	Case 3:14-cv-03264-JD	Jocument 2696	Filed 07/17/20	Page 1 of 5
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
	S	AN FRANCISCO	DIVISION	
	RE CAPACITORS ANTITI		MDL No. 3:17-m Case No. 3:14-cv	
	IS DOCUMENT RELATES	TO:	DISMISSAL WI	INAL JUDGMENT OF TH PREJUDICE AS TO IATSUO ELECTRIC

1 | 2 | C | 3 | T | 4 | C | 5 | E | 6 | a | 7 | M | P | 9 | a | 10 | C | 11 | R

14

12

13

1516

17 18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28

This matter has come before the Court to determine whether there is any cause why this Court should not enter Final Judgment as to Defendant Matsuo Electric Co., Ltd. ("Matsuo"). The Court, having reviewed (1) the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiffs Michael Brooks, CAE Sound, Steve Wong, Toy-Knowlogy Inc., AGS Devices, Ltd., J&O Electronics, Nebraska Dynamics, Inc., Angstrom, Inc., MakersLED, and In Home Tech Solutions, Inc., individually and on behalf of the Indirect Purchaser Class they seek to represent, on the one hand, and Matsuo, on the other hand, dated March 5, 2019 ("Settlement Agreement"), (2) Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Settlements with ELNA, Matsuo, Nichicon, and Panasonic, (3) the pleadings and other papers on file in this Action, and (4) the statements of counsel and the parties, finds no just reason to delay the entry of Final Judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Rule") 54(b). Accordingly, the Court directs entry of Judgment, which shall constitute a final adjudication of the above-captioned action ("Action") on the merits as to Matsuo in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

Good cause appearing therefore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, AJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

- The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation, the actions within this litigation, and the parties to the Settlement Agreements, including all members of the Settlement Class.
- 2. For purposes of this Judgment, except as otherwise set forth herein, the Court adopts and incorporates the definitions contained in the Settlement Agreement as though they were fully set forth in this Final Judgment. Specifically, "Class," as defined in the Settlement Agreement, means:

All persons and entities in the United States who, during the period from April 1, 2002 to February 28, 2014, purchased one or more Electrolytic Capacitor(s) from a distributor (or from an entity other than a Defendant) that a Defendant or alleged co-conspirator manufactured. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their parent companies, subsidiaries and Affiliates, any co-conspirators, Defendants' attorneys in this case, federal government entities and instrumentalities, states and their subdivisions, all judges assigned to this case, all jurors in this case, and all persons and entities who directly purchased Capacitors from Defendants.

3. Those persons and entities identified in the list attached hereto as **Exhibit A** are validly excluded from the Class. Such persons and entities are not included in or bound by this Judgment. Such persons and entities are not entitled to any recovery of the settlement proceeds obtained in connection with the Settlement Agreement.

- 4. The Court hereby dismisses on the merits and with prejudice IPPs' claims against Matsuo, with each party to bear their own costs and attorneys' fees, except as provided in the Settlement Agreement.
- 5. All persons and entities who are Releasors under the terms of the Settlement Agreement are hereby barred and enjoined from commencing, prosecuting, or continuing, either directly or indirectly, any claim against the Releasees, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, in this or any other jurisdiction arising out of, or related to, any of the Released Claims.
- 6. The Releasees are hereby and forever released from all Released Claims as defined in the Settlement Agreement.
- 7. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court hereby retains continuing jurisdiction over:
 - a. implementation of these settlements and any distribution to members of the
 Settlement Class pursuant to further orders of this Court;
 - b. disposition of the Settlement Fund;
 - c. determining attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, interest and Class Representative incentive awards;
 - d. the Action until Final Judgment contemplated hereby has become effective;
 - e. hearing and ruling on any matters relating to the plan of allocation of settlement proceeds; and
 - f. all parties to the Action and Releasing Parties, for the purpose of enforcing and administering the Settlement Agreement and the mutual releases and other documents contemplated by, or executed in connection with, the Agreement.
- 8. This document constitutes a final judgment and separate documents for purposes of Rule 58(a).

Case 3:14-cv-03264-JD Document 2696 Filed 07/17/20 Page 4 of 5

JAMES DONATO
United tates District Judge

EXHIBIT A

Requests for Exclusion from Matsuo Settlement

<u>Name</u>	Exclusion Request Timely
Jeanne Pogorzelski	Yes
Bruce Young	Yes
Rick Smith	Yes
Jonathan C. Neisch	Yes
Erik M. Sauber	Yes
Donald G. Becker	Yes
William B. Higinbotham	Yes
Mike Svela	Yes
Perry Jennings	Yes
Larry Kiser	Yes
Ed Polakoff	Yes
Michael Gillette	Yes
AssetGenie, Inc dba AGiRepair	Yes
Dell Inc on behalf of itself and its wholly-owned	Yes
subsidiaries	
Eleanor Mae Wolf	Yes
Jeff Hoffman	Yes
Greg Bower	Yes
Michael DeSoto	Yes
Pyramid One, Inc	Yes
DeSoto Labs, Inc.	Yes
Stanley W Vikla	Yes
James M. Tylman, Sr.	Yes
Burge Trucking	Yes
Group Spectral	Yes
Jacob Swary	Yes
Tech 22	Yes
Panasonic Automotive Systems Company of	Yes
America, Division of Panasonic Corporation of	
North America	