

1 FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA (41059)  
CRAIG C. CORBITT (83251)  
2 CHRISTOPHER T. MICHELETTI (136446)  
ZELLE HOFMANN VOELBEL & MASON LLP  
3 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
4 Telephone: (415) 693-0700  
Facsimile: (415) 693-0770  
5 fscarpulla@zelle.com  
ccorbitt@zelle.com

6 *Lead and Liaison Counsel for*  
7 *Indirect Purchaser Class*

8  
9  
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
12 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

13 IN RE STATIC RANDOM ACCESS  
MEMORY (SRAM) ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION

Case No. 4:07-md-1819 CW  
MDL No. 1819

14  
15 **~~PROPOSED~~ FINAL JUDGMENT OF  
DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE AS TO THE  
SAMSUNG DEFENDANTS**

16 This Document Relates to:  
17 ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

Hearing Date: October 6, 2011  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Courtroom: 2, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken

1 This matter has come before the Court to determine whether there is any cause why this  
2 Court should not approve the settlement with the Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung  
3 Semiconductor, Inc., and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Defendants”) set forth in the  
4 settlement agreement (“Settlement”), dated October 4, 2010, relating to the above-captioned  
5 litigation, *In re Static Random Access Memory (SRAM) Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 4:07-md-1819  
6 CW (N.D. Cal.) (“Action”). The Court, after carefully considering all papers filed and proceedings  
7 held herein and otherwise being fully informed in the premises, has determined (1) that the  
8 Settlement should be approved, and (2) that there is no just reason for delay of the entry of this final  
9 Judgment approving the Settlement. Accordingly, the Court directs entry of Judgment which shall  
10 constitute a final adjudication of this case on the merits as to the parties to the Settlement. Good  
11 cause appearing therefor, it is:

12 **ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:**

- 13 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation, and all actions  
14 within this litigation and over the parties to the Settlement, including all members of the Class and  
15 the Defendants.
- 16 2. The definitions of terms set forth in the Settlement are incorporated hereby as though  
17 fully set forth in this Judgment.
- 18 3. The Court hereby finally approves and confirms the settlement set forth in the  
19 Settlement and finds that said settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable and adequate to the Class  
20 pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 21 4. Jimmy Malo, Florbel Segura and William F. Steigman have timely and validly  
22 requested exclusion from the Class and, therefore, are excluded. Such persons/entities are not  
23 included in or bound by this Final Judgment. Such persons/entities are not entitled to any recovery  
24 for the settlement proceeds obtained through the Settlement.
- 25 5. This Court hereby dismisses on the merits and with prejudice the Action, certified as  
26 a class action on November 25, 2009, and certified as a settlement class in the Court’s Order  
27 Granting Final Approval of the Settlement, in favor of each and all of the Defendants, with each  
28

1 party to bear their own costs and attorneys' fees (subject to any motion to be made by IP Plaintiffs'  
2 Class Counsel to seek attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, including expert fees and costs, and other  
3 such items from the Settlement Fund – as provided for in the Settlement).

4 6. All persons and entities who are Releasors are hereby barred and enjoined from  
5 commencing, prosecuting, or continuing any claims, demands, actions, suits, or causes of action, or  
6 otherwise seeking to establish liability, against any Samsung Releasee based, in whole or in part,  
7 upon any of the Released Claims or conduct at issue in the Released Claims (as defined and limited  
8 in the Settlement).

9 7. The Samsung Releasees are hereby and forever released and discharged with respect  
10 to any and all claims, demands, actions, suits, or causes of action which the Releasors had or have  
11 arising out of or related to any of the Released Claims (as defined and limited in the Settlement).

12 8. The notice given to the Class of the settlement set forth in the Settlement and other  
13 matters set forth therein was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual  
14 notice to all members of the Class who could be identified through reasonable efforts. Said notice  
15 provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including  
16 the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement, to all persons entitled to such notice, and said  
17 notice fully satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the  
18 requirements of due process.

19 9. Four objections (Cochran, Foligno, Aune and Hallford) to the Settlements were filed.  
20 All objections are hereby overruled on the grounds that the objectors have failed to submit proof or  
21 otherwise establish that they are members of the Class, and they therefore lack standing to challenge  
22 the Settlements. Additionally, the objections are otherwise without merit for the reasons set forth in  
23 IP Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Final Approval of Samsung and Cypress Settlements and  
24 Distribution Plan and as argued at the October 6, 2011 Fairness Hearing (the "Fairness Hearing"),  
25 and for the reasons stated by the Court at the Fairness Hearing.

1           10. Cochran and Foligno filed their objections on August 25, 2011. On August 29, 2011, IP  
2 Plaintiffs sought discovery from Cochran and Foligno regarding, inter alia, their membership in the  
3 Settlement Class and their standing to object to the Settlements, Plan of Distribution and request for  
4 attorneys' fees. Cochran and Foligno objected to the discovery, IP Plaintiffs moved to compel (see  
5 DE 1386-1 – 1386-4), and Cochran and Foligno opposed the motion (see DE 1391). On September  
6 23, 2011, this Court granted the motion to compel, and ordered Cochran and Foligno to appear for  
7 depositions and produce documents to IP Plaintiffs by October 3, 2011. DE 1393. Cochran and  
8 Foligno refused to comply with and thereby violated the Order. Neither Cochran nor Foligno, nor  
9 counsel representing them, appeared at the Fairness Hearing. Cochran's and Foligno's failure to  
10 appear for a deposition or otherwise provide the Court-ordered discovery provides a separate and  
11 alternative basis for overruling Cochran's and Foligno's objections, and the Court overrules the  
12 objections on that basis as well.

13           11. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court hereby retains  
14 continuing jurisdiction over: (a) implementation of this settlement and any distribution to Class  
15 Members pursuant to further orders of this Court; (b) disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) hearing  
16 and determining applications by IP Plaintiffs' Class Counsel for attorneys' fees, costs, expenses,  
17 including expert fees and costs, and other such items; (d) the Class Action until the final judgments  
18 contemplated hereby have become effective and each and every act agreed to be performed by the  
19 parties all have been performed pursuant to the Settlement; and (e) all parties to the Class Actions  
20 and Releasees for the purpose of enforcing and administering the Settlement and the mutual releases  
21 and other documents contemplated by, or executed in connection with the Settlement.

22           12. In the event that the settlement does not become effective in accordance with the  
23 terms of the Settlement, then the judgment shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and  
24 in such event, all orders entered and releases delivered in connection herewith shall be null and void  
25 and, except as otherwise provided in the Settlement, the parties shall be returned to their respective  
26 positions *ex ante*.

1           13.     The Court finds, pursuant to Rules 54(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil  
2 Procedure, that this Final Judgment should be entered and further finds that there is no just reason  
3 for delay in the entry of this Judgment, as a Final Judgment, as to the parties to the Settlement.  
4 Accordingly, the Clerk is hereby directed to enter Judgment forthwith.

5  
6           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7  
8 Dated:        October 14 , 2011



\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable Claudia Wilken  
Northern District of California  
District Court Judge  
Oakland Division