

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

PRECISION ASSOCIATES, INC.; *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PANALPINA WORLD TRANSPORT
(HOLDING) LTD.; *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 08-CV-00042 (JG) (VVP)

FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
US DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.

★ AUG 22 2014 ★

BROOKLYN OFFICE

**ORDER (1) PRELIMINARILY
APPROVING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS WITH DEFENDANTS PANALPINA
WORLD TRANSPORT (HOLDING) LTD., PANALPINA, INC., GEODIS S.A., GEODIS
WILSON USA, INC., DSV A/S, DSV SOLUTIONS HOLDING A/S, DSV AIR & SEA
LTD. F/N/A DFDS TRANSPORT (HK) LTD., JET-SPEED LOGISTICS, LTD, JET-
SPEED AIR CARGO FORWARDERS (USA) INC., AND JET-SPEED LOGISTICS
(USA), LLC; AND (2) CONDITIONALLY CERTIFYING SETTLEMENT CLASS**

THIS CAUSE came before the Court on Plaintiffs' Omnibus Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlements. Plaintiffs have entered into a Settlement Agreement, dated March 18, 2014 ("Settlement Agreement"), with Defendants Panalpina World Transport (Holding) Ltd., and Panalpina, Inc. ("Settling Defendant"); a Settlement Agreement, dated May 5, 2014 ("Settlement Agreement"), with Defendants Jet Speed Logistics (USA), LLC, and Jet-Speed Air Cargo Forwarders, Inc.; a Settlement Agreement, dated May 5, 2014 ("Settlement Agreement"), with Defendants Geodis S.A. and Geodis Wilson USA, Inc.; and a Settlement Agreement, dated April 21, 2014 ("Settlement Agreement"), with Defendants DSV A/S, DSV Solutions Holdings A/S, and DSV Air & Sea, Ltd. F/N/A DFDS Transport (HK) Ltd. The Court, having reviewed

the Motion, its accompanying memorandum and the exhibits thereto, the Settlement Agreements¹, and the file, hereby:

ORDERS AND ADJUDGES:

Preliminary Approval of Settlement Agreement

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action and each of the parties to the Settlement Agreements. Upon review of the record, the Court finds that the four proposed Settlement Agreements, which were arrived at by arm's-length negotiations by highly experienced counsel, fall within the range of possible approval and are hereby preliminarily approved, subject to further consideration at the Court's Fairness Hearing. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlements encompassed by the Settlement Agreements raise no obvious reasons to doubt their fairness, and raise a reasonable basis for presuming that the Settlements and their terms satisfy the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and 23(e) and due process, and are fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class so that Notice of the Settlement should be given.

Class Certification

2. Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and in light of the proposed Settlements, the Court hereby finds that the prerequisites for a class action have been met and certifies the following class for settlement purposes (the "Settlement Class"):

All persons (excluding governmental entities, Defendants, their respective parents, subsidiaries and affiliates) who directly purchased Freight Forwarding Services

(a) for shipments within, to, or from the United States, or

(b) purchased or sold in the United States regardless of the location of shipment;

¹ Except as otherwise specified in this Order, the terms used in this Order shall have the same meaning as set forth in the Settlement Agreement executed by the settling parties and filed with this Court.

from any of the Defendants or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof, at any time during the period from January 1, 2001 to January 4, 2011.

3. For settlement purposes, the Court finds that the certification of the Settlement Class is warranted in light of the Settlement Agreements because:

(a) The Settlement Class, which has well over 1,000 members, is sufficiently numerous to satisfy the numerosity requirement;

(b) There are sufficient legal and factual issues common to the Settlement Class to meet the commonality requirement;

(c) Plaintiffs' and the Settlement Class' claims arise out of the same alleged illegal anticompetitive conduct and are based on the same legal theories, and therefore satisfy the typicality requirement;

(d) Plaintiffs Precision Associates, Inc., *et al.*, has retained experienced counsel and do not have interests antagonistic to the class, and thus these Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the Settlement Class; and

(e) Common issues, including those noted above, predominate over any individual issues affecting the members of the Settlement Class.

(f) Settlement of this Action on a class basis is superior to other means of adjudicating this matter.

4. Plaintiffs Precision Associates, Inc., *et al.*, will serve as Class Representatives on behalf of the Settlement Class.

Class Notice and Fairness Hearing

5. In the future, Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs shall submit for the Court's approval a Proposed Plan for Notice to the Class, including a proposed schedule for Class Members to opt out or object to the proposed Settlements. The Proposed Plan for Notice shall include the

proposed manner of Notice, a proposed Administrator for Notice and Claims and a proposed schedule for the Court's Fairness Hearing to determine whether the Settlements are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and whether they should be finally approved by the Court.

Class Counsel

6. The Court confirms the appointment of class counsel for purposes of the Settlement Class as the law firms of Lovell Stewart Halebian Jacobson LLP, Lockridge Grindal Nauen PLLP, Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy, LLP, and Gustafson Gluek PLLC.

Other Provisions

7. Terms used in this Order that are defined in the Settlement Agreements are, unless otherwise defined herein, used in this Order as defined in the Settlement Agreements.

8. In aid of the Court's jurisdiction to implement and enforce the proposed Settlements, as of the date of entry of this Order, Plaintiffs and all members of the Settlement Class shall be preliminarily enjoined from commencing or prosecuting any action or other proceeding in any federal, state, or local court, or agency against the Settling Defendants asserting any of the Claims released in the Settlement Agreements pending final approval of the Settlement Agreements or until such time as this Court lifts such injunction by subsequent order.

9. If the Settlement Agreements are terminated in accordance with their provisions, or are not approved by the Court or any appellate court, then the Settlement Agreements and all proceedings had in connection therewith shall be vacated, and shall be null and void, except insofar as expressly provided to the contrary in the Settlement Agreements, and without prejudice to the *status quo ante* rights of Plaintiffs, the Settling Defendants, and the members of the Settlement Class.

10. If the Settlement Agreements are terminated or are ultimately not approved, the Court will modify any existing scheduling order to ensure that the Plaintiffs and Settling Defendants will have sufficient time to prepare for the resumption of litigation, including, but not limited to, motion(s) to dismiss any amended complaint, the completion of discovery, preparation of expert reports, the filing of any summary judgment motion or motions, and preparation for trial.

11. The Court's certification of the Settlement Class as provided herein is without prejudice to, or waiver of: (a) the rights of any non-settling Defendant to contest certification of any other class proposed in this Action; or (b) the rights and/or arguments which have been or may be asserted by any non-settling Defendant in a motion to dismiss. The Court's findings in this Order shall have no effect on the Court's ruling on any motion to certify any class in this Action or on the Court's rulings concerning any non-settling Defendant's motion to dismiss; and no party may cite or refer to the Court's approval of the Settlement Class as persuasive or binding authority with respect to any motion to certify any such class or any non-settling Defendant's motion to dismiss. Further, if the Settlement Agreement is terminated or is ultimately not approved, Settling Defendant expressly retains the right to contest class certification, including, but not limited to, the right of appeal, of any other litigation class proposed in this Action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 21, 2014

Conformed copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record

s/John Gleeson

HON. JOHN GLEESON

United States District Judge