

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE RESISTORS ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:15-cv-03820-JD

This Documents Relates to:
DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

~~PROPOSED~~ FINAL JUDGMENT OF
DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE AS TO
DEFENDANTS KAMAYA ELECTRIC
CO. LTD, KAMAYA, INC., WAL SIN
TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION AND
WAL SIN TECHNOLOGY
CORPORATION, U.S.A.

1 This matter has come before the Court to determine whether a final judgment of dismissal
2 should be entered as to Defendants Kamaya Electric Co. Ltd and Kamaya, Inc. (together, “Kamaya
3 Defendants”) and Walsin Technology Corporation and Walsin Technology Corporation, U.S.A.
4 (together, “Walsin Defendants”) in light of the settlement with the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs
5 (“DPPs”). The Court, having reviewed the settlement agreement between DPPs and the Kamaya and
6 Walsin Defendants and DPPs’ Revised Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlements
7 (“Final Approval Motion”) (ECF No. 561), having held argument on said motions at two fairness
8 hearings, and finding no just reason for delay, hereby directs entry of Final Judgment under Federal
9 Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), which shall constitute a final adjudication of this case on the merits as
10 to members of the Settlement Class and the Kamaya and Walsin Defendants pursuant to the terms of
11 the Settlement Agreement Between Plaintiffs and the Kamaya and Walsin Defendants (“Settlement
12 Agreement”) (*see* ECF No. 561-2; Ex. D).

13 Good cause appearing therefore:

14 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:**

15 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation, and all actions
16 within this litigation (collectively, “Action”) and over the parties to the Settlement Agreement,
17 including all members of the Settlement Class and the Kamaya and Walsin Defendants.

18 2. For purposes of this Judgment, except as otherwise set forth herein, the Court adopts
19 and incorporates the definitions contained in the Settlement Agreement as though they were fully set
20 forth in this Final Judgment. Specifically, “Class,” as defined in the Settlement Agreement, means:

21 All persons in the United States who purchased linear
22 resistors (including through controlled subsidiaries, agents,
23 affiliates or joint ventures) directly from any Defendants, their
24 subsidiaries, agents, affiliates or joint ventures from July 9,
25 2003 through August 1, 2014 (the “Class Period”).

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

1 4. The Court finds the prerequisites to a class action under Rule 23(a) have been
2 satisfied for settlement purposes by each of the Settlement Class in that:

3 a. There are at least hundreds of putative members of the Settlement Class,
4 making joinder of all members impracticable;

5 b. There are questions of fact and law that are common to all members of the
6 Settlement Class;

7 c. The claim of the Class Representative is typical of those of the absent
8 members of the Settlement Class; and

9 d. Plaintiff Schuten Electronics, Inc. (“Class Representative”) has and will fairly
10 and adequately protect the interests of the absent members of the relevant Settlement Class
11 and has retained counsel experienced in complex antitrust class action litigation who have
12 and will continue to adequately advance the interests of the Settlement Class.

13 5. The Court has found that this Action may be maintained as a class action under Rule
14 23(b)(3) for settlement because: (i) questions of fact and law common to the members of the
15 Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting only the claims of individual members;
16 and (ii) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of
17 this controversy.

18 6. Pursuant to Rule 23(g), the Court hereby confirms that Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro
19 LLP and Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC are appointed as Settlement Class Counsel, and that
20 Plaintiff Schuten Electronics, Inc. is appointed to serve as Class Representative on behalf of the
21 Settlement Class.

22 7. Upon the Effective Date, all Releasing Parties shall be permanently barred and
23 enjoined from instituting, commencing, prosecuting or asserting any Released Claim against any of
24 the Released Parties as defined in the Settlement Agreement.

25 8. The Court has finally approved the settlement between the Class and Kamaya and
26 Walsin Defendants in the total amount of \$5,250,000, has found that said settlement is fair,
27 reasonable, an adequate pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
28

1 9. This Court hereby dismisses on the merits and with prejudice DPPs' claims and the
2 Action against the Kamaya and Walsin Defendants, with each party to bear its own costs and
3 attorneys' fees, except as provided in the Settlement Agreement.

4 10. Without affecting the finality of the Judgment in any way, this Court hereby retains
5 continuing jurisdiction over: (a) implementation of this settlement and any distribution to members
6 of the Settlement Class pursuant to further orders of this Court; (b) disposition of the Settlement
7 Fund; (c) determining attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and interest; (d) the Action until the Final
8 Judgment contemplated hereby has become effective and each and every act agreed to be performed
9 by the parties all have been performed pursuant to the Settlement Agreement; (e) hearing and ruling
10 on any matters relating to distribution of settlement proceeds; and (f) all parties to the Action and
11 Releasing Parties, for the purpose of enforcing and administering the Settlement Agreement and the
12 mutual releases and other documents contemplated by, or executed in connection with the
13 Agreement.

14 11. This document constitutes a final judgment and separate document for purposes of
15 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a).

16 12. The Court finds that, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(a) and (b), Final
17 Judgment should be entered, and further finds that there is no just reason for delay in the entry of
18 Final Judgment, as to the parties to the Settlement Agreement. Accordingly, the Clerk is hereby
19 directed to enter Final Judgment forthwith.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
22 DATED: April 23, 2020

23
24 
25 _____
26 HONORABLE JAMES DONATO
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28