	Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK D	ocument483	Filed07/26/13	Page1 of 3	
1					
2					
3	Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 19 Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 25029	8)			
4	Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &		LLP		
5	275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3. Telephone: 415.956.1000	339			
6	Facsimile: 415.956.1008				
7	Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064) Lisa J. Leebove (State Bar No. 186705)				
8	James G. Dallal (State Bar No. 277 JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, IN	826)			
9	505 Montgomery, Suite 625 San Francisco, CA 94111				
10	Telephone: 415.500.6800 Facsimile: 415.395.9940				
11	Co-Lead Class Counsel				
12 13	[Additional counsel listed on signature page]				
14	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
15	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
16	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
17	IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE		Master Docket N	No. 11-CV-2509-LHK	
18	ANTITRUST LITIGATION			BRIEF REGARDING OF THE PROPOSED	
19	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO):	SETTLEMEN	Γ ON PLAINTIFFS' ΓΑL MOTION FOR	
20	ALL ACTIONS		CLASS CERTIFICATION		
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	1123443.6			INTIFFS' STATEMENT REGARDING THE FECT OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK	

Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK Document483 Filed07/26/13 Page2 of 3

Pursuant to the Court's July 14, 2013 Case Management Order (Dkt. 460), Plaintiffs
 submit this brief regarding the effect of the proposed settlement between Plaintiffs and
 Defendants Lucasfilm, Ltd. ("Lucasfilm") and Pixar on Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion for Class
 Certification.¹

5 On July 12, 2013, following the all-party mediation and extensive subsequent 6 negotiations, Plaintiffs reached a settlement with two of the seven Defendants-Pixar and 7 Lucasfilm. With the Court's approval, the settlement will resolve all of the claims of the 8 proposed class of technical employees, as that class has been defined by Plaintiffs in their 9 Supplemental Motion for Class Certification (the "Technical Class"²), for settlement purposes 10 and only as against Pixar and Lucasfilm. In other words, the proposed settlement class is 11 coextensive with the proposed litigation class. Plaintiffs' claims against the other five 12 Defendants—Adobe, Apple, Google, Intel, and Intuit—on behalf of the same employees will 13 proceed. Upon completion of settlement documentation, Plaintiffs will promptly present the 14 Court with a motion for preliminary approval of the settlement, as well as a motion for 15 certification under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Technical Class (including employees of all of the 16 Defendants, both settling and not settling) only for purposes of settling the claims against 17 Lucasfilm and Pixar. Plaintiffs will suggest a schedule for the approval process in their 18 preliminary approval moving papers.

The settlement preserves Plaintiffs' right to litigate against the non-settling Defendants for
the entire amount of Plaintiffs' damages based on joint and several liability under the antitrust
laws. Beyond the scheduling of preliminary and final approval motions to effectuate the
settlement, there is no reason to delay or otherwise modify the litigation schedule set by the
Court, including the August 8, 2013 hearing on the Supplemental Motion for Class Certification,
the completion of expert discovery, dispositive motions, and trial. *See* May 15, 2013 Case
Management Order (Dkt. 421).

26

¹ Pursuant to the Court's Order of July 14 (Dkt. 460), lead trial counsel met and conferred with opposing counsel on July 24, 2013 and exchanged draft briefs.

^{28 &}lt;sup>2</sup> See Supp. Mot. at iii (Dkt. 418); Oct. 1, 2012 Expert Report of Edward Leamer, App. B (Dkt. 190).

Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK Document483 Filed07/26/13 Page3 of 3

1	As certification of the class for s	settlement purposes is di	stinct from certification of the			
2	class for litigation purposes, the settlement will not have an impact on Plaintiffs' pending					
3	Supplemental Motion for Class Certification, beyond the fact that certification for litigation					
4	purposes is only sought to pursue claims against the five remaining Defendants. Generally, the					
5	same Rule 23 standard applies for certification of a proposed class, whether for litigation or					
6	settlement purposes. Amchem Prod., Inc. v. Windsor, 521 U.S. 591, 619, (1997); Hanlon v.					
7	Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011, 1019-1023 (9th Cir. 1999).					
8						
9		Respectfully submitted,				
10	Dated: July 26, 2013 LIEFF	CABRASER, HEIMAN	NN & BERNSTEIN, LLP			
11	By:	/s/ Kelly M. Der				
12		Kelly M. Dermo				
13	Kelly I	d M. Heimann (State Bar M. Dermody (State Bar N	No. 171716)			
14		Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260) Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 199643)				
15	Dean H	Harvey (State Bar No. 25 3. Shaver (State Bar No.	0298)			
16	275 Ba	ttery Street, 29th Floor				
17	Teleph	San Francisco, California 94111-3339 Telephone: 415.956.1000 Facsimile: 415.956.1008				
18		H SAVERI LAW FIRM	. INC.			
19			,			
20	By:	/s/ Joseph R. Sav Joseph R. Saver	veri			
21	Iosanh	Ĩ				
22	Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064) Lisa J. Leebove (State Bar No. 186705) James G. Dallal (State Bar No. 277826)					
23	JOSEP	H SAVERI LAW FIRM lifornia, Suite 450				
24	San Fr	ancisco, CA 94111 one: 415. 500.6800				
25	Facin	ile: 415. 395.9940				
26	Co-Lea	Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiff Class				
27						
28						
	1123443.6	- 2 -	PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT REGARDING THE EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK			