt. 120); the completion of extensive fact discovery, including the taking of 100  
4 depositions, the review of millions of pages of documents, and analysis of over 15 gigabytes of  
5 data produced by Defendants; and two rounds of class certification briefing and argument,  
6 including the exchange of eight expert reports by four economists. (Dermody Decl. ¶ 6; Saveri  
7 Decl. ¶ 8.) The proposed notice provides Class members with the best notice practicable under  
8 the circumstances and will allow each Class member a full and fair opportunity to evaluate the  
9 Settlements and decide whether to participate. The Settling Defendants do not oppose this motion  
10 and will cooperate in the settlement process.

11 By this motion, Plaintiffs request that the Court: (1) certify a Settlement Class; (2)  
12 preliminarily approve the Settlements; (3) approve the proposed plan of notice to the Class; (4)  
13 appoint Heffler Claims Group as the Claims Administrator; (5) set a schedule for disseminating  
14 notice to Class members, as well as deadlines to comment on or object to the Settlements, and  
15 schedule a hearing pursuant to Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to determine  
16 whether the proposed Settlements are fair, reasonable, and adequate and should be finally  
17 approved. Prior to final approval, Plaintiffs will also request an order of the Court authorizing  
18 payment from the Settlement Fund of incurred litigation costs totaling \$3,593,000, and an  
19 advancement for trial-related costs in the amount of \$1,200,000.

## 20 **II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

21 The five named Plaintiffs are former technical employees of Defendants. Like the Class  
22 they seek to represent, each worked for a Defendant while that Defendant allegedly participated  
23 in at least one express unlawful agreement with another Defendant. Plaintiffs challenge  
24 agreements among Defendants—all horizontal competitors for the services of Plaintiffs and  
25 members of the proposed Class—to fix and suppress the compensation of their employees.<sup>2</sup> The

---

26 <sup>2</sup> The litigation commenced on May 4, 2011 when Plaintiff Hariharan filed his complaint in  
27 Alameda County Superior Court. On May 23, 2011, Defendants removed the *Hariharan* case to  
28 U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. (Dkt. 1.) Four cases were later filed in  
*Footnote continued on next page*

1 complaint alleges that Defendants entered into the following types of express agreements:

2 (1) illegal agreements not to recruit each other's employees; (2) illegal agreements to notify each  
3 other when making an offer to another's employee; and (3) illegal agreements that, when offering  
4 a position to another company's employee, neither company would counteroffer above the initial  
5 offer. (Complaint ¶¶ 55-107.) Plaintiffs also allege that each Defendant entered into,  
6 implemented, and enforced each express agreement with knowledge of the other Defendants'  
7 participation, and with the intent of accomplishing the conspiracy's objective: to reduce employee  
8 compensation and mobility by eliminating competition for skilled labor. (*Id.* ¶¶ 55, 108-110.)  
9 Plaintiffs seek compensation for violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1 and  
10 the Cartwright Act, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 16720, *et seq.* (*Id.* ¶¶ 119-164.)

11 After the Court consolidated the Plaintiffs' individual lawsuits, Plaintiffs filed their  
12 Consolidated Amended Complaint on September 13, 2011. (Dkt. 65.) Defendants challenged the  
13 pleadings. All Defendants jointly and Lucasfilm separately moved to dismiss Plaintiffs' claims.  
14 (Dkts. 79 and 83.) The Court denied both motions, with the exception that Plaintiffs' UCL claim  
15 for restitution and disgorgement was dismissed for failure to allege a vested interest. (Apr. 18,  
16 2012 Order; Dkt. 120.)

17 After adjustments to the case management schedule, Plaintiffs filed their first motion for  
18 class certification on October 1, 2012. (Pls.' Mot. For Class Cert.; Dkt. 187.) Plaintiffs proposed  
19 an "All-Employee Class," as well as an alternative class of salaried technical, creative, and  
20 research and development employees: the "Technical Class." (*Id.* at 1.) After the Court took the  
21 motion under submission, Plaintiffs continued discovery, conducting numerous depositions, and  
22 collecting voluminous documents. The Court required the parties to file discovery status reports  
23 on an ongoing basis. (Jan. 17, 2013 Case Management Orders; Dkts. 282 and 350.)

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 *Footnote continued from previous page*

26 Santa Clara County Superior Court, each of which Defendants subsequently removed. On  
27 July 27, 2011, all five cases were related before Judge Armstrong. (Dkt. 52.) On August 4, 2011,  
28 Judge Armstrong transferred all five cases to the San Jose Division. (Dkt. 58.) Pursuant to  
Stipulated Pretrial Order No. 1 as Modified, the Court consolidated all five cases on  
September 12, 2011. (Dkt. 64.)



1 The parties completed broad, extensive, and thorough discovery related to both class  
2 certification and the merits after the Court lifted a discovery stay in January 2012. Plaintiffs  
3 served 75 document requests, for which Defendants collectively produced over 325,000  
4 documents (over 3.2 million pages), and took 91 depositions of Defendant witnesses. (Dermody  
5 Decl. ¶ 6.) Defendants also propounded document requests, for which Plaintiffs produced over  
6 31,000 pages, and took the depositions of all five Plaintiffs. (*Id.*) With expert assistance,  
7 Plaintiffs' counsel also analyzed vast amounts of computerized employee compensation and  
8 recruiting data, including nearly 1,000 files of employment related data exceeding 15 gigabytes.  
9 (*Id.*) The discovery process, which is now complete as to all non-expert discovery, has been  
10 thorough, and it required the parties to engage in numerous and extensive meetings and  
11 conferences concerning the scope of discovery and the analysis regarding the various electronic  
12 data, policy documents, and other files produced. (*Id.*)

13 On April 5, 2013, the Court issued its Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part  
14 Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification. (Dkt. 382.) The Court found that Plaintiffs satisfied  
15 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a), and satisfied Rule 23(b)(3) as to conspiracy and damages.  
16 The Court found that "the adjudication of Defendants' alleged antitrust violation will turn on  
17 overwhelmingly common legal and factual issues." (*Id.* at 13.) Furthermore, after a detailed  
18 inquiry, the Court held that a statistical regression analysis prepared by Plaintiffs' expert  
19 "provides a plausible methodology for showing generalized harm to the class as well as  
20 estimating class-wide damages." (*Id.* at 43.)

21 The Court requested further briefing on whether the Rule 23(b)(3) predominance standard  
22 was met with respect to the common impact on the proposed class. (*Id.* at 45.) Though the Court  
23 did not find predominance satisfied as to common impact, the Court acknowledged that the  
24 documentary evidence "weighs heavily in favor of finding that common issues predominate over  
25 individual ones for the purpose of being able to prove antitrust impact." (*Id.* at 33.) The Court  
26 requested additional briefing to address this remaining concern: "the Court believes that, with the  
27 benefit of discovery that has occurred since the hearing on this motion, Plaintiffs may be able to  
28 offer further proof to demonstrate how common evidence will be able to show class-wide impact

1 to demonstrate why common issues predominate over individual ones.” (*Id.* at 45.)

2 Plaintiffs filed a Supplemental Motion for Class Certification to address the Court’s  
3 request. (Dkts. 418, 455.) Plaintiffs marshaled additional documentary evidence, testimony, and  
4 expert analyses. (Decl. of Dean M. Harvey, Dkt. 418-1; Decl. of Lisa J. Cisneros, Dkt. 418-2;  
5 Leamer Supp., Dkt. 418-4; Hallock Rpt., Dkt. 418-3; Decl. of Anne B. Shaver, Dkt. 456; and  
6 Leamer Supp. Reply, Dkt. 457.) While Plaintiffs respectfully submitted that the evidence  
7 supported certification of either the class of all-salaried employees or the Technical Class  
8 previously proposed, there was powerful evidence that the no-cold calling agreements at issue in  
9 this case were designed substantially to disrupt recruiting of Technical Class employees.  
10 Accordingly, Plaintiffs focused their supplemental briefing and analysis on demonstrating impact  
11 to all or nearly all of the Technical Class. A hearing on the Supplemental Motion was held on  
12 August 8, 2013, and the matter is under submission.

### 13 **III. SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS**

14 Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendants reached the Settlements under the supervision of  
15 experienced mediator David A. Rotman. After informal negotiations did not produce any  
16 settlements, Plaintiffs and all Defendants conducted a day-long mediation supervised by Mr.  
17 Rotman on June 26, 2013. (Dermody Decl. ¶ 8; Saveri Decl. ¶ 4.) After several weeks of follow-  
18 up negotiations, Plaintiffs reached a settlement agreement with both Lucasfilm and Pixar on July  
19 12, 2013 (Dkt. 453), and reached another settlement agreement with Intuit on July 30, 2013 (Dkt.  
20 489). Afterward, Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendants exchanged several drafts of the final  
21 Settlements and related settlement documents before the parties came to final agreement as to  
22 each. (Dermody Decl. ¶ 9; Saveri Decl. ¶¶ 4-7.) At all times during the negotiation process,  
23 counsel for Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendants bargained vigorously and at arm’s length on  
24 behalf of their clients. (Dermody Decl. ¶ 10; Saveri Decl. ¶ 9.)

### 25 **IV. TERMS OF THE SETTLEMENTS**

26 The Settlements resolve all claims of Plaintiffs and the Class against the Settling  
27 Defendants. The details are contained in the attached Settlements. (Saveri Decl., Ex. 1  
28

1 (“Lucas/Pixar Settlement”); Dermody Decl., Ex. 1 (“Intuit Settlement”).) The key terms of the  
2 Settlements are described below.

3 **A. The Class**

4 Both Settlements define the settlement Class in the same way as the proposed Class in  
5 Plaintiffs’ pending Supplemental Motion for Class Certification. (*See* Supp. Mot. at iii (Dkt. 418)  
6 and Oct. 1, 2012 Expert Report of Edward Leamer, App. B (Dkt. 190).) That is:

7 All natural persons who work in the technical, creative, and/or  
8 research and development fields that were employed on a salaried  
9 basis in the United States by one or more of the following: (a)  
10 Apple from March 2005 through December 2009; (b) Adobe from  
11 May 2005 through December 2009; (c) Google from March 2005  
12 through December 2009; (d) Intel from March 2005 through  
13 December 2009; (e) Intuit from June 2007 through December 2009;  
14 (f) Lucasfilm from January 2005 through December 2009; or (g)  
15 Pixar from January 2005 through December 2009. Excluded from  
16 the Class are: retail employees; corporate officers, members of the  
17 boards of directors, and senior executives of all Defendants.

18 (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § I.A; Intuit Settlement § I.A.) Both Settlements also attach a list of all  
19 job titles included in this Class. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement, Ex. E; Intuit Settlement, Ex. D.)

20 **B. Settlement Sums and Additional Consideration**

21 Lucasfilm and Pixar will pay \$9,000,000 and Intuit will pay \$11,000,000 into an escrow  
22 account (the “Settlement Fund”), held and administered by an escrow agent. Class Counsel have  
23 selected Citibank, N.A. to be appointed the escrow agent, with the consent of the Settling  
24 Defendants and with approval of the Court. The Settlement Fund will be utilized in accordance  
25 with applicable orders of the Court for potential payments to Class Members, as well as for notice  
26 and claims administration costs, Named Plaintiff service awards, and Court-approved attorneys’  
27 fees, costs, and litigation expenses.

28 As additional consideration, the Settling Defendants have agreed to cooperate with Class  
Counsel in the further prosecution of their claims against the Non-Settling Defendants.  
Specifically, the Settling Defendants have agreed, as needed, to authenticate documents and to  
provide the last known contact information for current or former employees for notice or  
subpoena purposes to the extent consistent with California law. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § III.B;

1 Intuit Settlement § III.B.)

2 **C. Monetary Relief To Class Members**

3 Each Class member who submits a timely and valid claim form is eligible to receive a  
4 share of the \$20 million Settlement Fund, based upon the following plan of allocation.

5 Class members who submit a claim form will be eligible to receive a share of the  
6 Settlement Fund based on a formula utilizing each claimant's base salary paid while working in a  
7 Class position within the Class period as set forth in the Class definition. (Lucas/Pixar  
8 Settlement, Ex. C; Intuit Settlement, Ex. C.) In other words, each Class member's share of the  
9 Settlement Fund is a fraction, with the Claimant's base salary during the Class Period as the  
10 numerator and the total base salary during the Class Period of all Claimants as the denominator:

11  
12 approved claimant's individual total base salary paid  
13 in class positions during the Class Period

---

14 total of base salaries paid to all approved Claimants  
15 in class positions during the Class Period

16 The Claimant's fractional amount will be multiplied against the Settlement Fund net of all  
17 reductions for costs and taxes, including court-approved costs, service awards, and attorneys'  
18 fees. (*Id.*) Because each claimant's fractional amount will depend in part on how many other  
19 Class members file claim forms, fractional amounts will increase if less than 100% of Class  
20 members participate as claimants. There will be no reversion of unclaimed funds to any Settling  
21 Defendant. (*Id.*)

22 **D. Release of All Claims Against the Settling Defendants and Reservation of Rights**

23 In exchange for the Settling Defendants' monetary and cooperation consideration, upon  
24 entry of a final judgment approving the proposed Settlements, Plaintiffs will release the Settling  
25 Defendants of all claims related to the alleged conduct giving rise to this litigation. (Lucas/Pixar  
26 Settlement § V; Intuit Settlement § V.) The settlements preserve Plaintiffs' right to litigate  
27 against the non-settling Defendants for the entire amount of Plaintiffs' damages based on joint  
28

1 and several liability under the antitrust laws. *See, e.g., In re Corrugated Container Antitrust*  
2 *Litig.*, Case No. M.D.L. 310, U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9687, at \*49-50 (S.D. Tex. June 4, 1981). Under  
3 the Settlements, the Non-Settling Defendants remain liable for the full amount of Class damages,  
4 including damages resulting from conduct by the Settling Defendants.

5 **E. Attorneys' Fees and Costs**

6 The Settlements recognize that Class Counsel may seek attorneys' fees and  
7 reimbursement of costs and expenses incurred in the prosecution of this action. (Lucas/Pixar  
8 Settlement § VII; Intuit Settlement § VII.) Pursuant to the Settlements, Class Counsel will look  
9 solely to the Settlement Fund for satisfaction of such fees and costs. (*Id.*) Class Counsel do not  
10 seek attorneys' fees at this time. Subject to Court approval, Class Counsel will seek an  
11 appropriate portion of the Settlement Fund to pay for costs and expenses incurred during the  
12 prosecution of the case against the Non-Settling Defendants, discussed more fully in Part VII,  
13 below.

14 **F. Class Representative Service Payments**

15 Class Counsel will also seek reasonable service award payments for each of the Named  
16 Plaintiffs for their services as Class representatives, to be paid from the Settlement Fund at the  
17 time when the Fund is distributed and claims are paid. The Lucas/Pixar Settlement and the Intuit  
18 Settlement each provide for a service award of \$10,000 for each Named Plaintiff. (Lucas/Pixar  
19 Settlement § VI; Intuit Settlement § VI.) These proposed service awards will be in addition to  
20 any monetary recovery to the Named Plaintiffs pursuant to the plan of allocation.

21 These payments are intended to recognize: (a) the time and effort the Named Plaintiffs  
22 have expended on behalf of the Class in assisting Class Counsel with the prosecution of their and  
23 the Class's claims and the consequent value they have conferred to the Class; and (b) the  
24 exposure and risk they have incurred by participating and taking a leadership role in this high-  
25 profile litigation. *See, e.g., In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 213 F.3d 454, 463 (9th Cir. 2000)  
26 (approving incentive awards to class representatives); *Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 977  
27 (9th Cir. 2003) (“[N]amed plaintiffs . . . are eligible for reasonable incentive payments”).

28 Here, the Named Plaintiffs have expended substantial time and effort in assisting Class

1 Counsel with the prosecution of the Class’s claims. They have responded to extensive document  
2 requests; produced over 31,000 pages of documents; responded to interrogatories; given full-day  
3 depositions; attended hearings and the mediation; and have otherwise devoted many hours  
4 consulting with Class Counsel regarding fact development and strategy. (Dermody Decl. ¶¶ 13-  
5 14.) The Named Plaintiffs—all of whom worked in technical positions for Defendants—have  
6 also incurred the risks and costs of taking on leadership roles in this visible litigation against  
7 seven of the most powerful technology firms in the world. Class representative service awards  
8 are “intended to compensate class representatives for work done on behalf of the class, to make  
9 up for financial or reputational risk undertaken in bringing the action, and, sometimes, to  
10 recognize their willingness to act as a private attorney general.” *Rodriguez v. W. Publ’g Corp.*,  
11 563 F.3d 948, 958-59 (9th Cir. 2009). The service awards provided here are reasonable and  
12 appropriate. *See, e.g., Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8476, at \*52 (N.D.  
13 Cal. Jan. 26, 2007) (approving \$25,000 enhancement to each former employee class  
14 representative), *aff’d*, 331 Fed. Appx. 452, 455 (9th Cir. 2009); *Van Vranken v. Atl. Richfield Co.*,  
15 901 F. Supp. 294, 299 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (approving \$50,000 award to plaintiffs).

16 **A. Class Member Privacy**

17 The Settling Defendants have agreed to maintain confidentiality regarding whether and  
18 how Class members respond to the Class notice. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § II.A and Ex. B at 10;  
19 Intuit Settlement § II.A and Ex. B and 10.) The settlement checks will be handled by the Heffler  
20 Claims Group (the “Claims Administrator”), an independent and experienced Claims  
21 Administrator. (Saveri Decl. ¶ 11.) Opt-out requests and comments on the Settlements  
22 (including objections) will also be sent to the Claims Administrator. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement §  
23 II.D; Intuit Settlement § II.D.) The Claims Administrator will report to the Settling Defendants’  
24 outside counsel and Class Counsel regarding opt-out requests and comments (including  
25 objections) submitted. (*Id.*)

26 The Settling Defendants have agreed not to share this information with the managers of  
27 Class members. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement, Ex. B at 10-11; Intuit Settlement, Ex. B at 10-11.) The  
28 Settling Defendants have also agreed that that no information about Class member submissions

1 (or lack thereof) will be shared within their companies unless there is a need-to-know in order to  
2 implement the Settlements. (*Id.*) For example, certain information may need to be viewed by a  
3 small number of employees in the Settling Defendants' human resources departments who may  
4 need to confirm employee data. The Settlements will protect Class members' privacy.

## 5 **V. LEGAL ARGUMENT**

### 6 **A. Class Action Settlement Procedure**

7 A class action may not be dismissed, compromised, or settled without the approval of the  
8 Court. Judicial proceedings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 have led to a defined  
9 procedure and specific criteria for approval of class action settlements. The Rule 23(e) settlement  
10 approval procedure describes three distinct steps:

- 11 1. Certification of a settlement class and preliminary approval of the proposed  
12 settlement;
- 13 2. Dissemination of notice of the settlement to all affected class members; and
- 14 3. A formal fairness hearing, also called the final approval hearing, at which class  
15 members may be heard regarding the settlement, and at which counsel may introduce evidence  
16 and present argument concerning the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the settlement.

17 This procedure safeguards class members' procedural due process rights and enables the  
18 Court to fulfill its role as the guardian of class interests. *See 4 Newberg on Class Actions*  
19 §§ 11.22, *et seq.* (4th ed. 2002) ("*Newberg*") (describing class action settlement procedure).

20 By way of this Motion, the parties request that the Court take the first step in the  
21 settlement approval process and certify a settlement class and preliminarily approve the proposed  
22 Settlement. Plaintiffs further request the Court appoint the Named Plaintiffs as Class  
23 representatives.

### 24 **B. Standards For Preliminary Settlement Approval**

25 Rule 23(e) requires court approval of any settlement of claims brought on a class basis.  
26 "[T]here is an overriding public interest in settling and quieting litigation . . . particularly . . . in  
27 class action suits[.]" *Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.*, 529 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1976); *see also*  
28 *Churchill Village, LLC v. General Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 576 (9th Cir. 2004); *In re Pacific Enters.*

1 *Sec. Litig.*, 47 F.3d 373, 378 (9th Cir. 1995); and *Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d  
2 1268, 1276 (9th Cir. 1992).

3 The purpose of the Court's preliminary evaluation of the proposed settlement is to  
4 determine whether it is within "the range of reasonableness," and thus whether notice to the Class  
5 of the terms and conditions of the settlement, and the scheduling of a formal fairness hearing, are  
6 worthwhile. Preliminary approval should be granted where "the proposed settlement appears to  
7 be the product of serious, informed, non-collusive negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, does  
8 not improperly grant preferential treatment to class representatives or segments of the class and  
9 falls within the range of possible approval." *In re NASDAQ Market Makers Antitrust Litig.*,  
10 176 F.R.D. 99, 102 (S.D.N.Y. 1997). Application of these factors here support an order granting  
11 the motion for preliminary approval.

12 The approval of a proposed settlement of a class action is a matter of discretion for the  
13 trial court. *Churchill Village, L.L.C.*, 361 F.3d at 575. In exercising that discretion, however,  
14 courts recognize that as a matter of sound policy, settlements of disputed claims are encouraged  
15 and a settlement approval hearing should "not be turned into a trial or rehearsal for trial on the  
16 merits." *Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982), *cert.*  
17 *denied sub nom. Byrd v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 459 U.S. 1217 (1983). Furthermore, courts must  
18 give "proper deference" to the settlement agreement, because "the court's intrusion upon what is  
19 otherwise a private consensual agreement negotiated between the parties to a lawsuit must be  
20 limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the agreement is not the product  
21 of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating parties, and the settlement,  
22 taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned." *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*,  
23 150 F.3d 1011, 1027 (9th Cir. 1988) (quotations omitted).

24 To grant preliminary approval of these proposed Settlements, the Court need only find  
25 that they fall within "the range of reasonableness." *Newberg* § 11.25. The *Manual for Complex*  
26 *Litigation (Fourth)* (2004) ("*Manual*") characterizes the preliminary approval stage as an "initial  
27 evaluation" of the fairness of the proposed settlement made by the court on the basis of written  
28 submissions and informal presentation from the settling parties. *Manual* § 21.632. A proposed



1 Settlement may be finally approved by the trial court if it is determined to be “fundamentally fair,  
2 adequate, and reasonable.” *City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d at 1276. While consideration of the  
3 requirements for *final* approval is unnecessary at this stage, all of the relevant factors weigh in  
4 favor of the Settlement proposed here. As shown below, the proposed Settlements are fair,  
5 reasonable and adequate. Therefore, the Court should allow notice of them to be disseminated to  
6 the Class.

7 **C. The Proposed Settlements Are Within The Range Of Reasonableness**

8 Plaintiffs’ proposed Settlements meet the standards for preliminary approval. First, the  
9 settlements are entitled to “an initial presumption of fairness” because they are the result of  
10 arm’s-length negotiations among experienced counsel. *Newberg* § 11.41. (Dermody Decl. ¶¶ 10-  
11 11; Saveri Decl. ¶¶ 4-10.) Second, the consideration agreed to—a total of \$20 million—is  
12 substantial, particularly in light of the fact that the Settling Defendants collectively account for  
13 less than 8% of Class members, and together account for approximately █% of total Class  
14 compensation. (Oct. 1, 2012 Leamer Rpt. at p.23; Dkt. 190.) Third, because the Non-Settling  
15 Defendants remain jointly and severally liable for all damages caused by the conspiracy,  
16 including damages from the Settling Defendants’ conduct, the Settlements do not reduce the total  
17 amount of damages recoverable from the Non-Settling Defendants in this litigation. *See In re*  
18 *Corrugated Container Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. M.D.L. 310, 1981 WL 2093, at \*17 (S.D. Tex.  
19 June 4, 1981). Fourth, the Settlements call for the Settling Defendants to cooperate with  
20 Plaintiffs in terms of authenticating documents and providing the last known contact information  
21 for current or former employee-witnesses for notice or subpoena purposes to the extent consistent  
22 with California law. *See In re Mid-Atlantic Toyota Antitrust Litig.*, 564 F. Supp. 1379, 1386 (D.  
23 Md. 1983) (a defendant’s agreement to cooperate with plaintiffs “is an appropriate factor for a  
24 court to consider in approving a settlement”). The proposed Settlements are fair, reasonable, and  
25 adequate.

26 **D. The Proposed Settlement Class Satisfies Rule 23**

27 Before granting preliminary approval of a settlement, the Court must determine that the  
28 proposed settlement presents a proper class for settlement purposes. *See Manual* § 21.632;

1 *Amchem Prods. Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 620 (1997). Rule 23 governs the issue of class  
2 certification, whether the proposed class is a litigated class or, as here, a settlement class. All  
3 criteria for certification of a class for litigation purposes, except manageability, apply to  
4 certification for settlement purposes. *Amchem Prods.*, 521 U.S. at 620. There is a “strong  
5 presumption in favor of voluntary settlement agreements” that is “especially strong in class  
6 actions and other complex cases because they promote the amicable resolution of disputes and  
7 lighten the increasing load of litigation faced by the federal courts.” *Sullivan v. DB Investments,*  
8 *Inc., et al.*, 667 F.3d 273, 311 (3d Cir. 2011) (en banc), *cert. denied*, *Murray v. Sullivan*, No. 11-  
9 1111, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 2656 (Apr. 2, 2012) (affirming certification of two nationwide antitrust  
10 settlement classes) (quotation and internal edit omitted).

11 Certification is appropriate where the proposed class and the proposed class  
12 representatives meet the four prerequisites of Rule 23(a)—numerosity, commonality, typicality,  
13 and adequacy of representation. As the Court has recognized, it is uncontested that Plaintiffs  
14 satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(a) with respect to the same proposed Class. (Apr. 5, 2013  
15 Order at 9; Dkt. 382.) Plaintiffs continue to satisfy these requirements for the reasons stated in  
16 Plaintiffs’ initial Class Certification Motion. (Class. Cert. Mot. at 4-14.)

17 In addition, certification of a class action for damages requires a showing that “questions  
18 of law and fact common to class members predominate over any questions affecting only  
19 individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and  
20 efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). This Court has held that  
21 Plaintiffs have satisfied predominance as to conspiracy and damages. The Court found that “the  
22 adjudication of Defendants’ alleged antitrust violation will turn on overwhelmingly common legal  
23 and factual issues.” (Apr. 5, 2013 Order at 13.) Furthermore, after a detailed inquiry, the Court  
24 held that a conduct regression prepared by Plaintiffs’ expert “provides a plausible methodology  
25 for showing generalized harm to the class as well as estimating class-wide damages.” (*Id.* at 43.)

26 Plaintiffs have also demonstrated predominance with respect to the common impact of  
27 Defendants’ alleged misconduct for the reasons set forth in Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Class  
28 Certification briefs and related documents, testimony, and expert analysis. These filings “offer

1 further proof to demonstrate how common evidence will be able to show class-wide impact to  
2 demonstrate why common issues predominate over individual ones.” (Apr. 5, 2013 Order at 45.)  
3 In the settlement context, moreover, the “district court need not ‘envision the form that a trial’  
4 would take, nor consider ‘the available evidence and the method or methods by which plaintiffs  
5 propose to use the evidence to prove’ the disputed element at trial.” *Sullivan*, 667 F.3d at 305-06.

6 The superiority prong of Rule 23(b)(3) requires balancing the merits of a class action with  
7 available alternate methods of adjudication. *See Valentino v. Carter-Wallace, Inc.*, 97 F.3d 1227,  
8 1234 (9th Cir. 1996). “[I]f common questions are found to predominate in an antitrust action,  
9 then courts generally have ruled that the superiority prerequisite of Rule 23(b)(3) is satisfied.”  
10 Charles Alan Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Mary Kay Kane, *Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil*  
11 *Procedure* § 1781 at 254-55 (3d ed. 2004).

12 This Court has found that “Class members’ interests weigh in favor of having this case  
13 litigated as a class action. In addition, the nature of Defendants’ alleged overarching conspiracy  
14 and the desirability of concentrating the litigation in one forum weigh heavily in favor of finding  
15 that class treatment is superior to other methods of adjudication of the controversy.” (Apr. 5,  
16 2013 Order at 45.) Here, a class action is superior to individual litigation because it would be a  
17 waste of judicial resources to require numerous separate trials relating to the same legal dispute.  
18 *See In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 94 C 897, 1994 U.S. Dist.  
19 LEXIS 16658, at \*15 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 18, 1994) (“We fail to see the logic in defendants’  
20 contention that 50,000 individual actions are less complex than a single action.”). The damages  
21 alleged by individual members of the class are relatively small, and the expense and burden of  
22 individual litigation would make it impracticable for them to seek redress individually. *See In re*  
23 *Static Random Access (SRAM) Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-01819 CW, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
24 107523, at \* 34-35 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2008). Moreover, the interests of class members in  
25 individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims are outweighed by the efficiency of the  
26 class mechanism. Finally, separate adjudication of claims creates a risk of inconsistent rulings,  
27 which further favors class treatment. Therefore, a class action is the superior method of  
28 adjudicating the claims raised in this case.

1           **E. Co-Lead Class Counsel Should be Confirmed As Settlement Class Counsel**

2           “An order certifying a class action . . . must appoint class counsel under Rule 23(g).” Fed.  
 3 R. Civ. P. 23(c)(1)(B). On April 5, 2013, the Court appointed Lief, Cabraser, Heimann &  
 4 Bernstein, LLP and the Joseph Saveri Law Firm, Inc. as Co-Lead Counsel. (Apr. 5, 2013 Order  
 5 at 47.) The work done by Co-Lead Counsel since their appointment provides a substantial basis  
 6 for the Court’s earlier finding that counsel satisfy each applicable criterion under Rule 23(g), and  
 7 are well qualified to serve as Class Counsel. (Dermody Decl. ¶¶ 1-7; Saveri Decl. ¶¶ 1-8.)  
 8 Accordingly, Co-Lead Counsel should be confirmed as class counsel for purposes of the  
 9 settlement.

10          **VI. PROPOSED PLAN OF NOTICE**

11           Rule 23(e)(1) states that, “[t]he court must direct notice in a reasonable manner to all class  
 12 members who would be bound by a proposed settlement, voluntary dismissal, or compromise.”  
 13 Notice of a proposed settlement must inform class members of the following: (1) the nature of  
 14 the pending litigation; (2) the general terms of the proposed settlement; (3) that complete  
 15 information is available from the court files; and (4) that any class member may appear and be  
 16 heard at the fairness hearing. *See Newberg* § 8.32. The notice must also indicate an opportunity  
 17 to opt-out, that the judgment will bind all class counsel who do not opt-out, and that any member  
 18 who does not opt-out may appear through counsel. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)(B). The form of  
 19 notice is “adequate if it may be understood by the average class member.” *Newberg* § 11.53.  
 20 Notice to the class must be “the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including  
 21 individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort.” *Amchem*  
 22 *Prods.*, 521 U.S. at 617.

23           Within twenty days after the Court grants preliminary approval, the Settling Defendants  
 24 have agreed to deliver to the Claims Administrator in an electronic database format, from the  
 25 information in their human resources databases, for the Class period, the full legal name, social  
 26 security number, all known email addresses, last known physical address, dates of employment in  
 27 that Defendant’s Class job titles, and associated base salary by date and relevant Class job title of  
 28 each Class member who was employed by that Defendant. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § II.B; Intuit

1 Settlement § II.B.) Plaintiffs seek an Order compelling the Non-Settling Defendants to produce  
2 the same data on that timetable, as all of the Defendants' technical employees during the Class  
3 Period are members of both Settlement Classes, and all must be given the same notice and  
4 opportunity to opt out.

5 Within two weeks thereafter, the Claims Administrator shall cause the Settlement Notice  
6 to be mailed by first-class mail, postage prepaid, and/or emailed to Class Members pursuant to the  
7 procedures described in the Settlement Agreement, and to any potential Class Member who  
8 requests one; and, in conjunction with Class Counsel, shall cause a case-specific internet website  
9 to become operational with case information, court documents relating to the Settlements, the  
10 Notice, and electronic claim filing capability. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § II.B; Intuit Settlement §  
11 II.B.) At least thirty days prior to the Final Approval Hearing, the Claims Administrator will file  
12 with the Court an Affidavit of Compliance with Notice Requirements. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement §  
13 II.E; Intuit Settlement § II.E.)

14 Class members will have until forty-five days from the date the Notice period begins  
15 (established by the first day upon which the Claims Administrator provides mail and e-mail  
16 Notice to Class Members ["Notice date"]) to opt-out (the "Opt-Out Deadline") of the proposed  
17 Settlements. (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § II.D; Intuit Settlement § II.D.) Any Class member who  
18 wishes to be excluded (opt out) from the Settlement Class must send a written Request for  
19 Exclusion to the Claims Administrator on or before the close of the Opt-Out Deadline.  
20 (Lucas/Pixar Settlement § II.D; Intuit Settlement § II.D.)

21 The content of the Proposed Class Notice fully complies with due process and Rule 23.  
22 ((Lucas/Pixar Settlement, Ex. B; Intuit Settlement, Ex. B.) It provides the definition of the Class,  
23 describes the nature of the action, including the class claims, and explains the procedure for  
24 making comments and objections. The Class Notice describes the terms of the Settlements with  
25 the Settling Defendants, informs Class members regarding the plan of allocation, and advises  
26 Class members that the funds will be distributed at a future time to be determined. The Class  
27 Notice provides specifics regarding the date, time, and place of the final approval hearing, and  
28 informs class members that they may enter an appearance through counsel. The Class Notice also

1 informs Class members how to exercise their rights and make informed decisions regarding the  
2 proposed Settlements, and tells them that if they do not opt out, the judgment will be binding  
3 upon them. The Class Notice further informs the Class about the payment of Plaintiffs'  
4 attorneys' fees and costs. Courts have approved Class Notice even when they have provided only  
5 general information about a settlement. *See, e.g., Mendoza v. United States*, 623 F.2d 1338, 1351  
6 (9th Cir. 1980) ("very general description of the proposed settlement" satisfies standards).

## 7 **VII. ALLOCATION AND USE OF SETTLEMENT FUNDS**

8 A plan of allocation of class settlement funds is subject to the "fair, reasonable and  
9 adequate" standard that applies to approval of class settlements. *In re Citric Acid Antitrust Litig.*,  
10 145 F. Supp. 2d 1152, 1154 (N.D. Cal. 2001). "A plan of allocation that reimburses class  
11 members based on the extent of their injuries is generally reasonable." *In re Oracle Sec. Litig.*,  
12 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21593, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. June 18, 1994). Here, as explained above,  
13 Plaintiffs propose that the Settlement Fund be allocated based upon total base salary received  
14 during the conspiracy period. Such *pro rata* distributions are "cost-effective, simple and  
15 fundamentally fair." *In re Airline Ticket Comm'n Antitrust Litig.*, 953 F. Supp. 280, 285 (D.  
16 Minn. 1997).

17 As noted above, the Settlements specify that Class Counsel may seek attorneys' fees,  
18 expenses and costs, which are to be paid solely from the Settlement Fund. (Lucas/Pixar  
19 Settlement § VII; Intuit Settlement § VII.) Plaintiffs propose that distribution of the Settlement  
20 Fund to Class members be deferred until the termination of the case, or until additional  
21 settlements occur, because piecemeal distribution of each settlement is expensive, time-  
22 consuming, and likely to cause confusion among Class members. Deferring distribution of  
23 settlement proceeds to Class members in the case of a partial settlement is common practice,  
24 particularly where, as here, certain Defendants settle while other Defendants remain. *See, e.g.,*  
25 *Manual for Complex Litigation*, Fourth § 21.651 (2004) ("Funds from the settlements typically  
26 are placed in income-producing trusts established by class counsel for the benefit of the class and  
27 held until the case is fully resolved."). In the meantime, the Settlement Fund will earn interest for  
28 the benefit of the Class.

1 At the time of filing of the motion for final approval, Class Counsel intend to move the  
2 Court for an order authorizing payment of incurred litigation expenses and costs totaling  
3 \$3,593,000 million, and anticipated (future) trial-related costs and administrative expenses  
4 associated with the Settlement in an amount not to exceed \$1,200,000. (See Dermody Decl.  
5 ¶ 15.) At that time, no attorneys' fees will be sought from the Settlement Fund.<sup>3</sup> Should the  
6 Court approve both the Settlement and Class Counsel's request, the residual amount in the  
7 Settlement Fund will bear interest and remain for the benefit of the Class, and will be distributed  
8 to the Class, less Court-approved attorneys' fees and administrative expenses, at a later time. No  
9 portion of the Settlement Fund will be distributed absent an order of this Court.

10 A request for reimbursement of incurred and anticipated litigation expenses and costs is  
11 routinely granted in many other large, complex class actions involving multiple defendants. See  
12 *Manual* § 13.21 ("Such partial settlements may provide funds needed to pursue the litigation.");  
13 *In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.*, No. 07-01827, Dkt. No. 2474 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18,  
14 2011) (advancing \$3 million from settlement fund to be used for future litigation expenses)  
15 (Dermody Decl., Ex. 2); *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig.*, No. 02-  
16 md-01486, Dkt. No. 1315 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 14, 2007) (authorizing disbursement of \$2 million from  
17 two settlement funds for advancement of litigation expenses) (Dermody Decl., Ex. 3); *In re High*  
18 *Pressure Laminates Antitrust Litig.*, No. 00-MD-1368, Dkt. No. 215 (S.D.N.Y. July 14, 2004)  
19 (granting \$4 million distribution from settlement fund to reimburse class counsel for expenses  
20 incurred and to be incurred on behalf of the Class) (Dermody Decl., Ex. 4); *In re Cal. Micro*  
21 *Devices Sec. Litig.*, 965 F. Supp. 1327, 1337 (N.D. Cal. 1997) (approving class counsel's request  
22 for \$1.5 million litigation fund "[b]ecause the remainder of the case appears to have potential  
23 value for the class") (Dermody Decl., Ex. 5); *In re Brand Name Prescription Drug Litig.*, No. 94

---

24  
25 <sup>3</sup> To be clear, Class Counsel do not intend to waive their right to seek attorneys' fees on the two  
26 partial Settlements before the Court, but rather to defer their request. In the meantime, the  
27 proposed Notice will inform Settlement Class members that Class Counsel will seek up to a third  
28 of the fund in fees. The payment of attorneys' fees, and the payment of Service Awards to the  
Class Representatives, will be deferred along with distributions of settlement proceeds to  
Settlement Class Members.

1 C 897, MDL No. 997 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 18, 1998) (granting \$6 million disbursement “for  
2 advancement of trial preparation expenses of Class Counsel”) (Dermody Decl., Ex. 6).

3 **VIII. THE COURT SHOULD SET A FINAL APPROVAL HEARING SCHEDULE**

4 The last step in the settlement approval process is the final approval hearing, at which the  
5 Court may hear all evidence and argument necessary to evaluate the proposed settlement. At that  
6 hearing, proponents of the Settlements may explain and describe their terms and conditions and  
7 offer argument in support of approval and members of the Class, or their counsel, may be heard in  
8 support of or in opposition to the Settlements. Plaintiffs propose the following schedule for final  
9 approval of the Settlements:

| <u>Event</u>   | <u>Date</u>   |
|--|---|
| Notice of Class Action Settlement to Be Mailed and Posted on Internet  | Within 14 days of receipt of Class member information from Settling and Non-Settling Defendants |
| Class Counsel Motion for Costs, and Motion for Plaintiffs’ Service Awards  | To be completed 31 days from Notice Date  |
| Opt-Out and Objection Deadline   | 45 days from Notice Date  |
| Postmark/Filing Deadline for Filing Claims   | 120 Days from Notice Date   |
| Claims Administrator Affidavit of Compliance with Notice Requirements  | To be filed 30 days prior to the Final Approval Hearing   |
| Motions for Final Approval   | To be filed 21 days prior to Final Approval Hearing   |
| Replies in Support of Motions for Final Approval, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs, and Service Awards to Be Filed by Class Counsel | To be filed 7 days prior to Final Approval Hearing  |
| Final Approval Hearing   | _____, 2014   |

25 **IX. CONCLUSION**

26 Based on the foregoing, plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court: (1) certify a  
27 Settlement Class; (2) preliminarily approve the Settlements; (3) approve the proposed plan of  
28



1 notice to the Class; (4) appoint Heffler Claims Group as the Claims Administrator; (5) set a  
2 schedule for disseminating notice to Class members, as well as deadlines to comment on or object  
3 to the Settlements; and (6) schedule a hearing pursuant to Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
4 Procedure to determine whether the proposed Settlements are fair, reasonable, and adequate and  
5 should be finally approved.

6 Respectfully submitted,

7 Dated: September 21, 2013 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP

8  
9 By:           /s/ Kelly M. Dermody            
          Kelly M. Dermody

10 Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607)  
11 Kelly M. Dermody (State Bar No. 171716)  
12 Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260)  
13 Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 199643)  
14 Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 250298)  
15 Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255928)  
16 Lisa J. Cisneros (State Bar No. 251473)  
17 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor  
18 San Francisco, California 94111-3339  
19 Telephone: 415.956.1000  
20 Facsimile: 415.956.1008

21 JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.

22 By:           /s/ Joseph R. Saveri            
          Joseph R. Saveri

23 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
24 Lisa J. Leebove (State Bar No. 186705)  
25 James G. Dallal (State Bar No. 277826)  
26 JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC  
27 255 California, Suite 450  
28 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415. 500.6800  
Facsimile: 415. 395.9940

*Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiff Class*