1 2 3 4	Robert J. Nelson (CSB No. 132797) rnelson@lchb.com LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BER 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3339 Telephone: (415) 956-1000 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008	RNSTEIN, LLP	
5	Juli E. Farris (CSB No. 141716)		
6	ifarris@kellerrohrback.com KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.		
7	801 Garden Street, Suite 301 Santa Barbara, CA 93101 Telephone: (805) 456-1496		
8	Telephone: (805) 456-1496 Facsimile: (805) 456-1497		
9	Class Counsel		
10	A. Barry Cappello (CSB No. 037835) abc@cappellonoel.com		
11	CAPPELLO & NOËL LLP 831 State Street		
12	Santa Barbara, CA 93101-3227 Telephone: (805)564-2444		
13	Facsimile: (805)965-5950		
14 15	Lead Trial Counsel (additional counsel listed at signature)		
16	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
17	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
	KEITH ANDREWS, an individual, et	G N 0.15 0.1110 PGG YFV	
18	al.,	Case No. 2:15-cv-04113-PSG-JEMx	
19 20	Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND	
21	V.	AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF	
22	PLAINS ALL AMERICAN	MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT	
23	PIPELINE, L.P., a Delaware limited	Date: September 20, 2022	
24	partnership, et al.,	Time: 1:30 p.m.	
25	Defendants.	Judge: Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez Courtroom: 6A	
26		Courtiooni. 0/1	
27			
28			

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this supplemental memorandum in support of their motion for final approval of the proposed Settlement. Dkt. 952. As set out in Plaintiffs' initial memorandum, the combined \$230 million, non-reversionary Settlement before the Court is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and should be finally approved pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e). The Settlement was reached on the eve of trial and only after an extraordinary degree of discovery and motion practice, and with the aid of experienced mediators who oversaw several mediation sessions over the course of many years. The proposed Settlement represents a substantial and impressive percentage of the Classes' maximum recoverable damages, and it heads off the unpredictable risks of trial and appeals – risks that are amplified in this case given its complexity, novelty, and scale.

Class members' response to the proposed Settlement indicates that they agree with this assessment. After implementation of a rigorous Class Notice plan that included individual mailed notice to thousands of Fisher and Property Class members, supplemented by extensive published notice, not a single Class member has objected to the proposed Settlement. The absence of objections, after a robust notice program, further supports final approval here.<sup>2</sup> "It is established that the absence of a large number of objections to a proposed class action settlement raises a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class settlement action are

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

28 free number, and establishing the online claims submission portal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A single Property Class member objected to the distribution plan because her property was included in the "Moderate" rather than "Heavy" oiling category. However, she does not challenge the Settlement itself or the Property Plan of Distribution generally. The issue she raises relates only to the classification of her individual property, and is based on the mistaken assumption that properties categorized as having sustained "Moderate" rather than "Heavy" oiling are treated differently in their allocations. They are not. These two oiling categories receive the same Fixed Share. This misunderstanding is more fully addressed in Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum in Support of the Plans of Distribution, Section II.A. <sup>2</sup> See Dkt. 959, Declaration of Jennifer Keough ("Keough Decl.") ¶ 11-14. The

<sup>26</sup> 27

Supplemental Declaration of Jennifer Keough ("Keough Supp. Decl.") describes the Administrator's efforts since July 29, 2022, including following-up on undeliverable direct mail notices, fielding inquiries through the website and toll-

1	favorable to the class members." N	at'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.,	
2	221 F.R.D. 523, 529 (C.D. Cal. 2004); see also Churchill Vill., LLC v. Gen. Elec.,		
3	361 F.3d 566, 577 (9th Cir. 2004) (	(affirming district court's approval of settlement	
4	where 45 of 90,000 class members	objected to the settlement and 500 class	
5	members opted out); <i>Smith v. Expe</i>	rian Info. Sols., Inc., No. SACV 17-00629-CJC	
6	(AFMx), 2020 WL 6689209, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 9, 2020). The absence of		
7	objections is especially meaningful given that many Class members have		
8	substantial recoveries at stake and therefore have more incentive to make any		
9	objections known. See Dkts. 951-1 ¶¶ 71, 75, 80; 951-2 ¶ 62; see also 4 Newberg		
10	AND RUBENSTEIN ON CLASS ACTIONS § 13:58 (6th ed.). <sup>3</sup>		
11	For the reasons stated above and in their initial memorandum in support of		
12	final settlement approval, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant their		
13	motion for final approval of the proposed Settlement as fair, adequate, and		
14	reasonable.		
15	Dated: September 2, 2022	Respectfully submitted,	
16		By:/s/Robert J. Nelson	
17			
18		Robert J. Nelson (CSB No. 132797) Nimish Desai (CSB No. 244953)	
19		Wilson M. Dunlavey (CSB No. 307719)	
20		Amelia A. Haselkorn (CSB No. 339633)	
21		LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP	
22		275 Battery Street, 29th Floor	
23		San Francisco, CA 94111-3339	
		Telephone: (415) 956.1000 Facsimile: (415) 956.1008	
24		, ,	
25		Juli E. Farris (CSB No. 141716)	
26	<sup>3</sup> Thirty-four Class members opted out of the case after the Classes were initially		
27		1 * 4 * CC 1	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Thirty-four Class members opted out of the case after the Classes were initially certified, prior to the Settlement. Plaintiffs have attached an amended proposed order that includes this list of opt-outs and references the lack of objections to the Settlement.

1	Matthew J. Preusch (CSB No. 298144)
2	KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
3	801 Garden Street, Suite 301 Santa Barbara, CA 93101
	Telephone: (805) 456-1496
4	Facsimile: (805) 456-1497
5	
6	Lynn Lincoln Sarko ( <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) Gretchen Freeman Cappio ( <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )
7	Michael D. Woerner ( <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )
8	Daniel Mensher (Pro Hac Vice)
9	Laura R. Gerber (Pro Hac Vice)
_	KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P. 1201 Third Ave, Suite 3200
10	Seattle, WA 98101
11	Telephone: (206) 623-1900
12	Facsimile: (206) 623-3384
13	Class Counsel
14	
15	A. Barry Cappello (CSB No. 037835) Leila J. Noël (CSB No. 114307)
16	Lawrence J. Conlan (CSB No. 221350)
	David L. Cousineau (CSB No. 298801)
17	CAPPELLO & NOËL LLP
18	831 State Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101-3227
19	Telephone: (805) 564-2444
20	Facsimile: (805) 965-5950
21	Lead Trial Counsel
22	W/11'. M. A. 1 / (COD. N. 117145.6)
23	William M. Audet (CSB No. 117456) Ling Y. Kuang (CSB No. 296873)
24	AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP
25	711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500
	San Francisco, CA 94102
26	Telephone: (415) 568-2555 Facsimile: (415) 568-2556
27	1 400111110. (110) 500 2000
28	Class Counsel

1	Plaintiffs,
2	vs.
3	PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE,
4	PLAINS ALL AMERICAN PIPELINE, L.P., a Delaware limited partnership, and PLAINS PIPELINE, L.P., a Texas limited partnership, and JOHN DOES 1
5	through 10,
6	Defendants.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Case No. 2:15-cv-04113-PSG-JEM

WHEREAS, plaintiffs Keith Andrews, Tiffani Andrews, Morgan Castagnola, Mike Gandall, Hwa Hong Muh, Ocean Angel IV LLC, Pacific Rim Fisheries, Inc., Sarah Rathbone, Community Seafood LLC, Santa Barbara Uni, Inc., Southern Cal Seafood, Inc., Wei International Trading, Inc., individually and in their representative capacities ("Fisher Class Representatives"), and Defendants Plains All American Pipeline, L.P. and Plains Pipeline, L.P. (collectively "Plains" or "Defendants") have reached a proposed settlement of the Fisher Class claims, which is embodied in the Settlement Agreement filed with the Court;

WHEREAS, plaintiffs Baciu Family LLC, Alexandra B. Geremia, Jacques Habra, Mark Kirkhart, and Mary Kirkhart ("Property Class Representatives"), and Plains have reached a proposed settlement of the Property Class claims, which is embodied in the Settlement Agreement filed with the Court;

WHEREAS, on May 25, 2022, an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Proposed Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order") was entered by this Court, preliminarily approving the proposed Settlement of this Action pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement and directing that Notice be given to the members of the Settlement Classes;

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, Class Members have been provided with Notice informing them of the terms of the proposed Settlement and of a Final Approval Hearing to, *inter alia*: (a) determine whether the proposed Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate so that the Final Approval Order and Judgment should be entered; (b) consider any timely objections to this Settlement and the Parties' responses to such objections; (c) rule on any application for attorneys' fees and expenses; (d) rule on any application for incentive awards; and (e) determine whether the Plans of Distribution that will be submitted by Class Counsel should be approved;

WHEREAS, a Final Approval Hearing was held on September 20, 2022. Prior to the Final Approval Hearing, proof of completion of Notice was filed with WHEREAS, the Fisher Class Representatives and the Property Class Representatives have applied to the Court for final approval of the proposed Settlement of the Action, the terms and conditions of which are set forth in the Settlement Agreement;

supporting the reasonableness of the Settlement;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Court having read and considered the Settlement Agreement and accompanying exhibits and the Motion For Final Settlement Approval, having heard any objectors or their counsel appearing at the Final Approval Hearing, having reviewed all of the submissions presented with respect to the proposed Settlement, and having determined that the Settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable and in the best interests of the Class Members, it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED THAT:

- 1. The capitalized terms used in this Order Granting Final Approval of Proposed Settlement have the same meaning as defined in the Settlement Agreement.
- 2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Action and over all claims raised therein and all Parties thereto, including the Classes.
- 3. The Court finds that the Notice set forth in Article V of the Settlement Agreement, detailed in the Notice Plan attached to the Declaration of Jennifer Keough of JND Legal Administration, and effectuated pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order: (a) constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances

-2 Case No. 2:15-cv-04113-PSG-JEN

- 4. Based on the papers filed with the Court and the presentations made to the Court at the hearing, the Court now gives final approval to the Settlement and finds that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class Members. The Court has specifically considered the factors relevant to class settlement approval. *See*, *e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e); *Churchill Vill.*, *L.L.C. v. Gen. Elec.*, 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004); *In re Bluetooth Headset Products Liability Litig.*, 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011).
  - a. Among the factors supporting the Court's determination are: the significant relief provided to Class Members; the risks of ongoing litigation, trial, and appeal; the risk of maintaining class action status through trial and appeal; the extensive discovery to date; and the positive reaction of Class Members.
  - b. Class certification remains appropriate for the reasons set out in the Court's prior orders certifying the Fisher Class and Property Classes. Further, the Fisher Class Representatives and the Property Class Representatives, and Class Counsel have adequately represented the classes.
  - c. The Settlement was negotiated at arm's length and was free of collusion. It was negotiated with experienced, adversarial counsel after extensive discovery, and with the aid of neutral, qualified mediators. Further, the attorneys' fees and costs award was the subject of a separate application to the Court.

- 5. The Settlement Agreement and every term and provision thereof are deemed incorporated in this Order and have the full force of an order of this Court.
- 6. Upon the Effective Date, all Class Members have, by operation of this Order, fully, finally and forever released, relinquished, and discharged the Released Parties pursuant to Article VII of the Settlement Agreement.<sup>1</sup>
- 7. Upon the Effective Date, Class Members, and their successors, assigns, parents, subsidiaries, affiliates or agents of any of them, are permanently barred and enjoined from commencing or continuing any action or proceeding in any court or tribunal asserting any claims released under the Settlement Agreement, including any claims for criminal restitution in *People v. Plains All Am. Pipeline, L.P.*, No. 1495091 (Cal. Superior Ct.) and writ relief sought in *Victim Restitution Claimants v. Superior Court of the County of Santa Barbara*, No. B317229 (Cal. Ct. of Appeal), and from accepting payment of any Restitution Award in *People v. Plains All Am. Pipeline, L.P.*, No. 1495091 (Cal. Superior Ct.).
- 8. This Final Approval Order, the Settlement Agreement, the Settlement that it reflects, and any and all acts, statements, documents or proceedings relating to the Settlement are not, and must not be construed as, or used as, an admission by or against Defendants of any fault, wrongdoing, or liability on their part, or of the validity of any claim or of the existence or amount of damages.
- 9. The above-captioned Action is dismissed in its entirety with prejudice. Except as otherwise provided in orders separately entered by this Court on any application for attorneys' fees and expenses, any application for incentive awards, and the Plans of Distribution submitted by Class Counsel, the parties will bear their own expenses and attorneys' fees.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A list of those who previously opted out of each of the Classes at the time they were certified, and therefore are not bound by the terms of the Settlement, is attached to this Order.

## Case 2:15-cv-04113-PSG-JEM Document 970-1 Filed 09/02/22 Page 7 of 8 Page ID #:45971

1	10. Without affecting the finality of this Order and the accompanying
2	Judgment, the Court reserves jurisdiction over the implementation of the Settlement,
3	including enforcement and administration of the Settlement Agreement, including
4	any releases in connection therewith, and any other matters related or ancillary to
5	the foregoing.
6	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	
9	DATED:
10	
11	
12	Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

## **LIST OF OPT-OUTS** 1 2 **Fisher Opt-outs Property Opt-outs** 3 Anthony Sogliuzzo Anthony Luna 4 Donald W. and Carol L. Swenson Jason Robinson 5 Kenneth Millington Janet Thornton 6 Francis F. and Edna L. Chen **Shane Robinson** 7 Patsy R. Lockwood John Burris 8 Erlaine Seeger Adam White 9 Adeline M. Godcombe Matthew Arf Jason Deaton **Boris LLC** 10 **David Meline** Henry Lara 11 Diane Ward 12 Donna Reckseen 13 Edward & Donna Martyn Fred Sanford 14 John Jones 15 John Torpey 16 Linda Ann and John Henry Seiter 17 Margaret Toth 18 Phyllis Walker Richard Gunther 19 Robin Arnold 20 Sarah Hinton 21 Steven C. Comstock 22 Thacher Family Beach House Trust 23 Waldemar S. Nelson Co. Inc. Joan Riley 24 25 26 27

28