

1 Daniel Feinberg (SBN No. 135983)
2 FEINBERG, JACKSON,
3 WORTHMAN, WASOW LLP
4 2030 Addison Street, Suite 500
5 Berkeley, CA 94704
6 Telephone: (510) 269-7998
7 Fax: (510) 269-7994

8 Michelle C. Yau (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 Caroline E. Bressman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC
11 1100 New York Ave. NW • Suite 800
12 Washington, DC 20005
13 Telephone: (202) 408-4600
14 Fax: (202) 408-4699

15 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

10
11
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
14

15 Linna Chea, on behalf of the Lite Star, Inc.
16 Employee Stock Ownership Plan,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 LITE STAR ESOP COMMITTEE, B-K
20 LIGHTING, INC., NATHAN SLOAN,
21 KATHLEEN A. HAGEN, KATHLEEN A.
22 HAGEN, as legal successor to DOUGLAS
W. HAGEN, ESTATE OF DOUGLAS W.
HAGEN, MIGUEL PAREDES, and
PRUDENT FIDUCIARY SERVICES, LLC,
a California Limited Liability Company,

23 Defendants.

24 No: 1:23-CV-00647-SAB

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
2510
2511
2512
2513
2514
2515
2516
2517
2518
2519
2520
2521
2522
2523
2524
2525
2526
2527
2528
2529
2530
2531
2532
2533
2534
2535
2536
2537
2538
2539
2540
2541
2542
2543
2544
2545
2546
2547
2548
2549
2550
2551
2552
2553
2554
2555
2556
2557
2558
2559
2560
2561
2562
2563
2564
2565
2566
2567
2568
2569
2570
2571
2572
2573
2574
2575
2576
2577
2578
2579
2580
2581
2582
2583
2584
2585
2586
2587
2588
2589
2590
2591
2592
2593
2594
2595
2596
2597
2598
2599
25100
25101
25102
25103
25104
25105
25106
25107
25108
25109
25110
25111
25112
25113
25114
25115
25116
25117
25118
25119
25120
25121
25122
25123
25124
25125
25126
25127
25128
25129
25130
25131
25132
25133
25134
25135
25136
25137
25138
25139
25140
25141
25142
25143
25144
25145
25146
25147
25148
25149
25150
25151
25152
25153
25154
25155
25156
25157
25158
25159
25160
25161
25162
25163
25164
25165
25166
25167
25168
25169
25170
25171
25172
25173
25174
25175
25176
25177
25178
25179
25180
25181
25182
25183
25184
25185
25186
25187
25188
25189
25190
25191
25192
25193
25194
25195
25196
25197
25198
25199
25200
25201
25202
25203
25204
25205
25206
25207
25208
25209
25210
25211
25212
25213
25214
25215
25216
25217
25218
25219
25220
25221
25222
25223
25224
25225
25226
25227
25228
25229
25230
25231
25232
25233
25234
25235
25236
25237
25238
25239
25240
25241
25242
25243
25244
25245
25246
25247
25248
25249
25250
25251
25252
25253
25254
25255
25256
25257
25258
25259
25260
25261
25262
25263
25264
25265
25266
25267
25268
25269
25270
25271
25272
25273
25274
25275
25276
25277
25278
25279
25280
25281
25282
25283
25284
25285
25286
25287
25288
25289
25290
25291
25292
25293
25294
25295
25296
25297
25298
25299
252100
252101
252102
252103
252104
252105
252106
252107
252108
252109
252110
252111
252112
252113
252114
252115
252116
252117
252118
252119
252120
252121
252122
252123
252124
252125
252126
252127
252128
252129
252130
252131
252132
252133
252134
252135
252136
252137
252138
252139
252140
252141
252142
252143
252144
252145
252146
252147
252148
252149
252150
252151
252152
252153
252154
252155
252156
252157
252158
252159
252160
252161
252162
252163
252164
252165
252166
252167
252168
252169
252170
252171
252172
252173
252174
252175
252176
252177
252178
252179
252180
252181
252182
252183
252184
252185
252186
252187
252188
252189
252190
252191
252192
252193
252194
252195
252196
252197
252198
252199
252200
252201
252202
252203
252204
252205
252206
252207
252208
252209
252210
252211
252212
252213
252214
252215
252216
252217
252218
252219
252220
252221
252222
252223
252224
252225
252226
252227
252228
252229
252230
252231
252232
252233
252234
252235
252236
252237
252238
252239
252240
252241
252242
252243
252244
252245
252246
252247
252248
252249
252250
252251
252252
252253
252254
252255
252256
252257
252258
252259
252260
252261
252262
252263
252264
252265
252266
252267
252268
252269
252270
252271
252272
252273
252274
252275
252276
252277
252278
252279
252280
252281
252282
252283
252284
252285
252286
252287
252288
252289
252290
252291
252292
252293
252294
252295
252296
252297
252298
252299
2522100
2522101
2522102
2522103
2522104
2522105
2522106
2522107
2522108
2522109
2522110
2522111
2522112
2522113
2522114
2522115
2522116
2522117
2522118
2522119
2522120
2522121
2522122
2522123
2522124
2522125
2522126
2522127
2522128
2522129
2522130
2522131
2522132
2522133
2522134
2522135
2522136
2522137
2522138
2522139
2522140
2522141
2522142
2522143
2522144
2522145
2522146
2522147
2522148
2522149
2522150
2522151
2522152
2522153
2522154
2522155
2522156
2522157
2522158
2522159
2522160
2522161
2522162
2522163
2522164
2522165
2522166
2522167
2522168
2522169
2522170
2522171
2522172
2522173
2522174
2522175
2522176
2522177
2522178
2522179
2522180
2522181
2522182
2522183
2522184
2522185
2522186
2522187
2522188
2522189
2522190
2522191
2522192
2522193
2522194
2522195
2522196
2522197
2522198
2522199
2522200
2522201
2522202
2522203
2522204
2522205
2522206
2522207
2522208
2522209
2522210
2522211
2522212
2522213
2522214
2522215
2522216
2522217
2522218
2522219
2522220
2522221
2522222
2522223
2522224
2522225
2522226
2522227
2522228
2522229
25222210
25222211
25222212
25222213
25222214
25222215
25222216
25222217
25222218
25222219
25222220
25222221
25222222
25222223
25222224
25222225
25222226
25222227
25222228
25222229
252222210
252222211
252222212
252222213
252222214
252222215
252222216
252222217
252222218
252222219
252222220
252222221
252222222
252222223
252222224
252222225
252222226
252222227
252222228
252222229
2522222210
2522222211
2522222212
2522222213
2522222214
2522222215
2522222216
2522222217
2522222218
2522222219
2522222220
2522222221
2522222222
2522222223
2522222224
2522222225
2522222226
2522222227
2522222228
2522222229
25222222210
25222222211
25222222212
25222222213
25222222214
25222222215
25222222216
25222222217
25222222218
25222222219
25222222220
25222222221
25222222222
25222222223
25222222224
25222222225
25222222226
25222222227
25222222228
25222222229
252222222210
252222222211
252222222212
252222222213
252222222214
252222222215
252222222216
252222222217
252222222218
252222222219
252222222220
252222222221
252222222222
252222222223
252222222224
252222222225
252222222226
252222222227
252222222228
252222222229
2522222222210
2522222222211
2522222222212
2522222222213
2522222222214
2522222222215
2522222222216
2522222222217
2522222222218
2522222222219
2522222222220
2522222222221
2522222222222
2522222222223
2522222222224
2522222222225
2522222222226
2522222222227
2522222222228
2522222222229
25222222222210
25222222222211
25222222222212
25222222222213
25222222222214
25222222222215
25222222222216
25222222222217
25222222222218
25222222222219
25222222222220
25222222222221
25222222222222
25222222222223
25222222222224
25222222222225
25222222222226
25222222222227
25222222222228
25222222222229
252222222222210
252222222222211
252222222222212
252222222222213
252222222222214
252222222222215
252222222222216
252222222222217
252222222222218
252222222222219
252222222222220
252222222222221
252222222222222
252222222222223
252222222222224
252222222222225
252222222222226
252222222222227
252222222222228
252222222222229
2522222222222210
2522222222222211
2522222222222212
2522222222222213
2522222222222214
2522222222222215
2522222222222216
2522222222222217
2522222222222218
2522222222222219
2522222222222220
2522222222222221
2522222222222222
2522222222222223
2522222222222224
2522222222222225
2522222222222226
2522222222222227
2522222222222228
2522222222222229
25222222222222210
25222222222222211
25222222222222212
25222222222222213
25222222222222214
25222222222222215
25222222222222216
25222222222222217
25222222222222218
25222222222222219
25222222222222220
25222222222222221
25222222222222222
25222222222222223
25222222222222224
25222222222222225
25222222222222226
25222222222222227
25222222222222228
25222222222222229
252222222222222210
252222222222222211
252222222222222212
252222222222222213
252222222222222214
252222222222222215
252222222222222216
252222222222222217
252222222222222218
252222222222222219
252222222222222220
252222222222222221
252222222222222222
252222222222222223
252222222222222224
252222222222222225
252222222222222226
252222222222222227
252222222222222228
252222222222222229
2522222222222222210
2522222222222222211
2522222222222222212
2522222222222222213
2522222222222222214
2522222222222222215
2522222222222222216
2522222222222222217
2522222222222222218
2522222222222222219
2522222222222222220
2522222222222222221
2522222222222222222
2522222222222222223
2522222222222222224
2522222222222222225
2522222222222222226
2522222222222222227
2522222222222222228
2522222222222222229
25222222222222222210
25222222222222222211
25222222222222222212
25222222222222222213
25222222222222222214
25222222222222222215
25222222222222222216
25222222222222222217
25222222222222222218
25222222222222222219
25222222222222222220
25222222222222222221
25222222222222222222
25222222222222222223
25222222222222222224
25222222222222222225
25222222222222222226
25222222222222222227
25222222222222222228
25222222222222222229
252222222222222222210
252222222222222222211
252222222222222222212
25222222

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I.	INTRODUCTION	1
2	II.	BACKGROUND	2
3	A.	Claims Alleged in the Complaint.....	2
4	B.	Terms of the Settlement	3
5	C.	Procedural History	3
6	D.	Settlement Notice and Independent Fiduciary Review	4
7	(1)	Notice and Settlement Administration.....	4
8	(2)	Independent Fiduciary Report.....	5
9	III.	ARGUMENT	6
10	A.	The Settlement provides adequate notice to all Class Members.....	7
11	B.	The Settlement should be considered fair, adequate, and reasonable.	8
12	(1)	The strength of plaintiff's case, in light of the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation favors final approval.....	9
13	(2)	The risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial is neutral.....	10
14	(3)	The amount offered in settlement is fair.	10
15	(4)	The extent of discovery completed and the stage of proceedings favors final approval.	11
16	(5)	The experience and views of counsel favor final approval.....	12
17	(6)	The reactions of the class support final approval.....	13
18	C.	The Settlement satisfies the <i>Bluetooth</i> factors, supporting final approval.....	14
19	(1)	Class Counsel is seeking a proportionate distribution of the settlement.	14
20	(2)	The Settlement does not include a "clear sailing" provision.	14
21	(3)	The Settlement does not revert fees to the defendant.	15
22	IV.	CONCLUSION.....	15
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		Page(s)
1	Cases	
2	<i>Adoma v. Univ. of Phoenix, Inc.</i> , 913 F. Supp. 2d 964 (E.D. Cal. 2012).....	11
3		
4	<i>Arredondo v. Sw. & Pac. Specialty Fin., Inc.</i> , No. 118CV01737DADSKO, 2022 WL 2052681 (E.D. Cal. June 7, 2022).....	10
5		
6	<i>Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Sols. Corp.</i> , 297 F.R.D. 431 (E.D. Cal. 2013)	13
7		
8	<i>Briseño v. Henderson</i> , 998 F.3d 1014 (9th Cir. 2021).....	7, 14
9		
10	<i>Carlin v. DairyAmerica, Inc.</i> , 380 F. Supp. 3d 998 (E.D. Cal. 2019).....	12, 13
11		
12	<i>Churchill Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.</i> , 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004).....	8
13		
14	<i>Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle</i> , 955 F.2d 1268 (9th Cir. 1992).....	7
15		
16	<i>Conkright v. Frommert</i> , 559 U.S. 506 (2010).....	9
17		
18	<i>DeFazio v. Hollister Employee Share Ownership Tr.</i> , 612 Fed. Appx. 439 (9th Cir. 2015).....	10
19		
20	<i>DeFazio v. Hollister, Inc.</i> , 854 F.Supp.2d 770 (E.D. Cal. 2012).....	9
21		
22	<i>Foster v. Adams & Assocs., Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 4924849 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2021).....	9
23		
24	<i>Foster v. Adams and Assocs., Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 4305538 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2019)	12
25		
26	<i>Gamino v. KPC Healthcare Holdings, Inc.</i> , 2023 WL 3325190 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2023)	11
27		
28	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998).....	7, 9
	<i>Hurtado v. Rainbow Disposal Co.</i> , 2021 WL 79350 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2021)	10

1	<i>In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liability Litig.,</i> 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011).....	7, 14, 15
2		
3	<i>In re Syncor ERISA Litig.,</i> 516 F.3d 1095 (9th Cir. 2008).....	9
4		
5	<i>In re Tableware Antitrust Litig.,</i> 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	10
6		
7	<i>Johnson v. Shaffer,</i> No. 2:12-cv-1059-KJM-AC, 2016 WL 3027744 (E.D. Cal. May 27, 2016)	9
8		
9	<i>Kim v. Allison,</i> 8 F.4th 1170 (9th Cir. 2021).....	7
10		
11	<i>Knapp v. Art.com, Inc.,</i> 283 F. Supp. 3d 823 (N.D. Cal. 2017)	9
12		
13	<i>Linney v. Cuellar Alaska P'ship,</i> 151 F.3d 1234 (9th Cir. 1998).....	11
14		
15	<i>Martinez v. Knight Transport., Inc.,</i> No. 1:16-CV-01730-SKO, 2023 WL 5917989 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2023)	10
16		
17	<i>Mendoza v. Tucson Sch. Dist. No. 1,</i> 623 F.2d 1338 (9th Cir. 1980).....	8
18		
19	<i>Monterrubio v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.,</i> 291 F.R.D. 443 (E.D. Cal. 2013)	11
20		
21	<i>National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative v. DIRECTV, Inc.,</i> 221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004)	13
22		
23	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n,</i> 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982).....	7
24		
25	<i>Ontiveros v. Zamora,</i> 303 F.R.D. 356 (E.D. Cal. 2014)	13
26		
27	<i>Pfeifer v. Wawa, Inc.,</i> No. 16-CV-00497, 2018 WL 4203880 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 31, 2018).....	9
28		
	<i>Protective Comm. For Indep. Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson,</i> 390 U.S. 414 (1968).....	10
	<i>Rodriguez v. W. Publ'g Corp.,</i> 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009).....	10
	<i>Rush v. GreatBanc Tr. Co.,</i> 2025 WL 975214 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2025).....	9

1	<i>Silber v. Mabon</i> , 18 F.3d 1449 (9th Cir. 1994).....	8
2		
3	<i>Torchia v. W.W. Grainger, Inc.</i> , 304 F.R.D. 256 (E.D. Cal. 2014)	12
4		
5	<i>Urakhchin v. Allianz Asset Mgmt. of Am., L.P.</i> , 2018 WL 3000490 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2018).....	11
6		
7	<i>Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.</i> , 529 F.2d 943 (9th Cir. 1976).....	6
8		
9	<i>Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing</i> , 266 F.R.D. 482 (E.D. Cal. 2010)	12
10		
11	<i>Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc.</i> , 266 F.R.D. 482 (E.D. Cal. 2010)	13
12		
13	<i>Walsh v. Bowers</i> , 561 F.Supp.3d 973 (D. Haw. 2021)	9
14		
15	<i>Weinberger v. Great N. Nekoosa Corp.</i> , 925 F.2d 518 (1st Cir. 1991)	14
16		
17	Statutes	
18	ERISA § 405(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1105(a)	2
19		
20	ERISA § 406, 29 U.S.C. § 1106	2
21		
22	ERISA § 410(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1110	2
23		
24	ERISA § 502(a), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)	2
25		
26		
27	Other Authorities	
28	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)	6, 14

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Plaintiff Linna Chea, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, respectfully
 3 moves this Court to grant final approval of the settlement reached in this case between Plaintiff
 4 and Defendants B-K Lighting, Inc. (“B-K” or the “Company”), Nathan Sloan, Kathleen A.
 5 Hagen, Kathleen A. Hagen, as legal successor to Douglas W. Hagen, Estate of Douglas W.
 6 Hagen, the Lite Star ESOP Committee (collectively, “Hagen Defendants”), and Miguel Paredes
 7 and Prudent Fiduciary Services, LLC (collectively, “PFS”) (B-K, Hagen Defendants and PFS
 8 hereinafter collectively, “Defendants”).

9 Pursuant to the Settlement, Defendants have collectively agreed to a Settlement Amount¹
 10 comprised of a \$1.5 million Cash Payment and a \$1 million principal reduction on the debt the
 11 ESOP owes to the Company (and the Company’s corresponding debt to the selling shareholder)
 12 from the 2017 ESOP transaction (less deductions for attorneys’ fees, costs, settlement
 13 administration and a service award). In exchange, the Class will dismiss with prejudice its claims
 14 asserted in the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 59) (“AC”) against Defendants. The Class will also
 15 release Defendants from any claims relating to or arising out of the allegations of the AC.

16 Given the uncertainty of establishing liability and the value of the settlement consideration,
 17 the Settlement represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate result for the Class. Among the relevant
 18 factors showing the Settlement is fair and reasonable are: (1) the Settlement is commensurate with
 19 the strength of Plaintiffs’ claims, and the Settlement’s \$2.25 million value falls well within the
 20 range of reasonableness given the risk, expenses, and complexity of further litigation; (2) Class
 21 counsel conducted rigorous investigation and damages analysis, sufficient to enable Class Counsel
 22 to evaluate the claims and defenses in the action and to recommend this Settlement; and (3) no
 23 Class Member has objected to the Settlement. Furthermore, there is no evidence that collusion
 24 influenced parties’ negotiation; and an Independent Fiduciary has reviewed and approved the
 25 Settlement on behalf of the Plan. The Court should therefore grant final approval.

26
 27 ¹ Unless otherwise indicated, capitalized terms have the same meaning as set forth in the Settlement
 28 Agreement, filed concurrently herewith as Ex. A to the Declaration of Daniel Feinberg.

1 **II. BACKGROUND**

2 **A. Claims Alleged in the Complaint**

3 On December 31, 2017, PFS and Paredes caused the Lite Star Employee Stock Ownership
 4 Plan (the “Plan” or “ESOP”) to purchase 100% of the shares of B-K Lighting, Inc. from Douglas
 5 W. Hagen (the “ESOP Transaction”). The ESOP Transaction was financed primarily through a
 6 loan from Mr. Hagen to the ESOP, which the Company assumed in exchange for a corresponding
 7 promissory note from the ESOP to B-K Lighting (“Internal Note”). AC ¶ 38. Plaintiff Linna Chea
 8 alleges that the ESOP Transaction was for more than fair market value. *Id.* ¶¶ 23-39, 42. Chea, a
 9 former employee of the Company and a participant in the ESOP, sought to enforce her rights and
 10 those of other participants in the Plan under ERISA to recover the losses incurred by the Plan. *Id.*
 11 ¶ 11. The claims against Defendants are as follows:

- 12 • **Count I:** Engaging in a prohibited transaction with a party-in-interest, in violation
 13 of ERISA § 406(a)(1)(A) and (a)(1)(D), against PFS and the Estate of Douglas
 14 Hagen and Kathleen Hagen as legal successor the Estate of Douglas Hagen.
- 15 • **Count II:** Engaging in a prohibited transaction, in violation of ERISA § 406(b),
 16 against the Estate of Douglas Hagen and Kathleen Hagen as legal successor the
 17 Estate of Douglas Hagen.
- 18 • **Count III:** Breach of fiduciary duty against PFS Defendants.
- 19 • **Count IV:** Failure to monitor an appointed fiduciary, against the Hagen Defendants.
- 20 • **Count V:** Co-fiduciary liability pursuant to ERISA § 405(a)(1) and (a)(3), against
 21 Defendants Nathan Sloan, the Estate of Douglas Hagen, Kathleen Hagen, and
 22 Kathleen Hagen as legal successor to the Estate of Douglas Hagen.
- 23 • **Count VI:** For knowing participation in fiduciary breaches and prohibited
 24 transactions, under ERISA § 502(a)(3), against Defendants Nathan Sloan, the Estate
 25 of Douglas Hagen, Kathleen Hagen, and Kathleen Hagen as legal successor to the
 26 Estate of Douglas Hagen.
- 27 • **Count VII:** Violation of ERISA § 410(a) and a breach of fiduciary duty of loyalty,
 28 against all Defendants.

1 Defendants do not admit any wrongdoing of any kind regarding the ESOP Transaction,
 2 deny any wrongdoing or liability associated with Plaintiff's claims, and have vigorously defended
 3 themselves in this Lawsuit.

4 **B. Terms of the Settlement**

5 The full terms of the proposed Settlement are set forth in the Settlement Agreement ("Set.
 6 Agmt."). ECF No. 79. In short, the Settlement provides \$2.25 million of estimated aggregate
 7 economic value to the ESOP and its participants (prior to deductions for attorneys' fees, costs,
 8 settlement administration and a service award). Set. Agmt. §§ I.A, VI.4, VII.1 First, the
 9 Defendants will cause their insurers to pay \$1,500,000 (the Cash Payment) into a Qualified
 10 Settlement Fund and distributed to Class members under an approved Plan of Allocation. Set.
 11 Agmt. § VI.2; Declaration of Daniel Feinberg ("Feinberg Decl.") ¶ 10. Second, the principal
 12 amount owed on the Seller Note will be reduced by \$1 million, with a corresponding reduction in
 13 the Internal Note. *Id.* at § VI.4. Without this concession, B-K would be obligated to pay this \$1
 14 million. *Id.* at I.R.

15 In exchange for the Settlement Amount from Defendants and satisfaction of the conditions
 16 required by the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiff, the Class, and the Plan will release any claims
 17 which were or could have been asserted in the Lawsuit that arise from the facts and claims alleged
 18 in the Amended Complaint. Set. Agmt § X. The Released Claims are set forth in full in the
 19 Settlement Agreement. *Id.*

20 The Plan of Allocation was filed with Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Settlement
 21 Approval at ECF No. 79-4. To clarify the Parties' intent regarding the operation of the Settlement
 22 Fund allocation, the Parties make the following clarification to the Plan of Allocation at ¶ 4:
 23 4. Allocation of the Settlement Fund. Each Authorized Claimant shall be allocated a pro rata
 24 share of the Net Settlement Amount based upon the number of vested B-K Lighting, Inc. shares
 25 allocated to that Authorized Claimant's ESOP account *on or before* 12/31/2024, as a fraction of
 26 the total number of vested B-K Lighting, Inc. shares allocated to all Authorized Claimants' ESOP
 27 accounts as of 12/31/2024. Feinberg Decl. ¶ 11.

28 **C. Procedural History**

1 Plaintiff filed this lawsuit on April 27, 2023. ECF No. 1. Defendants moved to dismiss on
 2 July 6, 2023. ECF No. 23 (PFS Defendants), ECF No. 24 (Hagen Defendants), ECF No. 25 (B-K
 3 Lighting). On January 25, 2024, Magistrate Judge Boone issued Findings and Recommendations
 4 (F&R), recommending denying the Motions to Dismiss except as to one count of the complaint.
 5 ECF No. 44. The three Defendant groups objected to the F&R. ECF Nos. 47, 48, 49. District
 6 Judge Thurston largely adopted the F&R and granted the Motions to Dismiss only with respect to
 7 Count VII with leave to amend and denied the remainder of the Motions to Dismiss. ECF No. 56.
 8 Plaintiff filed the First Amended Complaint on October 24, 2024 (ECF No. 59), which all
 9 Defendants Answered in November 2024. ECF Nos. 60, 61, 62. Shortly thereafter, Defendants
 10 proposed that the parties engage in mediation. Feinberg Decl. ¶ 4.

11 In preparation for the mediation, Plaintiff requested and Defendants produce a targeted set
 12 of documents regarding the 2017 ESOP Transaction, including the Transaction binder, several
 13 years of financial statements and ESOP valuations, trustee minutes, board minutes, and other
 14 relevant documents. *Id.* at ¶¶ 5-6. Plaintiff's counsel also consulted with an expert on ESOP
 15 valuations. *Id.* at ¶ 7. The parties ultimately participated in a full day mediation on June 3, 2025,
 16 with mediator Maxine Aaronson, where they executed a written Confidential Settlement Term
 17 Sheet. *Id.* at ¶ 9. The Court granted preliminary approval to the settlement on October 16, 2025.
 18 ECF No. 84.

19 Consistent with the Court's orders, Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator timely
 20 sent notice of the Settlement to the Class. *See* Declaration of Analytics, LLC In Support of
 21 Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval ("Analytics Decl."). Class Counsel filed a motion for
 22 attorneys' fees and litigation expenses on December 3, 2025, which also included a request for a
 23 service award. ECF No. 86. As of submission, no Class Members filed an objection with the
 24 Settlement Administrator. Analytics Decl. ¶ 15.

25 **D. Settlement Notice and Independent Fiduciary Review**

26 **(1) Notice and Settlement Administration**

27 The Court-approved Class Notice was distributed to the Class by the Settlement
 28 Administrator, Analytics Consulting, LLC ("Analytics"), on November 6, 2025. Analytics Decl.

¶ 8. For any Notices returned with a forwarding address, Analytics processed a re-mail of the Notice to the updated address. *Id.* ¶ 9. For any Notices returned as undeliverable, Analytics used a skip trace to ascertain the Class Member's current mailing address, and where possible, Analytics re-mailed the Notice to the current mailing address. *Id.* ¶ 10. To date, the Class Notice reached 204 of the 205 Class Members. *Id.* ¶ 11. Thus, the Class Notice was successfully transmitted to over 99% of Class Members, *id.*, which is above the targeted 70% to 95% "reach" for class notices. *See* Federal Judicial Center, Judges' Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide (Jan. 1, 2010), <https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/2012/NotCheck.pdf>.

The Class Notice, attached to the Analytics Declaration as Exhibit A, is clear and straightforward, providing Class Members with key information about Class Members' rights and how to object to the Settlement or the requested attorneys' fees and expense reimbursement, settlement administration expenses, or service awards; the deadline to object to the same; the date of the Fairness Hearing; and the terms of the Settlement Agreement. On November 6, 2025, the Settlement Administrator published the settlement website: www.LiteStarESOPSettlement.com. Analytics Decl. ¶ 12. The website explains the Settlement, important dates, and links to key documents, including the Class Notice and all Court filings related to the Settlement. *Id.* Analytics has documented a total of 91 unique visitors to the website as of January 6, 2026. *Id.* The Class Notice also provided Class Members with a toll-free number, staffed by live agents, if Class Members have additional questions. *Id.* ¶ 13. As of January 6, 2026, the call center received 19 calls and one email related to the Settlement, and Class Counsel has received no inquiry concerning the settlement. Analytics Decl. ¶¶ 13-14; Feinberg Decl. ¶ 13. To date, no Class Member has objected to, or articulated any concerns to, Class Counsel with any aspect of the Settlement. Feinberg Decl. ¶ 14.

25 (2) Independent Fiduciary Report

26 The Settlement is subject to a written determination by an Independent Fiduciary.
 27 Settlement Agreement § XI. The Independent Fiduciary's review is set forth in a Department of
 28 Labor regulation, Prohibited Transaction Exemption 2003-39 (the "PTE 2003-39"), which applies

1 to “Class Exemption for the Release of Claims and Extensions of Credit in Connection with
 2 Litigation.” 68 Fed. Reg. 75,632 (Dec. 31, 2003), *as amended*, 75 Fed. Reg. 33, 830 (June 15,
 3 2010). To meet the requirements of this Department of Labor regulation and to satisfy § XI of the
 4 Settlement Agreement, the Independent Fiduciary must review and consider whether to approve
 5 the Settlement, including (i) the scope of the release of claims, (ii) the Settlement recovery and
 6 the amount of any attorneys’ fee award or any other sums to be paid from such recovery, (iii) the
 7 Plan of Allocation, (iv) whether the Settlement terms are reasonable, and (v) whether the
 8 Settlement complied with all relevant requirements set forth in PTE 2003-39. *Id.* at 33,836-837.

9 The parties engaged Fiduciary Counselors, Inc. (“FCI”) to review the Settlement
 10 Agreement and provide a report. FCI has served as an independent fiduciary under ERISA for
 11 over 50 class action litigation settlements and has provided independent advice to a variety of
 12 stakeholders. *See* Fiduciary Counselors, Inc., Litigation Settlements Brochure,
 13 <https://www.fiduciarycounselors.com/assets/FCI-Litigation-Settlements-Brochure.pdf> (last
 14 accessed January 5, 2026).

15 FCI issued its written report on January 2, 2026, attached as Exhibit 1 to the Feinberg
 16 Declaration. In so issuing, FCI reviewed the relevant materials, interviewed counsel for all
 17 parties, and determined that the Settlement Agreement met the requirements of PTE 2003-39.
 18 Thus, FCI approved and authorized the Settlement on behalf of the ESOP. Feinberg Decl., Ex. A
 19 at 1.

20 **III. ARGUMENT**

21 The public interest favors settlement, particularly in class actions where substantial
 22 resources can be conserved by avoiding the time, cost, and rigors of formal litigation. *Van*
 23 *Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.*, 529 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1976). Final approval of a proposed class
 24 action settlement will be granted where it is established that the proposed settlement is “fair,
 25 reasonable, and adequate.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2). In determining whether to grant final
 26 approval, the Court does not “reach any ultimate conclusions on the contested issues of fact and
 27 law which underlie the merits of the dispute, for it is the very uncertainty of outcome in litigation
 28 and avoidance of wasteful and expensive litigation that induce consensual settlements.” *Class*

1 *Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1291 (9th Cir. 1992) (quoting *Officers for Justice v.*
 2 *Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982).

3 In this Circuit, a district court examining whether a proposed settlement comports
 4 with Rule 23(e)(2) is guided by the eight “*Churchill* factors,” viz., “(1) the strength
 5 of the plaintiff’s case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of
 6 further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial;
 7 (4) the amount offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery completed and the
 8 stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the presence
 9 of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of the class members of the
 10 proposed settlement.”

11 *Kim v. Allison*, 8 F.4th 1170, 1178 (9th Cir. 2021) (quoting *In re Bluetooth Headset Products*
 12 *Liability Litigation*, 654 F.3d 935, 946 (9th Cir. 2011)).² The relative importance of any particular
 13 factor will depend upon the nature of the claims, the types of relief sought, and the unique facts
 14 and circumstances presented by the individual case. *Class Plaintiffs*, 955 F.2d at 1291.

15 In addition, even where a class has been certified courts must scrutinize settlements to
 16 ensure they are “not the product of collusion among the negotiating parties.” *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d
 17 at 947 (citation omitted); *Briseño v. Henderson*, 998 F.3d 1014, 1023 (9th Cir. 2021) (explaining
 18 that *Bluetooth*’s “heightened inquiry applies to *post-class certification* settlements”). The
 19 *Bluetooth* court identified the following factors as signs of collusion: (1) “when counsel receive a
 20 disproportionate distribution of the settlement, or when the class receives no monetary
 21 distribution but class counsel are amply rewarded,” (2) “when the parties negotiate a ‘clear
 22 sailing’ arrangement providing for the payment of attorneys’ fees separate and apart from class
 23 funds,” and (3) “when the parties arrange for fees not awarded to revert to defendants rather than
 24 be added to the class fund.” *Bluetooth*, 654 F. 3d at 947.

25 As explained below, the relevant factors support granting final approval to this Settlement.

26 **A. The Settlement provides adequate notice to all Class Members.**

27 Adequate notice of the class action settlement must be provided under Federal Rule of
 28 Civil Procedure Rule 23(e). *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1025 (9th Cir. 1998).
 “Notice is satisfactory if it ‘generally describes the terms of the settlement in sufficient detail to

2 As no governmental participant is involved, factor (7) is not discussed below.

1 alert those with adverse viewpoints to investigate and to come forward and be heard.”” *Churchill*
 2 *Vill., L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004) (quoting *Mendoza v. Tucson Sch.*
 3 *Dist. No. 1*, 623 F.2d 1338, 1352 (9th Cir. 1980)). The Court need not ensure all members receive
 4 actual notice, only that “best practicable notice” is given. *Silber v. Mabon*, 18 F.3d 1449, 1453-54
 5 (9th Cir. 1994).

6 The Court previously reviewed the notice provided in this case, and found it to be
 7 satisfactory, apart from two corrections concerning the courthouse address included on the
 8 Agreement and value of the Settlement for class members included in the notice. ECF No. 84 at
 9 18. The Court approved the form and requirements of the Class Notice on October 16, 2025,
 10 finding that sending the Class Notice to all Class members by U.S. Mail and posting on a website
 11 maintained by the Settlement Administrator is the “best notice practicable under the
 12 circumstances.” ECF No. 84 at 18. Class Counsel subsequently made the requested corrections to
 13 the Class Notice. Feinberg Decl. ¶ 12.

14 Following the Court’s preliminary approval, the appointed Settlement Administrator,
 15 Analytics Consulting, LLC (“Analytics”), received the names and addresses of Settlement Class
 16 Members from Counsel and mailed the Court-approved Notice on November 6, 2025. Analytics
 17 Decl. ¶¶ 6, 8. In total, only one of the 205 Notices was ultimately undeliverable, despite
 18 Analytics’ best efforts to track down updated contact information. *Id.* at ¶ 11. Nevertheless, the
 19 Settlement Administrator reports an over 99% delivery success rate. *Id.* No Class Members
 20 objected to the Settlement. *Id.* at ¶ 15.

21 Given all but one Class Members received actual notice of the settlement and no Class
 22 Member objected to the Settlement, the Court should find adequate notice has been provided,
 23 satisfying Rule 23(e).

24 **B. The Settlement should be considered fair, adequate, and reasonable.**

25 The seven *Churchill* factors are non-exclusive, and each need not be discussed if they are
 26 irrelevant to a particular case. *Churchill*, 361 F.3d at 576 n.7. Instead, “It is the settlement taken
 27 as a whole, rather than the individual component parts, that must be examined for overall
 28

1 fairness.” *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026. Together, these factors show that the Settlement here is fair,
2 adequate, and reasonable, and should therefore be approved by the Court.

(1) The strength of plaintiff's case, in light of the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation favors final approval.

5 Judicial policy strongly favors settlements, “particularly where complex class action
6 litigation is concerned.” *In re Syncor ERISA Litig.*, 516 F.3d 1095, 1101 (9th Cir. 2008). “In most
7 situations, unless the settlement is clearly inadequate, its acceptance and approval are preferable
8 to lengthy and expensive litigation with uncertain results.” *Knapp v. Art.com, Inc.*, 283 F. Supp.
9 3d 823, 832 (N.D. Cal. 2017) (citation omitted); *see also Johnson v. Shaffer*, No. 2:12-cv-1059-
10 KJM-AC, 2016 WL 3027744, at *4 (E.D. Cal. May 27, 2016) (citation omitted) (“[A]pproval of
11 settlement is preferable to lengthy and expensive litigation with uncertain results.”).

12 ERISA is an “enormously complex” statute, and many ERISA matters also involve facts
13 that are “exceedingly complicated.” *Conkright v. Frommert*, 559 U.S. 506, 509 (2010). “ERISA
14 actions are notoriously complex cases, and ESOP cases are often cited as the most complex of
15 ERISA cases.” *Pfeifer v. Wawa, Inc.*, No. 16-CV-00497, 2018 WL 4203880, at *7 (E.D. Pa. Aug.
16 31, 2018). The Court affirmed this exact sentiment at preliminary approval. *See* ECF No. 79 at 13
17 (quoting *Foster v. Adams & Assocs., Inc.*, 2021 WL 4924849, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2021)).
18 While Plaintiff believes she has a strong case and would ultimately prevail, Plaintiff recognizes
19 the expense, risk, and length of continued proceedings necessary to prosecute the litigation
20 against Defendants through trial and appeal.

21 Several defense verdicts entered by courts after trial in a complex ERISA fiduciary breach
22 actions illustrate the substantial risk of losing at trial. *E.g., Walsh v. Bowers*, 561 F.Supp.3d 973
23 (D. Haw. 2021) (entering defense verdict in ESOP case after one week trial); *Rush v. GreatBanc*
24 *Tr. Co.*, 2025 WL 975214 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2025) (entering defense verdict in ESOP case after
25 14-day trial). Even when plaintiffs successfully prove at trial that defendants breached their
26 fiduciary duties, courts have sometimes concluded that those breaches resulted in no harm or loss
27 to the Plan or the participants. *DeFazio v. Hollister, Inc.*, 854 F.Supp.2d 770, 816 (E.D. Cal.
28 2012) (finding after trial that “the fiduciaries’ breaches of their duties did not cause a material

1 harm to the Plan and plaintiffs [were] not entitled to damages”), *aff’d sub nom. DeFazio v.*
 2 *Hollister Employee Share Ownership Tr.*, 612 Fed. Appx. 439 (9th Cir. 2015). While Class
 3 Counsel have successfully tried ERISA cases and do not shy away from trial, they fully
 4 appreciate the risks involved.

5 For these reasons, the risks of litigation weigh in favor of granting final approval of
 6 parties’ settlement.

7 **(2) The risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial is
 8 neutral.**

9 “[W]here there appear no specific risks to maintaining class action litigation, the Court
 10 need not consider this factor for settlement purposes.” *Hurtado v. Rainbow Disposal Co.*, 2021
 11 WL 79350, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2021). But even where there are no specific risks in prospect,
 12 “[a] district court may decertify a class at any time.” *Rodriguez v. W. Publ’g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948,
 13 966 (9th Cir. 2009). The Settlement Class has been certified. ECF No. 84 at 10. While Defendants
 14 could move to decertify the Class, there is no reason to presume that such a motion would be
 15 meritorious. Thus, this factor is neutral.

16 **(3) The amount offered in settlement is fair.**

17 When analyzing the fourth *Churchill* factor, the court “compare[s] the terms of the
 18 compromise with the likely rewards of litigation.” *Martinez v. Knight Transportation, Inc.*, No.
 19 1:16-CV-01730-SKO, 2023 WL 5917989 at *6 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2023) (citing *Protective
 20 Comm. For Indep. Stockholders of TMT Trailer Ferry, Inc. v. Anderson*, 390 U.S. 414, 424-25
 21 (1968)). “To determine whether a settlement falls within the range of possible approval a court
 22 must focus on substantive fairness and adequacy, and consider plaintiffs expected recovery
 23 balanced against the value of the settlement offer.” *Arredondo v. Sw. & Pac. Specialty Fin., Inc.*,
 24 No. 118CV01737DADSKO, 2022 WL 2052681 (E.D. Cal. June 7, 2022) (quoting *In re
 25 Tableware Antitrust Litig.*, 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078, 1080 (N.D. Cal. 2007)).

26 As explained on preliminary approval, Class Counsel estimates the maximum potential
 27 combined recovery for the Class against Defendants was approximately \$3 million to \$5 million.
 28 ECF No. 84 at 13. The total recovery for the Class under the Settlement amounts to \$2.25 million

1 of aggregate economic value to the ESOP and its participants. *Id.* The Defendants will pay \$1.5
2 million to the Class and reduce the ESOP's debt by \$1 million. The total economic value of the
3 Settlement is about \$2.25 million, which is approximately \$11,000 per Class Member before the
4 deduction of cost and fees. Feinberg Decl. ¶¶ 10-11. As a result of the Settlement, the Class will
5 recover approximately 45% of the estimated maximum damages. ECF No. 84 at 13. The Court
6 previously held that this amount fell within the range of approval based on the risks of continued
7 litigation. *Id.* at 14.

8 In comparison, the total relief provided by the Settlement exceeds amounts approved in
9 other complex ERISA class action litigation in this Circuit. *See, e.g., Gmino v. KPC Healthcare*
10 *Holdings, Inc.*, 2023 WL 3325190, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2023) (finding ESOP class
11 settlement that recovered approximately 7% of the estimated total damages “fair and adequate”);
12 *Foster v. Adams & Assocs., Inc.*, 2022 WL 425559, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2022) (approving
13 ESOP class settlement that recovered 28.5% of estimated total loss); *Urakhchin v. Allianz Asset*
14 *Mgmt. of Am., L.P.*, 2018 WL 3000490, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2018)) (approving ERISA class
15 action settlement representing between 25.5% and 78.9% of losses).

16 Particularly considering the risks of further litigation, this factor thus weighs in favor of
17 approving the Settlement.

(4) The extent of discovery completed and the stage of proceedings favors final approval.

This factor considers whether “the parties have sufficient information to make an informed decision about settlement.” *Linney v. Cuellar Alaska P’ship*, 151 F.3d 1234, 1239 (9th Cir. 1998). The Court presumes a settlement is fair when parties engage in “sufficient discovery and genuine arms-length negotiation.” *Adoma v. Univ. of Phoenix, Inc.*, 913 F. Supp. 2d 964, 977 (E.D. Cal. 2012). Even informal discovery is sufficient for approval of a class action settlement, “as long as discovery allowed parties to form a clear view of the strengths and weaknesses of their cases.” *Monterrubio v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, 291 F.R.D. 443, 454 (E.D. Cal. 2013).

26 This Settlement resulted from vigorous, non-collusive bargaining facilitated by a seasoned
27 mediator and conducted by skilled counsel. Specifically, the parties engaged in settlement
28

1 negotiation only after Plaintiff's Counsel sought and obtained thousands of pages of documents
 2 from Defendants and consulted with an ESOP valuation expert. Feinberg Decl. ¶ 6. This informal
 3 discovery allowed Plaintiff's counsel to assess the relative merits of Plaintiff's claims and
 4 Defendants' asserted defenses and weigh the risks of continued litigation against the potential
 5 recovery to the Class. *Id.* ¶ 8. The actual terms of the Settlement were agreed upon after hard-
 6 fought negotiations over the course of an all-day, in-person mediation aided by Maxine Aaronson,
 7 a mediator experienced in ERISA class action disputes, on June 3, 2025, in Dallas, Texas. *Id.* ¶ 9.
 8 Only at the end of the day did Plaintiff and Defendants agree to settle for the Settlement Amount
 9 and execute a Term Sheet. *Id.* Class Counsel therefore had full understanding of the facts, the
 10 claims, the likely defenses sufficient to analyze the likelihood of success or loss.

11 The fact that experienced counsel has been actively engaged in the litigation for over two
 12 years and has conducted the necessary informal discovery indicates the non-collusive nature of
 13 the settlement. *Id.* ¶ 3. The assistance of a neutral, experienced mediator in the settlement
 14 negotiations further evidences the non-collusive nature of the negotiations. This factor thus favors
 15 final approval of the Settlement.

16 **(5) The experience and views of counsel favor final approval.**

17 The Ninth Circuit recognizes that "parties represented by competent counsel are better
 18 positioned than courts to produce a settlement that fairly reflects each party's expected outcome in
 19 the litigation." *Carlin v. DairyAmerica, Inc.*, 380 F. Supp. 3d 998, 1013 (E.D. Cal. 2019) (citation
 20 omitted). Thus, Courts grant "great weight . . . to the recommendation of counsel . . . who are
 21 most closely acquainted with the facts of the underlying litigation." *Vasquez v. Coast Valley
 22 Roofing*, 266 F.R.D. 482, 490 (E.D. Cal. 2010).

23 Here, the "recommendations of counsel are entitled to significant weight and support
 24 approval of the settlement." *Torchia v. W.W. Grainger, Inc.*, 304 F.R.D. 256, 270 (E.D. Cal.
 25 2014). Counsel are "experienced class actions lawyers who specialize in employee benefit cases."
 26 *Foster v. Adams and Assocs., Inc.*, 2019 WL 4305538, at *6 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2019); ECF No.
 27 79 at 8-9. Based on their experience, Class Counsel are highly qualified to assess the risks of
 28 continued litigation and weigh them against the merits of the Settlement. *See id.* Taking into

1 consideration the record developed during this litigation and the results achieved in similar cases,
 2 Class Counsel believe the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. Feinberg Decl. ¶ 16. This
 3 factor therefore supports approval of the Settlement.

4 **(6) The reactions of the class support final approval.**

5 “The reactions of the members of a class to a proposed settlement is a proper
 6 consideration for the trial court.” *Vasquez v. Coast Valley Roofing, Inc.*, 266 F.R.D. 482, 490
 7 (E.D. Cal. 2010) (quoting *National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative v. DIRECTV, Inc.*,
 8 221 F.R.D. 523, 528 (C.D. Cal. 2004)). “The absence of a large number of objections to a class
 9 settlement raises a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class settlement action are
 10 favorable to the class members.” *Carlin*, 380 F. Supp. 3d at 1013. A court may infer that a class
 11 action settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable “where the settlement agreement enjoys
 12 overwhelming support from the class.” *Barbosa v. Cargill Meat Sols. Corp.*, 297 F.R.D. 431, 448
 13 (E.D. Cal. 2013).

14 Here, “the reaction of the class members [to] the settlement is positive[.]” *Barbosa*, 297
 15 F.R.D. at 448. Pursuant to the Court’s Preliminary Approval Order, the Settlement Administrator
 16 provided the Class Notice by U.S. mail on November 6, 2025 to all Class Members identified
 17 through data provided by Defendants. Analytics Decl. ¶¶ 7-8. The Settlement Administrator
 18 received seven Class Notices returned as undeliverable but was able to locate an updated address
 19 and re-mail the Class Notice to six of those Class Members. *Id.* at ¶ 10. A settlement website was
 20 also created for class members to be able to obtain additional information about the settlement. *Id.*
 21 at ¶ 12. The website includes a copy of a non-personalized Class Notice, a clear summary of
 22 essential case information, and copies of various Court documents. *Id.* As the Class Notice states,
 23 the deadline to object to the Settlement was January 5, 2026. At the time of filing, no Class
 24 Members objected to the Settlement. *Id.* ¶ 15. The absence of objections demonstrates support for
 25 the Settlement Agreement. *Ontiveros v. Zamora*, 303 F.R.D. 356, 371 (E.D. Cal. 2014), *Barbosa*,
 26 297 F.R.D. at 297 (the fact that no class member objected to the settlement supports approval of
 27 the settlement).

28

1 In conclusion, the relevant *Churchill* factors demonstrate the Settlement is fair, adequate,
 2 and reasonable.

3 **C. The Settlement satisfies the *Bluetooth* factors, supporting final approval.**

4 Consideration of the *Churchill* factors alone is not sufficient to survive appellate review,
 5 as revised Rule 23(e) requires district courts to apply the *Bluetooth* factors to determine whether
 6 collusion may have impacted class members' settlement outcomes. *Briseño*, 998 F.3d at 1026.
 7 Here, consideration of the *Bluetooth* factors clearly weighs in favor of approval of the Settlement
 8 as there is no evidence of collusion between the negotiating parties.

9 **(1) Class Counsel is seeking a proportionate distribution of the settlement.**

10 Class Counsel seeks \$500,000, representing 22% of the common fund, as attorney's fees.
 11 Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Attorney's Fees, ECF No. 86 at 3. This figure is
 12 substantially less than Class Counsel's lodestar fees (\$773,999.00 as of November 1, 2025), does
 13 not constitute a "disproportionate distribution of the settlement," *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 947, and
 14 fairly compensates Class Counsel for the excellent result they obtained for the Class and the risks
 15 they took in pursuing this case. Indeed, the vast majority of the Settlement will be distributed to
 16 the Class. *Compare Briseño*, 998 F.3d at 1026 (finding a "gross disparity in distribution of funds"
 17 where class counsel received \$7 million and the class received less than \$1 million). As set forth
 18 in detail in Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees, attorneys are regularly awarded commensurate
 19 fees in similar cases. ECF No. 86 at 7-9. Moreover, unlike the settlement in *Bluetooth*, which
 20 provided no money to the class, Class Members will receive significant monetary benefits from
 21 the Settlement. Thus, this factor indicates no evidence of collusion between the parties.

22 **(2) The Settlement does not include a "clear sailing" provision.**

23 "[T]he very existence of a clear sailing provision increases the likelihood that class
 24 counsel will have bargained away something of value to the class." *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 948,
 25 (quoting *Weinberger v. Great N. Nekoosa Corp.*, 925 F.2d 518, 525 (1st Cir. 1991)). A "clear
 26 sailing" provision exists when a defendant expressly agrees not to oppose an award of attorney's
 27 fees up to an agreed upon amount. *See Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 947 (rejecting a settlement
 28 agreement in part because it included a clear sailing agreement in which defendants agreed not to

object to an award of attorneys' fees). The Settlement Agreement simply does not include a clear sailing provision. Thus, this factor does not signal collusion.

(3) The Settlement does not revert fees to the defendant.

“A kicker arrangement reverting unpaid attorneys’ fees to the defendant rather than to the class amplifies the danger of collusion already suggested by a clear sailing provision.” *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 949. Just as the Settlement Agreement does not include a clear sailing provision, it does not provide for unpaid fees to revert to the defendant. Set. Agmt. § VII.9. Instead, unclaimed net cash settlement proceeds will be redistributed amongst members of the Settlement Class. *Id.* at § VII.5-6. Any remaining residual funds after the second distribution are to be distributed to a *cy pres* recipient approved by the Court. *Id.* at VII.6. Consequently, the Settlement Agreement does not pose a risk of collusion.

In sum, the Settlement Agreement represents a proportionate fee arrangement for Class Counsel, free of provisions which could have indicated “class counsel have allowed pursuit of their own self-interests . . . to infect negotiations.” *Bluetooth*, 654 F.3d at 947.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court grant Class Counsel's Motion for Final Approval of the Proposed Settlement.

DATED: January 9, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Daniel Feinberg
Daniel Feinberg (SBN No. 135983)
FEINBERG, JACKSON, WORTHMAN
& WASOW, LLP
2030 Addison Street, Suite 500
Berkeley, CA 94704
Tel. (510) 269-7998
Fax (510) 269-7994
dan@feinbergjackson.com

Michelle C. Yau (admitted *pro hac vice*)

1 Caroline E. Bressman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PLLC
3 1100 New York Ave. NW, Suite 800
4 Washington, DC 20005
5 Tel. (202) 408-4600
6 Fax (202) 408-4699
7 myau@cohenmilstein.com
8 cbressman@cohenmilstein.com

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Settlement Class