	Case 3:17-md-02801-JD Document 13	50 Filed 07/17/20 Page 1 of 5		
1 2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION			
14 15	IN RE CAPACITORS ANTITRUST LITIGATION	MDL No. 3:17-md-02801-JD Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD		
16	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE AS TO DEFENDANT PANASONIC CORPORATION		
17	ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS			
18 19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	[Proposed] Final Judgment of Dismissal with Prejudice as MDL No. 3:17-md-02801-JD; Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD	to Defendant Panasonic Corporation;		
	1910 INU. 3.17-1110-02001-JD, Case INU. 5:14-CV-05204-JD			

Case 3:17-md-02801-JD Document 1350 Filed 07/17/20 Page 2 of 5

1 This matter has come before the Court to determine whether there is any cause why this 2 Court should not enter Final Judgment as to Panasonic Corporation ("Panasonic"). The Court, 3 having reviewed (1) the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiffs Michael Brooks, CAE Sound, 4 Steve Wong, Toy-Knowlogy Inc., AGS Devices, Ltd., J&O Electronics, Nebraska Dynamics, 5 Inc., Angstrom, Inc., MakersLED, and In Home Tech Solutions, Inc., individually and on behalf of the Indirect Purchaser Classes they seek to represent, on the one hand, and Panasonic, on the 6 other hand, dated October 4, 2018 ("Settlement Agreement"), (2) Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs' 7 8 Motion for Final Approval of Settlements with ELNA, Matsuo, Nichicon, and Panasonic, (3) the 9 pleadings and other papers on file in this Action, and (4) the statements of counsel and the 10 parties, finds no just reason to delay the entry of Final Judgment under Federal Rule of Civil 11 Procedure ("Rule") 54(b). Accordingly, the Court directs entry of Judgment, which shall 12 constitute a final adjudication of the above-captioned action ("Action") on the merits as to 13 Panasonic in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

14

15

Good cause appearing therefore:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, AJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

16 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation, the actions
17 within this litigation, and the parties to the Settlement Agreements, including all members of the
18 Settlement Classes.

19 2. For purposes of this Judgment, except as otherwise set forth herein, the Court
20 adopts and incorporates the definitions contained in the Settlement Agreement as though they
21 were fully set forth in this Final Judgment. Specifically, "Classes," as defined in the Settlement
22 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 in the United States who, during the period from January 1, 2002 to February 28, 2014, purchased one or more Film Capacitor(s) from a

28

23

24

25

26

27

Case 3:17-md-02801-JD Document 1350 Filed 07/17/20 Page 3 of 5

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, and 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 6 validly excluded from the Classes. Such persons and entities are not included in or bound by this 7 8 Judgment. Such persons and entities are not entitled to any recovery of the settlement proceeds obtained in connection with the Settlement Agreement. 9
- 10

1

2

3

4

5

4. The Court hereby dismisses on the merits and with prejudice IPPs' claims against Panasonic, with each party to bear their own costs and attorneys' fees, except as provided in the 11 Settlement Agreement. 12

13

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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 14 directly or indirectly, any claim against the Releasees, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, in 15 this or any other jurisdiction arising out of, or related to, any of the Released Claims. 16

6. The Releasees are hereby and forever released from all Released Claims as 17 defined in the Settlement Agreement. 18

Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court hereby 19 7. retains continuing jurisdiction over: 20

- a. implementation of these settlements and any distribution to members of the Settlement Classes 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

[Proposed] Final Judgment of Dismissal with Prejudice as to Defendant Panasonic Corporation; MDL No. 3:17-md-02801-JD; Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD

1	f. all parties to the Action and Releasing Parties, for the purpose of enforcing		
2	and administering the Settlement Agreement and the mutual releases and other		
3	documents contemplated by, or executed in connection with, the Agreement.		
4	8. This document constitutes a final judgment and separate documents for purposes		
5	of Rule 58(a).		
6	9. The Court finds that, pursuant to Rule 54(a) and (b), Final Judgment should be		
7	entered and further finds that there is no just reason for delay in the entry of Final Judgment, as		
8	to the parties to the Settlement Agreements. Accordingly, the Clerk is hereby directed to enter		
9	Final Judgment.		
10			
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
12			
13	Dated: July 17, 2020		
14	JAMES DONATO United states District Judge		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	[Proposed] Final Judgment of Dismissal with Prejudice as to Defendant Panasonic Corporation;		
	MDL No. 3:17-md-02801-JD; Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD 3		

1

2

EXHIBIT A

Requests for Exclusion from Panasonic Settlement

3	Name	Exclusion Request Timely
4	Jeanne Pogorzelski	Yes
5	Bruce Young	Yes
	Rick Smith	Yes
6	Jonathan C. Neisch	Yes
<u>_</u>	Erik M. Sauber	Yes
7	Donald G. Becker	Yes
8	William B. Higinbotham	Yes
	Mike Svela	Yes
9	Perry Jennings	Yes
	Larry Kiser	Yes
0	Ed Polakoff	Yes
1	Michael Gillette	Yes
	AssetGenie, Inc dba AGiRepair	Yes
2	Dell Inc on behalf of itself and its wholly-owned subsidiaries	Yes
3	Eleanor Mae Wolf	Yes
	Jeff Hoffman	Yes
4	Greg Bower	Yes
5	Michael DeSoto	Yes
	Pyramid One, Inc	Yes
6	DeSoto Labs, Inc.	Yes
<u>_</u>	Stanley W Vikla	Yes
7	James M. Tylman, Sr.	Yes
8	Bourgeois & Associates, Inc	Yes
Ŭ	Burge Trucking	Yes
9	Group Spectral	Yes
	Jacob Swary	Yes
0	Tech 22	Yes
21	Panasonic Automotive Systems Company of	Yes
2	America, Division of Panasonic Corporation of North America	
3		
4		
5		
6		
27		
28		
	Proposed] Final Judgment of Dismissal with Prejudice as to Defendan MDL No. 3:17-md-02801-JD; Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD	t Panasonic Corporation;

1