

ENDORSED FILED SAN MATEO COUNTY

APR 0 4 2016

Clerk of the Sizzenov Court

By TERRI MARAGOVIAS

DEPUTY CLERK

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN

& DOWD LLP

CHRISTOPHER P. SEEFER (201197)

DAVID W. HALL (274921)

Post Montgomery Center

One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800

San Francisco, CA 94104

5 Telephone: 415/288-4545 415/288-4534 (fax)

6

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

3

4

LABATON SUCHAROW LLP

JOEL H. BERNSTEIN

DAVID J. GOLDSMITH

8 140 Broadway

New York, NY 10005 Telephone: 212/907-0700

212/818-0477 (fax)

.

Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

RECEIVED

MAR 2 8 2016

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COUNTY BAN MATEO COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

PLYMOUTH COUNTY RETIREMENT

SYSTEM, Individually and on Behalf of All
Others Similarly Situated,

Master Case No. CIV530291
(Consolidated with Case No CIV532190)

) Assigned for all Purposes to
Plaintiff, The Hon. Marie S. Weiner, Dept. 2

vs. CLASS ACTION

MODEL N, INC., et al.,

DATE: April 4, 2016
TIME: 2:00 p.m.

Defendants.) DEPT: 2
21 DATE ACTION FILED: 09/05/14

JUDGMENT AND ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

26

27

28

JUDGMENT AND ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

1130357_1

11

13

14

16

18

19

20

22

23 24

25

2627

28

WHEREAS, the Court is advised that the Settling Parties, through their counsel, have agreed, subject to Court approval following notice to the Class and a hearing, to settle this Litigation upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement dated November 20, 2015 (the "Stipulation"), which was filed with the Court; and

WHEREAS, on December 7, 2015, the Court entered its Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Providing for Notice, which preliminarily approved the settlement, and approved the form and manner of notice to the Class of the settlement, and said notice has been made, and the Settlement Fairness Hearing having been held; and

NOW, THEREFORE, based upon the Stipulation and all of the filings, records and proceedings herein, and it appearing to the Court upon examination that the settlement set forth in the Stipulation is fair, reasonable and adequate, and upon a Settlement Fairness Hearing having been held after notice to the Class of the settlement to determine if the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and whether the Judgment should be entered in this Litigation;

THE COURT HEREBY FINDS AND CONCLUDES THAT:

- A. The provisions of the Stipulation, including definitions of the terms used therein, are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- B. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this Litigation and over all of the Settling Parties and all Members of the Class.
 - C. With respect to the Class, the Court finds that:
- (i) The Members of the Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Litigation is impracticable. There were approximately 7.751 million shares of Model N common stock offered through the IPO. The Class is, therefore, sufficiently numerous to render joinder impracticable.
- (ii) The Class is ascertainable because Members of the Class share common characteristics that are sufficient for persons to determine whether they are Members of the Class, i.e.,

As used herein, the term "Settling Parties" means Plaintiffs: Plymouth County Retirement System, James Small, and Dwight Bucher, on behalf of themselves and the Class (as defined below), and Defendants: Model N, Inc. ("Model N" or the "Company"), Zack Rinat, Sujan Jain, James W. Breyer, Sarah Friar, Mark Garrett, Charles J. Robel, J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Deutsche Bank Securities, Inc., Stifel, Nicolaus & Company, Incorporated, Pacific Crest Securities LLC, Piper Jaffray & Co., and Raymond James & Associates, Inc.

9

11

12

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

2526

27

whether they purchased or otherwise acquired Model N common stock pursuant or traceable to the Registration Statement issued in connection with Model N's IPO.

- (iii) There are questions of law and fact common to the Class. Those questions include whether the Defendants violated the Securities Act of 1933, whether the Registration Statement contained misstatements or omissions, whether any misstatements or omissions were material, and whether any misstatements or omissions caused harm to the Members of the Class.
- (iv) The claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class Members. Plaintiffs claim to have purchased or otherwise acquired the Model N common stock pursuant or traceable to the same Registration Statement as the Members of the Class. Consequently, Plaintiffs claim that they and the other Members of the Class sustained damages as a result of the same misconduct by Defendants.
- (v) Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interests of the Class Members. Plaintiffs have no interests in conflict with absent Members of the Class. The Court is satisfied that Plaintiffs' Counsel are qualified, experienced, and have represented the Class to the best of their abilities.
- (vi) The questions of law or fact common to the Members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.
 - (vii) A class action is the superior means of resolving the Litigation.
- D. The form, content, and method of dissemination of notice given to the Class was adequate and reasonable and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort.
- E. Notice, as given, complied with the requirements of California law, satisfied the requirements of due process, and constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth herein.
- F. The settlement set forth in the Stipulation in the amount of \$8,550,000 is fair, reasonable, and adequate.
- (i) The settlement was vigorously negotiated at arm's length by Plaintiffs on behalf of the Class and by Defendants, all of whom were represented by highly experienced and skilled counsel. The case settled only after: (a) a mediation conducted by an experienced mediator who was

thoroughly familiar with this Litigation; (b) the exchange of detailed mediation statements prior to the mediation which highlighted the factual and legal issues in dispute; (c) Plaintiffs' Counsel's extensive investigation, which included, among other things, a review of Model N's press releases, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission filings, analyst reports, media reports, and other publicly disclosed reports and information about the Defendants; (d) the removal of this Litigation to federal court and a successful remand motion to state court; (e) the drafting and submission of a detailed Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint for Violations of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Complaint") that survived Defendants' demurrer; and (f) the review and analysis of non-public documents produced by Defendants. Accordingly, both the Plaintiffs and Defendants were well-positioned to evaluate the settlement value of this Litigation. The Stipulation has been entered into in good faith and is not collusive.

- (ii) If the settlement had not been achieved, both Plaintiffs and Defendants faced the expense, risk, and uncertainty of extended litigation. The Court takes no position on the merits of either Plaintiffs' or Defendants' arguments, but notes these arguments as evidence in support of the reasonableness of the settlement.
- G. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the interest of the Class Members in connection with the settlement.
- H. Plaintiffs, all Class Members, and Defendants are hereby bound by the terms of the settlement set forth in the Stipulation.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Class, defined in the Stipulation as: "all Persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of Model N pursuant or traceable to the Registration Statement and Prospectus issued in connection with Model N's March 20, 2013 initial public offering. Excluded from the Class are: the Defendants and their respective successors and assigns; past and current officers and directors of Model N and the Underwriter Defendants; members of the immediate families of the Individual Defendants; the legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns of the Individual Defendants; any entity in which any of the above excluded Persons have or had a majority ownership

2

3

4

5

7

9

interest; and any Person who validly requests exclusion from the Class," is certified solely for purposes of this settlement.

- 2. The settlement on the terms set forth in the Stipulation is finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The settlement shall be consummated in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Stipulation. The Settling Parties are to bear their own costs, except as otherwise provided in the Stipulation.
- All Released Parties as defined in the Stipulation are released in accordance with, and as defined in, the Stipulation.
- 4. Upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each Class Member shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims against the Released Parties, whether or not such Class Member executes and delivers a Proof of Claim and Release.
- 5. Upon the Effective Date, each of the Released Parties shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' Counsel, and each and all of the Class Members from all Settled Defendants' Claims.
- 6. All Class Members who have not made their objections to the settlement in the manner provided in the Notice are deemed to have waived any objections by appeal, collateral attack, or otherwise.
- All Class Members who have failed to properly file requests for exclusion (requests to
 opt out) from the Class are bound by the terms and conditions of the Stipulation and this Final
 Judgment.
- All other provisions of the Stipulation are incorporated into this Judgment as if fully rewritten herein.
- Plaintiffs and all Class Members are hereby barred and enjoined from instituting, commencing, maintaining, or prosecuting in any court or tribunal any of the Released Claims against any of the Released Parties.
- 10. Neither the Stipulation nor the settlement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Stipulation or the settlement: (a) is or may be deemed to be, or may

be used as, a presumption, concession, or admission of, or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claim or of any wrongdoing or liability of the Defendants and the Released Parties; or (b) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used, as a presumption, concession, or admission of, or evidence of, any fault or omission of any of the Defendants and the Released Parties in any civil, criminal, or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency, or other tribunal; or (c) is or may be deemed to be an admission or evidence that any claims asserted by Plaintiffs were not valid in any civil, criminal, or administrative proceeding. Defendants and the Released Parties may file the Stipulation and/or this Judgment in any action that may be brought against them in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, or any other theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.

- 11. Pursuant to and in full compliance with California law, this Court hereby finds and concludes that due and adequate notice was directed to all Persons and entities who are Class Members advising them of the Plan of Allocation and of their right to object thereto, and a full and fair opportunity was accorded to all Persons and entities who are Class Members to be heard with respect to the Plan of Allocation.
- 12. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Litigation was brought, prosecuted and/or defended in good faith, with a reasonable basis.
- 13. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Authorized Claimants, which is set forth in the Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action (the "Notice") sent to Class Members, provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund established by the Stipulation among Class Members, with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity.
- 14. The Court hereby awards Plaintiffs' Counsel attorneys' fees of \$2,565,000, plus expenses in the amount of \$67,155.72, together with the interest earned thereon for the same time period and at the same rate as that earned on the Settlement Fund until paid. The Court finds that the amount of fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of fees awarded is fair and reasonable given

1130357_1



1	ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP	JUDGE'S COPY
2	SHAWN A. WILLIAMS (213113) Post Montgomery Center	D = -
3	One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94104	RECEIVED
4	Telephone: 415/288-4545	AUG - 4 2015
5	415/288-4534 (fax) - and -	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT SAN MATEO COUNTY
6	ELLEN GUSIKOFF STEWART (144892) LAURIE L. LARGENT (153493)	TO COOMPY
7	ASHLEY M. ROBINSON (281597) 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900	
	San Diego, CA 92101	ENDORSED FILED
8	Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax)	SAN MATEO COUNTY
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff Hussain Jinnah	AUG 1 1 2015
10		Clerk of the Silverior Court
11	GLANCY PRONGAY & MURRAY LLP ROBERT V. PRONGAY (270796)	By ILLARI MARAGOLIANA
12	EX KANO S. SAMS II (192936) CASEY E. SADLER (274241)	DEPOTY CLERK
- 11	ELAINE CHANG (293937) 1925 Century Park East, Suite 2100	
- 1	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: 310/201-9150	
	310/201-9160 (fax)	
15	Attorneys for Plaintiff Wallace J. Desmarais Jr	
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORN		THE STATE OF CALLEOPNIA
17		OF SAN MATEO
18		
19	In re CAFEPRESS INC. SHAREHOLDER LITIGATION) Master File No. CIV522744
20) CLASS ACTION
21	This Document Relates To:	Assigned for All Purposes to
	ALL ACTIONS	Hon. Marie S. Weiner Dept. 2
22	ALL ACTIONS.	}
23		DATE: August 11, 2015 TIME: 9:00 a.m.
24		DATE ACTION FILED: 07/10/13
25		
26	HIDGMENT AND ORDER OR ANTIN	G FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
		PLEMENT
27		
28		
-	JUDGMENT AND ORDER GRANTING FINA	AL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
	1059603_1	

WHEREAS, the Court is advised that the Settling Parties, ¹ through their counsel, have agreed, subject to Court approval following notice to the Settlement Class and a hearing, to settle this Litigation upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement dated April 2, 2015 (the "Stipulation"), which was filed with the Court; and

WHEREAS, on May 11, 2015, the Court entered its Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Providing for Notice, which preliminarily approved the settlement, and approved the form and manner of notice to the Settlement Class of the settlement, and said notice has been made, and the fairness hearing having been held; and

NOW, THEREFORE, based upon the Stipulation and all of the filings, records and proceedings herein, and it appearing to the Court upon examination that the settlement set forth in the Stipulation is fair, reasonable and adequate, and upon a Settlement Fairness Hearing having been held after notice to the Settlement Class of the settlement to determine if the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and whether the Judgment should be entered in this Litigation;

THE COURT HEREBY FINDS AND CONCLUDES THAT:

- A. The provisions of the Stipulation, including definitions of the terms used therein, are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- B. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this Litigation and over all of the Settling Parties and all members of the Settlement Class.
 - C. With respect to the Settlement Class, the Court finds that:
- (i) The members of the Settlement Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Litigation is impracticable. There were approximately 5.175 million shares of CafePress common stock

As used herein, the term "Settling Parties" means (i) Plaintiffs Wallace J. Desmarais Jr. and Hussain Jinnah (collectively, "Plaintiffs") (on behalf of themselves and each of the Settlement Class Members), by and through their counsel of record; (ii) the Defendants CafePress Inc. ("CafePress" or the "Company"), Bob Marino, Monica N. Johnson, Fred E. Durham III, Brad W. Buss, Patrick J. Connolly, Douglas M. Leone and Michael Dearing (collectively, the "CafePress Defendants"); and (iii) underwriters of the Company's March 28, 2012 initial public offering ("IPO"), specifically J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Jefferies & Company, Inc. (currently Jefferies LLC), Cowen and Company, LLC, Janney Montgomery Scott LLC and Raymond James & Associates, Inc. (the "Underwriter Defendants," and collectively with the CafePress Defendants, the "Defendants").

offered through the IPO. The Settlement Class is, therefore, sufficiently numerous to render joinder impracticable;

- (ii) The Settlement Class is ascertainable because members of the Settlement Class share common characteristics that are sufficient for persons to determine whether they are members of the Settlement Class, *i.e.*, whether they purchased or otherwise acquired CafePress common stock pursuant or traceable to the Registration Statement issued in connection with CafePress' IPO:
- (iii) There are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class. Those questions include whether the Defendants violated the Securities Act of 1933, whether the Registration Statement contained misstatements or omissions, whether any misstatements or omissions were material, and whether any misstatements or omissions caused harm to the members of the Settlement Class;
- (iv) The claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class Members. Plaintiffs claim to have purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock pursuant or traceable to the same Registration Statement as the members of the Settlement Class. Consequently, Plaintiffs claim that they and the other members of the Settlement Class sustained damages as a result of the same misconduct by Defendants;
- (v) Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interests of the Settlement Class Members. Plaintiffs have no interests in conflict with absent members of the Settlement Class. The Court is satisfied that Plaintiffs' Counsel are qualified, experienced and have represented the Settlement Class to the best of their abilities;
- (vi) The questions of law or fact common to the members of the Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members; and
 - (vii) A class action is the superior means of resolving the Litigation.
- D. The form, content, and method of dissemination of notice given to the Settlement Class was adequate and reasonable and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort.

E. Notice, as given, complied with the requirements of California law, satisfied the requirements of due process and constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth herein.

F. The settlement set forth in the Stipulation is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

(i) The settlement was vigorously negotiated at arm's length by Plaintiffs on behalf of the Settlement Class and by Defendants, all of whom were represented by highly experienced and skilled counsel. The case settled only after: (a) a mediation conducted by an experienced mediator who was thoroughly familiar with this Litigation; (b) the exchange of detailed mediation statements prior to the mediation which highlighted the factual and legal issues in dispute; (c) Plaintiffs' Counsel's extensive investigation, which included, among other things, a review of CafePress' press releases, Securities and Exchange Commission filings, analyst reports, media reports and other publicly disclosed reports and information about the Defendants; (d) the removal of this Litigation to federal court and a successful remand motion to state court; (e) the drafting and submission of a detailed Consolidated Complaint for Violation of §§11 and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 ("Complaint") that survived Defendants' demurrer; (f) the review and analysis of non-public documents produced by Defendants and third parties; (g) the Settling Parties' responses to interrogatories; and (h) extensive briefing on Plaintiffs' motion for class certification. Accordingly, both the Plaintiffs and Defendants were well-positioned to evaluate the settlement value of this Litigation. The Stipulation has been entered into in good faith and is not collusive.

- (ii) If the settlement had not been achieved, both Plaintiffs and Defendants faced the expense, risk, and uncertainty of extended litigation. The Court takes no position on the merits of either Plaintiffs' or Defendants' arguments, but notes these arguments as evidence in support of the reasonableness of the settlement.
- G. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the interest of the Settlement Class Members in connection with the settlement.
- H. Plaintiffs, all Settlement Class Members, and Defendants are hereby bound by the terms of the settlement set forth in the Stipulation.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Settlement Class, defined in the Stipulation as: "all Persons who purchased or otherwise acquired the common stock of CafePress pursuant or traceable to the Registration Statement and Prospectus issued in connection with CafePress' March 28, 2012 initial public offering. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: the Defendants and their respective successors and assigns; past and current officers and directors of CafePress and the Underwriter Defendants; members of the immediate families of the Individual Defendants; the legal representatives, heirs, successors or assigns of the Individual Defendants; any trust or entity in which any of the above excluded Persons have or had a controlling interest or which is related to or affiliated with any of the Defendants; and any Person who validly requests exclusion from the Settlement Class," is certified solely for purposes of this Settlement.
- 2. The settlement on the terms set forth in the Stipulation is finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate. The settlement shall be consummated in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Stipulation. The Settling Parties are to bear their own costs, except as otherwise provided in the Stipulation.
- 3. All Released Parties as defined in the Stipulation are released in accordance with, and as defined in, the Stipulation.
- 4. Upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each Settlement Class Member shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims against the Released Parties, whether or not such Settlement Class Member executes and delivers a Proof of Claim and Release.
- 5. Upon the Effective Date, each of the Released Parties shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs' Counsel and each and all of the Settlement Class Members from all Settled Defendants' Claims.
- 6. All Settlement Class Members who have not made their objections to the settlement in the manner provided in the Notice are deemed to have waived any objections by appeal, collateral attack, or otherwise.

7. All Settlement Class Members who have failed to properly file requests for exclusion (requests to opt out) from the Settlement Class are bound by the terms and conditions of the Stipulation and this Final Judgment.

- 8. All other provisions of the Stipulation are incorporated into this Judgment as if fully rewritten herein. To the extent that the terms of this Judgment conflict with the terms of the Stipulation, the Stipulation shall control:
- 9. Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members are hereby barred and enjoined from instituting, commencing, maintaining, or prosecuting in any court or tribunal any of the Released Claims against any of the Released Parties.
- 10. Neither the Stipulation nor the settlement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Stipulation or the settlement: (a) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used as, a presumption, concession, or admission of, or evidence of, the validity of any Released Claim or of any wrongdoing or liability of the Defendants and the Released Parties; or (b) is or may be deemed to be, or may be used, as a presumption, concession, or admission of, or evidence of, any fault or omission of any of the Defendants and the Released Parties in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal; or (c) is or may be deemed to be an admission or evidence that any claims asserted by Plaintiffs were not valid in any civil, criminal or administrative proceeding. Defendants and the Released Parties may file the Stipulation and/or this Judgment in any action that may be brought against them in order to support a defense or counterclaim based on principles of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, good faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, or any other theory of claim preclusion or issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.
- 11. Pursuant to and in full compliance with California law, this Court hereby finds and concludes that due and adequate notice was directed to all Persons and entities who are Settlement Class Members advising them of the Plan of Allocation and of their right to object thereto, and a full and fair opportunity was accorded to all Persons and entities who are Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the Plan of Allocation.

- 12. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Authorized Claimants, which is set forth in the Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action (the "Notice") sent to Settlement Class Members, provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund established by the Stipulation among Settlement Class Members, with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity.
- 13. The Court hereby awards Plaintiffs' Counsel attorneys' fees of \$2,400,000, plus expenses in the amount of \$131,445.81, together with the interest earned thereon for the same time period and at the same rate as that earned on the Settlement Fund until paid. The Court finds that the amount of fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of fees awarded is fair and reasonable given the contingent nature of the case and the substantial risks of non-recovery, the time and effort involved, and the result obtained for the Settlement Class.
- 14. The awarded attorneys' fees and expenses and interest earned thereon shall immediately be paid to Plaintiffs' Counsel from the Settlement Fund subject to the terms, conditions, and obligations of the Stipulation, which terms, conditions and obligations are incorporated herein.
- 15. Plaintiffs Wallace J. Desmarais Jr. and Hussain Jinnah shall each be awarded \$2,500 for their time and expenses in this Litigation. Such reimbursement is appropriate considering their active participation as Plaintiffs in this action, as attested to by the declarations submitted to the Court. Such reimbursement is to be paid from the Settlement Fund.
- 16. In the event that the Stipulation is terminated in accordance with its terms: (i) this Judgment shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated *nunc pro tunc*; and (ii) this Litigation shall proceed as provided in the Stipulation.

1	17. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing
2	jurisdiction over: (a) implementation of this settlement and any award or distribution of the Settlement
3	Fund, including interest earned thereon; (b) disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) hearing and
4	determining applications for attorneys' fees, interest and expenses in the Litigation; and (d) all parties
5	hereto for the purposed of construing, enforcing, and administrating the Stipulation.
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	DATED: 8/11/15
8	HONORABLE MARIE S. WEINER
9	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	



887640_1

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN SUPERIOR COURT CIVIL DIVISION & DOWD LLP JAMES I. JACONETTE (179565) PHONG L. TRAN (204961) 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 OCT 3 1 2013 Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax) SCOTT + SCOTT LLP DAVID R. SCOTT 6 **DEBORAH CLARK-WEINTRAUB** The Chrysler Building 405 Lexington Avenue, 40th Floor New York, NY 10174 Telephone: 212/233-6444 212/233-6334 (fax) - and -ANNE L. BOX (224354) JOHN T. JASNOCH (281605) 707 Broadway, 10th Floor 11 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/233-4565 12 619/233-0508 (fax) 13 Class Counsel 14 15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 16 **COUNTY OF SAN MATEO** 17 IN RE PACIFIC BIOSCIENCES OF Master File No. CIV509210 CALIFORNIA, INC. SECURITIES 18 **CLASS ACTION** LITIGATION 19 TENDOROGET TINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER GRANTING FINAL 20 This Document Relates To: APPROVALOR DATE: Submitted Matter 21 ALL ACTIONS. TIME: Submitted Matter CLASS ACTION DEPT: SG TTLEMENT 22 Ronorable Marie S. Weiner JUDGE: DATE ACTION FILED: 10/21/11 23 24 25 26 27

[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT

WHEREAS, the Court is advised that the Parties, through their counsel, have agreed, subject to Court approval following notice to the Class and a hearing, to settle this Action (the "Action") upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement (the "Stipulation") which was filed with the Court; and

WHEREAS, the Court entered its Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Confirming Final Settlement Hearing, which preliminarily approved the settlement, conditionally certified the Class, and preliminarily approved notice to the Class of the settlement, and said notice has been made, and the fairness hearing having been held; and

NOW, THEREFORE, based upon the Stipulation and all of the filings, records, and proceedings herein, and it appearing to the Court upon examination that the Stipulation and Settlement are fair, reasonable and adequate, and upon a Settlement Fairness Hearing having been held after notice to the Class of the Settlement to determine if the Stipulation and Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and whether the Final Judgment should be entered in this Action based upon the Stipulation;

THE COURT HEREBY FINDS AND CONCLUDES THAT:

- A. The provisions of the Stipulation, including definitions of the terms used therein, are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein.
- B. This Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter of this Action and over all of the Parties and all members of the Class.
- C. All of the requirements for class certification under California law are met, and therefore this Action is properly maintained as a class action for purposes of settlement and the Class is properly certified. The Class is defined as:

As used herein, the term "Parties" means Plaintiffs Greg Young, Mathew Sandnas, Oklahoma Firefighters Pension Fund and Pompano Beach Police & Firefighters' Retirement System (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and the Class (as defined below), and Defendants: Pacific Biosciences of California, Inc. ("Pacific Biosciences," "PACB," or the "Company"); current and former PACB officers and/or directors, Hugh C. Martin, Susan K. Barnes, Brian B. Dow, Brook Byers, William W. Ericson, Michael Hunkapiller, Randall S. Livingston, Susan Siegel, and David B. Singer (the "Individual Defendants," collectively with PACB, the "Issuer Defendants"), and the underwriters of the Company's October 27, 2010 initial public offering ("IPO"), specifically J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC (formerly Morgan Stanley & Co. Incorporated), Deutsche Bank Securities, Inc., and Piper Jaffray & Co. (the "Underwriter Defendants," collectively with the Issuer Defendants, "Defendants").

All persons or entities ("Persons") that purchased Pacific Biosciences common stock between October 27, 2010 and September 20, 2011 (inclusive), including those Persons that purchased the Company's stock pursuant or traceable to the Company's Registration Statement and Prospectus for the Company's October 27, 2010 IPO. Excluded from the Class are: the Defendants; any officers or directors of Pacific Biosciences or the Underwriter Defendants during or after the Class Period; any corporation, trust or other entity in which any Defendant has a controlling interest; and the members of the immediate families of the Individual Defendants, and the Individual Defendants' successors, heirs, assigns and legal representatives. Also excluded from the Class are Persons otherwise meeting the definition of the Class who submit valid and timely requests for exclusion from the Settlement (see paragraph 8 below).

D. With respect to the Class, the Court finds that:

- (i) The members of the Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Action is impracticable. There were approximately 12.5 million shares of Pacific Biosciences stock offered through the IPO. The Class is, therefore, sufficiently numerous to render joinder impracticable.
- (ii) There are questions of law and fact common to the Class. Those questions include whether the Registration Statement contained misstatements or omissions, whether any misstatements or omissions were material, and whether any misstatements or omissions caused harm to the members of the Class.
- (iii) The claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Class Members. Plaintiffs claim to have purchased Pacific Biosciences stock between October 27, 2010 and September 20, 2011 pursuant or traceable to the same Registration Statement as the members of the Class. Consequently, Plaintiffs claim that they and the other members of the Class sustained damages as a result of the same misconduct by Defendants.
- (iv) Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interests of the Class Members. Plaintiffs have no interests in conflict with absent members of the Class. The Court is satisfied that Lead Counsel are qualified, experienced and prepared to represent the Class to the best of their abilities. The law firms of Scott+Scott, Attorneys at Law, LLP and Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP are hereby appointed Lead Counsel for the Class.
- (v) The questions of law or fact common to the members of the Class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.

7

8

12 13

11

15

14

16 17

18 19

20

2122

23 24

25

26 27

- E. The form, content, and method of dissemination of Notice given to the Class was adequate and reasonable and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort.
- F. Notice, as given, complied with the requirements of California law, satisfied the requirements of due process and constituted due and sufficient notice of the matters set forth herein.
 - G. The Settlement set forth in the Stipulation is fair, reasonable, and adequate.
- (i) The Settlement was vigorously negotiated at arm's length by Plaintiffs on behalf of the Class and by Defendants, all of whom were represented by highly experienced and skilled counsel. The case settled only after: (a) a mediation conducted by a retired U.S. District Court Judge who was thoroughly familiar with this Action; (b) Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted an extensive investigation, which included, among other things, a review of Pacific Biosciences' press releases, Securities Exchange Commission filings, analyst reports, media reports and other publicly disclosed reports and information about the Defendants, as well as non-public documents, including documents produced by certain PACB customers who obtained limited production release versions of the RS System; (c) the removal of this Action to federal court pursuant to the Securities Litigation Uniform Standards Act and a remand motion to state court (see Young v. Pacific Biosciences of California, Inc., et. al., Case Nos. 5:11-cv-05668, 5:11-cv-05669 EJD, 2012 WL 851509 (N.D. Cal. March 13, 2012); and (d) the drafting and submission of a highly detailed First Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint ("Complaint") that survived a demurrer. Accordingly, both the Plaintiffs and Defendants were well-positioned to evaluate the settlement value of this Action. The Stipulation has been entered into in good faith and is not collusive.
- (ii) If the Settlement had not been achieved, both Plaintiffs and Defendants faced the expense, risk, and uncertainty of extended litigation. The Court takes no position on the merits of either Plaintiffs' or Defendants' arguments, but notes these arguments as evidence in support of the reasonableness of the Settlement.
- H. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the interest of the Class Members in connection with the settlement.

6

10

11

12

13

9

14 15

17 18

16

19 20

21

23

22

2425

2627

28

 Plaintiffs, all Class Members, and Defendants are hereby bound by the terms of the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Stipulation and the Settlement embodied therein are approved as final, fair, reasonable and adequate. The Settlement shall be consummated in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Stipulation. The Parties are to bear their own costs, except as otherwise provided in the Stipulation.
- 2. All Released Parties as defined in the Stipulation are released in accordance with, and as defined in, the Stipulation.
- 3. Upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and all members of the Class shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the judgment shall have, absolutely and unconditionally, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged any and all of the Defendants, their past or present subsidiaries, parents, successors and predecessors, officers, directors, shareholders, partners, agents, employees, attorneys, advisors, and investment advisors, insurers, and any person, firm, trust, corporation, officer, director, or other individual or entity in which any Defendant has a controlling interest or which is related to or affiliated with any of the Defendants, and the legal representatives, heirs, successors in interest or assigns of the Defendants ("Released Parties") from, and shall forever be enjoined from suing any or all of the Released Parties for, any and all claims, including "Unknown Claims" (as defined in the Stipulation), arising out of, relating to, or in connection with: (i) the facts and circumstances alleged in the Complaint filed in this Action; and (ii) the purchase of PACB common stock, that were asserted or could have been asserted by any Plaintiff or member of the Class against the Released Parties. "Settled Claims" also includes any and all claims arising out of, relating to, or in connection with the Settlement or resolution of the Action against the Released Parties (including Unknown Claims), except claims to enforce any of the terms of the Stipulation.
- 4. Upon the Effective Date, all Released Parties, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the judgment shall have, absolutely and unconditionally, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged any and all claims, including "Unknown Claims" (as defined in the Stipulation), relating to the institution, prosecution or settlement of the Action that have been or could

28 |

have been asserted in the Action or any other forum by any of the Released Parties against Plaintiffs, Class Members, or their attorneys (except for claims to enforce any of the terms of the Stipulation) ("Settled Defendants' Claims").

5. The Releases granted herein shall be effective as a bar to any and all claims within the scope of their express terms and provisions that Plaintiffs or any Class Member does not know or suspect to exist in his, her, or its favor as of the Effective Date, and any claims against Plaintiffs which Defendants do not know or suspect to exist in their favor, which if known by him, her, or it might have affected his, her, or its decision(s) with respect to the Settlement. With respect to any and all Settled Claims (including Unknown Claims) and Settled Defendants' Claims (including Unknown Claims), the Parties stipulate and agree that by operation of this Final Judgment, upon the Effective Date, the Plaintiffs and Defendants shall have expressly waived, and each Class Member shall be deemed to have waived, and by operation of the Final Judgment shall have expressly waived, the provisions, rights and benefits of Cal. Civ. Code §1542, which provides:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR:

and any and all provisions, rights and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States, or principle of common law, which is similar, comparable, or equivalent to Cal. Civ. Code §1542. Plaintiffs and Class Members may hereafter discover facts in addition to or different from those which he, she, or it now knows or believes to be true with respect to the subject matter of the Settled Claims, but the Plaintiffs shall expressly fully, finally, and forever settle and release, and each Class Member, upon the Effective Date, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of this Final Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever settled and released, any and all Settled Claims, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, contingent or non-contingent, whether or not concealed or hidden, which now exist, or heretofore have existed, upon any theory of law or equity now existing or coming into existence in the future, including, but not limited to, conduct which is negligent, intentional, with or without malice, or a breach of any duty, law or rule, without regard to the subsequent discovery or existence of such different or additional facts. Plaintiffs and Defendants

acknowledge, and Class Members shall be deemed to have acknowledged, that the inclusion of "Unknown Claims" in the definition of Settled Claims and Settled Defendants' Claims was separately bargained for and was a key element of the Settlement.

- 6. All Class Members who have not made their objections to the settlement in the manner provided in the notice are deemed to have waived any objections by appeal, collateral attack, or otherwise.
- 7. All Class Members who have failed to properly file requests for exclusion (requests to opt out) from the Class are bound by the terms and conditions of the Stipulation and this Final Judgment.
 - 8. The single request for exclusion, by Mr. Evan A. Powell, is accepted by the Court.
- 9. All other provisions of the Stipulation are incorporated into this Order as if fully rewritten herein. To the extent that the terms of this Order conflict with the terms of the Stipulation, the Stipulation shall control.
- 10. Plaintiffs and all Class Members are hereby barred and enjoined from instituting, commencing, maintaining, or prosecuting in any court or tribunal any of the Settled Claims against any of the Released Parties.
- 11. Defendants and their successors or assigns are hereby barred and enjoined from instituting, commencing, maintaining, or prosecuting any of the Settled Defendants' Claims against Plaintiffs, Class Members or Plaintiffs' Counsel. The Court hereby decrees that neither the Stipulation nor this Final Judgment nor the fact of the settlement is an admission or concession by the Released Parties, or any of them, of any liability or wrongdoing. This Final Judgment is not a finding of the validity or invalidity of any of the claims asserted or defenses raised in the Action. Neither the Stipulation nor this Final Judgment nor the fact of settlement nor the settlement proceedings nor the settlement negotiations nor any related documents shall be offered or received in evidence as an admission, concession, presumption or inference against any of the Released Parties in any proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to consummate or enforce the Stipulation, or in an action or proceeding to determine the availability, scope, or extent of insurance coverage (or

reinsurance related to such coverage) for the sums expended for the settlement and defense of this Action.

- 12. Pursuant to and in full compliance with California law, this Court hereby finds and concludes that due and adequate notice was directed to all Persons and entities who are Class Members advising them of the Plan of Allocation and of their right to object thereto, and a full and fair opportunity was accorded to all Persons and entities who are Class Members to be heard with respect to the Plan of Allocation.
- 13. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Authorized Claimants, which is set forth in the Notice of Pendency and Proposed Settlement of Class Action (the "Notice") sent to Class Members, provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund established by the Stipulation among Class Members, with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity.
- 14. The Court hereby awards Lead Counsel attorneys' fees of \$2,260,000.00, plus expenses in the amount of \$113,000.00, together with the interest earned thereon for the same time period and at the same rate as that earned on the Settlement Fund until paid. The Court finds that the amount of fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of fees awarded is fair and reasonable given the contingent nature of the case and the substantial risks of non-recovery, the time and effort involved, and the result obtained for the Class.
- 15. The awarded attorneys' fees and expenses and interest earned thereon shall immediately be paid to Lead Counsel subject to the terms, conditions, and obligations of the Stipulation, and in particular ¶8 thereof, which terms, conditions and obligations are incorporated herein.
- 16. Time and expenses are awarded to the following Plaintiffs in the amounts indicated: Mathew Sandnas \$2,540.00 and Oklahoma Firefighters Pension and Retirement System \$5,943.36. Such reimbursement is appropriate considering their active participation as Plaintiffs in this action, as attested to by the declarations submitted to the Court.
- 17. In the event that the Stipulation is terminated in accordance with its terms: (i) this Judgment shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated *nunc pro tunc*; (ii) this Action shall

[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT

1	proceed as provided in the Stipulation; and (iii) the Defendants shall be permitted to object to the	
2	certification of any proposed class in this Action.	
3	18. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing	
4	jurisdiction over: (a) implementation of this settlement and any award or distribution of the Settlement	
5	Fund, including interest earned thereon; (b) disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) hearing and	
6	determining applications for attorneys' fees, interest and expenses in the Action; and (d) all parties	
7	hereto for the purposed of construing, enforcing, and administrating the Stipulation. under the terms of the stipulation of Settles	
8	19. Final judgment shall be entered herein for the amount of \$7,686,494.82 plus (i) with	
9	respect to the \$256,000 held back by the Company's insurer to pay Wilson Sonsini's fees and costs to	
10	complete the settlement of this action, 80% of any amount not spent, and (ii) with respect to the	
11	\$200,000 held back by the Company's insurer for Wilson Sonsini's fees and costs in connection with	
12	the Primo Federal Action, 80% of any amount not spent.	
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
14	DATED: OCT 3 1 2013	
15	THE HONORABLE MARIE S. WEINER	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25	• •	
26		
27		
28		
-0	- 8 -	
	[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT	