	GIV-130
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Graham B. LippSmith (SBN 221984)	
Kasdan LippSmith Weber Turner LLP	
360 East 2nd Street, Suite 300	
Los Angeles, CA 90012 TELEPHONE NO.: (213) 254-4800 FAX NO. (Optional): (213) 254-4801	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): glippsmith@klwtlaw.com	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs Miles Houze, et al.	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES STREET ADDRESS: 312 North Spring Street	
MAILING ADDRESS:	
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Los Angeles 90012	
BRANCH NAME: Spring Street Courthouse	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Miles Houze, et al.	
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: BrassCraft Manufacturing Company, et al.	
NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT	CASE NUMBER:
OR ORDER	BC493276
(Check one): X UNLIMITED CASE (Amount demanded exceeded \$25,000) LIMITED CASE (Amount demanded was \$25,000 or less)	
TO ALL PARTIES :	
1. A judgment, decree, or order was entered in this action on (date): April 8, 2019	
2. A copy of the judgment, decree, or order is attached to this notice.	
Date: April 8, 2019	

Graham B. LippSmith

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF X ATTORNEY

(SIGNATURE)

PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY)

	014-130
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Miles Houze, et al.	CASE NUMBER:
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: BrassCraft Manufacturing Company, et al.	BC493276

PROOF OF SERVICE BY FIRST-CLASS MAIL NOTICE OF ENTRY OF HIDGMENT OR ORDER

	NOTICE OF	NIKI OF JUDGIMENT OR ORDER		
	OTE: You cannot serve the Notice of Entry of notice must complete this proof of service.)	Judgment or Order if you are a party in the action. The person who se	9 r \	
	am at least 18 years old and not a party to th place, and my residence or business address is	s action. I am a resident of or employed in the county where the mailing too (specify):	эk	
	 2. I served a copy of the Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order by enclosing it in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid and (check one): a deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service. b placed the sealed envelope for collection and processing for mailing, following this business's usual practices, with which I am readily familiar. On the same day correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service. 			
3.	3. The Notice of Entry of Judgment or Order was mailed:			
	a. on (date):			
	b. from (city and state):			
4.	The envelope was addressed and mailed as foll	ws:		
	a. Name of person served:	c. Name of person served:		
	Street address:	Street address:		
	City:	City:		
	State and zip code:	State and zip code:		
	b. Name of person served:	d. Name of person served:		
	Street address:	Street address:		
	City:	City:		
	State and zip code:	State and zip code:		
I	Names and addresses of additional persons served are attached. (You may use form POS-030(P).)			
5. 1	Number of pages attached			
I de	clare under penalty of perjury under the laws of	he State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.		
Dat	re:			
		k		
		<u>*</u>		
	(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)	(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)		

Kenneth S. Kasdan, SBN 71427 1 kkasdan@kasdancdlaw.com Michael D. Turner, SBN 126455 mturner@kasdancdlaw.com CONFORMED COPY KASDAN LIPPSMITH WEBER TURNER LLP ORIGINAL FILED 3 19900 MacArthur Boulevard, Suite 850 Superior Court of California Irvine, California 92612 County of Los Angeles 4 Tel: 949-851-9000 Fax: 949-833-9455 APR 08 2019 5 Sherri R. Garter, Execulive Officer/Clark of Court Graham B. LippSmith, SBN 221984 6 glippsmith@klwtlaw.com Jaclyn L. Anderson, SBN 258609 Dejane Wortham 7 janderson@klwtlaw.com KASDAN LIPPSMITH WEBER TURNER LLP 8 360 East 2nd Street, Suite 300 Los Angeles, California 90012 9 Tel: 213-254-4800 Fax: 213-254-4801 10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 12 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE 13 14 Case No.: BC493276 MILES HOUZE, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, 15 Assigned for all Purposes to: SUSAN HOUZE, individually and on Hon. Ann I. Jones Judge: 16 behalf of all others similarly situated, KEVIN NGAI, individually and on behalf 17 CLASS ACTION of all others similarly situated, MARCIA PRICE, individually and on behalf of all 18 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF EZ-FLO others similarly situated, HENRY 19 SETTLEMENT OKONKWO, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, 20 April 8, 2019 Date: 10:00 a.m. Time: 21 Plaintiffs, Dept.: SS11 22 Action Filed: October 4, 2012 VS. None Set Trial Date: 23 By Fax BRASSCRAFT MANUFACTURING 24 COMPANY, a Michigan corporation, EZ-FLO INTERNATIONAL, INC., a LOS ANGELES SUPERIOR COURT 25 California corporation, and DOES 1 through 1,000, inclusive, 26 APR 0 3 2019 27 Defendants. 28

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF EZ-FLO SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs Miles Houze, Susan Houze, Kevin Ngai, and Marcia Price (collectively "Plaintiffs" or "Class Representatives"), on behalf of the EZ-Flo Settlement Class, and Defendant EZ-Flo International, Inc. ("EZ-Flo") have applied to the Court pursuant to Rule 3.769(c) of the California Rules of Court for an Order (i) finally approving the proposed settlement of the above-captioned class action as to Defendant EZ-Flo, only, (the "EZ-Flo Action") in accordance with the parties' Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release as to Defendant EZ-Flo and addenda thereto ("Settlement Agreement"), which set forth the terms and conditions for a proposed settlement of the EZ-Flo Action, and (ii) resolving all Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class Members' claims regarding or relating to Covered Products upon the terms and conditions in the Settlement Agreement;

WHEREAS, at an August 27, 2018, hearing, the Court granted Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval ("Preliminary Approval Order"), preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement, provisionally certifying the Settlement Class, appointing Class Counsel, directing Notice to the Class, setting a hearing to consider whether to grant final approval of the EZ-Flo Action settlement (the "Fairness Hearing"), and thereafter entered the Second Amended Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Settlement on September 24, 2018;

WHEREAS, on September 7, 2018, the Notice Plan entered first stages of implementation;

WHEREAS, as of April 2, 2019, there were zero Class Members who objected to the proposed Settlement Agreement;

WHEREAS, as of April 2, 2019, there were zero Class Members who opted out of

All capitalized terms have the same definitions provided in the final Class Action Settlement Agreement as to Defendant EZ-Flo International, Inc. executed by the parties unless otherwise provided herein.

the proposed Settlement Agreement;

WHEREAS, the Court held the Fairness Hearing on April 8, 2019, to determine, among other things, (i) whether the terms and conditions of the proposed Settlement Agreement are fair, reasonable and adequate and should therefore be approved; (ii) whether the Settlement Class should be finally certified for settlement purposes; (iii) whether Notice to the Settlement Class was implemented pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order and Second Amended Preliminary Approval Order and constituted due and adequate notice to the Class; (iv) whether to approve the proposed benefits to the settlement; (v) whether to enter judgment resolving all Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class Members' claims regarding or relating to Covered Products upon the terms and conditions in the Settlement Agreement; (vi) whether and in what amount to award attorney fees and expenses to Class Counsel; and (vii) whether and in what amounts to award incentive awards to the Class Representatives; and

WHEREAS, at the Fairness Hearing on April 8, 2019, the Court addressed the proposed Settlement Agreement with Class Counsel on behalf of the Settlement Class Members and Defense Counsel on behalf of EZ-Flo (collectively, the "Settling Parties").

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the written submissions of the Settling Parties and other documents and evidence in the Court's record in the EZ-Flo Action, and on the arguments of counsel at the Fairness Hearing, and good cause appearing, it is hereby **ORDERED AND DECREED** as follows:

- 1. <u>Incorporation of Settlement Documents</u>. This Order and Decree (the "Order" or "Final Order") incorporates and makes a part hereof the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release as to Defendant EZ-Flo International, Inc. executed on or about March 15, 2018, which was approved by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Order ("Settlement Agreement"). All capitalized terms not defined in this Order shall have the definitions ascribed to them in the Settlement Agreement.
- 2. <u>Jurisdiction</u>. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the parties and all other Settlement Class Members (as defined below) and has subject matter jurisdiction

over the Action, including, without limitation, jurisdiction to approve the proposed Settlement, grant final certification of the Settlement Class, and enter final judgment resolving all Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class Members' claims regarding or relating to Covered Products upon the terms and conditions in the Settlement Agreement. The Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this Final Order and the Judgment.

- 3. <u>Final Class Certification</u>. The Court finds that, for settlement purposes, the prerequisites for certification of a class under California law (including Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 382 and Cal. R. Ct., Rule 3.769) have been satisfied, in that:
 - a. The Settlement Class is ascertainable;
 - b. The Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder of all members would be impractical;
 - c. Plaintiffs have alleged one or more questions of fact and law that are common to all members of the Settlement Class;
 - d. The Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of the other Settlement Class Members;
 - e. The Class Representatives and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interests of the members of the Settlement Class, in that (i) their interests are and have been consistent with those of the other Settlement Class Members; (ii) Class Counsel are able and qualified to represent the Settlement Class; and (iii) the Class Representatives and their attorneys have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class Members in prosecuting this Action and in negotiating and entering into the Settlement; and
 - f. For settlement purposes only, questions of law and/or fact common to members of the Settlement Class predominate over any such questions affecting only individual Settlement Class Members, and a class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and

efficient resolution of the Action. In making these findings for settlement purposes, the Court considered, among other things, (i) the Settlement Class Members' interests in individually controlling the prosecuting of separate actions, (ii) the impracticability of inefficiency of prosecuting separate actions, (iii) the extent and nature of any litigation concerning these claims already commenced, and (iv) the desirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in a particular forum.

4. Pursuant to Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 382 and Cal. R. Ct., Rule 3.769, the Court hereby finally certifies this Action as a nationwide class action, for settlement purposes only, on behalf of a Settlement Class consisting of:

All Persons that own or have owned a Property Unit(s) located in the United States that contain or have ever contained a Covered Product manufactured up to ten (10) years before the Effective Date.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are:

- a. Persons who validly and timely exclude themselves using the procedure set forth in Paragraphs 8.3 through 8.5 of the Settlement Agreement;
- b. Retailers, wholesalers, and claims aggregators or persons or entities who claim to be an assignee of rights associated with any product covered by the Settlement Agreement, except associations of homeowners may seek Settlement Benefits for common areas, only;
- Except as specified in the Settlement Agreement,
 insurers and/or providers of extended service

contracts or warranties for the Settlement Class Structures; and

- d. The Honorable Ann I. Jones and members of her family.
- 5. <u>Class Representative and Class Counsel Appointments</u>. The Court confirms its appointments of Miles Houze, Susan Houze, Kevin Ngai, and Marcia Price as Class Representatives. The Court also confirms its appointments of Kenneth S. Kasdan, Graham B. LippSmith and Michael D. Turner as Class Counsel.
- 6. Notice. The Court confirms that the distribution of the Notice, the publication of the publication notice, the notice methodology as set forth in the Declaration of Carla Peak on Settlement Notice Plan filed on March 21, 2018, as well as supplemental declarations by Carla Peak filed on June 4, 2018 and August 10, 2018, previously approved by the Court on August 27, 2018, were all implemented in accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order and Amended Preliminary Approval Order.
 - 7. The Court further finds and confirms that the Notice and the Notice Plan:
 - a. Constituted the best practicable notice;
 - b. Constituted notice that was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise potential Settlement Class Members, and fully and accurately inform them, of the pendency of the EZ-Flo Action, the effect of the Settlement Agreement (including the Released Claims), the nature and material terms of the proposed Settlement (including the benefits to Settlement Class Members, and Class Counsel's requests for attorney fees, expenses and incentive awards), their right to object to the proposed Settlement (benefits to Settlement Class Members, and Class Counsel's requests for attorney fees, expenses and incentive awards), their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class, and their right to appear at the

Fairness Hearing;

- c. Were reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons or entities entitled to receive notice; and
- Met all applicable requirements of California law (including Cal. R.
 Ct. 3.766 and 3.769(f)), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Rules of the Court, and any other applicable law.
- 8. Final Settlement Approval. The Court finds that the proposed Settlement Agreement resulted from multiple, non-collusive negotiations conducted at arms' length by the parties before Justice Howard B. Wiener and was entered into in good faith. The terms of the Settlement Agreement do not have any material deficiencies and do not improperly grant preferential treatment to any individual Settlement Class Member. Accordingly, the proposed Settlement Agreement is hereby fully and finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate, consistent and in full compliance with all applicable requirements of California law (including Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 382 and Cal. R. Ct., Rule 3.769), the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and the Rules of the Court, and in the best interests of each of the Settling Parties, and the Settlement Class Members.
- 9. In making these findings, the Court considered, among other factors, (i) the nature of the claims asserted and the strength of Plaintiffs' claims and EZ-Flo's defenses, (ii) the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation, (iii) the prospects of Plaintiffs' obtaining certification of a litigation class and of maintaining such certification through trial, (iv) the amount and kinds of benefits to be offered in the proposed Settlement Agreement, including what amounts to an extended warranty, (v) the stage of the proceedings at which the proposed Settlement Agreement was reached, (vi) the information available to the Settling Parties, and Settlement Class, and the Court, (vii) the experience and views of the Settling Parties' counsel, (viii) the extensive involvement of a well-respected mediator, a retired Justice of the California Court of

Appeal, (ix) the Settlement Class Members' reactions to the proposed Settlement Agreement, including the number of objections and exclusion requests submitted by action or potential members of the Settlement Class, and (x) the submissions made for consideration at the Fairness Hearing.

- 10. The Court Has Subject Matter Jurisdiction. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this matter, which is the first-filed class action involving allegations related to the Covered Products.
- 11. The Settlement Class Was Properly Certified. The bases articulated by the Court for its provisional certification of the Class for settlement purposes support the final certification of the Settlement Class. The evidence shows that Plaintiffs have standing and that Class Counsel can adequately represent the Settlement Class. Moreover, this Court may certify a nationwide Settlement Class under these circumstances. Issues of manageability of a trial of the action are no longer a concern in settlement.
- 12. The Settlement Is Non-Collusive. This action has been vigorously contested by the Settling Parties for several years before this Court. The Court is familiar with counsel for the Settling Parties and, by observing the litigation and their conduct, does not believe that they have engaged in collusion. Moreover, arms-length settlement negotiations were overseen by a neutral mediator who monitored and observed the negotiation process.
- Sufficient Benefits Under the Settlement. In light of the costs and uncertainties of litigating this case—including the substantial possibility that Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class would not succeed on the merits and would recover nothing at all, as well as the expense and delays inherent in continued litigation—the Settlement is reasonable. The Settlement Class Members receive a variety of benefits depending on the conditions that their Covered Product(s) present, giving them lasting protection for up to 17 years depending on the condition(s) manifested.

In summary, the Settlement Agreement provides, among other relief, the following benefits and protections to Class Members:

SETTLEMENT BENEFITS FOR EXTERIOR MERINGUE DEPOSITS

For each qualifying Covered Product with exterior meringue deposits,
 EZ-Flo shall provide Claimant owners of Property Units with a
 replacement part for no more than fifteen (15) Covered Products per
 Property Unit.

SETTLEMENT BENEFITS FOR LEAKS

- o For each qualifying Covered Product with a Leak without property damage, EZ-Flo shall provide Claimant owners of Property Units with the following benefits: (a) cash reimbursement for all Replacement Part(s); and (b) cash reimbursement for the reasonable, out-of-pocket labor costs incurred to repair and/or replace the part in accordance with the reasonable labor costs for plumbing professionals in the relevant market area, limited to \$100 per Replacement Part with a maximum of \$500 per Property Unit.
- Property Damage For each qualifying Covered Product with a Leak with property damage, EZ-Flo shall provide Claimants who incurred property damage as a direct and proximate result of the Leak with the following benefits: (a) cash reimbursement for the reasonable out-of-pocket labor and property damage costs incurred to repair and/or replace the part(s), and (b) property damage in accordance with the reasonable labor and materials costs for plumbing and repair professionals in the relevant market area, not to exceed \$3,500 per Property Unit. Claimants who incur more than \$3,500 in property damage may later elect to opt out of the Settlement during the claims period to pursue their individual claims against EZ-Flo, forfeiting all Settlement benefits. Claimants may not recover property damage costs covered and paid by insurers, but

may recover for deductibles not paid by insurance.

• SETTLEMENT BENEFITS FOR OCCLUSIONS

For each qualifying Covered Product with an Occlusion, EZ-Flo shall provide a Replacement Part to Claimant owners of Property Units.
 Claimants are entitled to Replacement Parts for a maximum of three (3)
 Covered Products with Occlusions per Property Unit.

• SETTLEMENT BENEFITS FOR INOPERABLE VALVES

- For each qualifying Covered Product with an Inoperable Valve, EZ-Flo shall provide a Replacement Part to Claimant owners of Property Units.

 Claimants are entitled to Replacement Parts for a maximum of three (3)

 Covered Products with Inoperable Valves per Property Unit.
- 14. The Claims Process is Reasonable and Not Unduly Burdensome. The claims process is reasonable and not unduly burdensome. The Court is satisfied that the period within which Settlement Class Members may make claims is sufficient; there is no evidence that a longer period is necessary. The Court is further satisfied that the evidence requirement of the claims process is reasonable, requiring, in some cases, only a photograph of the product and a completed claim form to initiate a claim. Settlement Class Members are permitted to rely on multiple and different types of evidence to prove that a covered failure has occurred, and such methods are clearly disclosed in the Settlement Agreement and in the Claim Form. Requiring Settlement Class Members to demonstrate their membership in the Class in this fashion is a reasonable method of filtering out fraudulent and improper claims.

The Court is not aware of any evidence suggesting that EZ-Flo has used or intends to use the claims process to discourage Settlement Class Members from filing claims for settlement relief, particularly when a claimant may appeal a denied claim to an independent Special Master without incurring fees or costs.

15. The Notice Program Complied with All Requirements. The notice plan was a sufficient and reasonable method of providing notice of the Settlement to all

Settlement Class Members and further complied with all due process requirements.

Notice was provided pursuant to the Notice Plan, which included substantial efforts to disseminate Notice by several means, including internet banner advertisements, notice by publication in national leading magazines, and a settlement website.

The content of the Notice, whether sent directly to Settlement Class Members or published, was clear and succinct and as complete as practicable. The Notices appropriately directed Class Members to further resources, such as the Settlement website, which contained additional and more detailed information relating to the Settlement.

- 16. The Plaintiffs Conducted a Sufficient Investigation of Class Claims.

 Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have satisfied their due diligence duty to the Settlement
 Class by conducting a thorough examination and investigation of the law and facts,
 including substantial discovery relating to the matters set forth in the class action
 complaint and any amendments thereto, giving rise to this Settlement Agreement and the
 claims set forth therein, as demonstrated by their continued litigation of this action, which
 has now been ongoing for over six years. The Court is satisfied, based on the time spent
 by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel in this litigation and the extent and scope of law and
 motion, expert analysis, and settlement negotiations that Plaintiffs and Class Counsel
 have conducted a sufficient investigation of class claims.
- 17. The Class Representatives' Incentive Award Is Reasonable. The Court finds that an award of up to \$1,000 per Property Unit owned by the proposed Class Representatives is fair and reasonable under the circumstarces. Each Class Representative served in a class representative capacity, supplied essential factual information, responded to discovery, submitted their homes and yellow brass products to inspections and extractions, participated in depositions, committed to testifying at trial, and placed the interests of the Class ahead of their own. This Settlement Agreement would not have been achieved without the information provided by and gathered from the Class Representatives or their participation in the litigation.

18. The Settlement Appropriately Protects Class Members' Due Process

<u>Rights</u>. The Settlement does not infringe on any due process rights of the Settlement Class Members. All Settlement Class Members were given an opportunity to contest the fairness of the Settlement at the March 8, 2019 Fairness Hearing, after receiving Notice pursuant to the notice plan.

- 19. <u>Implementation of the Settlement Agreement</u>. The Settling Parties are directed to implement and consummate the Settlement Agreement—including all approved addenda—according to its terms and provisions. The Court approves the documents submitted to the Court in connection with implementation of the Settlement Agreement.
- 20. <u>Binding Effect</u>. All Settlement Class Members were given a full and fair opportunity to participate in the Fairness Hearing, and all Settlement Class Members wishing to be heard have been heard. Settlement Class Members have had a full and fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement and the Settlement Class. Accordingly, the terms of the Settlement Agreement and of this Order shall be forever binding on Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class Members who did not timely exclude themselves from the Class, as well as on all of their heirs, executors, predecessors, successors, affiliates (as defined in 17 C.F.R. Part 210.1-02b) and assigns.
- 21. Exclusion Requests. The Claims Administrator has received zero requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class. All Settlement Class Members that did not opt out of the Settlement are, therefore, bound by and subject to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, this Order, the Judgment, and all other orders entered in this Action, regardless of whether any such person or entity previously initiated, has pending, or subsequently initiates any litigation, arbitration, or other proceeding or has any other Claim, against any or all of the Released Parties relating to any of the Released Claims.
- 22. <u>Releases</u>. As of the date of the Fairness Hearing, and without limiting the full language of the Released Claims identified in Paragraphs 1.26-1.28, 4.3-4.9 of the Settlement Agreement, which are given full force and effect, the Released Claims against

each and all of the Released Parties shall be released and barred, without costs to any party, except as provided in the Settlement Agreement.

- 23. <u>Permanent Injunction</u>. Subject to the Settlement Agreement's terms, the Court permanently bars and enjoins:
 - a. All Settlement Class Members (and their heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, affiliates and assigns) that did not serve timely and valid exclusions, from filing, commencing, prosecuting, intervening in, participating in (as class members or otherwise), or receiving any benefits or other relief from any other lawsuit, arbitration, or administrative, regulatory, or other proceeding or order in any jurisdiction that is based upon, arises out of, or relates to any claim released against the Released Parties, including, but not limited to, any claim that is based upon, arises out of, or relates to the EZ-Flo Action or the transactions and occurrences referred to in any Complaint filed in the EZ-Flo Action; and
 - b. All persons and entities that did not serve timely valid exclusions, from filing, commencing, or prosecuting any other lawsuit or proceeding as a class action (including by seeking to amend a pending complaint to include class allegations or by seeking class certification in a pending action) or other representative or derivative action on behalf of any Settlement Class Members as to the Released Parties, if such other lawsuit or proceeding is based upon, arises out of, or relates to any claims brought against the Released Parties, including, but not limited to, any claim that is based upon, arises out of, or relates to the Action or the transactions and occurrences referred to any Complaint filed in the EZ-Flo Action.
 - 24. No Admissions. This Order, the Settlement Agreement, the offer of the

1 Settlement Agreement, and compliance with this Order or the Settlement Agreement shall 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

not constitute or be construed as an admission by the Released Parties of any wrongdoing or liability. This Order and the Settlement Agreement are to be construed solely as a reflection of the Settling Parties' desire to facilitate a resolution of the claims in the EZ-Flo Action and of the claims brought against the Released Parties. The Settling Parties agree that no party was or is a "prevailing party" in this case. In no event shall this Order. the Settlement Agreement, any of their provisions, or any negotiations, statements, or court proceedings relating to their provisions in any way be construed as, offered as, received as, used as, or deemed to be evidence of any kind in the EZ-Flo Action, any other action, or any judicial, administrative, regulatory or other proceeding, except a proceeding to enforce the Settlement Agreement. Without limiting the foregoing, neither this Order nor the Settlement Agreement, nor any related negotiations, statements, or court proceedings, shall be construed as, offered as, received as, used as, or deemed to be evidence or an admission or concession of any liability or wrongdoing whatsoever on the part of any person or entity, including, but not limited to, EZ-Flo, or as a waiver by EZ-Flo of any applicable defense, provided, however, that this Order and the Settlement Agreement may be filed in any action against or by EZ-Flo or Released Party to support a defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, release, waiver, good-faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, full faith and credit, or any other theory of claim preclusion, issue preclusion, or similar defense or counterclaim.

25. Attorney Fees and Incentive Awards.

The Court awarded \$ 1,806,068.40 in total attorney fees to Class Counsel. The Court awarded \$ 193,021.60 in total costs reimbursements to Class Counsel. The Court awarded \$ 1,000.000 as incentive awards for each home owned by the Class Representatives for a total of \$ ______ in incentive awards. The Court set forth its analysis and the bases for its awards of attorney fees, costs reimbursements, and incentive awards in its separate Order Granting the Class' Motion for Attorney Fees, Costs Reimbursements, and Incentive Awards decided in conjunction with the Fairness

9

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25 26

27

28

Hearing proceedings and this Order. The Court finds all such sums are fair and reasonable and are to be paid by EZ-Flo pursuant to the Settlement.

To the extent there are any disputes arising from or in any way related to any allocations or payments of attorney fees, costs reimbursements, or incentive awards awarded from the Settlement, the Court shall have the sole and exclusive jurisdiction and shall be the sole and exclusive venue to decide any and all such disputes.

- 26. Notice of Final Order and Judgment to the Class, Pursuant to Cal. R. Ct. 3.771(b), the Claims Administrator shall provide notice of this Final Order and the Judgment to the Settlement Class by posting this Final Order and the Judgment on the settlement website, www.EZ-Flosettlement.com, within five (5) days after entry of this Final Order and the Judgment. The Court finds that such notice satisfies the notice requirements of Cal. R. Ct. 3.771(b).
- Modification of Settlement Agreement. Without further approval from 27. the Court, the Settling Parties are hereby authorized to agree to and adopt such amendments, modifications, and expansions of the Settlement Agreement (including its exhibits and addenda) as (i) are not materially inconsistent with this Order and (ii) do not materially limit the rights of Settlement Class Members under the Settlement Agreement.
- Resolution of Action. All claims that have been or could have been 28. asserted by any member of the Settlement Class regarding or relating to any and all Covered Products are hereby released and barred upon the terms and conditions in the Settlement Agreement.
- Retention of Jurisdiction. Nothing in this Cader shall preclude any action 29. to enforce the terms of the Settlement Agreement as approved by the Court. Without in any way affecting the finality of this Order and the Judgment, the Court expressly retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Settling Parties, the Settlement Class Members and anyone else who or any law firm that appeared before this Court for all matters related to this Action, including the administration, consummation, interpretation, effectuation, or enforcement of the Settlement Agreement and of this Order, and for any

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

other reasonably necessary purpose, including, without limitation:

- Enforcing the terms and conditions of the Settlement Agreement and
- Resolving any disputes, claims, or causes of action that, in whole or in part, are related to or arise out of the Settlement Agreement or this Order (including, without limitation, whether claims or causes of action allegedly related to the Action are or are not barred by this Order, the Judgment, and the Release);
- Resolving any disputes, claims, or causes of action that, in whole or in part, are related to or arise out of the Court's award of attorney fees and costs herein (including, without limitation, the allocation of any portion of the attorney fees and/or costs to any attorney who seeks any portion of the attorney fees and/or costs awarded herein and the resolution of any attorney fee and/or cost liens associated
- Entering such additional orders as may be necessary or appropriate to protect or effectuate this Order and the Judgment, including whether to impose a bond on any parties who appeal this Final Order
- Entering any other necessary or appropriate orders to protect and effectuate this Court's retention of continuing jurisdiction, provided, however, that nothing in this Order shall interfere with the Special Master's ability to make final, binding, and non-appealable rulings as prescribed in the Settlement Agreement.

	·			
1	30. <u>Termination</u> . If the Settlement Agreement is not approved by the Court or			
2	is otherwise terminated pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, this Order			
3	shall be rendered null and void to the extent provided by and in accordance with the			
4	Settlement Agreement.	1 - 1. fold an or before		
5	July 8, 2019.	t to be filled on or before		
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.	7.45		
7		ARIRI t tobacomo		
8	Dated: April 8 , 2019	Ann I. Jones		
9		HON, ANN I. JONES		
10				
11				
12				
13				
14		w.		
15		•		
16				
17				
18	*.			
19				
20				
21				
22		•		
23				
24		•		
25				
26		,		
27				
28	,			

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am an employee of or agent for Kasdan LippSmith Weber Turner LLP, whose business address is 360 East 2nd Street, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90012.

On April 3, 2019, I served the foregoing document(s): [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF EZ-FLO SETTLEMENT to the following parties in this action addressed as follows:

☑ (BY ELECTRONIC FILING & SERVICE CASE ANYWHERE) I caused the above-entitled document(s) to be served through Case Anywhere at www.caseanywhere.com addressed to all parties appearing on the electronic service list for the above-entitled case. The service transmission was reported as complete and a copy of the Case Anywhere Filing Receipt Page/Confirmation will be maintained with the original document(s) in this office.

Executed on April 3, 2019 in Los Angeles, California. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

PROOF OF SERVICE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. I am an employee of or agent for Kasdan LippSmith Weber Turner LLP, whose business address is 360 East 2nd Street, Suite 300, Los Angeles, CA 90012. On April 8, 2019, I served the foregoing document(s): **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER** GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF EZ-FLO SETTLEMENT to the following parties in this action addressed as follows: ☑ (BY ELECTRONIC FILING & SERVICE CASE ANYWHERE) I caused the above-entitled document(s) to be served through Case Anywhere at www.caseanywhere.com addressed to all parties appearing on the electronic service list for the above-entitled case. The service transmission was reported as complete and a copy of the Case Anywhere Filing Receipt Page/Confirmation will be maintained with the original document(s) in this office. Executed on April 8, 2019 in Los Angeles, California. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. **NIKI SMITH**