

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

**IN RE: WEBKINZ ANTITRUST
LITIGATION**)

**Case No. M:08-cv-01987-RS
MDL NO. 1987**

_____))
**THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL
ACTIONS**)

**ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL
OF SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF
ALLOCATION**

1 On September 13, 2012, Plaintiffs' Motion for Approval of Settlement with Defendants
2 and Plan of Allocation came on for hearing before this Court. Notice was given as required by
3 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules of this Court, and the Court's
4 Amended Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement and Issuance of Class Notice
5 (Dkt No. 151). Proof of dissemination of notice was provided to the Court through the
6 declaration of Carlos Rasch from Epiq Systems. (Dkt No. 152).

7 The Court, after carefully considering all papers filed herein and otherwise being fully
8 informed, has determined (1) that the Settlement with Defendants and Plan of Allocation should
9 be approved, and, (2) that there is no just reason for delay of the entry of final Judgment
10 approving the Settlement. Accordingly, the Court directs entry of Judgment which shall
11 constitute a final adjudication of this case on the merits as to the parties to the Settlement.

12 Due and adequate notice having been given, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby
13 finds that:

14 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the request and all matters
15 relating thereto, including all members of the Class and the Defendants.

16 2. Due and adequate notice of the proposed Plan of Allocation was provided to the
17 Class, including notice of the Settlement that was disseminated via direct mail and email, and
18 through posting on the website established for this case, www.plushtoysettlement.com. Such
19 notice was given in accordance with this Court's order preliminarily approving the Settlements.
20 *See* Dkt. No. 151. Such notice adequately advised the Class of the proposed Plan of Allocation
21 and their right to object to it. Full and fair opportunity was provided to the members of the Class
22 to be heard regarding the proposed Plan of Allocation and the notice requirements of Rule 23(e)
23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and due process have been satisfied.

24 3. The Settlement was reached only after protracted, arms-length negotiations that
25 included the assistance of an experienced mediator. The Settlement was reached only after
26 extensive litigation, and the completion of fact and expert discovery.

27 4. There have been no objections to the Settlement or the Plan of Allocation.

28 5. Accordingly, the Court grants final approval of the settlement with Defendants.

1 6. The Plan of Allocation set forth in the notice of Settlement is, in all respects, fair,
2 adequate and reasonable to the Class. Accordingly, the Court hereby grants final approval of the
3 Plan of Allocation.

4

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6

7 Date: September 17, 2012



8 RICHARD SEEBORG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28