

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: CAPACITORS ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION**

**MASTER FILE NO. 3:14-cv-03264-JD**

**MDL No. 17-md-0281-JD**

**THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS**

**[PROPOSED] FINAL JUDGMENT OF  
DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE AS TO  
HOLY STONE DEFENDANTS**

1 This matter has come before the Court to determine whether there is any cause why this  
2 Court should not enter Final Judgment as to Defendants Holy Stone Enterprise Co., Ltd., Holy  
3 Stone Holdings Co., Ltd., Holy Stone Polytech Co. Ltd., Milestone Global Technology, Inc. dba  
4 HolyStone International, and Vishay Polytech Co., Ltd. (collectively, “Holy Stone”). The Court,  
5 having reviewed the settlement agreement between Plaintiffs Michael Brooks, CAE Sound, Steve  
6 Wong, Toy-Knowlogy Inc., AGS Devices, Ltd., J&O Electronics, Nebraska Dynamics, Inc.,  
7 Angstrom, Inc., MakersLED, In Home Tech Solutions, Inc., individually and on behalf of the  
8 Indirect Purchaser Class they seek to represent, on the one hand, and Holy Stone, on the other,  
9 dated April 12, 2018 (the “Settlement Agreement”); Indirect Purchasers’ Motion for Final  
10 Approval of Settlements with Holy Stone, NCC/UCC, and Rubycon Defendants; the pleadings  
11 and other papers on file in this action; and the statements of counsel and the parties, including at  
12 the October 18, 2018 Fairness Hearing, hereby finds no just reason to delay the entry of Final  
13 Judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b). Accordingly, the Court directs entry of  
14 Judgment, which shall constitute a final adjudication of the case on the merits as to Holy Stone in  
15 accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

16 Good cause appearing therefore:

17 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, AJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:**

18 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation, the Actions  
19 within this litigation, and the parties to the Settlement Agreements, including all members of the  
20 Settlement Class.

21 2. For purposes of this Judgment, except as otherwise set forth herein, the Court  
22 adopts and incorporates the definitions contained in the Settlement Agreement as though they  
23 were fully set forth in this Final Judgment. Specifically, “Class,” as defined in the Settlement  
24 Agreement, means:

25 All persons and entities in the United States who, during the period  
26 from April 1, 2002 to February 28, 2014, purchased one or more  
27 Electrolytic Capacitor(s) from a distributor (or from an entity other  
28 than a Defendant) that a Defendant or alleged co-conspirator  
manufactured. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their parent

1 companies, subsidiaries and Affiliates, any co-conspirators,  
2 Defendants' attorneys in this case, federal government entities and  
3 instrumentalities, states and their subdivisions, all judges assigned to  
4 this case, all jurors in this case, and all persons and entities who  
5 directly purchased Capacitors from Defendant.

6 3. Those persons and entities identified in the list attached hereto as **Exhibit A** are  
7 validly excluded from the Class. Such persons and entities are not included in or bound by this  
8 Judgment. Such persons and entities are not entitled to any recovery of the settlement proceeds  
9 obtained in connection with the Settlement Agreement.

10 4. The Court hereby dismisses on the merits and with prejudice IPPs' claims against  
11 Holy Stone, with each party to bear their own costs and attorneys' fees, except as provided in the  
12 Settlement Agreement.

13 5. All persons and entities who are Releasers under the terms of the Settlement  
14 Agreement are hereby barred and enjoined from commencing, prosecuting, or continuing, either  
15 directly or indirectly, any claim against the Releasees, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, in  
16 this or any other jurisdiction arising out of, or related to, any of the Released Claims.

17 6. The Releasees are hereby and forever released from all Released Claims as defined  
18 in the Settlement Agreement.

19 7. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court hereby  
20 retains continuing jurisdiction over

- 21 a. implementation of these settlements and any distribution to members of the  
22 Settlement Class pursuant to further orders of this Court;
- 23 b. disposition of the Settlement Fund;
- 24 c. determining attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, interest and Class Representative  
25 incentive awards;
- 26 d. the Action until Final Judgment contemplated hereby has become effective;
- 27 e. hearing and ruling on any matters relating to the plan of allocation of  
28 settlement proceeds; and

1 f. all parties to the Action and Releasing Parties, for the purpose of enforcing and  
2 administering the Settlement Agreement and the mutual releases and other  
3 documents contemplated by, or executed in connection with the Agreement.

4 8. This document constitutes a final judgment and separate documents for purposes  
5 of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 58(a).

6 9. The Court finds that, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(a) and (b),  
7 Final Judgment should be entered, and further finds that there is no just reason for delay in the  
8 entry of Final Judgment, as to the parties to the Settlement Agreements. Accordingly, the Clerk is  
9 hereby directed to enter Final Judgment forthwith.

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

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October \_\_, 2018

---

Hon. James Donato  
United States District Court Judge

**EXHIBIT A****REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION FROM HOLYSTONE SETTLEMENT**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Exclusion Request Timely</u></b>
Gayle L. Roberts	Yes
Peter Zdinak	Yes
LingoTeach Inc	Yes
Microsoft Mobile, Inc. and Microsoft Mobile Oy	Yes
Microsoft Corporation	Yes
Microsoft Corporation's Subsidiaries	Yes
Nokia Corporation (Finland)	Yes
Nokia Sales International Oy (Finland)	Yes
Nokia India Pvt. Ltd. (India)	Yes
OOO Nokia (Russia)	Yes
Nokia (China) Investment Co., Ltd. (China)	Yes
Nokia Telecommunications Ltd. (China)	Yes
Nokia Inc. (United States)	Yes
Nokia UK Limited (United Kingdom)	Yes
Nokia do Brasil Technologia Ltda (Brazil)	Yes
Nokia TMC Limited (South Korea)	Yes
Nokia (Thailand) Ltd. (Thailand)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks B.V. (The Netherlands)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks Oy (Finland)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks US LLC (United States)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks Japan Corp (Japan)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks India Private Limited (India)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks System Technology (Beijing) Co., Ltd (China)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks Branch Operations Oy (Finland)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks Korea Ltd (South Korea)	Yes
Nokia Solutions and Networks do Brasil Telecomunicações Ltda (Brazil)	Yes

**Final Judgment of Dismissal with Prejudice as to Approval of Settlement with Holy Stone Defendants; Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD**

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Exclusion Request Timely</u>
Nokia Solutions and Networks Technology Service Co., Ltd (China)	Yes
HERE Holding Corporation (United States)	Yes
HERE Global B.V. (The Netherlands)	Yes
HERE Europe B.V. (The Netherlands)	Yes
HERE North America LLC (United States)	Yes
HERE Deutschland GmbH (Germany)	Yes
Nokia Finance International B.V. (The Netherlands)	Yes
Nokia GmbH (Germany)	Yes
Nokia Capitel Telecommunications Ltd. (China)	Yes
Dongguan Nokia Mobile Phones Company Ltd. (China)	Yes
Nokia Komarom Kft (Hungary)	Yes
Nokia Romania SRL (Romania)	Yes
Nokia Communications Equipment (Shanghai) Ltd (China)	Yes
Nokia (HK) Ltd (Hong Kong)	Yes
Nokia Mobile Phone Manufacturing (HK) Ltd (Hong Kong)	Yes
Nokia Mobile Communications KK (formerly Nokia Mobile Phone Japan)	Yes
Dell Inc.	Yes
Dell Technologies, Inc.	Yes
EMC Corporation	Yes
Wyse Technology, Inc.	Yes

**Final Judgment of Dismissal with Prejudice as to Approval of Settlement with Holy Stone Defendants; Case No. 3:14-cv-03264-JD**