

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MDL No. 1917

Case No. C-07-5944-SC

This Order Relates To:

ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

ORDER RE: PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENTS WITH THOMSON
AND TDA DEFENDANTS

Now before the Court is Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' ("DPPs") motion for preliminary approval of a class action settlement with Defendants Thomson SA (now known as Technicolor SA) and Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc. (now known as Technicolor USA, Inc.) (collectively, "Thomson"). ECF No. 3562 ("Mot."). The matter was initially set for hearing on March 20, 2015, which the Court rescheduled for April 3, 2015. The parties subsequently filed a stipulation seeking to move the rescheduled hearing, ECF No. 3808, but because the Court finds no hearing is necessary at this time, the hearing is VACATED and the stipulation is DENIED. See Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Rather than decide the motion at this time, the Court

1 ORDERS the parties to meet and confer and file supplemental
2 submissions addressing the Court's concerns.

3 The Court has three concerns about the current form of notice
4 and notice plan. First, the Court believes the summary notice
5 should be published in more than just the Wall Street Journal. The
6 parties should meet and confer and agree on another national
7 newspaper in which to publish notice and submit a revised proposed
8 order to that effect. Second, in light of a previous issue with
9 the parties' notice website,

10 www.CRTDirectPurchaserAntitrustSettlement.com, the Court requests
11 an additional submission (in declaration from the claims
12 administrator or in some other convenient form) assuring the Court
13 that the "Frequently Asked Questions" and "Dates to Remember" pages
14 will be updated promptly to reflect the opt-out deadline and other
15 important deadlines related to this settlement. See ECF Nos. 2698;
16 2698-1, at ¶ 10 & Ex. 6 (raising questions about whether these
17 pages were updated promptly in a previous settlement). Finally,
18 for similar reasons, the Court finds that the first page of the
19 notice should be edited to include the objection and opt-out
20 deadlines and the date, time, and place of the fairness hearing.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 The parties shall meet and confer and submit a revised form of
2 notice, proposed order, supplemental declaration, and any other
3 necessary documents within fourteen (14) days of the signature date
4 of this order.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: March 26, 2015


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE