| | Case 3:14-cv-00560-SI Document 18 | 32 Filed 09/02/16 Page 1 of 7 |
|----|---|--|
| | | |
| 1 | Richard M. Heimann (Cal. Bar No. 063607) | |
| 2 | rheimann@lchb.com Robert J. Nelson (Cal. Bar No. 132797) | |
| 3 | rnelson@lchb.com Nimish R. Desai (Cal. Bar No. 244953) | |
| 4 | ndesai@lchb.com LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNST | 'EIN, LLP |
| 5 | 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 | |
| 6 | Telephone: 415.956.1000 Facsimile: 415.956.1008 | |
| 7 | David M. Birka-White (Cal. Bar No. 85721) | |
| 8 | dbw@birka-white.com Mindy M. Wong (Cal. Bar No. 267820) | |
| 9 | mwong@birka-white.com BIRKA-WHITE LAW OFFICES | |
| 10 | 65 Oak Court Danville, CA 94526 Talanhana: (025) 362 0000 | |
| 11 | Telephone: (925) 362-9999 Facsimile: (925) 362-9970 | |
| 12 | Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Cla | SS |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | UNITED STAT | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| 15 | NORTHERN DIS | FRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 16 | SAN FRAN | CISCO DIVISION |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | MICHAEL ALLAGAS, ARTHUR RAY BRETT MOHRMAN, and BRIAN | Case No. 3:14-cv-00560-SI (EDL) |
| 19 | DICKSON, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, | [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION |
| 20 | Plaintiffs, | FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT |
| 21 | V. | |
| 22 | BP SOLAR INTERNATIONAL, INC., | |
| 23 | HOME DEPOT U.S.A., INC. and DOES 1-10, inclusive, | |
| 24 | Defendants. | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINAR APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMEN |

Case 3:14-cv-00560-SI Document 182 Filed 09/02/16 Page 2 of 7

Upon review and consideration of Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary
 Approval, the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement"), and all
 declarations and exhibits submitted therewith, which have been filed with the Court, it is hereby
 ORDERED and ADJUDGED as follows:

The parties have agreed to settle this action set forth in the proposed nationwide
 class action settlement agreement ("Settlement" or "Agreement"). This Court has jurisdiction
 over the subject matter and parties to this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2) and 28 U.S.C.
 § 1453.

2. 9 The Settlement, including all exhibits thereto, is preliminarily approved as fair, 10 reasonable, and adequate. The Plaintiffs, by and through their counsel, have investigated the 11 pertinent facts and law, have engaged in substantial motion practice and discovery, and have 12 evaluated the risks associated with continued litigation, trial, and/or appeal. The Court finds that 13 the Settlement was reached in the absence of collusion, is the product of informed, good-faith, 14 arm's-length negotiations between the parties and their capable and experienced counsel, and was 15 reached with the assistance of an experienced mediator. The Court further finds that the proposed 16 Class meets the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(3) and should 17 be certified for settlement purposes only; that the named Plaintiffs should be appointed as Class 18 Representatives; that the attorneys identified below should be appointed as Class Counsel; and 19 that it is appropriate to effectuate notice to the Class and to schedule a Fairness Hearing to assist 20 the Court in determining whether to grant final approval to the Settlement and enter a Final Order 21 and Judgment.

3. The Settlement Class includes all persons or entities in the United States who
purchased Class Panels, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, for installation on a property or
who purchased a property on which Class Panels had previously been installed and (in either
case), currently some or all of such Class Panels. Excluded from the Class are: (1) Defendants,
any entity in which they have a controlling interest, and such entity's legal representatives,
officers, directors, employees, assigns and successors; (2) the United States government and any
agency or instrumentality thereof; (3) the judge to whom this case is assigned and any member of

1300475.3

Case 3:14-cv-00560-SI Document 182 Filed 09/02/16 Page 3 of 7

1 the judge's immediate family; and (4) persons who timely and validly opt to exclude themselves 2 from the Settlement Class..

3 4. The Settlement confers substantial benefits upon the Settlement Class and avoids 4 the costs, uncertainty, delays, and other risks associated with continued litigation, trial, and likely 5 appeals. The Court finds that the Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness and, as 6 such, merits preliminary approval.

7 First, Defendants will contribute \$45.33 million into a common fund that a. 8 will be utilized to replace all FDK+ Panels, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, irrespective 9 of whether they show any sign of failure. This amount is intended to cover the removal and 10 disposal of the Class Panels, and purchase and installation of the replacement panels, based on a 11 cost of \$2.35 per watt. Claims will be paid until the fund is depleted.

12

Second, Defendants will fund the administration of a claims made program b. that entitles class members to a visual inspection of all Non-FDK+ Panels, as defined in the 13 14 Settlement Agreement, and will remove, replace, and dispose of those that have failed due to 15 junction box failure. If more than 20% of the Non-FDK+ panels on a property have failed due to 16 junction box failure, inclusive of any documented past failures (for example, in BP's warranty 17 database), the Settlement will fund the replacement of all remaining Non-FDK+ panels on the 18 property. If the Class Member does not receive full replacement following the initial inspection, 19 he or she will receive a free arc-fault detection inverter, fully installed, which is designed to 20 preemptively arrest any "arc-faults" in the panels. Finally, the Class Member remains eligible to 21 submit further claims while the program remains active (either three years or once the \$20 million 22 is depleted, whichever is earlier), and to obtain full replacement should the failure rate of panels 23 on the property exceed 20% pursuant to any such claims, subject only to a credit back to 24 Defendants for the cost of a new inverter if previously provided. After the claims made program 25 ends, Non-FDK+ Class Members will still be able to pursue warranty claims pursuant to 26 Defendant BP's standard warranty program, meaning that they will continue to get failed panels 27 replaced for the remainder of their warranties.

28

| 1 | c. Third, for any Class Members with large, non-residential systems (i.e., | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | more than 400 panels not used in a residential setting) ("LNR"), Defendants have agreed to enter | |
| 3 | negotiations to settle the claims, mediated by a Special Master or another mutually agreed person. | |
| 4 | If the negotiations do not resolve the Class Member's claims, a LNR Class Member remains free | |
| 5 | to opt out of the Settlement, notwithstanding the official opt-out deadline, but agrees not to | |
| 6 | commence class litigation against Defendants during this period of negotiations. | |
| 7 | 5. The Court finds that the prerequisites for a class action under Rules 23(a) and | |
| 8 | (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure have been satisfied, and therefore certifies the | |
| 9 | Settlement Class under Rules 23(a) and 23(b)(3) for settlement purposes only. | |
| 10 | a. Class Members are ascertainable based on BP solar panels' model numbers | |
| 11 | and serial numbers. | |
| 12 | b. The members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all members is | |
| 13 | impractical. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). The parties estimate that there are several thousands of | |
| 14 | Class Members, based on the hundreds of thousands of Class Panels still installed throughout the | |
| 15 | country. | |
| 16 | c. This litigation involves common class-wide issues that would drive the | |
| 17 | resolution of the claims absent the Settlement, satisfying the commonality and predominance | |
| 18 | requirements. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2), (b)(3); Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, 131 S. Ct. 2541, | |
| 19 | 2551 (2011). Common issues include the alleged common design defect, BP's alleged knowledge | |
| 20 | of the defect, and its alleged failure to disclose known information about the defect. | |
| 21 | d. The claims of the named Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class, | |
| 22 | and the named Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c), (d). The | |
| 23 | typicality and adequacy requirements are satisfied because the Plaintiffs are owners of the Class | |
| 24 | Panels, and BP's conduct at issue is alleged to have caused similar harm to Plaintiffs and the | |
| 25 | Class. Accordingly, the Court appoints as Settlement Class Representatives Michael Allagas, | |
| 26 | Arthur Ray, Brett Mohrman, and Brian Dickson. | |
| 27 | e. Plaintiffs' counsel have the qualifications and experience to represent the | |
| 28 | Settlement Class. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(d). Accordingly, the Court appoints the following firms as | |
| | PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00560-SI (EDL) | |

Class Counsel for purposes of effectuating the Settlement: Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein,
 LLP; and Birka-White Law Offices.

f. The Court also finds that common issues predominate and the proposed
Settlement is a superior way to resolve this national controversy. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). The
common issues include those identified above. Further, given the inefficiencies and difficulties in
pursuing thousands of individual claims, the class mechanism is superior to any other for
resolution of these common disputes.

8 6. The Court finds that the Notice Plan is reasonable and provides due, adequate and 9 sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice, and meets the requirements of due 10 process and Rule 23. The Notice Plan includes individualized first-class mail and email service to 11 Class Members known to BP and Class Counsel, a settlement website maintained by the Claims 12 Administrator and linked to Class Counsel, a toll-free telephone line staffed by the Claims 13 Administrator, internet and social media advertisements, and publication notice in numerous 14 periodicals throughout the United States where the Class Panels were installed. The Notice 15 Program complies with Rule 23(c)(2)(B) because it constitutes the best notice practicable under 16 the circumstances, provides individual notice to all Class Members who can be identified through 17 reasonable effort, and is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the Class 18 Members of the nature of the action, the claims it asserts, the Class definition, the Settlement 19 terms, the right to appear through an attorney, the right to opt out of the Class or to comment on 20 or object to the Settlement and how to do so, and the binding effect of a final judgment upon 21 Class Members who do not opt out. The Court approves for dissemination to the Class the notices 22 filed with the Court with Plaintiffs' preliminary approval motion, and directs the Claims 23 Administrator and the Parties to carry out the Notice Plan as provided for in the Settlement.

. .

7. The Court appoints Jennifer Keough of JND Legal Administration to serve as the
Independent Claims Administrator ("ICA") as provided under the Settlement. All reasonable fees,
costs, and expenses of notice and claims administration shall be paid as provided in the
Settlement. The Parties are ordered to finalize the publication notice dates as soon as practicable
after the entry of this Order. Notice shall be completed within 75 days of the entry of this Order.

Case 3:14-cv-00560-SI Document 182 Filed 09/02/16 Page 6 of 7

- 1 8. Class Counsel shall file their Motion for Final Approval and Motion for Class 2 Counsel's Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Service Awards to Class Representatives on or before 3 65 days after the date of this Preliminary Approval Order.

4 9. Any Class Member may opt out of the proposed Settlement in the manner 5 prescribed in the Settlement Agreement and provided their request is postmarked by not later than 6 the date indicated in the Long Form Notice (which corresponds to no less than 85 days following 7 commencement of the Notice Program). Any Class Member may object to the Settlement and/or 8 to Class Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs in the manner prescribed in the Settlement 9 Agreement and Long Form Notice, and provided any such objection is postmarked to the Court, 10 Counsel, and the ICA by the date indicated in the Long Form Notice (which corresponds to no 11 less than 85 days following the commencement of the Notice Program). Plaintiffs' and 12 Defendants' responses to Objections and Reply Briefs, if any, shall be filed 9 days after the opt-13 out and objection deadline. Any Class Member that wishes to appear at the Fairness Hearing 14 must so state in their objection, or if the Class Member has no objection, in a letter addressed to 15 Class Counsel and Defendants by the objection deadline.

- 16 10. The Fairness Hearing shall be held no less than 100 days after commencement of 17 the Notice Program to (i) consider the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement; 18 (ii) consider entry of a Final Order and Judgment approving the Settlement and the dismissal with 19 prejudice of the Action; (iii) consider any objections to the Settlement filed by Class Members; 20 (iv) consider Class Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of 21 costs and expenses; (v) consider the payment of service awards to the Class Representatives; and 22 (vi) consider such other matters as the Court may deem necessary or proper under the 23 circumstances in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.
- 24

11. The Fairness Hearing may be postponed, adjourned, or continued by Order of the 25 Court without further notice to the Class. After the Fairness Hearing, the Court may enter a Final 26 Order and Judgment in accordance with the Settlement.

27 12. Pending the Fairness Hearing, other than proceedings necessary to carry out or to 28 enforce the terms and conditions of the Settlement, this matter is stayed.

Case 3:14-cv-00560-SI Document 182 Filed 09/02/16 Page 7 of 7

| 1 | 13. If the Settlement does not receive Final Approval, then the Settlement shall |
|----|--|
| 2 | become null and void. Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Defendants shall be restored to their |
| 3 | respective positions prior to the entry of this Order. |
| 4 | 14. Class Counsel and Counsel for Defendants are hereby authorized to employ all |
| 5 | reasonable procedures in connection with approval and administration of the Settlement that are |
| 6 | not materially inconsistent with this Order or the Settlement, including making, without further |
| 7 | approval of the Court, non-material changes to the form or content of the Notice. |
| 8 | 15. The dates of performance contained herein may be extended by Order of the |
| 9 | Court, for good cause shown, without further notice to the Class. |
| 10 | |
| 11 | IT IS SO ORDERED this $\frac{2nd}{2nd}$ day of $\frac{\text{September}}{2nd}$, 2016. |
| 12 | Sugar Matter |
| 13 | The Honorable Susan Illston United States District Judge |
| 14 | United States District Judge |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| | PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY1300475.3- 7 -PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARYAPPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CASE NO. 3:14-CV-00560-SI (EDL) |