## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page1 of 34

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Michael D. Braun (167416) BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C. 10680 West Pico Blvd., Suite 280 Los Angeles, CA 90064 Telephone: (310) 836-6000 Facsmile: (310) 836-6010  Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. (admitted pro hac vice) Wyatt A. Lison (admitted pro hac vice) STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC 429 Forbes Avenue 17th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Telephone: (412) 281-8400 Facsimile: (412) 281-1007  Janet Lindner Spielberg (221926) LAW OFFICES OF JANET LINDER SPIELBERG 12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 400 Los Angeles, CA 90025 Telephone: (310) 392-8801 Facsimile: (310) 278-5938  Attorneys for Plaintiffs Thurston, Denmon-Clark, and Astiana	James S. Notis (admitted pro hac vice) Jennifer Sarnelli (242510) Kelly A. Noto (admitted pro hac vice) GARDY & NOTIS, LLP 560 Sylvan Avenue Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632 Telephone: (201) 567-7377 Facsimile: (201) 567-7337  Attorneys for Plaintiffs Corriette and Waldron
16	IN THE UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
17	FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18		G . N. 10 . 04027 DVV
19	CHANEE THURSTON, and TANASHA DENMON-CLARK on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	Case No. 10-cv-04937-PJH  NOTICE OF MOTION, PLAINTIFFS'
20 21	Plaintiffs,	UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENTS, AND SUPPORTING
		MEMORANDUM
22	CONOPCO, INC. d/b/a UNILEVER (formerly d/b/a GOOD HUMOR-BREYERS) d/b/a	Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton
23	BREYERS,	Date: March 28, 2012
24	Defendant.	Time: 9:00 a.m. Location: Courtroom 3, Oakland Courthouse
25		
26		
27		
28		

Notice of Motion, Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH and 10-cv-04387-PJH

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page2 of 34

1		
2	ROSS CORRIETTE and JAMES WALDRON on behalf of themselves and all others similarly	RELATED CASE
3	situated,	Case No. 11-cv-01811-PJH
4	Plaintiffs, v.	
5	UNILEVER d/b/a BREYERS,	
6	Defendant.	
7		
8	SKYE ASTIANA on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,	RELATED CASE
9	Plaintiff,	Case No. 10-cv-04387-PJH
10	V.	
11	BEN & JERRY'S HOMEMADE, INC.,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14		
15		
16 17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Notice of Motion, Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH, and 10-cv-04387-PJH

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

MOTION	[	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT		
ARGUMI	ENT	5
I.	FACTUAL BACKGROUND	5
	A. Nature Of The Actions	5
	B. Litigation And Discovery	6
	C. Settlement Discussions	7
II.	THE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD BE PRELIMINARILY APPROVED	8
	A. The Settlement Classes Should Be Conditionally Certified	8
	1. The Settlement Classes Satisfy The Numerosity Requirement	10
	2. The Settlement Classes Satisfy The Commonality Requirement	10
	3. The Settlement Classes Satisfy The Typicality Requirement	11
	4. The Settlement Class Satisfies The Adequacy Requirement	12
	5. The Settlement Class Satisfies The Necessary Criteria Of Rule 23(b)	12
	a. Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate	13
	b. Differences in State Law Do Not Defeat Predominance	15
	c. A Class Action Is Superior To Other Methods Of Adjudication	19
	B. The Substantive Terms Of The Settlements Are Fair, And Should Be Granted Preliminary Approval.	20
	The Proposed Settlements Are Within The Range Of Possible Approval     As Fair, Reasonable, And Adequate	20
	2. The Settlement Was A Product Of Adversarial Arms'-Length Negotiation	22
	3. The Proposed Settlement Is Recommended By Class Counsel	23
	4. Summary	23
	C. The Notice Plan Should Be Approved	23
CONCLU	JSION	25
	:	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES 1 2 Cases 3 Alabama v. Blue Bird Body Co., Inc., 4 5 Amchem Prods. Inc. v. Windsor ("Amchem"), 6 7 Arenson v. Whitehall Convalescent & Nursing Home, Inc., 8 9 Astiana v. Ben & Jerry Homemade Inc., 10 Case No. 10-4387-PJH.....passim 11 Baghdasarian v. Amazon.com, Inc., 12 2009 WL 2263581 (C.D. Cal., Jul. 7, 2009)......19 13 Bellows v. NCO Fin. Sys., 14 15 16 Boyd v. Bechtel Corp., 17 18 Cal. Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. v. Legal Servs. Corp., 19 20 Carder Buick-Olds Co., Inc. v. Reynolds & Reynolds, Inc., 21 22 Castro v. Zenith Acquisition Corp., 23 24 Chavez v. Blue Sky Natural Beverage Co., 25 26 Class Plaintiffs v. Seattle, 27 28 Notice of Motion, Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting

Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH and 10-cv-04387-PJH

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page5 of 34

1	Collins v. Gamestop Corp., 2010 WL 3077671 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2010)
2	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1
3	Corriette, et al. v. Unilever,
4	Case No. 11-1811-PJHpassim
5	Friedman v. 24 Hour Fitness USA Inc.,
6	2009 WL 2711956 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2009)
7	Gattreaux v. Pierce,
8	690 F.2d 616 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982)
9	Gribble v. Cool Transports, Inc.,
10	2008 WL 5281665 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2008)
11	
12	Gruber v. Price Waterhouse, 117 F.R.D. 75 (E.D.Pa.1987)
13	
14	Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)
15	
16	Hanrahan v. Britt, 174 F.R.D. 356 (E.D.Pa. 1997)
17	17 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
18	Ikonen v. Hartz Mountain Corp., 122 F.R.D. 258 (S.D. Cal. 1998)
19	122 F.R.D. 238 (S.D. Cal. 1998)10
20	In re Badger Mountain Irr. Dist. Sec. Litig.,
21	143 F.R.D. 693 (W.D. Wash. 7 1992)
22	In re Connecticut General Life Ins. Co.,
23	1997 WL 910387 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 1997)
24	In re Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings in Petroleum Products Antitrust Litig.,
25	1993 WL 39306 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 1993)9
26	In re Domestic Air Transp Antitrust Litig,
27	141 FRD 534 (N.D. Ga. 1992)
28	iii
	Notice of Motion Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting

Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH and 10-cv-04387-PJH

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page6 of 34

1	In re Portal Software Sec. Litig.,
2	2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51794 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2007)
3	In re Tableware Antitrust Litig.,
4	484 F.Supp. 2d 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2007)
5	In re Tobacco II Cases, 46 Col 4th at 227, 02 Col Bata 2d 550, 207 B 2d 20 (Col. 2000)
6	46 Cal.4th at 327, 93 Cal.Rptr.3d 559, 207 P.3d 20 (Cal. 2009)
7	Jenson v. First Trust Corp.,
8	2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45078 (C.D. Cal. June 9, 2008)
9	Klay v. Humana, Inc.,
10	382 F.3d 1241 (11th Cir. 2004)
11	Liberty Lending Serv. v. Canada,
12	293 Ga.App. 731 (Ga. Ct. App. 2008)
13	
14	Local Joint Executive Bd. of Culinary/Bartender Trust Fund v. Las Vegas Sands, Inc., 244 F.3d 1152 (9th Cir. 2001)
15	
16	<i>Mazza v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.,</i> F.3d, 2012 WL 89176 (9th Cir. Jan 12, 2012)
17	1.5 <b>d</b> , 2012 WE 05170 (5th Ch. <b>5th</b> 12, 2012)
18	Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust,
19	339 U.S. 306 (1950)
20	Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Comm'n,
21	688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)
22	Parra v. Bashas, Inc.,
23	536 F.3d 975 (9th Cir. 2008)
24	Planconoia y Londina let Montega
25	Plascencia v. Lending 1st Mortgage, 259 F.R.D. 437 (N.D. Cal. 2009)
26	
27	Ross v. Trex Co., Inc., 2009 WL 2365865 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 2009)
28	
_0	iv
	Notice of Motion, Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting

Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH and 10-cv-04387-PJH

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page7 of 34

Rutstein v. Avis Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc., 211 F.3d 1228 (11th Cir. 2000)
Staton v. Boeing, 327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003)
Sullivan v. DB Investments, Inc., F.3d, 2011 WL 6367740 (3d Cir. Dec. 20, 2011)
Tchoboian v. Parking Concepts, Inc., 2009 WL 2169883 (C.D. Cal. Jul. 16, 2009)
Thurston et al v. Conopco, Inc., Case No. 10-04937-PJH
Torrisi v. Tucson Elec. Power, 8 F.3d 1370 (9th Cir. 1993)
Valentino v. Carter-Wallace, Inc., 97 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 1996)
Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp., 529 F.2d 943 (9th Cir. 1976)
Vasquez v. Superior Court of San Joaquin County, 94 Cal.Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964 (1971)
Wolin v. Jaguar Land Rover North America, LLC, 617 F.3d 1168 (9th Cir. 2010)
Zeisel v. Diamond Foods, Inc., Case No. 3:10-cv-01192 (N.D.Cal.)
Other Authorities
1 Herbert Newberg & Alba Conte, Newberg on Class Actions, § 3-13 (3d ed. 1992) 11, 13
V

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page8 of 34

1	7AA Charles Wright, Arthur Miller & Mary Kay Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure, §
2	1779 (3d ed.2005)
3	Manual for Complex Litigation (4th Ed. 2004) § 21.311
4	Williston on Contracts s 1515 (3d ed. 1970)
5	Williston on Contracts \$ 1313 (3d ed. 1970)
6	Rules
7 8	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1)
9	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2)
10	
11	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)
12	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)
13	
14	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)
15	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)
16	
17	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)(a)-(d)
18	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2)
19 20	
20	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2)
$\begin{bmatrix} 21 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$	Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6)
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	vi

Notice of Motion, Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH and 10-cv-04387-PJH

#### **MOTION**

#### TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, at the date, time, and location as set forth above, Plaintiffs Thurston, Denmon-Clark, Corriette, and Waldron (the "*Thurston/Corriette* Plaintiffs") and Plaintiff Skye Astiana (collectively, "Plaintiffs") will and hereby do, move the Court to grant preliminary approval of two class action settlements as set forth in the Settlement Agreements and exhibits attached herewith.<sup>1</sup>

For the reasons set forth in the accompanying memoranda of law filed in support of this Motion, Plaintiffs move this Court to preliminarily approve the two class action settlements (the "Settlements") set forth in the accompanying Settlement Agreements, to conditionally certify two classes for settlement purposes, to appoint counsel for the *Thurston/Corriette* Plaintiffs as class counsel for the Breyer's settlement class and counsel for Plaintiff Astiana as class counsel for the Ben & Jerry's settlement class, respectively, and to approve the proposed form and manner of giving notice to settlement class members of the settlements and advising them of their rights to participate and receive settlement benefits, to exclude themselves, or object.

Plaintiffs also move the Court to enter the following schedule regarding approval of the proposed settlement:

Hearing on Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Settlement	March 28, 2012
Deadline to complete notice ("Notice	July 1, 2012
Date") to settlement class members by	(No more than 95 days after preliminary

A copy of the Settlement Agreement entered into between Plaintiffs Chanee Thurston, Tanasha Denmon-Clark, Ross Corriette and James Waldron and defendant CONOPCO, INC. d/b/a UNILEVER d/b/a BREYERS (hereinafter, the "Breyers Settlement Agreement") is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Supporting exhibits are attached as Exhibits A1-A6.

A copy of the Settlement Agreement entered into between Plaintiff Skye Astiana and Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc. (hereinafter, the "B&J Settlement Agreement") is attached hereto as Exhibit B. Supporting exhibits are attached as Exhibits B1-B6.

The Breyers Settlement Agreement and the B&J Settlement Agreement are referred to collectively herein as the "Settlement Agreements."

mail and publication	approval Proposed Prelim. App. Orders at ¶ 6)
Deadline for filing of motion for final approval of proposed settlement	July 18, 2012 (28 days before Objection date Proposed Prelim. App. Orders, p.5 at ¶ 8)
Deadline for filing of application by Class Counsel for attorney's fees, reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, and incentive payment to Class Representative	July 25, 2012 (21 days before Objection Date Proposed Prelim. App. Orders, p. 2 at ¶ 7 and p.5 at ¶ 9)
Deadline for settlement class members to object to ("Objection Date") or opt out ("Opt-Out Date") of the proposed settlement	August 15, 2012 (No more than 45 days after the Notice Date Proposed Prelim. App. Orders, p.3 at ¶¶ 11-12, p. 6 at ¶ 13(a)
Deadline for filing supplemental papers in support of Final Approval and addressing any objections	August 29, 2012 (14 days before Final Approval HearingProposed Prelim. App. Orders, p. 5 at ¶ 10)
Deadline for settlement class members to submit claims forms ("Claim Deadline")	August 30, 2012 (60 days after Notice Date Proposed Prelim. App. Orders, p. 6 at ¶ 12)
Proposed Final Approval Hearing	September 12, 2012 (Proposed Prelim. App. Orders, p.6 at ¶ 13)

Plaintiffs have calculated the above dates for the schedule in bold italics, using March 28, 2012 as an estimated entry date for the Preliminary Approval Orders. If preliminary approval is instead entered at a later date for either or both Settlements, Plaintiffs respectfully ask that the proposed dates in the above chart be pushed back accordingly. A proposed order has been submitted separately for each of the class action settlements.

At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will have the opportunity to determine whether to grant final approval to the class action settlements, the settlement classes and the requested attorneys' fees and expenses, as well as to evaluate any objections thereto that may have been filed.

## 

# 

## 

# 

See Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(2) (directing that class action settlement that purports to bind absent class members may only be entered after hearing held by the court).

# MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

After a day-long, in-person mediation session on September 14, 2011, and through more than five weeks of subsequent, extensive negotiations between the parties with the mediator's continued assistance, settlements in principle were reached to resolve the claims asserted in the related cases, *Thurston et al v. Conopco, Inc.*, Case No. 10-04937-PJH (the "*Thurston* Action"), *Corriette, et al. v. Unilever*, Case No. 11-1811-PJH (the "*Corriette* Action"), and *Astiana v. Ben & Jerry Homemade Inc.*, Case No. 10-4387-PJH (the "*Astiana* Action") (collectively, the "Actions"), against Conopco, Inc. d/b/a Unilever (formerly d/b/a Good Humor-Breyers) d/b/a Breyers ("Unilever"), and its wholly-owned subsidiary, Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc. ("B&J") (collectively "Defendants"). The parties' agreement to resolve the claims asserted in the *Thurston* and *Corriette* Actions against Unilever based upon its sales of Breyers Ice Cream Products is set forth in the Breyers Settlement Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit A.<sup>2</sup> The parties' agreement to resolve the claims asserted in the *Astiana* Action against Defendant B&J based upon its sales of B&J Ice Cream Products is set forth in the B&J Settlement Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit B. As detailed below, preliminary approval of both Settlements should be granted.

The Settlements reached are unquestionably fair – they provide class members with meaningful monetary relief to compensate them for the claims that were pled in the Actions and call for Defendants to cease the offending practices. The gravamen of the allegations in each of the three Actions is that Defendants' Ice Cream Products were falsely and misleadingly labeled as "All Natural" when in fact those Ice Cream Products contained cocoa alkalized with potassium carbonate, a man-made, synthetic substance. *Thurston*, Doc. 21 at ¶¶ 1-2; *Corriette*, Doc. 1 at ¶¶ 2, 6; *Astiana*, Doc. 20 at ¶¶ 1-2. The Settlement Agreements redress these allegations by providing that B&J and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "The Ice Cream Products" at issue include B&J and Breyers ice cream flavors containing alkalized cocoa, as identified in footnote 3, *infra*; Exhibit A (Breyers Settlement Agreement) at Section II,  $\P$  20; and in Exhibit B (B&J Settlement Agreement) at Section II,  $\P$  20.

#### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page12 of 34

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

Unilever will discontinue use of the term "All Natural" on their Ice Cream Products, and reimburse each B&J and Breyers Settlement Class Member who certifies that he or she purchased B&J or Breyer Ice Cream Products, \$2.00 per package for each Ice Cream Product purchased, for up to ten packages. No proof of purchase is required for the first three packages claimed. If Breyers Class Members' claims are less than \$2,500,000.00 in total, then the difference between the amount paid to Breyers Class Members and \$2,500,000 will be donated to not-for-profit charities and/or causes of Unilever's choice related to food or nutrition in the United States through cy pres. Similarly, for B&J, which had approximately double the sales volume of Ice Cream Products as did Unilever, a \$5,000,000.00 restitution fund has been created. If B&J Class Members' claims are less than \$5,000,000.00 in total, then the difference between the amount paid to B&J Class Members and \$5,000,000.00 will be donated to not-for-profit charities and/or causes of B&J's choice related to food or nutrition in the United States through cy pres. Defendants have also agreed not to use the disputed "All Natural" claims on all other ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets containing alkalized cocoa in the future, thereby providing meaningful injunctive relief to Breyers and B&J Settlement Class Members. In addition, the Settlement Agreements require B&J and Unilever to bear the cost of the settlement logistics, including the costs of notice, claims administration, and awarded attorneys' fees and expenses. By any objective standard, the Settlements warrant preliminary approval.

The notices of the proposed Settlements also fully comply with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 and due process, as they fully advise Settlement Class Members of their rights under the Settlements and are tailored to provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances. *See* Exhibits A3, A4, B3, and B4 (proposed Short-form and Long-form notices). Further, the proposed Settlement Classes should be conditionally certified for settlement purposes since, as detailed below, all of the prerequisites for certification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 are satisfied. Thus, certification of both Settlement Classes is proper.

At bottom, the terms of the proposed Settlements are fair, reasonable, and not the subject of any collusion or unfair dealing. Indeed, under the proposed Settlements, Settlement Class Members have the opportunity to recover a substantial portion of the retail price for the B&J and/or Breyers

2 | 3 |

Ice Cream Products they purchased, and the allegedly unlawful and misleading product labeling has been discontinued. At this *preliminary* stage, approval should be granted. Doing so will allow notice of the proposed Settlements to be sent to the Settlement Classes and, in turn, will allow the Court to gauge the reaction of the Settlement Class Members to the proposed Settlements.

## **ARGUMENT**

#### I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

## A. <u>Nature Of The Actions</u>

On September 29, 2010, Plaintiff Skye Astiana filed a Complaint for Damages, Equitable, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief against Defendant B&J in the Northern District of California. *See Astiana*, Doc. 1 at 1. The *Astiana* Action asserted claims for common law fraud, consumer fraud (*i.e.*, violation of the UCL and FAL), and unjust enrichment on behalf of a nationwide class and a California sub-class of consumers who purchased B&J's "All Natural" ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets containing alkalized cocoa, and alleged that B&J had falsely and misleadingly packaged, marketed and sold its B&J "All Natural" premium ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets as being "All Natural" despite the fact that they contained alkalized cocoa processed with a non-natural, manmade, synthetic ingredient – potassium carbonate. *Id.* at ¶¶ 1-2 and n.1.

Thereafter, on November 1, 2010, Plaintiffs Thurston and Denmon-Clark filed a Complaint for Damages, Equitable, Declaratory and Injunctive Relief against Defendant Unilever in the Northern District of California. *See Thurston*, Doc. 1 at 1. The *Thurston* Action asserted claims for common law fraud, consumer fraud (i.e., violation of UCL/FAL), and unjust enrichment on behalf of a nationwide class and a California sub-class of consumers who purchased Breyers "All Natural" original ice creams, yogurts and sorbets or Breyers Smooth & Dreamy ½ Fat "All Natural" ice creams, yogurts and sorbets which contained alkalized cocoa, and alleged that Unilever had falsely and misleadingly packaged, marketed and sold its Breyers brand Original and Smooth & Dreamy ½ Fat ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets as "All Natural" despite the fact that they contained alkalized cocoa processed with a non-natural, man-made, synthetic ingredient – potassium carbonate. *Id.* at ¶¶ 1-2 and n.1.

On November 4, 2010, Plaintiffs Corriette and Waldron (along with a third Plaintiff who has since withdrawn), filed a Class Action Complaint against Defendant Unilever in the District of New Jersey. *See Corriette*, Doc. 1. The *Corriette* Action asserted claims for consumer fraud, breach of express and implied warranties, and unjust enrichment on behalf of a nationwide class and a New Jersey sub-class of consumers who purchased Breyers All Natural Original Ice Cream and Breyers Smooth & Dreamy ½ Fat All Natural Ice Cream containing alkalized cocoa, and alleged that these Ice Cream Products were not all natural because they contained alkalized cocoa. *Id.* at ¶¶1-2, 6.

The *Thurston* Action was initially assigned to Judge Richard Seeborg, but, given the common issues of law and fact, as well as the overlapping corporate ownership of B&J and Unilever, on January 19, 2011 this Court entered an order relating the *Astiana* and *Thurston* Actions. *See Astiana*, Doc. 34. After Judge William H. Walls ordered the *Corriette* action to be transferred from the District of New Jersey to the Northern District of California on March 28, 2011, the parties to the Actions filed a stipulation advising this Court that the *Corriette* Action should be related to the *Astiana* and *Thurston* Actions as it arose from similar events, involved related defendants, and called for a determination of substantially similar questions of law and fact. *See Astiana*, Doc. 55 at 2. By Order entered May 3, 2011, the Actions were related. *See Astiana*, Doc. 58.

## B. <u>Litigation And Discovery</u>

Subsequent to the filing of the *Astiana* and *Thurston* Actions, the parties to these two actions participated in a joint 26(f) conference. Defendants advised that they intended to file motions to dismiss and strike, and on November 24, 2010 and December 6, 2010, filed those motions in the *Astiana* and *Thurston* Actions, respectively. *See Astiana*, Doc. 16; *Thurston*, Doc. 17. Defendants' briefs included an exhaustive array of arguments and defenses, including federal preemption, abstention, and a Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b) challenge.

In response to Defendants' motions, Plaintiffs Astiana, Thurston, and Denmon-Clark filed Amended Complaints. *See Astiana*, Doc. 20; *Thurston*, Doc. 21. Thereafter, on December 20, 2010, Defendants renewed their motions to dismiss and strike, once again vigorously contesting Plaintiffs' claims. Plaintiffs responded with lengthy, rigorously-argued briefing on the panoply of arguments set forth by Defendants. *See Astiana*, Docs. 38, 39; *Thurston*, Docs. 34, 35.

5 6

7 8

10

9

12 13

11

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

During this time, Defendant also filed a motion to dismiss the *Corriette* Action, which was pending in the District of New Jersey. See Corriette, Doc. 13. The Corriette Plaintiffs opposed Defendant's motion to dismiss on January 24, 2011, see id., Doc.15, and on March 28, 2011, Judge William H. Walls denied Defendant's motion to dismiss and ruled that the Corriette Plaintiffs' claims were to be transferred to the Northern District of California, where the Astiana and Thurston actions were pending. Id., Doc. 19. Judge Walls further ruled that if the motion to dismiss that was pending in the Astiana and Thurston actions was granted for certain, specified reasons, the Corriette Plaintiffs could return to the District of New Jersey to litigate their claims. *Id.*, Doc. 18 at 11.

After extensive briefing submitted by the parties, as well as a zealously argued hearing before the Court on the Astiana and Thurston motions to dismiss, on May 26, 2011 the Court entered a 22-page order denying Defendants' motions to dismiss and strike in their entirety. See Astiana, Doc. 62. Subsequent to the Court's May 26, 2011 order, Plaintiffs engaged in discovery, serving document requests and interrogatories. The parties also agreed to engage in settlement discussions. See infra. Even after the parties agreed in principle to settle this matter, the Plaintiffs continued to engage in confirmatory discovery regarding Defendants' profits and sales, merits issues, and class certification issues, including thorough Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6) depositions of Unilever and B&J on February 23, 2012 and February 24, 2012, respectively.

#### C. **Settlement Discussions**

After a series of preliminary discussions, the parties agreed to mediate on September 14, 2011 before David A. Rotman, Esq., of Gregorio, Haldeman, Piazza & Rotman. During that mediation, including break-out sessions for the separate cases, and with the assistance of the mediator, the parties were able to reach agreement on certain key terms of the Settlements, and agreed to continue negotiating remaining terms thereafter. After approximately five weeks of continued negotiations involving the mediator, the parties reached agreements in principle to settle the three Actions, which are reflected in the Settlements presently before the Court.

The parties have diligently worked on the Settlements, which are the product of months of hard fought, arms-length negotiation. Plaintiffs believe the terms of the Settlements are incredibly favorable to the Settlement Classes, providing substantial remuneration (i.e., \$2.00 per package of

B&J or Breyers Ice Cream Products). Settlement Class Members may claim up to three packages of 1 2 Ice Cream Products with a sworn attestation of purchase and claim up to 10 packages with the 3 submission of adequate proofs of purchase. If the claims by the Breyers Settlement Class are less 4 than \$2,500,000 of purchases, the difference between what has been claimed and \$2,500,000 will be 5 donated to not-for-profit charities and/or causes of Unilever's choice related to food or nutrition in the United States as cy pres. Likewise, if the claims by the B&J Settlement Class are less than 6 7 \$5,000,000.00 of purchases, the difference between what has been claimed and \$5,000,000.00 will be donated to not-for-profit charities and/or causes of B&J's choice related to food or nutrition in the 8 9 United States as cy pres. In addition to the monetary compensation, the Settlements also provide for 10 injunctive relief to the Settlement Classes as B&J and Unilever agree in the future not to use the "All 11 Natural" claims on products containing alkalized cocoa. This injunctive relief not only provides a 12 future benefit to the Classes, but also represents a substantial cost to Defendants, since it will cost 13 \$7,500 per flavor to change Defendants' Ice Cream Products labels. The cost of this change for the 23 flavors of B&J Ice Cream Products and 35 flavors of Breyers Ice Cream Products will be 14 15 upwards of \$435,000. Defendants must also bear the costs of the settlement logistics, including the

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

As demonstrated below, the Notice Plans contemplated by the terms of the Settlement Agreements provide for both publication notice and direct mail notice where possible, and constitute the best notice practicable under the circumstances, comporting both with Fed.R.Civ.P. 23 and due process.

## II. THE SETTLEMENTS SHOULD BE PRELIMINARILY APPROVED

costs of notice, claims administration, and awarded attorneys' fees and expenses.

## A. The Settlement Classes Should Be Conditionally Certified

The Actions are class actions and, as such, the proposed Settlement Agreements call for certification of classes for settlement purposes only. *See* Exhibit A (Breyers Settlement Agreement) at Section III(A)(2) and III(B)(1); Exhibit B (B&J Settlement Agreement) at Section III(A)(2) and III(B)(1). The use of such settlement classes is common and proper in the resolution of class action litigation. *See*, *e.g.*, *Gribble v. Cool Transports*, *Inc.*, 2008 WL 5281665, at \* 3 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 15, 2008) (approving settlement class as part of final approval of class action settlement); *In re* 

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page17 of 34

1	Connecticut General Life Ins. Co., 1997 WL 910387, at *1 ¶ 2 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 13, 1997) (certifying
2	"for purposes of settlement, the Settlement Class defined in Section II and Exhibit E of the
3	Settlement Agreement"); In re Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings in Petroleum Products Antitrust
4	Litig., 1993 WL 39306, at *2 ¶2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 1993) (granting preliminary approval and
5	certifying "for purposes of this settlement only, Temporary Settlement Classes as defined in the
6	Settlement Agreement.").
7	Here, the Breyers Settlement Class is defined as:
8	all persons in the United States who purchased Breyers' Unilever Ice Cream Products
9	from November 4, 2004 through the date of Preliminary Approval of Settlement. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Unilever and its employees, principals,
10	affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (ii) any person who files a valid, timely Request for Exclusion; and (iii) the Judges to whom these Actions
11	are assigned and any members of their immediate families.
12	Exhibit A (Breyers Settlement Agreement) at Section III.A.2. Similarly, the B&J Settlement Class is
13	defined as:
14	all persons in the United States who purchased Ben &Jerry's Unilever Ice Cream
15 16	Products from September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval of the Settlement. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Unilever and its employees, principals, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (ii) any
17	person who files a valid, timely Request for Exclusion; and (iii) the Judges to whom this Action is assigned and any members of their immediate families.
18	Exhibit B (B&J Settlement Agreement) at Section III.A.2. <sup>3</sup>
19	Each of the two Settlement Class definitions sets forth an identifiable class, and each tracks
20	the putative class definitions pled by Plaintiffs. See Astiana, Doc. 20 at ¶¶ 25, 27 (alleging class
21	definition); Thurston, Doc. 21 at ¶¶ 25, 27 (same); Corriette, Doc. 1 at ¶¶ 1, 15 (same). Because, as
22	
23	
24	<sup>3</sup> Although both class definitions refer to "Unilever Ice Cream Products," this term is defined
25	differently for the B&J Settlement Class and Unilever Settlement Class. Under the B&J Settlement Agreement, "Unilever Ice Cream Products" is defined to mean "Ben & Jerry's All Natural premium
26	ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets containing alkalized cocoa," (Exhibit B at Section II, ¶ 20), while under the Unilever Settlement Agreement, "Unilever Ice Cream Products" is defined to mean

9

"Breyers All Natural Original Ice Cream containing alkalized cocoa or Breyers Smooth & Dreamy

½ Fat All Natural Ice Cream containing alkalized cocoa," (Exhibit A at Section II, ¶ 20).

27

28

shown below, the Settlement Classes meet all the requirements of Rule 23, each should be certified for settlement purposes.

## 1. The Settlement Classes Satisfy The Numerosity Requirement.

Rule 23(a)(1) requires that "the class [be] so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). It is undisputed that the Actions meet the numerosity requirement. Further, B&J and Unilever are among the largest ice cream manufacturers in the United States, and Plaintiffs have alleged, and discovery has confirmed, that hundreds of thousands of packages of the Ice Cream Products were sold nationwide by both B&J and Unilever during the approximately four-year class periods for the B&J and Breyers Settlement Classes. Unquestionably, although Plaintiffs do not know the precise numbers of Settlement Class Members in each of the two Settlement Classes, the overall number in each Settlement Class satisfies the numerosity requirement for class certification. *See, e.g., Ikonen v. Hartz Mountain Corp.*, 122 F.R.D. 258, 262 (S.D. Cal. 1998) (indicating 40 or more members generally sufficient). *See also In re Badger Mountain Irr. Dist. Sec. Litig.*, 143 F.R.D. 693, 696 (W.D. Wash. 7 1992) (indicating a plaintiff may satisfy Rule 23(a)(1)'s numerosity requirement by providing "[a] reasonable estimate of the limited number of purported class members")).

## 2. The Settlement Classes Satisfy The Commonality Requirement.

Rule 23(a)(2) requires that "there [be] questions of law or fact common to the class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2). "To establish commonality, '[t]he existence of shared legal issues with divergent factual predicates is sufficient, as is a common core of salient facts coupled with disparate legal remedies." *Parra v. Bashas, Inc.*, 536 F.3d 975, 978 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1019 (9th Cir. 1998)). This requirement is easily satisfied.

Here, the commonality requirement is met for each of the Settlement Classes because the claims of all absent Settlement Class Members in each Settlement Class arise from the same allegations, namely, that B&J and Unilever misleadingly labeled their Ice Cream Products as "All Natural" even though they contained a synthetic, man-made substance. Thus, common questions for both the Breyers Settlement Class and the B&J Settlement Class include: (1) whether the Ice Cream Products labeled as "All Natural" were in fact "All Natural"; and (2) whether Defendants uniformly

#### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page19 of 34

misrepresented through materially identical labels that their Ice Cream Products containing alkalized cocoa with potassium carbonate were "All Natural."

Each of the Settlement Classes shares the commonality requirement in that all Settlement Class Members in each Settlement Class have claims which depend upon the answers to this set of common questions. Additionally, the Settlement Classes share the commonality requirement in that all Settlement Class Members who purchased any of the "All Natural" Breyers Ice Cream Products as defined in the Settlement Agreements during the class periods are entitled to claim under the terms of the Settlements.

#### 3. The Settlement Classes Satisfy The Typicality Requirement.

Rule 23(a)(3) requires that "the claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3). This requirement is also met here.

Courts consistently find that the typicality requirement is satisfied if the claims arise from a common course of conduct. As stated by Professor Newberg:

Typicality determines whether a sufficient relationship exists between the injury to the named plaintiff and the conduct affecting the class, so that the court may properly attribute a collective nature to the challenged conduct. In other words, when such a relationship is shown, a plaintiff's injury arises from or is directly related to a wrong to a class, and that wrong includes the wrong to the plaintiff. Thus, a plaintiff's claims is typical if it arises from the same event or practice or course of conduct that gives rise to the claims of other class members, and if his or her claims are based on the same legal theory

1 Herbert Newberg & Alba Conte, Newberg on Class Actions, § 3-13, at 3-76 (3d ed. 1992). Typicality does not require the claims to be substantially identical. *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1020. Rather, the Ninth Circuit has found typicality if the requisite claims "share a common issue of law or fact' ... and are 'sufficiently parallel to insure a vigorous and full presentation of all claims for relief." *Cal. Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. v. Legal Servs. Corp.*, 917 F.2d 1171, 1175 (9th Cir. 1990) (citations omitted), amended, 937 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1991).

Plaintiffs Thurston, Denmon-Clark, Corriette and Waldron, like other absent Breyers Settlement Class Members, purchased Unilever's "All Natural" Breyers ice creams based upon identical written representations prominently displayed on the packages that the ice creams were "All Natural". Similarly, Plaintiff Astiana, like other absent B&J Settlement Class Members,

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

purchased B&J Ice Cream Products based upon identical written representations prominently displayed on the packages that the ice creams were "All Natural." Because Plaintiffs are members of the proposed Settlement Classes, and assert claims for common law fraud, consumer fraud, and unjust enrichment on behalf of themselves and all absent Settlement Class Members based upon Defendants' respective uniform courses of conduct and series of identical misrepresentations, their claims are typical of Settlement Class Members' claims.

## 4. The Settlement Class Satisfies The Adequacy Requirement.

Rule 24(a)(4) requires that "the representative parties will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). "Resolution of two questions determines legal adequacy: (1) do the named plaintiffs and their counsel have any conflicts of interest with other class members and (2) will the named plaintiffs and their counsel prosecute the action vigorously on behalf of the class?" *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1020. There are no conflicts of interest alleged or that could possibly exist here. Plaintiffs seek the exact same remedy as all class members: namely, relief to address the claims that Defendants misrepresented and misbranded their Ice Cream Products in order to entice individuals to purchase these products when in fact the Ice Cream Products had synthetic, man-made substances that rendered them non-natural. Plaintiffs' interests, therefore, are perfectly aligned with the interests of the Settlement Classes.

The adequacy of Plaintiffs and their counsel is evidenced by the Settlements negotiated with Defendants, which yield meaningful relief to the Settlement Classes. Further, counsel for Plaintiffs are highly experienced in class action litigation, and have been involved in many class action settlements and actions. *See* Declaration of Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. ("Kravec Decl.") filed herewith at Exs. 1-4 (attaching resumes of class counsels' law firms).

#### 5. The Settlement Class Satisfies The Necessary Criteria Of Rule 23(b).

In addition to meeting all the class certification requirements enumerated in Rule 23(a), a movant must also satisfy at least one of the requirements of Rule 23(b). Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b). Here, the Settlement Classes' claims may be appropriately certified under Rule 23(b)(3), which provides that class certification is appropriate if the criteria of Rule 23(a) are met, and if:

[T]he court finds that the questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3). These so-called "predominance" and "superiority" requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are readily met in this case.

## a. Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate.

"To establish predominance of common issues, a party seeking class certification is not required to show that the legal and factual issues raised by the claims of each class member are identical. Rather, the predominance inquiry focuses on whether the proposed class is 'sufficiently cohesive to warrant adjudication by representation.'" *Friedman v. 24 Hour Fitness USA Inc.*, 2009 WL 2711956, at \*6 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2009) (quoting *Local Joint Executive Bd. of Culinary/Bartender Trust Fund v. Las Vegas Sands, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 1152, 1162 (9th Cir. 2001)). Here, for each of the two Settlement Classes, this cohesiveness assuredly exists because the overarching inquiry and interest of all putative class members is whether the members of the Settlement Classes are entitled to relief for their purchases of Defendants' misbranded and misleadingly-labeled Ice Cream Products. This evidence, and proof as to the existence of a legally cognizable claim to obtain such relief, therefore, would predominate over any individual issues in adjudicating this case.

Professor Newberg summarized the issue by stating that:

A single common issue may be the overriding one in the litigation, despite the fact that the suit also entails numerous remaining individual questions .... In finding that common questions predominate over individual ones in particular cases, courts have pointed to such issues that possess the common nucleus of fact for all related questions, have spoken of a common issue as the central, or overriding question, or have used similar articulations.

1 Newberg & Conte, supra, § 4.25 at 4-85 to 4-86 (internal citations omitted). Similarly, the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has explained that the requirement of predominance may be satisfied by showing that the litigation is dominated by a "common nucleus of facts and potential legal remedies." *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1022; *see also Klay v. Humana, Inc.*, 382 F.3d 1241, 1255 (11th Cir. 2004)(citation omitted) ("Common issues of fact and law predominate if they 'ha[ve] a

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page22 of 34

direct impact on every class member's effort to establish liability and on every class member's entitlement to injunctive and monetary relief."). "[O]ne methodology is to determine whether the addition or subtraction of any class member would have "a substantial effect on the substance or quantity of the evidence offered." *Id.* at 1255 (quoting *Alabama v. Blue Bird Body Co., Inc.,* 573 F.2d 309, 322 (5th Cir. 1978)). If manipulation of the proposed class members does not affect "the quantum of evidence introduced by the plaintiffs as a whole," then "common issues are likely to predominate." *Id.* Plaintiffs can satisfy Rule 23(b)(3) predominance by showing that "the issues in the class action that are subject to generalized proof, and thus applicable to the class as a whole, ... predominate over those issues that are subject only to individualized proof." *Rutstein v. Avis Rent-A-Car Sys., Inc.*, 211 F.3d 1228, 1233 (11th Cir. 2000).

In cases such as the *Astiana*, *Thurston* and *Corriette* Actions, where claims are based on a single defendant's (either Unilever in the case of the *Thurston* and *Corriette* Actions, or B&J in the case of the *Astiana* Action) common course of standardized misconduct, predominance of common questions is easily satisfied. *See, e.g., Hanrahan v. Britt*, 174 F.R.D. 356, 365 (E.D.Pa. 1997) (finding predominance in allegations that "defendants' systematic course of conduct misled class members and concealed material information from putative class").

Here, Plaintiffs maintain, and discovery has confirmed, that labels bearing identical material "All Natural" claims were made on Ice Cream Products sold nationwide by B&J and Unilever. Plaintiffs' common law fraud, consumer fraud, and unjust enrichment claims are all based on the language of the labels themselves, which are identical with respect to the alleged misrepresentation that the Ice Cream Products were "All Natural." Every package of Ice Cream Products purchased by Plaintiffs and the Settlement Classes included an identical alleged misrepresentation that the Ice Cream Products were "All Natural" when they in fact contained a synthetic, man-made substance, namely alkalized cocoa processed with potassium carbonate. This was a material misstatement with respect to each label. Whether B&J misrepresented that its Ice Cream Products were "All Natural" is the core predominant issue in every B&J Settlement Class Member's claim, and, whether Unilever misrepresented its Ice Cream Products as "All Natural" is the core predominant issue in every Breyers Settlement Class Member's claims. For both Settlement Classes, all Class Members' claims

are dependent upon the same factual and legal issues. None of the Settlement Class Members'

claims will require case-specific inquiries into the facts surrounding each alleged class member's

purchases of the Ice Cream Products to establish liability on behalf of either B&J or Unilever. It is

not necessary for the Court to parse through individual fact scenarios to determine whether B&J and

Unilever misrepresented the nature of the products they were offering for sale to consumers. The

answer would be the same for all Settlement Class Members. As such, common issues clearly

predominate and it is fair to say that these related cases are designed precisely for class action

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

treatment.

## b. Differences in State Law Do Not Defeat Predominance.

Consistent with the above, differences in state laws do not predominate in this case. Each of the claims asserted on behalf of the Settlement Classes is routinely certified on behalf of national classes, and the elements of these claims are sufficiently similar across the country that they do not present an obstacle to certification.

Specifically, numerous courts have certified claims for common law fraud claims on behalf of national classes where those fraud claims are based upon identical, material written misrepresentations. See, e.g., Chavez v. Blue Sky Natural Beverage Co., 268 F.R.D. 365, 376-380 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (certifying common law fraud claims on behalf of national class); *Plascencia v.* Lending 1st Mortgage, 259 F.R.D. 437 (N.D. Cal. 2009); Carder Buick-Olds Co., Inc. v. Reynolds & Reynolds, Inc., 148 Ohio App.3d 635, 775 N.E.2d 531 (Ohio App. 2 Dist., 2002) (certifying common law fraud claim on behalf of national class; stating "when courts are faced with commonlaw state claims such as fraud ... they have expressed doubts that differences in state laws are so great as to preclude class treatment ... We also doubt that the elements of a common-law fraud claim could vary greatly from state to state."). See also, Collins v. Gamestop Corp., 2010 WL 3077671, \*3-4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2010) (refusing to strike allegations of national common law fraud class).

Moreover, while defendants opposing class certification have frequently argued that the element of reliance introduces individual issues that require individualized proof, numerous courts have explained that, while reliance is a requirement of common law fraud, "[i]n claims of fraud based upon written representations, the reliance element may sometimes be presumed." Liberty

Lending Serv. v. Canada, 293 Ga.App. 731, 741 (Ga. Ct. App. 2008) (concluding class-wide reliance could be inferred based upon "fact that similar written representations were common to all the security agreements at issue"; certifying class claims for common law fraud). See also Vasquez v. Superior Court of San Joaquin County, 94 Cal.Rptr. 796, 484 P.2d 964, 973 (1971) citing Williston on Contracts § 1515 (3d ed. 1970) ("where action is taken in response to material representations, "in the absence of evidence showing the contrary, it will be presumed that the representations were relied on"); Arenson v. Whitehall Convalescent & Nursing Home, Inc., 164 F.R.D. 659, 666 (N.D.Ill. 1996) ("Even for the common law fraud claim, which requires proof of reliance, it is well established that individual issues of reliance do not thwart class actions.") (citations omitted); Gruber v. Price Waterhouse, 117 F.R.D. 75, 81 (E.D.Pa.1987) ("[T]he existence of individual questions of reliance does not defeat class certification ....").

For instance, in *Chavez* – a similar case dealing with misrepresentations on beverage labels – Chief Judge Walker recently explicitly rejected arguments that individual issues of reliance would predominate and prevent certification of a common law fraud claim on behalf of a national class of "consumers who purchased a Blue Sky beverage bearing the allegedly misleading labels in violation of state [labeling] laws." 268 F.R.D. at 377. As Chief Judge Walker explained in certifying a national litigation class, "a presumption, or at least an inference, of reliance arises wherever there is a showing that a misrepresentation was material [that is] if 'a reasonable man would attach importance to its existence or nonexistence." *Id.*, citing *In re Tobacco II Cases*, 46 Cal.4th at 327, 93 Cal.Rptr.3d 559, 207 P.3d 20 (Cal. 2009).

Here, as in *Chavez*, the alleged misrepresentations on the labels violated applicable product labeling laws – which is strong evidence of materiality and, *ipso facto*, of reliance. Thus, common issues clearly predominate with respect to Plaintiffs' common law fraud claims.

In addition, settlement certification of Plaintiffs' consumer fraud and unjust enrichment claims is also appropriate. Plaintiffs recognize that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently held in *Mazza v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.* ("*Mazza*"), --- F.3d ---, 2012 WL 89176 (9th Cir. Jan 12, 2012), that certification of a nationwide class of consumers for the purpose of *litigation* under California's consumer protection and unjust enrichment laws was inappropriate where the plaintiffs

#### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page25 of 34

alleged non-uniform misrepresentations and omissions of material facts about an automobile manufacturer's breaking system. *Mazza*, 2012 WL at \* 12. However, it is undersigned counsel's understanding that the plaintiffs in *Mazza* is seeking *en banc* review of the ruling. Moreover, to the extent *Mazza* evades or survives *en banc* review, it should not impact grant of a *settlement-only* class certification here.

Specifically, *Mazza* holds that in the context of certifying a *litigation* class under Rule 23, predominance is not met when the court must look to the consumer protection and unjust enrichment laws of each state. *Id.* at \*12. This ruling is inapplicable here as Plaintiffs seek nationwide class certification for the purpose of *settlement*, not litigation.

Where a settlement class was concerned, the Supreme Court recognized in *Amchem Prods*. *Inc. v. Windsor* ("*Amchem*"), 521 U.S. 591, 625 (1997), that "predominance is a test readily met in certain cases alleging consumer or securities fraud..." The Supreme Court explained that predominance "tests whether proposed classes are sufficiently cohesive to warrant adjudication by representation." *Id.* at 623. Accordingly when "[c]onfronted with a request for settlement-only class certification, a district court need not inquire whether the case, if tried, would present intractable management problems." *Id.* at 620.

Relying heavily on *Amchem*, an *en banc* panel of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, reviewing a nationwide class certification of consumer fraud and unjust enrichment claims in the settlement context, recently held that Rule 23's predominance requirement does not preclude nationwide *settlement-only* class certification of claims brought under the consumer protection and unjust enrichment laws of all 50 states. *See Sullivan v. DB Investments, Inc.*, --- F.3d ---, 2011 WL 6367740 (3d Cir. Dec. 20, 2011).

In *Sullivan*, the parties entered into an agreement to settle claims for antitrust violations on behalf of a class of indirect purchasers nationwide for claims brought under state antitrust, consumer protection, and unjust enrichment laws of all 50 states. *Id.* at \*4. In response to the settlement, objectors attacked predominance arguing settlement class certification was inappropriate due to differences among various states' consumer protection and unjust enrichment laws, specifically because many states prohibited indirect purchasers from recovering damages for antitrust injuries.

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page26 of 34

Id. at 5. The Third Circuit disagreed. Relying on the Supreme Court's decision in Amchem, the Third Circuit held that "in the settlement context, variations in state antitrust, consumer protection and unjust enrichment laws did not present the types of insuperable obstacles that could render class litigation unmanageable." Id. at \*16 (emphasis added, internal quotation and citation omitted).

Moreover, the Third Circuit found that for the purposes of certifying a nationwide class for settlement purposes, the Court need not find that each absent class member has a valid claim as this would inappropriately introduce the requirements of Rule 12(b)(6) into Rule 23. *Id.* at \*17-18 ("a court may inquire whether the elements of asserted claims are capable of proof through common evidence, but lacks authority to adjudge the legal validity or soundness of the substantive elements of asserted claims"). The requirements of Rule 23 are to "assess[]whether a class action 'would achieve economies of time, effort, and expense, and promote uniformity of decision as to persons similarly situated." *Id.* at \*11 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) advisory committee's note to 1966 amendment).

It is under these same guiding principles that the Ninth Circuit has upheld *settlement-only* class certification in nationwide settlements. *See, e.g., Hanlon,* 150 F.3d at 1022 (finding predominance met for the purpose of certifying a nationwide settlement class alleging individual states' breach of express and implied warranties and "lemon laws"). Similarly, in reliance on *Sullivan,* Judge Jeffrey S. White of this District also granted preliminary approval of settlement post-*American Honda* to a national class of walnut purchasers asserting claims under the UCL, FAL and for unjust enrichment. *See Zeisel v. Diamond Foods, Inc.*, Case No. 3:10-cv-01192 (N.D.Cal.), at Docs. 210 (granting preliminary approval of nationwide settlement) and 212 (granting plaintiff leave to file supplemental brief on *American Honda* and *Sullivan*), attached as Kravec Decl. Exs. 5 and 6.

In sum, Plaintiffs have met their burden at this preliminary stage of demonstrating that the Settlement Classes' claims are based on substantially uniform principles of law, and that common issues of law and fact remain the predominant focus of the Actions.

# 234

## 5 6

## 7

## 8

## 10

# 1112

## 13 14

## 15

## 16

## 17

## 18

## 19

# 2021

## 22

## 23

# 2425

## 26

## 27

## 28

## c. A Class Action Is Superior To Other Methods Of Adjudication.

The "superiority" requirement of Rule 23(b)(3) is also easily met in this case. Rule 23(b)(3) identifies four factors relevant to a superiority inquiry: (1) the class members' interests in individually prosecuting separate actions; (2) whether any litigation concerning the controversy has already been brought by class members; (3) the desirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum; and (4) the likely difficulties in managing a class action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)(a)-(d). "[T]he purpose of the superiority requirement is to assure that the class action is the most efficient and effective means of resolving the controversy." *Wolin v. Jaguar Land Rover North America, LLC*, 617 F.3d 1168, 1175 (9th Cir. 2010) (citing 7AA Charles Wright, Arthur Miller & Mary Kay Kane, Federal Practice and Procedure, § 1779 at 174 (3d ed.2005).

Here, each of the Rule 23(b)(3) "superiority" factors clearly militates in favor of class certification. First, there is no interest by Settlement Class Members to individually litigate. Where damages suffered by each putative class member are small compared to the cost of litigating, this factor weighs in favor of certifying a class action. See Wolin, 617 F.3d at 1175. Although the damage resulting from Defendants' alleged misrepresentations to the Settlement Classes are real and significant, the cost of individually litigating such a case against Unilever or B&J would easily exceed the value of any relief that could be obtained by any one purchaser. This, alone, warrants a finding that a class action is a superior method of adjudication. See Tchoboian v. Parking Concepts, Inc., 2009 WL 2169883, at \*7 (C.D. Cal. Jul. 16, 2009) (granting motion for class certification and noting that "[t]his superiority inquiry requires a comparative evaluation of alternative mechanisms of dispute resolution."); Baghdasarian v. Amazon.com, Inc., 2009 WL 2263581, at \*7 (C.D. Cal., Jul. 7, 2009) (granting motion for class certification and noting that the superiority inquiry is geared to address "the problem that small recoveries do not provide the incentive for any individual to bring a solo action prosecuting his or her rights."). A class action is the superior method to adjudicate class claims when it will protect the rights of class members who may lack the financial resources to bring the alleged wrongdoers into court. Amchem Prods., Inc., 521 U.S. at 617. A class action is the superior method for managing litigation if no realistic alternative exists. Valentino v. Carter-Wallace, Inc., 97 F.3d 1227, 1234 -1235 (9th Cir. 1996).

#### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page28 of 34

The other factors also each weigh in favor of certification. Regarding the second factor, there is no evidence of any other litigation involving the claims asserted in the present case. The third factor also favors certification because efficiency makes it desirable to litigate similar, related claims in one forum. The fourth factor points to the superiority of a class approach because there is nothing before the Court to suggest difficulty in managing this case as a settlement class action. On the contrary, litigating all claims together avoids the risk of inconsistent results for Defendants and for all Settlement Class Members. In short, a class action here promotes judicial efficiency, avoids inconsistency, and provides a single forum to resolve numerous common claims.

Because each of the proposed Settlement Classes meets all the applicable requirements for certification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the Breyers Settlement Class and the B&J Settlement Class should be conditionally certified from purposes of settlement. At the Fairness Hearing, the Court will have the further opportunity to revisit this conditional certification in deciding whether to grant Final Approval to the Settlement Agreements.

## B. The Substantive Terms Of The Settlements Are Fair, And Should Be Granted Preliminary Approval

## 1. The Proposed Settlements Are Within The Range Of Possible Approval As Fair, Reasonable, And Adequate

Preliminary approval should also be granted to the Settlements because their terms are fair and reasonable. Ultimately, the decision as to whether to grant preliminary approval to a settlement of a class action is a matter left to the discretion of the trial court. *See Castro v. Zenith Acquisition Corp.*, 2007 WL 81905, \*1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2007). In exercising that discretion, however, the Court should bear in mind that "there is an overriding public interest in settling and quieting litigation," and this is "particularly true in class action suits." *Van Bronkhorst v. Safeco Corp.*, 529 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1976). Recognizing that a settlement represents an exercise of judgment by the negotiating parties, *see Torrisi v. Tucson Elec. Power*, 8 F.3d 1370, 1375-1376 (9th Cir. 1993), the Ninth Circuit has held that "the court's intrusion upon what is otherwise a private consensual agreement negotiated between the parties to a lawsuit must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or

collusion between, the negotiating parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned." *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Comm'n*, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982).

The general standard by which courts are guided when deciding whether to grant preliminary approval to a class action settlement is whether the proposed settlement falls within the range of what could be "fair, adequate, and reasonable," so that notice may be given to the proposed class, and a hearing for final approval may be scheduled. *Class Plaintiffs v. Seattle*, 955 F.2d 1268, 1276 (9th Cir. 1992); *see also Gattreaux v. Pierce*, 690 F.2d 616, 621 n.3 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982) (If the court finds that the proposed settlement is "within the range of possible approval" and that notice should be given, "the next step is the fairness hearing.").

The proposed Settlements assuredly satisfy the foregoing criteria. The terms of the Settlement Agreements provide B&J and Breyers Settlement Class Members with meaningful relief that addresses the precise legal injury that was alleged in the *Astiana*, *Thurston* and *Corriette* Actions. The recovery offered is real and substantial. In addition to the injunctive relief secured by the Settlements, each qualifying Settlement Class Member is entitled to receive \$2.00 per package of Ice Cream Products purchased. Exhibit A (Breyers Settlement Agreement) at Section III(C)(1)(b); Exhibit B (B&J Settlement Agreement) at Section III(C)(1)(b). Class Members may claim up to three packages with a sworn attestation of purchase and claim up to ten packages with submission of adequate proofs of purchase. *Id.* The amounts payable to Settlement Class Members under the Settlements reasonably approximate the amounts that could have been recovered at trial on a price premium theory or through restitutionary disgorgement of profits. Indeed, the \$2.00 per package amount is about 60% of the average retail price paid by Settlement Class Members. Of course, Defendants' wholesale price (*i.e.*, revenue) and ultimate profit per package after deduction of costs is lower than the retail price. By any measure, the Settlements' terms are fair and reasonable.

The Settlements' terms are also fair and reasonable when considered in light of the uncertain prospects and risks faced by Plaintiffs and the putative classes. Defendants vigorously denied liability (and still do) and voiced their intention to vigorously contest not only the ultimate liability but also the amount of damages. Although the *Thurston/Corriette* Plaintiffs and Plaintiff Astiana

remained confident of the merits of their cases, the results were not predictable with any degree of certainty. Further, even if judgment were entered against either or both Defendants, they could still appeal. Such an appeal to the Ninth Circuit would likely take years to resolve, such that, even if successful, ultimate relief to the Settlement Classes would likely be years down the road.

## 2. The Settlement Was A Product Of Adversarial Arms'-Length Negotiation

The discussions and negotiations leading up to the Settlements were conducted in vigorous, adversarial, and arms-length fashion, which provides added indicia of the fairness of the Settlements.

Here, it is undeniable that the settlement negotiations were non-collusive and adversarial in nature. Before engaging in any settlement talks, the parties vigorously litigated Defendants' motions to dismiss and motions to strike, which raised exhaustive challenges to Plaintiffs' claims. Further, it was only after Plaintiffs demonstrated the strength of their claims by overcoming Defendants' motions to dismiss and strike that Defendants were willing to consider the possibility of mediation. Thus, it was only in September 2011, after months of litigation and discovery, that the agreements in principle to settle the three Actions were reached. The settlement negotiations were then presided over by a professional mediator, including a one-day, in person, session followed by five weeks of continued negotiations conducted by the mediator.

Moreover, the Settlement Agreements were reached at a time when uncertainties lay ahead for each party. All parties faced the prospect of a protracted and costly discovery process. In addition, at the Case Management Conference, Defendants indicated that they intended to file a motion for summary judgment, *see Astiana*, Doc. 66 at 3, the outcome of which, like any other adversarial motion in litigation, was uncertain. If the motion were granted, then, subject to any appeal, Defendants' exposure would decrease, potentially completely. On the other hand, even if the motion were denied, Plaintiffs faced the prospect of arduous preparations for a trial on the merits, which could go either way. Thus, the chronology of the proceedings made it particularly reasonable for the parties to explore a settlement at the time that they did, if doing so could be done on a fair and reasonable basis.

## 3. The Proposed Settlement Is Recommended By Class Counsel

The recommendations of class counsel are entitled to a presumption of reasonableness. *Boyd v. Bechtel Corp.*, 485 F. Supp. 610, 622 (N.D.Cal. 1979). Here, class counsel, and with the well-informed support of Plaintiffs Thurston, Denmon-Clark, Corriette, Waldron, and Astiana, believe strongly that the Settlements offer broad and valuable relief to the Breyers Settlement Class and B&J Settlement Class, and are in the best interest of the Settlement Classes.

## 4. Summary

The factors to consider in determining the fairness of a proposed settlement must be analyzed in the context of the settlement as a whole. *Staton v. Boeing*, 327 F.3d 938, 959, 961 (9th Cir. 2003). Here, all pertinent factors indicate that the Breyers and B&J Settlements are "within the range" of being fair, reasonable, and adequate. *See, e.g., In re Tableware Antitrust Litig.*, 484 F.Supp. 2d 1078, 1079-80 (N.D. Cal. 2007); *Ross v. Trex Co., Inc.*, 2009 WL 2365865, \*3 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 2009). Because the proposed Settlements amount to a reasonable means of resolving the Actions, and because the risks and expenses inherent in continuing to litigate these matters are significant and uncertain, the proposed Settlements should be preliminarily approved.

## C. The Notice Plan Should Be Approved.

Rule 23 and due process concerns call for notice to be provided to absent Settlement Class Members in order to inform them of the proposed Settlements, and grant them the opportunity to opt-out or object. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(c)(2). The notice and means of disseminating it must be the "best notice practicable" under the circumstances. *See Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust*, 339 U.S. 306, 314-315, 317 (1950). That test is clearly satisfied by the parties' proposed notice.

Here, the parties propose to disseminate notice of the proposed class action settlements by: (1) U.S. Mail for putative class members whose names and addresses are known; (2) by publication as set forth in the Notice Plans for the remainder of the putative classes whose names and address cannot be determined; (3) Website provided by the class action claims administrator and the posting of notices and other settlement papers on class counsel's websites. Exhibit A (Breyers Settlement Agreement) at Section V(1) and Exhibit A6 (Decl. of Mark Rapazzini setting forth Breyers Notice Plan); Exhibit B (B&J Settlement Agreement) at Section V(1) and Exhibit B6 (Decl. of Mark

#### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page32 of 34

Rapazzini setting forth B&J Notice Plan). With respect to the publication notice component, the parties propose to disseminate notice of each of the Settlements through the websites and publication in four national circulation periodicals in which Defendants' have historically advertised their Ice Cream Products, namely Cooking Light, Country Living, Entertainment Weekly (print and eversions), and Rolling Stone (print and e-versions). Kravec Decl. Ex. 7 (Unilever 30(b)(6) testimony) at 46; Kravec Decl. Ex. 8 (B&J 30(b)(6) testimony) at 6. These publications have a collective readership of over 45 million people. See Exhibit A6 (Rapazzini Decl. on Breyers Notice Plan) at attachment B thereto; Exhibit B6 (Rapazzini Decl. on B&J Notice Plan) at attachment B thereto. The proposed Notice Plans are tailored to the demographics of consumers of B&J and Breyers Ice Cream Products, as well as to those magazines in which Defendants have historically published, and are appropriate to reach members of the Classes. See Id. at ¶ 2 and Ex. 1 thereto; Kravec Decl. Ex. 7 (Unilever 30(b)(6) testimony) at 45-46; Kravec Decl. Ex. 8 (B&J 30(b)(6) testimony) at 5-9. See also Zeisel v. Diamond, Case No. 3:10-cv-01192 (N.D.Cal.), Doc. 194 at 2 (approving similar proposed plan of notice in litigation context where notice was tailored to reach consumers), attached as Kravec Decl. Exhibit 9.

The Notice Plans constitute the "best notice practicable" under the circumstances and in similar circumstances has been approved by courts. *See*, *e.g.*, *Jenson v. First Trust Corp.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 45078 (C.D. Cal. June 9, 2008) (mail notice to all members who could be identified through reasonable effort and by publication, provided the best notice practicable); *In re Portal Software Sec. Litig.*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 51794, 18-19 (N.D. Cal. June 30, 2007) (notice by mail and publication was the "best notice practicable under the circumstances"); *In re Domestic Air Transp Antitrust Litig*, 141 FRD 534, 550-51 (N.D. Ga. 1992) (providing notice by mail to those class members who could be identified and by publication only to those who could not be identified

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The parties propose to publish the Breyers Short-form Notice in Country Living and Cooking Light magazines, and the B&J Short-form Notice in Rolling Stone and Entertainment Weekly. *See* Exhibit A6 (Rappazini Decl. on Breyers Notice Plan) at ¶¶ 2-3; Exhibit B6 (Rappazini Decl. on B&J Notice Plan at ¶¶ 2-3). However, the Breyers Short-form Notice and the B&J Short-form Notice both apprise Settlement Class Members of both Settlements. *See* Exhibit A4 (Breyers Short-form Notice); Exhibit B4 (B&J Short-form Notice).

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page33 of 34

- 1			
	satisfies due process); In re Tableware Antitrust Litig., 484 F. Supp. 2d 1078, 1080 (N.	D. Cal.	
	2007)("because defendants do not have a list of potential class members [] the court agre	es with	
	plaintiffs that notice by publication is the only reasonable method of informing class member	rs of the	
	pending class action and []settlement); Manual for Complex Litigation (4th Ed. 2004) §	21.311	
	("Publication in magazines, newspapers, or trade journals may be necessary if class members	are not	
	identifiable after reasonable effort"); Bellows v. NCO Fin. Sys., 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1144	151, 6-7	
	(S.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2008) (summary notice in USA Today, with national distribution further d	lirecting	
	class members to a dedicated website was the best notice practicable under the circumstances	).	
	In addition, the proposed forms of notice also comply with due process requireme	ents and	
	Rule 23. The proposed forms of notice are attached as Exhibits 3 and 4 to the Breyers Set	tlement	
	Agreement, and as Exhibits 3 and 4 to the B&J Settlement Agreement. See Exhibits A3, A4,	B3, B4	
	attached hereto. The proposed forms follow the guidelines developed by the Federal Ju	udiciary	
	Center, www.fjc.gov, use simple and concise language, and effectively inform absent Set	ttlement	
	Class Members as to the terms of the Settlements, as well as their right to avail themselves	s of the	
	Settlements, opt-out, or object. See Exhibits A3, A4, B3, and B4.		
	The forms of notice and plan of dissemination should, therefore, be approved.		
	CONCLUSION		
	For all the foregoing reasons, the Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Appr	roval of	
	Class Action Settlements should be GRANTED.		
	Dated: February 24, 2012		
	STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE GARDY & NOTIS, LLP PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC		
	By: s/Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.  Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.  By: s/Kelly A. Noto Kelly A. Noto (admitted pro had	c vice)	
	(admitted pro hac vice)  James S. Notis (admitted pro hac vice)		
	Wyatt A. Lison (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ) 429 Forbes Avenue 17th Floor  Jennifer Sarnelli (242510) 560 Sylvan Avenue		
	Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632		
	Telephone: (412) 281-8400 Telephone: (201) 567-7377		
	Facsimile: (412) 281-1007 Facsimile: (201) 567-7337		

Unopposed Motion for Preliminary A

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Corriette and Waldron

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75 Filed02/24/12 Page34 of 34

J	
1	Michael D. Braun (167416)
2	BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C. 10680 West Pico Blvd., Suite 280
3	Los Angeles, CA 90064 Telephone: (310) 836-6000
4	Facsmile: (310) 836-6010
5	Janet Lindner Spielberg (221926) LAW OFFICES OF JANET
6	LINDER SPIELBERG 12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 400
7	Los Angeles, CA 90025 Telephone: (310) 392-8801
8	Facsimile: (310) 278-5938
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Thurston, Denmon-Clark, and Astiana
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	26

Notice of Motion, Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements, and Supporting Memorandum; Case Nos.: 10-cv-04937-PJH, 11-cv-01811-PJH and 10-cv-04387-PJH

# EXHIBIT B TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

## Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-1 Filed02/24/12 Page2 of 35

1		
1	Michael D. Braun (167416) BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.	Janet Lindner Spielberg (221926) LAW OFFICES OF JANET
2	10680 West Pico Blvd., Suite 280 Los Angeles, CA 90064	LINDER SPIELBERG 12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 400
3	Telephone: (310) 836-6000 Facsmile: (310) 836-6010	Los Angeles, CA 90025 Telephone: (310) 392-8801 Facsimile: (310) 278-5938
4	Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. (admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )	
5	STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC 429 Forbes Avenue 17th Floor	
6	Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Telephone: (412) 281-8400	
7	Facsimile: (412) 281-1007	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff Astiana	
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SKYE ASTIANA on behalf of herself and all	Case No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH
12	others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
13	V.	Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton
14	BEN & JERRY'S HOMEMADE, INC.,	
15	Defendant.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT	Case No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH

1
 2
 3

28 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The undersigned parties (collectively, the "Parties," and each separately a "Party") to the above-captioned action (the "Action"), by and through their attorneys, have entered into the following Stipulation of Class Action Settlement (the "Agreement"), subject to the approval of this Court.

#### I. RECITALS

This Agreement, including its attached Exhibits, is entered into by and among Plaintiff SKYE ASTIANA ("Plaintiff"), on behalf of herself and on behalf of each of the Settlement Class Members, and defendant BEN & JERRY'S HOMEMADE, INC. ("Unilever" or "Defendant"). Capitalized terms used herein are defined in Section II of this Agreement or indicated in parentheses elsewhere in this Agreement. Subject to Court approval as required by applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and as provided herein, the Parties hereby stipulate and agree that, in consideration for the promises and covenants set forth in the Agreement and upon the entry by the Court of a Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement and the occurrence of the Effective Date, the Action shall be settled and compromised upon the terms and conditions contained herein.

WHEREAS on September 29, 2010, plaintiff Skye Astiana filed a class action complaint against Unilever in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California captioned, *Astiana, et al. v. Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc.*, No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH (N.D. Cal.) (the "Astiana Action"), on behalf of herself and other consumers who, on or after September 28, 2006, purchased in the State of California Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream products that were labeled "All Natural" but contained alkalized cocoa; and

WHEREAS, the complaint generally alleges that Ben & Jerry's packaged, marketed and sold its ice cream products as being "All Natural" despite the fact they contain alkalized cocoa—a non-natural, processed ingredient that additionally contains man-made, synthetic ingredients including potassium carbonate; and

WHEREAS on November 24, 2010, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss the Action, on December 8, 2011, plaintiff Astiana filed an amended class action complaint against Unilever, and on December 20, 2010, Defendant filed a motion to dismiss the Action; and

to the Thurston Action and *Astiana v. Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc.*, No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH (N.D. Cal.); and

WHEREAS, on May 26, 2011, the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton entered an order Denying Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and Motions to Strike [Docket No. 62]; and

WHEREAS on May 3, 2011, the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton entered a Related Case

Order relating Catanese, et al. v. UNILEVER d/b/a BREYERS, No. 11-CV-01811-PJH (N.D. Cal.)

WHEREAS on August 22, 2011, Ben & Jerry's began producing to Plaintiffs' counsel internal, non-public documents pertaining to the Action in response to Plaintiff's requests for discovery; and

WHEREAS the parties agreed to engage the services of a private mediator to explore the possibility of a settlement of the Action, and between September 14, 2011, and October 25, 2011, following the exchange of mediation position statements, the parties engaged in mediation and thereafter held extensive arm's-length discussions with respect to a potential settlement of the Action; and

WHEREAS counsel for all parties to the Action have reached an agreement in principle set forth in this Agreement, providing for, among other things, the settlement of the Action between and among Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Settlement Class, and Unilever, on the terms and subject to the conditions set forth below; and

WHEREAS Plaintiffs' counsel have determined that a settlement of the Action on the terms reflected in this Agreement is fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of Plaintiff and the Settlement Class; and

WHEREAS Unilever, to avoid the costs, disruption and distraction of further litigation, and without admitting the validity of any allegations made in the Action, or any liability with respect thereto, has concluded that it is desirable that the claims against it be settled and dismissed on the terms reflected in this Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, this Agreement is entered into by and among the Parties, by and through their respective counsel and representatives, and the Parties agree that: (a) upon the

-2-

6 7

> 8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

25

26

27 28

Effective Date, the Action and all Released Claims shall be settled and compromised as between Plaintiff and the Settlement Class on the one hand, and Unilever on the other hand; and (b) upon Final Approval of the Agreement, the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement, substantially in the form attached as Exhibit 1 hereto, shall be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice and releasing all Released Claims against Plaintiff, Unilever and all Released Parties, all on the following terms and conditions:

#### II. **DEFINITIONS**

As used in the Agreement and the Exhibits hereto, in addition to any definitions elsewhere in the Agreement, the following terms shall have the meanings set forth herein:

- 1. "Action" or "Complaint" means Astiana, et al. v. Ben & Jerry's, Homemade, Inc., No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH (N.D. Cal.).
- 2. "Administrative Costs" means all costs incurred by the Claims Administrator, excluding Notice Expenses.
- 3. "Agreement" means this Settlement Agreement (including all Exhibits attached hereto).
- 4. "Award" means the monetary relief obtained by Settlement Class Members pursuant to Section III.C.1. and Section IV of this Agreement.
- 5. "Attorneys' Fees and Expenses" means such funds as may be awarded by the Court to Co-Lead Counsel based on the stipulation described herein to compensate them and all other Plaintiffs' Counsel in this Action for their fees and expenses in connection therewith, as described more particularly in Section VIII of this Agreement.
- 6. "Authorized Claimant" means any member of the Settlement Class who timely submits a valid Claim Form and confirms on that form the information required.
- 7. "Claim" means a request for relief pursuant to Sections III.C.1. and IV of this Agreement submitted by a Settlement Class Member on a Claim Form filed with the Claims Administrator in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.
  - 8. "Claim Form" means the form to be used by a Settlement Class Member to file a

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Claim with the Claims Administrator. The proposed Claim Form is subject to Court approval and attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

- 9. "Claims Administration Expenses" means the expenses incurred by the Claims Administrator in administering the Notice Program (as described in Section V, below) and processing all Claims made by Settlement Class Members, including all Notice Expenses.
  - 10. "Claims Administrator" means Rust Consulting, Inc.
- 11. "Claims Deadline" means the date by which all Claim Forms must be postmarked or received by the Claims Administrator to be considered timely. The Claims Deadline shall be clearly set forth in the Court Orders granting Preliminary and Final Approval of the Settlement, the Class Notice, the Claims Administrator's dedicated website, and the front page of the Claim Form, and shall be 60 days after the Notice Date.
- 12. "Class Notice" or "Notice" means the forms of notice to be disseminated to Settlement Class Members informing them about the Settlement. Copies of each of the proposed Notices are attached respectively in the form of Exhibits 3 and 4.
  - 13. "Class Representative" means plaintiff Skye Astiana.
- 14. "Co-Lead Counsel" means the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg, the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Stember Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC.
- 15. "Court" means the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton presiding.
- 16. "Defendant" means BEN & JERRY'S, HOMEMADE, INC. ("Unilever") and includes, without limitation, all related entities including but not limited to parents, subsidiaries, agents, employees and assigns, predecessors, successors and affiliates.
- 17. "Effective Date" means either: (a) the date thirty-five (35) days after the entry of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement, if no timely motions for reconsideration and/or no appeals or other efforts to obtain review have been filed; or (b) in the event that an appeal or other effort to obtain review has been initiated, the date thirty-five (35) days after such appeal or other review has been finally concluded and is no longer subject to review, whether by

5

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28 appeal, petitions for rehearing, petitions for rehearing en banc, petitions for writ of certiorari, or otherwise.

- 18. "Final Approval Hearing" means the hearing to be conducted by the Court on such date as the Court may order to determine of the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the Settlement in accordance with applicable jurisprudence.
- 19. "Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement" means the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement to be entered by the Court, substantially in the form of Exhibit 1 and conforming to Section IX herein, approving the Settlement, as fair, adequate, and reasonable, confirming the certification of the Settlement Class for purposes of the Settlement only, and issuing such other findings and determinations as the Court and/or the Parties deem necessary and appropriate to implement the Settlement.
- 20. "Ice Cream Product" or "Unilever Ice Cream Product" or "Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream" means Ben & Jerry's All Natural premium ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets containing alkalized cocoa including: (a) the following All Natural ice cream flavors: Banana Split, Boston Cream Pie, Brownie Batter, Cake Batter, Cheesecake Brownie, Cherry Garcia, Chocolate, Chocolate Chip Cookie Dough, Chocolate Fudge Brownie, Chocolate Macadamia, Chubby Hubby, Chunky Monkey, Dublin Mudslide, Fossil Fuel, Half Baked, Imagine Whirled Peace, Karamel Sutra, Milk & Cookies, Mint Chocolate Cookie, Mud Pie, Neapolitan Dynamite, New York Super Fudge Chunk, Oatmeal Cookie Chunk, Peanut Butter Cup, Phish Food, S'mores, Triple Caramel Chunk, Turtle Soup, and Vanilla Caramel Fudge; AND (b) the following All Natural frozen yogurt flavors: Froyo Cherry Garcia, Froyo Chocolate Fudge Brownie, Froyo Half-Baked; AND (c) the following All Natural popsicle flavors: Cherry Garcia, Fudgy Brownies, and Half Baked.
- 21. "Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement" means the motion, to be filed by Plaintiff, for Preliminary Approval of this Agreement and includes all supporting papers.
- 22. "Notice Expenses" means the reasonable costs and expenses incurred in connection with preparing, printing, mailing, disseminating, posting, emailing, internet hosting

and publishing the Class Notice.

- 23. "Notice Date" means the date by which the Claims Administrator shall cause the Class Notice to be disseminated to potential Settlement Class Members as provided in the Agreement and shall be no later than 95 days after the Court enters an order granting Preliminary Approval of this Settlement. Notice shall be made in accordance with the Notice Program described in Section V, below.
- 24. "Opt Out Date" means the date, to be set by the Court, by which a Request For Exclusion must be filed with the Claims Administrator in order for a Settlement Class Member to be excluded from the Settlement Class.
- 25. "Objection Date" means the date by which Settlement Class Members must file objections, if any, to the Settlement in accordance with Section VI.1. herein.
  - 26. "Plaintiff" means plaintiff Skye Astiana.
- 27. "Plaintiffs' Counsel" includes all attorneys representing Plaintiff or any Settlement Class Member.
- 28. "Preliminary Approval" means the order to be entered by the Court, substantially in the form of Exhibit 5 and conforming to Sections III.A. and III.B. herein, conditionally certifying the Settlement Class, preliminarily approving the Settlement, setting the date of the Final Approval Hearing, appointing Co-Lead Counsel as Counsel for the Settlement Class, approving the Notice Program (described in Section V, below), Class Notice, and Claim Form, and setting dates for the Claims Deadline, Opt Out Date, Objection Date, and Notice Date.
- 29. "Proof of Purchase" means documentation from a third-party commercial source reasonably establishing the fact of purchase of a Unilever Ice Cream Product including, but not limited to, receipts for the purchase of Ice Cream Products and/or UPC codes from containers of Ice Cream Products.
- 30. "Request For Exclusion" means the written communication that must be filed with the Claims Administrator and postmarked on or before the Opt Out Date and Objection Date by a Settlement Class Member who wishes to be excluded from the Settlement Class (as described in

\_\_\_\_

Section VI.2, below).

- 31. "Residual Restitution" or "Donation Amount" means the amount calculated by subtracting from five million dollars (\$5,000,000) the total Restitution paid to Settlement Class Members in satisfaction of validly submitted Claims.
- 32. "Restitution" means the total compensation paid to Settlement Class Members in satisfaction of validly submitted Claims.
  - 33. "Settlement" means the terms and conditions of this Agreement.
- 34. "Settlement Class" and "Settlement Class Member(s)" each means all consumers who purchased Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products from September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Unilever and its employees, principals, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (ii) any person who files a valid, timely Request for Exclusion; and (iii) the Judge(s) to whom this Action is assigned and any members of their immediate families.
- 35. "Settlement Consideration" means the consideration exchanged by and between Unilever and the Settlement Class, as set forth in this Agreement.

#### III. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

# A. CONDITIONAL CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES ONLY

- 1. This Agreement is for settlement purposes only, and neither the fact of, nor any provision contained in this Agreement or its Exhibits, nor any action taken hereunder, shall constitute, be construed as, or be admissible in evidence as an admission of: (a) the validity of any claim or allegation by Plaintiff, or of any defense asserted by Defendant, in the Action or any other action or proceeding; or (b) any wrongdoing, fault, violation of law, or liability of any kind on the part of any Party, Released Party, Settlement Class Member, or their respective counsel.
- 2. As part of her Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement, Plaintiff seeks certification of the Settlement Class. Plaintiff seeks to certify the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only. The Settlement Class shall be defined as: all persons in the United States who

-7-

- purchased Ben & Jerry's Unilever Ice Cream Products from September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval of the Settlement. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Unilever and its employees, principals, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (ii) any person who files a valid, timely Request for Exclusion; and (iii) the Judges to whom this Action is assigned and any members of their immediate families.
- 3. Subject to Preliminary Approval and for settlement purposes only, Plaintiff Skye Astiana is appointed Class Representative of the Settlement Class and her counsel, Janet Lindner Spielberg of the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg, Michael D. Braun, of the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Joseph N. Kravec, Jr., of Stember Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC, are appointed Co-Lead Counsel for the Settlement Class.
- 4. This Agreement is without prejudice to the rights of each Releasing Party and each Released Party (as defined below) to: (a) seek or oppose class certification of the Settlement Class in this Action should the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement not be approved or implemented for any reason; or (b) seek or oppose class certification in any other action (unless barred by the Releases).

### B. REQUIRED EVENTS AND COOPERATION BY THE PARTIES

- 1. <u>Preliminary Approval</u>: The Settling Parties and their respective counsel agree that Plaintiff shall seek Preliminary Approval and Final Approval of the Settlement as described herein. As soon as reasonably practicable after execution of the Agreement, Plaintiff shall submit a Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement, including this Agreement and all Exhibits, and shall seek an order of Preliminary Approval from the Court, substantially in the form of Exhibit 5 hereto, which, by its terms shall:
- a. Determine preliminarily that this Agreement and the Settlement set forth herein fall within the range of reasonableness meriting possible entry of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement and dissemination of Notice to the Settlement Class;
- b. Determine preliminarily that the Class Representative is a member of the Settlement Class and that, for purposes of the Settlement, satisfies the requirements of typicality,

-8-

and that she adequately represents the interests of the Settlement Class Members, and appoint her as the representative of the Settlement Class;

- c. Determine preliminarily that the Settlement Class meets all applicable requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 ("Rule 23"), and conditionally certify the Settlement Class for purposes of the Agreement under Rule 23 for settlement purposes only;
- d. Appoint Co-Lead Counsel as counsel for the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23(g).
- e. Schedule the Final Approval Hearing to: (i) determine finally whether the Settlement Class satisfies the applicable requirements of Rule 23 and should be finally certified for settlement purposes only; (ii) review objections, if any, regarding the Agreement; (iii) consider the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of the Settlement; (iv) consider Co-Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses consistent with the Agreement of the parties set forth herein; (v) determine the validity of Requests for Exclusion and exclude from the Settlement Class those persons who validly and timely opt out by the Opt Out Date; and (vi) consider whether the Court shall issue the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement approving the Settlement and dismissing the Action with prejudice;
  - f. Set a briefing schedule for the Final Approval Hearing;
- g. Approve the proposed Class Notice and Notice Program (as described below);
- h. Approve the designation of Rust Consulting, Inc. as the Claims Administrator;
- i. Direct Unilever, the Claims Administrator, or their designee(s) to cause the
   Class Notice to be disseminated in the manner set forth in the Notice Program (as described below)
   on or before the Notice Date;
- j. Determine that the Class Notice and the Notice Program (as described below): (i) meets the requirements of Rule 23(c)(3) and due process; (ii) is the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (iii) is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Settlement Class Members of the pendency of the Actions and their right to object to the proposed Settlement or opt out of the Settlement Class; and (iv) is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate and sufficient notice to all those entitled to receive notice;

- k. Require each Settlement Class Member who wishes to opt out of the Settlement Class to submit a timely written Request for Exclusion, on or before the Opt Out Date and the Objection Date, as specified in Section VI.2. herein;
- l. Rule that any Settlement Class Member who does not submit a timely written Request for Exclusion will be bound by all proceedings, orders and judgments in the Action;
- m. Require any Settlement Class Member who wishes to object to the fairness, reasonableness or adequacy of the Agreement or to the award of attorneys' fees, costs and expenses, to deliver to Co-Lead Counsel and Unilever's Counsel and to file with the Court, by the Opt Out Date and the Objection Date, a statement containing the information specified in Section VI.1. of this Agreement, including a statement of his or her membership in the Class including all of the information required by the Claim Form in paragraph IV.2.a of this Agreement, a statement of his or her objection, as well as the specific reason, if any, for each objection, including any legal support the Settlement Class Member wishes to bring to the Court's attention and any evidence the Settlement Class Member wishes to introduce in support of his or her objection, and to state whether the Settlement Class Member and/or his or her counsel wishes to make an appearance at the Final Approval Hearing, or be forever barred from separately objecting; and
- n. Require that any Settlement Class Member who wishes to submit a Claim pursuant to Sections III.C.1 and/or IV herein, submit such Claim in writing on or before the Claims Deadline in the manner set forth in Section IV herein, or forever be barred from submitting a Claim under this Agreement.
- 2. <u>Cooperation</u>: The Parties acknowledge that each intends to implement the Settlement. The Parties shall, in good faith, cooperate and assist with and undertake all reasonable actions and steps in order to accomplish all required events on the schedule set by the Court, and shall use their best efforts to implement all terms and conditions of the Agreement.

23 | 24

#### C. SETTLEMENT CONSIDERATION

#### 1. <u>Monetary Relief</u>

a. Unilever will establish and fully fund a "Unilever Restitution Fund" of five million dollars (\$5,000,000). This fund does not include Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and costs. There will be no reversion. Any amount not paid out as Restitution to the Settlement Class will be donated to charity as follows:

Through the Unilever Foundation, Ben & Jerry's Foundation, or any other affiliated Unilever charitable foundation, Unilever shall commit to donating to the not-for-profit charities and/or causes of its choice related to food or nutrition in the United States, which may include but are not limited to such charities as Oxfam International, Population Services International (PSI), Save the Children, UNICEF, and World Food Programme (WFP), a sum up to \$5 million over a three-year period commencing on the Effective Date (the "Donation Amount"). This Donation Amount represents the balance after subtracting Claims made and paid under the "Unilever Restitution Fund." Selection criteria for these donations shall be solely within the discretion of Unilever. Unilever will certify in writing to Co-Lead Counsel that it has fulfilled this commitment within 60 days after the third anniversary of the Effective Date.

b. Consumers who purchased Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products labeled "All Natural" during the class action period of September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval of the Settlement that contained Dutch (i.e., alkalized) cocoa as a listed ingredient will be allowed to make a Claim against the Unilever Restitution Fund at the rate of \$2.00 per unit. Any Claim for reimbursement shall be made under penalty of perjury. No documentation is required for the first 3 (three) units on any individual Claim beyond the statement made under penalty of perjury. Any individual Claim for reimbursement for more than three units shall also require documentation in the form of an authentic Proof of Purchase such as receipts or UPC codes. All Claims shall be submitted via regular mail, and there shall be a maximum of 10 units

28 | SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

(\$20.00) claimed per household.

- c. If Unilever rejects any Proof of Purchase, it shall notify Co-Lead Counsel of how many Claims it has rejected, the names of the rejected Settlement Class Members, and the reason(s) for rejection no later than 35 days after the Effective Date. Co-Lead Counsel shall notify Unilever within fifteen (15) days of Co-Lead Counsel's receipt of written notification identifying the Claims rejected and reasons therefore if Co-Lead Counsel believes some or all of the rejected Claims should be honored, such notice to be in writing and to identify which Claims Co-Lead Counsel believes included satisfactory Proof of Purchase and the reason Co-Lead Counsel believes the Proof of Purchase to be satisfactory.
- d. In the event Unilever and Co-Lead Counsel are unable to agree on the handling of rejected Claims, the Parties agree to submit such rejected claims to the Court for final resolution. Materials submitted to the Court shall be limited to no more than fifteen (15) pages total briefing per side, and the Court shall resolve such rejected Claims without live hearing unless otherwise agreed by the Parties or required by the Court. In the Court's discretion, a telephonic hearing not to exceed ninety (90) minutes may be called.

#### 2. Equitable Relief

a. Unilever will, as equitable relief pursuant to this Settlement, cease the use of the term "All Natural" in relation to Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream flavors that contain alkalized cocoa, including the Ice Cream Products. Unilever has represented that the cost of that equitable relief amounts to approximately \$7,500 per SKU (i.e., per flavor) just for direct costs of redesigning and implementing the label changes. This does not include the substantial costs incurred by Unilever employees and third party vendors in overseeing and implementing the label change, advertising, and rolling out the label change nationwide. However, the parties have agreed that this amount shall not be used in valuing the overall Settlement for the purposes of obtaining a particular percent as an attorneys' fee award, although it may otherwise be used to support a motion for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses. This change in labeling is only for new labels printed after the Effective Date of the settlement. Unilever shall be permitted to sell off

existing Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream inventory with the former labels.

b. Unilever shall provide 60 days written notice to Co-Lead Counsel at the addresses written below of its intention to reinstate the use of the term "All Natural" in connection with any Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream flavor or Ice Cream Product that contains alkalized cocoa.

#### 3. Residual Restitution / Donation Amount

a. Once all proper Settlement Class Member Claims are paid, and any disputes concerning the validity of Claims have been resolved in accordance with Section III.C.1.d, above, any Residual Restitution will be considered cy pres which Unilever will donate to non-interested third party non-profit organization(s) or food bank(s) in the form of food products as described above in Section III.C.1.a. Unilever will certify in writing that it has fulfilled this commitment within 60 days after the third anniversary of the Effective Date.

#### 4. Miscellaneous

a. No Restitution shall be paid to Settlement Class Members on Claims submitted until the Effective Date. All checks issued under this Paragraph shall state that they must be cashed within 120 days from the date issued or they will become stale. The amount of any checks under this Paragraph that are not cashed within 120 days from the date issued or that are returned to the Claims Administrator as undeliverable after mailing to the Settlement Class Member at the address provided by the Settlement Class Member on the Claim Form, will cease to be the property of those Settlement Class Members, and shall be added to the Residual Restitution. The Claims Administrator shall provide Unilever's Counsel and Co-Lead Counsel with an identification of the checks returned as undeliverable or not cashed within 120 days of the date issued and of the amounts of those checks to be added to the Residual Restitution.

#### IV. CLAIM DEADLINES, CLAIM FORMS, AND ADMINISTRATION

1. The Claim Deadline is 60 days after the Notice Date. All Claims must be submitted with a Claim Form and received by the Claims Administrator or postmarked by the Claims Deadline. The Claims Deadline shall be clearly set forth in the Settlement Class Notice,

the websites of the Claims Administrator, and on the Claim Form. Settlement Class Members who do not timely submit a completed Claim Form shall not be eligible for an Award.

- 2. Claim Forms must be signed by the Class Member by hand under penalty of perjury. Claim Forms will be made available by mail and for downloading from the Settlement Website maintained by the Claims Administrator and may be made available on the websites of Co-Lead Counsel. Such Claim Form shall be approved by the Court and substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and must include the following information and/or affirmations:
  - a. The following information relating to purchase:
- i. The Settlement Class Member's name, address, email address and telephone number; and
- ii. Identification of the quantity of Unilever Ice Cream Products for which the Claim is made;
- 3. Class Members may submit completed and signed Claim Forms to the Claims Administrator by mail or private courier postmarked or sent on or before the Claims Deadline. Claims submitted for more than three (3) units of Unilever Ice Cream Products shall include Proof of Purchase, and the Claim Form shall conspicuously notify Settlement Class Members that failure to include Proof of Purchase for such Claims or submission of false or fraudulent Claims may result in the Claim being rejected in its entirety or for units in excess of three.
- 4. The Parties agree that the Claims Administrator shall be approved by the Court, shall be an agent of the Court, and shall be subject to the Court's supervision and direction as circumstances may require. The Claims Administrator will administer the Notice Program and Claims process, and oversee the distribution of Awards to Settlement Class Members in accordance with the terms of the Settlement and orders of the Court. Unilever will pay all Claims Administration Expenses, including the costs of the Claims Administrator, Notice Program and related website, and Claims process, whether or not the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement is entered.
  - 5. The Claims Administrator shall administer the monetary relief for Settlement

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

manner consistent with the terms of this Agreement and the orders of the Court. The Claims Administrator shall maintain records of all Claims submitted until at least 180 days after the last of the Claims payment checks to Settlement Class Members is issued, and such records will be made available upon request to Co-Lead Counsel and Unilever's Counsel. Upon request by counsel for Unilever or Co-Lead Counsel, the Claims Administrator shall provide reports totaling: number of Claims submitted; number of units claimed; number of Claims for more than three (3) units; and such other information as reasonably required for Unilever or Co-Lead Counsel to exercise the rights under this Agreement. Claim Forms and supporting documentation will be kept confidential by the Claims Administrator and will be provided only to the Court upon request and to Co-Lead Counsel and counsel for Unilever to the extent necessary to resolve issues relating to this Agreement. The Claims Administrator also shall provide such reports and such other information to the Court as it may require.

6. The Claims Administrator shall cause a website to be created containing Claims information and relevant documents, including but not limited to, all applicable deadlines, the Class Notice, a downloadable Claim Form, orders of the Court pertaining to the Settlement, this Agreement, a toll-free telephone number and addresses to contact the Claims Administrator by email and U.S. mail. Unilever shall pay the cost of creating and maintaining this website. The website shall be rendered inactive after the Final Approval Hearing has passed. The Parties shall agree on all information and documents to be posted on this website.

#### V. NOTICE TO THE SETTLEMENT CLASS

1. No later than 95 days after the entry by the Court of an order granting Preliminary Approval, the Claims Administrator shall cause the Class Notice to be disseminated to potential Settlement Class Members as provided herein ("Notice Date"). The Parties agree that notice by a combination of national publication and direct mail/e-mail is the best means under the circumstances of this case to effect notice to the class and that the Notice Program outlined in Exhibit 7 comports with the requirements of due process. Notice shall be disseminated pursuant

27

1	to the Notice Program set forth in Exhibit 7 on or before the Notice Date. Copies of the proposed				
2	forms of Class Notice and the Notice Program are attached as Exhibits 3, 4 and 7.				
3	2. <u>Notice Program</u>				
4	a. Long-form Notice: The Class Notice shall be in substantially the form of				
5	Exhibit 3, attached hereto and shall be posted on the website created by the Claims Administrator.				
6	At a minimum, the Class Notice shall:				
7	i. include a short, plain statement of the background of the Action and				
8	the proposed Settlement;				
9	ii. describe the proposed Settlement relief as set forth in this				
10	Agreement;				
11	iii. inform Settlement Class Members that, if they do not exclude				
12	themselves from the Settlement Class, they may be eligible to receive relief;				
13	iv. describe the procedures for participating in the Settlement including				
14	all applicable deadlines and advise Settlement Class Members of their rights, including their right				
15	to file a Claim to receive an Award under the Settlement, to opt out of the Settlement, or to object				
16	thereto;				
17	v. explain the scope of the Release and Covenant Not To Sue, and the				
18	impact of the proposed Settlement on any existing litigation, arbitration or other proceeding;				
19	vi. state that any Award to Settlement Class Members under the				
20	Settlement is contingent on the Court's final approval of the proposed Settlement;				
21	vii. state the identity of Co-Lead Counsel and the amount sought in				
22	attorneys' fees and costs;				
23	viii. explain that neither counsel for the Parties, nor the Claims				
24	Administrator may advise on the tax consequences of participating or not participating in the				
25	Settlement;				
26	ix. explain the procedures for opting out of the Settlement including				
27	the applicable deadline for opting out as well as the consequences of opting out, and specifying				
<b>2</b> 0					

that so-called "mass" or "class" opt outs shall not be allowed; and

Χ.

applicable deadlines, including that any papers submitted in support of said objection will be considered only if the Settlement Class Member making an objection has filed timely notice of his or her intention to do so, with the grounds for the objection and a statement of his or her membership in the Class including all of the information required by the Claim Form in paragraph IV.2.a of this Agreement, and has filed copies of such papers he or she proposes to submit at the Final Approval Hearing with the Clerk of the Court and served copies of such papers on Co-Lead Counsel and Unilever's Counsel on or before the Opt Out Date and the Objection Date, as approved by the Court and specified in the Class Notice.

explain the procedures for objecting to the Settlement including

- b. Short-form Notice: The Claims Administrator shall cause to be published in accordance with the terms set forth below, a short form of the Class Notice. The short form shall be in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit 4 and shall at a minimum, include the web address of the Settlement website and a telephone number for the Claims Administrator, the class definition, a brief description of relief available to the Settlement Class Members and the right to object and/or opt-out of the Class.
- c. Direct Mail Notice: The Claims Administrator shall mail the Long-form Notice to those Settlement Class Members who made complaints or directed inquiries to Unilever about the "All Natural" label and for whom Unilever can provide either a U.S. postal address or an e-mail address.
- d. Publication: The Short-form Notice shall be published in accordance with the Notice Plan set forth in Exhibit 7 no later than 95 days from an Order of Preliminary Approval, approving the Settlement and Notice Program.
- e. The Claims Administrator shall provide the Court with documentation showing, and an affidavit attesting, that Notice was disseminated pursuant to the Notice Program.

### VI. OBJECTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION

1. Objections

2

3

Any Settlement Class Member who intends to object to the fairness of the a. Settlement must do so no later than 45 days after the Notice Date (the Objection Date). In order to object, the Settlement Class Member must file with the Court, and provide a copy to Co-Lead Counsel and Unilever's Counsel a document that includes the following: (a) a heading which refers to the Action; (b) the objector's name, address, telephone number and e-mail address and, if represented by counsel, of his/her counsel; (c) a statement that the objector purchased Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products at issue in the lawsuit; the number of packages purchased, the date(s) of purchase and the location(s) of the purchase(s); (d) a statement whether the objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through counsel, and, if through counsel, identifying counsel by name, address, and phone number; (e) a statement of the objection and the grounds supporting the objection; (f) a list of all persons who will be called to testify in support of the objection; (g) a list of other cases in which the objector or objector's counsel have appeared either as settlement objectors or as counsel for objectors during the preceding five (5) years; (h) copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (i) the objector's signature. Any Settlement Class Member who fails to file and serve timely a written objection and notice of his or her intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing pursuant to this Section shall not be permitted to object to the approval of the Settlement at the Final Approval Hearing and shall be foreclosed from seeking any review of the Settlement or the terms of the Agreement by appeal or other means, unless given special permission by the Court.

#### 2. Requests for Exclusion

a. Any member of the Settlement Class may request to be excluded (or "opt out") from the Settlement Class. A Settlement Class Member who wishes to opt out of the Settlement Class must do so no later than 45 days after the Notice Date (the "Opt Out Date"). In order to opt out, a Settlement Class Member must complete and send to the Claims Administrator a Request For Exclusion that is post-marked no later than the Opt Out Date and the Objection Date. The Request for Exclusion must be personally signed by the Settlement Class Member requesting exclusion and contain a statement that indicates a desire to be excluded from the Settlement Class.

27

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

So-called "mass" or "class" opt-outs shall not be allowed.

- b. Except for those Settlement Class Members who timely and properly file a Request for Exclusion, all other Settlement Class Members will be deemed to be Settlement Class Members for all purposes under the Agreement, and upon the Effective Date, will be bound by its terms, regardless of whether they file a Claim or receive any monetary relief.
- c. Any Settlement Class Member who properly requests to be excluded from the Settlement Class shall not: (a) be bound by any orders or judgments entered in the Action relating to the Settlement; (b) be entitled to relief under, or be affected by, the Agreement; (c) gain any rights by virtue of the Agreement; or (d) be entitled to object to any aspect of the Settlement.
- d. The Claims Administrator shall provide Co-Lead Counsel and Unilever's Counsel with a final list of all timely Requests For Exclusion within five (5) business days after the Opt Out and Objection Date.

#### VII. RELEASES

The Agreement shall be the sole and exclusive remedy for any and all Released Claims of all Releasing Parties against all Released Parties. No Released Party shall be subject to liability or expense of any kind to any Releasing Party with respect to any Released Claim. Upon entry of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement, each and every Releasing Party shall be permanently barred and enjoined from initiating, asserting and/or prosecuting any Released Claim against any Released Party in any court or any forum.

- 1. The following terms have the meanings set forth herein:
- a. "Released Claim" means any individual, class, representative, group or collective claim, liability, right, demand, suit, matter, obligation, damage, loss, action or cause of action, of every kind and description that a Releasing Party has or may have, including assigned claims, whether known or Unknown (as defined below), asserted or un-asserted, latent or patent, that is, has been, could reasonably have been or in the future might reasonably be asserted under any body of law by the Releasing Party either in a court or any other judicial or other forum, regardless of legal theory or relief claimed, and regardless of the type of relief or amount of

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

damages claimed, against any of the Released Parties arising from, or in any way relating to use of synthetic ingredients in the sales, marketing, or advertising, of any Unilever Ice Cream Products, including but not limited to any claim that the product labeling, advertising, and/or marketing was mislabeled as "All Natural." For purposes of this Agreement, the term "Unknown Claim" means any and all Released Claims that any member of the Settlement Class, or anyone acting on behalf of or in their interest, does not know or suspect to exist against any of the Released Parties which, if known, might have affected his or her decision regarding the Settlement of this Action. The members of the Settlement Class further acknowledge that they may hereafter discover facts in addition to or different from those that they now know or believe to be true concerning the subject matter of this release, but nevertheless fully, finally and forever settle and release all Released Claims, known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, contingent or non-contingent, which now exist, may hereafter exist, or heretofore have existed based upon actions, conduct, events or transactions occurring on or before the date of this Agreement, without regard to subsequent discovery or the existence of such different or additional facts concerning each of the Released Parties. Notwithstanding the above, the release does not include claims for personal injury related to the use of Unilever Ice Cream Products.

- b. "Released Party" means Unilever and any entity that manufactured, tested, inspected, audited, certified, purchased, distributed, licensed, transported, marketed, labeled, advertised, donated, promoted, sold or offered for sale at wholesale or retail any Ice Cream Products, or any label, packaging, ingredient or component thereof, including all of their respective predecessors, successors, assigns, parents, subsidiaries, divisions, departments, and affiliates, and any and all of their past, present and future officers, directors, employees, stock-holders, partners, agents, servants, successors, attorneys, insurers, representatives, licensees, licensors, customers, subrogees and assigns. It is expressly understood that, to the extent a Released Party is not a Party to the Agreement, all such Released Parties are intended third party beneficiaries of the Agreement.
- c. "Releasing Party" means each Plaintiff, Plaintiffs' Counsel, and each
  Settlement Class Member and any Person claiming by or through each Settlement Class Member,

associates, co-owners, attorneys, agents, administrators, predecessors, successors, assignees,

representatives of any kind, shareholders, partners, directors, or affiliates.

1

6

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

-21-

CASE No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH

2. Upon entry of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement each Releasing Party shall be deemed to have released and forever discharged each Released Party of and from any and all liability for any and all Released Claims.

including but not limited to, spouses, children, wards, heirs, devisees, legatees, invitees, employees,

3. With respect to any and all Released Claims, and upon entry of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement without further action, for good and valuable consideration, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the Settlement Class and as the representative of the Settlement Class, shall expressly, and Releasing Parties shall be deemed to, and by operation of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement shall, to the fullest extent permitted by law, fully, finally, and forever expressly waive and relinquish with respect to the Released Claims, any and all provisions, rights, and benefits of Section 1542 of the California Civil Code and any and all similar provisions, rights, and benefits conferred by any law of any state or territory of the United States or principle of common law that is similar, comparable, or equivalent to Section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides:

> "A general release does not extend to claims which the creditor does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release, which if known by him or her must have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor."

#### 4. Additional Mutual Releases

On and after the Effective Date, each of the Released Parties shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished and discharged each and all of the Plaintiff and Settlement Class Members, and their respective present and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions, and affiliates, the present and former partners, employees, officers and directors of each of them, the present and former attorneys, accountants, experts, consultants, insurers, and agents of each of them, each of the foregoing solely in their capacity as such, and the predecessors, successors, heirs, and assigns of each, from all claims of every nature and description, known and

unknown, relating to the initiation, assertion, prosecution, non-prosecution, settlement, and/or

resolution of the Action or the Released Claims.

b.

1

8

11

10

1213

14

15

16

1718

19

20

2122

23

VIII. COUNSEL FEES AND COSTS

24

25

2627

28

deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished and discharged the Released Parties, its present and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions, affiliates, partners, employees, officers and directors, attorneys, accountants, experts, consultants, insurers, agents, predecessors, successors, heirs, and assigns, from all claims of every nature and description, including Unknown claims, relating to the defense, settlement and/or resolution of the Action or the Released Claims.

c. Except as to the rights and obligations provided for under this Agreement, Unilever and its attorneys and all of their respective past, present and future predecessors,

On and after the Effective Date, each of the Releasing Parties shall be

present and future predecessors, successors, assigns, devisees, relatives, heirs, legatees, and agents, hereby release and forever discharge Plaintiff and Plaintiffs' Counsel from any and all charges, complaints, claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, costs, expenses, actions and causes of action of every nature, character, and description, whether known or unknown, asserted or unasserted, suspected or unsuspected, fixed or contingent, which Unilever may now have, own or hold

or which Unilever at any time may have, own, or hold, against the Plaintiff, her attorneys (including

Co-Lead Counsel, or Plaintiffs' Counsel) by reason of any matter, cause or thing whatsoever

occurred, done, omitted or suffered from the beginning of time to the date of this Agreement.

successors, assigns, devisees, relatives, heirs, legatees, and agents, including their respective past,

5. The Parties agree that the Court shall retain exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the Parties, Settlement Class Members, and the Claims Administrator to interpret and enforce the terms, conditions, and obligations under the Agreement.

1. Co-Lead Counsel agree to make, and Unilever agrees not to oppose, an application for an award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses in this Action in the amount of \$1,250,000, in addition to reasonable expenses, to be paid by Unilever in addition to the Unilever Restitution Fund.

- 2. Co-Lead Counsel agree to make, and Unilever agrees not to oppose, an application by Co-Lead Counsel for an incentive award of up to \$1,500 for the Representative Plaintiff to be paid from the Attorneys' Fees and Expenses awarded to Co-Lead Counsel in this Action.
- 3. If the Court approves the motion, such fees, expenses, and incentive award will be paid by Unilever as follows:
- a. Unilever shall issue to Co-Lead Counsel an IRS Form 1099 for the award of attorneys' fees and costs. Unilever shall pay any fees and litigation expenses approved by the Court to an account jointly held by Co-Lead Counsel in an amount that does not exceed \$1,250,000 (One Million Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars) within thirty (30) days of the later of: (1) the Effective Date; or (2) receipt by counsel for Unilever of Co-Lead Counsel's completed W-9 forms. If the Court reduces the amount of fees and expenses, Unilever shall pay the reduced amount within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date.
- b. Unilever shall issue to Plaintiff an IRS Form 1099 for the incentive award. Unilever shall pay any incentive award approved by the Court in an amount that does not exceed \$1,500 within thirty (30) days of the later of: (1) the Effective Date; or (2) receipt by counsel for Unilever of Plaintiff's completed W-9 forms. If the Court reduces the amount of incentive, Unilever shall pay the reduced amount within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date.
- 4. Co-Lead Counsel, in their sole discretion, shall allocate and distribute this award of Attorneys' Fees and Expenses among Plaintiffs' Counsel. Upon payment of the fees ordered by the Court as set forth above, Unilever's obligations regarding fees and expenses shall be fully and forever discharged and no Plaintiff, Settlement Class Member or Plaintiffs' Counsel shall be entitled to seek or recover any further payment of fees or expenses from Unilever. Co-Lead Counsel agree to indemnify and hold harmless Unilever and its Released Parties from any and all claims for payment of attorneys' fees and/or expenses to Plaintiffs' Counsel other than as set forth in paragraph 1 above, except that Co-Lead Counsel shall not be responsible to indemnify and hold harmless Unilever and its Released Parties for any attorneys' fees and/or expenses claimed by or awarded to counsel for any objector to the Settlement.

-23-

1112

13

1415

16

17

18

1920

cost;

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

#### IX. FINAL JUDGMENT AND ORDER APPROVING SETTLEMENT

- 1. This Agreement is subject to and conditioned upon the issuance by the Court of the Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement that finally certifies the Settlement Class for the purposes of settlement only, grants final approval of the Settlement, and provides the relief specified herein, which relief shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the Agreement and the Parties' performance of their continuing rights and obligations hereunder. Such Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement shall be in substantially the form attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and shall:
- a. Confirm the final certification, for settlement purposes only, of the Settlement Class;
- b. Confirm the compliance of the Settlement Class with all requirements of Rule 23, including confirmation of the adequacy of the representation of the Class Representative as a representative of the Settlement Class;
- c. Confirm that the Notice Program complied in all respects with the requirements of due process and Rule 23 by providing due, adequate, and sufficient notice to the Settlement Class;
- d. Determine that the Agreement is entered into in good faith, is reasonable, fair and adequate, and is in the best interest of the Settlement Class;
  - e. Dismiss the Action with prejudice as to the Released Parties and without
- f. Release each Released Party from the Released Claims that any Releasing
  Party has, had, or may have in the future, against each Released Party and provide that the
  Covenant Not To Sue has been given by each Settlement Class Member in favor of each Released
  Party and that all Settlement Class Members are bound thereby;
- g. Bar and enjoin all Releasing Parties from asserting against any Released Party any Released Claim and bar and enjoin all Settlement Class Members from initiating or pursuing any claim or action barred by the Covenant Not To Sue;

8 9

11 12

10

14

15

13

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

- h. Release each Releasing Party and Settlement Class Member, and their respective present and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions and affiliates, the present and former partners, employees, officers and directors of each of them, the present and former attorneys, accountants, experts, consultants and insurers, and agents of each of them, each of the foregoing solely in their capacity as such, and the predecessors, successors, heirs and assigns of each of them, from all claims of every nature and description, known and unknown, that any Released Party has had, or may in the future have relating to the initiation, assertion, prosecution, nonprosecution, settlement and/or resolution of the Action or the Released Claims, and bar and enjoin all Released Parties from asserting the same;
- i. Release each Defendant and their respective present and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions and affiliates, the present and former partners, employees, officers, and directors of each of them, the present and former attorneys, accountants, experts, consultants, insurers and agents of them, and the predecessors, successors, heirs and assigns of each of them from all claims of every nature and description, known and unknown, that any Releasing Party has, had or may in the future have relating to the defense, settlement and/or resolution of the Action or the Released Claims, and bar and enjoin all Releasing Parties from asserting the same;
- j. Release the Plaintiff and Settlement Class Members, and their respective present and former parents, subsidiaries, divisions, and affiliates, the present and former partners, employees, officers and directors of each of them, the present and former attorneys, accountants, experts, consultants, insurers, and agents of each of them, each of the foregoing solely in their capacity as such, and the predecessors, successors, heirs, and assigns of each, from all claims of every nature and description, known and unknown, relating to the initiation, assertion, prosecution, non-prosecution, Settlement, and/or resolution of the Action or the Released Claims; and
- k. Retain the Court's continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Parties to the Agreement, including all Settlement Class Members, to construe and enforce the Agreement in accordance with its terms for the mutual benefit of the Parties.

authority to execute, deliver and perform the Agreement and to consummate the transactions

contemplated hereby; (b) that the execution, delivery and performance of the Agreement and the

consummation by it of the actions contemplated herein have been duly authorized by necessary

corporate action on the part of Unilever; and (c) that the Agreement has been duly and validly

of herself individually and as representative of the Settlement Class Members and the Releasing

provided in the Agreement or disclosed to, and authorized by, the Court. Plaintiff represents and

warrants that she has reviewed the terms of the Settlement in consultation with Co-Lead Counsel

Exclusion from the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement. Co-Lead Counsel represent and

and believes them to be fair and reasonable, and covenants that she will not file a Request for

warrant that they are fully authorized to execute the Agreement on behalf of the Plaintiff,

individually and as representative of the Settlement Class Members and Releasing Parties.

the Settlement has been made, except those set forth herein. No consideration, amount or sum

paid, accredited, offered or expended by Unilever in its performance of this Agreement and the

Settlement constitutes a fine, penalty, punitive damages or other form of assessment for any claim

Parties, of her own free will and without the receipt of any consideration other than what is

executed and delivered by Unilever and constitutes its legal, valid and binding obligation.

Unilever represents and warrants: (a) that it has the requisite corporate power and

Plaintiff represents and warrants that she is entering into the Agreement on behalf

The Parties warrant and represent that no promise, inducement or consideration for

REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES

X.

1.

2.

3.

against it.

4

7

1213

14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

27

## XI. NO ADMISSIONS; NO USE

The Agreement and every stipulation and term contained in it is conditioned upon final approval of the Court and is made for settlement purposes only. Whether or not consummated, this Agreement shall not be: (a) construed as, offered in evidence as, received in evidence as, and/or deemed to be, evidence of a presumption, concession or an admission by Plaintiff,

Unilever, any Settlement Class Member or Releasing or Released Party, of the truth of any fact

28

12 13

14 15

17 18

16

19

21

22

20

23

25

24

26

27

28

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

alleged or the validity of any claim or defense that has been, could have been, or in the future might be asserted in any litigation or the deficiency of any claim or defense that has been, could have been, or in the future might be asserted in any litigation, or of any liability, fault, wrongdoing or otherwise of such Party; or (b) construed as, offered in evidence as, received in evidence as, and/or deemed to be, evidence of a presumption, concession or an admission of any liability, fault or wrongdoing, or in any way referred to for any other reason, by Plaintiff, Unilever, any Releasing Party or Released Party in the Action or in any other civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Agreement.

#### XII. TERMINATION OF THIS AGREEMENT

- 1. Any Party may terminate this Agreement by providing written notice to the other Parties hereto within ten (10) days of any of the following events:
- The Court does not ultimately enter an order granting Preliminary Approval that conforms in all material respects to Sections III.A. and III.B. herein and Exhibit 5 hereof;
- b. The Court does not conditionally and finally certify the Settlement Class as defined herein or the Court's order certifying the Settlement Class is reversed, vacated, or modified in any material respect by another court; or
- The Court does not ultimately enter a Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement conforming in all material respects to Section IX herein and Exhibit 1, or if entered, such Final Judgment and Order Approving Settlement is reversed, vacated, or modified in any material respect by another court.
- 2. In the event of termination, the terminating Party shall cause the Claims Administrator to post information regarding the termination on the website established for the Settlement and to e-mail such information to those Settlement Class Members who provided an email address to the Claims Administrator. It is expressly agreed that neither the failure of the Court to award Attorneys' Fees and Expenses to Co-Lead Counsel, nor the amount of such

3

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Attorney's Fees and Expenses or Incentive Award that may be finally determined and awarded, shall provide a basis for termination of this Agreement.

- 3. In addition to the provisions regarding termination set forth above and elsewhere in this Agreement, this Agreement is voidable at the option of Unilever up to five days prior to the Final Approval Hearing if Administrative Costs exceed \$562,000. In such an event, Unilever may terminate this Agreement by serving written notice upon Co-Lead Counsel within five (5) business days of receiving notice that administrative costs exceeded \$562,000, but in no event shall written notice be served, and shall Unilever terminate this Settlement Agreement pursuant to this provision, less than five days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. In the event that Unilever terminates the Agreement pursuant to this provision, it shall cause the Claims Administrator to post information regarding the termination and the reason therefore on the website established for the Settlement and to e-mail such information to those Settlement Class Members who provided an e-mail address to the Claims Administrator.
- 4. In the event that this Agreement terminates for any reason, all Parties shall be restored to their respective positions as of immediately prior to the date of execution of this Agreement. Upon termination, Sections III.A.1., III.A.4., XI, XII.2., XII.3., XIII.2., XIII.4., XIII.5. and XIII.6. herein shall survive and be binding on the Parties, but this Agreement shall otherwise be null and void.

#### XIII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

1. **Entire Agreement**: The Agreement, including all Exhibits hereto, shall constitute the entire Agreement among the Parties with regard to the Settlement and shall supersede any previous agreements, representations, communications and understandings among the Parties with respect to the subject matter of the Settlement. The Agreement may not be changed, modified, or amended except in a writing signed by all Parties and, if required, approved by the Court. The Parties contemplate that certain of the Exhibits to the Agreement relating to Class Notice may be modified by subsequent agreement of Unilever and Co-Lead Counsel, or by the Court prior to dissemination to the Settlement Class.

	2.	Soverning Law: The Agreement shall be construed under and governed by the law
of the	State of	California, applied without regard to laws applicable to choice of law.

- Execution in Counterparts: The Agreement may be executed by the Parties in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original but all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument. Facsimile signatures or signatures sent by e-mail shall be treated as original signatures and shall be binding.
- Notices: Any notice, instruction, application for Court approval or application for Court orders sought in connection with the Settlement and the Agreement or other document to be given by any Party to any other Party shall be in writing and delivered personally, by UPS, FedEx or similar service next business day delivery, or sent by registered or certified mail, postage prepaid, if to Unilever to the attention of Unilever's Counsel, and if to Settlement Class Members to the attention of Co-Lead Counsel on their behalf. All notices to the Parties or counsel required by the Agreement shall be communicated to the following addresses:
  - If to Plaintiff or Co-Lead Counsel:

Joseph N. Kravec, Jr., Esq. STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC 429 Forbes Avenue 17th Floor Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Tel: 412-281-8400 Fax: 412-281-1007

If to Unilever or Unilever's Counsel:

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482 Tel: 415-268-7000

Fax: 415-268-7522

Publicity: Unilever, the Plaintiffs, and Co-Lead Counsel shall not cause any aspect of the Action or the terms of this Settlement Agreement not available in the public record to be reported to the media or news reporting services, except to respond that "the case has settled" and to confine any comments specifically to what is required by the provisions of this Settlement

28

27

25

26

regarding the Settlement of this Action, any such statements shall be limited to what is available in the public record. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Unilever may make such disclosures regarding the terms of this Settlement as it deems necessary to its auditors or as otherwise required by state or federal law.

Agreement. To the extent Unilever, Plaintiff, or Co-Lead Counsel make any public statements

- 6. Good Faith: The Parties agree that they will act in good faith and will not engage in any conduct that will or may frustrate the purpose of this Agreement, including but not limited to, soliciting or otherwise encouraging, directly or indirectly, Settlement Class Members to request exclusion from the Settlement Class, object to the Settlement or appeal the final judgment. The Parties further agree, subject to Court approval, to reasonable extensions of time to carry out any of the provisions of the Agreement.
- 7. Protective Orders: All orders, agreements and designations regarding the confidentiality of documents and information ("Protective Orders") remain in effect, and all Parties and counsel remain bound to comply with the Protective Orders. Within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, the Parties will certify in writing that they have used their best efforts to destroy or return to the producing party all documents and information produced in the Action that were designated as "Confidential" or "Attorneys' Eyes Only" pursuant to the Protective Order previously entered in the Action. Notwithstanding this provision, Unilever's Counsel and Co-Lead Counsel may retain copies of all deposition transcripts and exhibits and all documents submitted to the Court, but those documents must be kept confidential, and will continue to be subject to the Protective Order.
- 8. <u>Binding on Successors</u>: The Agreement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the heirs, successors, assigns, executors and legal representatives of the Parties to the Agreement and all Defendants and Released Parties.
- 9. <u>Arms Length Negotiations</u>: The determination of the terms and conditions contained herein and the drafting of the provisions of this Agreement has been by mutual understanding after negotiation, with consideration by, and participation of, the Parties hereto and their counsel. This

28 SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

- Agreement shall not be construed against any Party on the basis that the Party was the drafter or participated in the drafting.
- 10. <u>Waiver</u>: The waiver by one Party of any provision or breach of the Agreement shall not be deemed a waiver of any other provision or breach of the Agreement.
- 11. <u>Variance</u>: In the event of any variance between the terms of this Agreement and any of the Exhibits hereto, the terms of this Agreement shall control and supersede the Exhibit(s).
- 12. <u>Exhibits</u>: All Exhibits to this Agreement are material and integral parts hereof, and are incorporated by reference as if fully rewritten herein.
- 13. <u>Taxes</u>: No opinion concerning the tax consequences of the Settlement to any Settlement Class Member is given or will be given by Unilever, Unilever's Counsel, Co-Lead Counsel, or Plaintiffs' Counsel; nor is any Party or their counsel providing any representation or guarantee respecting the tax consequences of the Settlement as to any Settlement Class Member. The Class Notice will direct Settlement Class Members to consult their own tax advisors regarding the tax consequences of the Settlement and any tax reporting obligations with respect thereto. Each Settlement Class Member is responsible for his/her tax reporting and other obligations respecting the Settlement, if any.
- 14. <u>Modification in Writing Only</u>: This Agreement and any and all parts of it, may be amended, modified, changed or waived only by an express instrument in writing and signed by the Parties. The Parties recognize and agree that all modifications are subject to Court approval.
- 15. <u>Integration</u>: This Agreement represents the entire understanding and agreement among the Parties and supersedes all prior proposals, negotiations, agreements, and understandings related to the subject matter of this Agreement. The Parties acknowledge, stipulate and agree that no covenant, obligation, condition, representation, warranty, inducement, negotiation or undertaking concerning any part or all of the subject matter of this Agreement has been made or relied upon except as set forth expressly herein.

# Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-1 Filed02/24/12 Page34 of 35

1	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the Part	ies hereto has caused the Agreement to be
2	executed on its behalf by its duly authorized counse	el of record, all as of the day set forth below.
3		
4	Stipulated and agreed to this 23 day of	February 2012.
5		0
6	By:BEN & JERRY'S, HOMEMADE, INC.	Ву:
7	1	William L. Stern Counsel for BEN & JERRY'S
8		HOMEMADE, INC.
9	Sky Wana	
10	By:	By:
11		Janet Lindner Spielberg  Counsel for Plaintiff ASTIANA
12	IS	By: M. ) Line
13		Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.
14		Counsel for Plaintiff ASTIANA
15		By: Maker
16		Michael D. Braun
17		Counsel for Plaintiff ASTIANA
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT	Case No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH

# Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-1 Filed02/24/12 Page35 of 35

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the Parties hereto has caused the Agreement to be				
executed on its behalf by its duly authorized counsel of record, all as of the day set forth below.				
		·		
Stipulated and agreed to this day of	of	, 2012.		
Bruit. Clarkin		1500.		
By: BEN & JERRY'S, HOMEMADE, INC.	By:	LAB		
		William L. Stern Counsel for BEN & JERRY'S		
		HOMEMADE, INC.		
By:SKYE ASTIANA	Ву:			
		Janet Lindner Spielberg		
	_	Counsel for Plaintiff ASTIANA		
	Ву:	T. 137.77		
		Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. Counsel for Plaintiff ASTIANA		
	By:			
	•	Michael D. Braun		
		Counsel for Plaintiff ASTIANA		
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT		CASE No. 4:10-CV-04387-PJH		
	Stipulated and agreed to this day of the second state of th	By:  Stipulated and agreed to this day of By:  By:  By:  SKYE ASTIANA  By:  By:		

# EXHIBIT B-1 TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

(EXHIBIT 1 TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT)

11 12

13 14

16

17

15

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

This matter came on for hearing upon the joint application of the Parties for approval of the settlement set forth in the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release, dated February 24, 2012 ("Settlement Agreement").

Due and adequate notice having been given to the Class, and the Court having considered the Settlement Agreement, all papers filed and proceedings had herein, and all oral and written comments received regarding the proposed settlement, and having reviewed the record in this Action, and good cause appearing,

#### IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Court, for purposes of this Judgment and Order of Dismissal ("Judgment"), adopts all defined terms as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Action, the Class Representative, the other Members of the Settlement Class, and the Defendant, and venue is proper.
- 3. For settlement purposes only, the Court certifies this action under Rule 23(a), and 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The certified Settlement Class is defined as follows:

All persons in the United States who purchased Ben & Jerry's Unilever Ice Cream Products from September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

- 4. The Court reaffirms the appointment of Janet Lindner Spielberg of the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg, Michael D. Braun, of the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Joseph N. Kravec, Jr., of Stember Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC, as Class Counsel, and reaffirms the appointment of Skye Astiana as Class Representative.
- 5. The Court concludes that, for the purposes of approving this settlement only, the Settlement Class, Class Counsel, and the Class Representative satisfy the requirements of Rule 23(a), 23(b)(2), 23(b)(3), and Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Specifically, the Court finds: (a) the proposed Settlement Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all Members of the Settlement Class is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

14

13

16

15

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

or fact common to the proposed Settlement Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest among members of the proposed Settlement Class with respect to the subject matter of the Actions; (c) the claims of Plaintiff Skye Astiana are typical of the claims of the members of the proposed Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiff Skye Astiana and the Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Members of the Settlement Class; (e) Unilever has engaged in a pattern of behavior subject to injunctive relief; (f) for purposes of the Rule 23(b)(2) certification, injunctive relief predominates over monetary damages; and (g) Class Counsel will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the Settlement Class.

- 6. The Court finds that the distribution of the Notice to Class Members as provided for in the Order Granting Preliminary Approval for the Settlement constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all Persons within the definition of the Class, and fully met the requirements of due process under the United States Constitution. The Members of the Settlement Class have received proper notice of: (a) the Settlement Agreement; (b) the Final Approval Hearing; (c) Class Counsel's intention to seek Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Incentive Awards for the Plaintiffs; (d) each Class Member's right to exclude himself/herself from the Settlement Class; and (e) each Class Member's right to object to the proposed settlement and to Class Counsel's application for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and Incentive Awards for Plaintiffs.
- 7. Based on evidence and other material submitted in conjunction with the Final Approval Hearing, the notice to the class was adequate.
  - 8. The Court finds in favor of settlement approval.
- 9. The Court approves the settlement of the above-captioned action, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, each of the releases, and other terms as fair, just, reasonable, and adequate as to the Parties. The Parties are directed to perform in accordance with the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 10. The Court reaffirms its finding that proper and timely notice has been provided under 28 U.S.C. § 1715.
  - 11. The Court finds that the requirements set forth in *In re Mercury Interactive*

4 5

7 8

9

6

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Corp. Sec. Litig., 618 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2010), have been satisfied with regard to Class Counsel's application for attorney's fees and expenses.

- 12. Except as to any individual claim of those persons (identified in Attachment A hereto) who have validly and timely requested exclusion from the Class, all of the Released Claims are dismissed with prejudice as to the Class Representative and the other Members of the Class. The Parties are to bear their own attorneys' fees and costs, except as otherwise provided in the Settlement Agreement.
- 13. Solely for purposes of effectuating this settlement, this Court has certified a class of all Members of the Settlement Class, as that term is defined in and by the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 14. By this Judgment, the Class Representative shall release, relinquish, and discharge, and each of the Settlement Class Members shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all Released Claims and Unknown Claims, as described in Section VII of the Settlement Agreement.
- 15. Neither the Settlement Agreement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the settlement may be: (a) construed as, offered in evidence as, received in evidence as, and/or deemed to be, evidence of a presumption, concession or an admission by Plaintiff, Unilever, any Settlement Class Member or Releasing or Released Party, of the truth of any fact alleged or the validity of any claim or defense that has been, could have been, or in the future might be asserted in any litigation or the deficiency of any claim or defense that has been, could have been, or in the future might be asserted in any litigation, or of any liability, fault, wrongdoing or otherwise of such Party; or (b) construed as, offered in evidence as, received in evidence as, and/or deemed to be, evidence of a presumption, concession or an admission of any liability, fault or wrongdoing, or in any way referred to for any other reason, by Plaintiff, Unilever, any Releasing Party or Released Party in the Actions or in any other civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Agreement.
  - Class Counsel shall receive an award of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ [up to \$1,250,000] for 16.

all attorneys' fees and expenses. Class Counsel shall allocate and distribute this award among
Plaintiffs' Counsel. Class Counsel's receipt of \$ in total shall constitute full
satisfaction of any claim for fees and/or costs. The Court finds that this arrangement is fair and
reasonable.

- 17. The Class Representative is hereby awarded the following amount for her time and costs incurred in serving as Class Representative: Skye Astiana \$ \_\_\_\_ [not to exceed \$1,500].
- 18. The Court reaffirms its previous order regarding the Parties' communication concerning the settlement, and directs the Parties to the Settlement Agreement and their counsel shall not make any public statements regarding the settlement, unless as otherwise allowed for in the Settlement Agreement.
- 19. The Court reserves exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the Action, the Class Representative, the Settlement Class, and Defendant for the purposes of supervising the implementation, enforcement, construction, administration, and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement and this Judgment and to resolve any and all disputes that may arise thereunder.
- 20. If the settlement is terminated for any reason, this Judgment shall become null and void and shall be without prejudice to the rights of the Parties to the Settlement Agreement, all of whom shall be restored to their previous positions in accord with Section XII.4. of the Settlement Agreement.
- 21. This Order shall not be construed or used as an admission, concession, or declaration by or against Defendant of any finding of fault, wrongdoing, or liability. This Order shall not be construed or used as a waiver or admission as to any arguments or defenses that might be available to Defendant, including objections to class certification in the event that the Settlement Agreement is terminated.
- 22. This document shall constitute a judgment for purposes of Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Final Judgment in this action is hereby entered. All claims asserted by Plaintiffs in this Action are dismissed on the merits with prejudice.

### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-2 Filed02/24/12 Page7 of 8 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_ HONORABLE PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON United States District Court Judge

	Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-2 Filed02/24/12 Page8 of 8	
1		
2	ATTACHMENT A	
3		
4	1.	
5	2.	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		

## EXHIBIT B-2 TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

(EXHIBIT 2 TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT)

### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-3 Filed02/24/12 Page2 of 3

### CLAIM FORM Page 1

Claims Administrator			Astiana, et al. v. Ben & Jerry's, Homemade, Inc., No 4:10-cv-04387-PJH (N.D. Cal.)			
Toll Free: (888)com						
FOR VOUR CLAU	M TO PE TIME! V	AND VAL	ID, YOU MUST CON	ADI ETE SICN	AND DETIII	ON THIS
			ARKED NO LATER			
FAILURE TO SUBI REQUIRED INFORM			AIM FORM BY THI			
_	_		MPLETED FORM A			
		[AD	D ADDRESS]			
1) Print Your Name:						
2) E-mail:						
3) Street Address:						
City, State and Zip Code:						
4) Phone Number:	( )					
5) Please state the number 2006 and ((the date o		-	Cream products that yo	u purchased betv	veen Septemb	er 28,
	1 2	3	Other:			

### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-3 Filed02/24/12 Page3 of 3

### CLAIM FORM Page 2

6) If you are claiming more than three (3) units of Ice Cream Products you must attach proof(s) of purchase, such as a receipt or container label. Failure to include Proof of Purchase for Claims in excess of three units or submission of false or fraudulent claims may result in the Claim being rejected in its entirety.

I hereby certify in connection with this federal action, that I purchased the above-referenced number of Ben Jerry's Ice Cream Products stated above.		
Dated:	Signature of Claimant	
QUESTIONS? CA	LL OR VISIT www.	.com

## EXHIBIT B-3 TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

(EXHIBIT 3 TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT)

Astiana, et al. v. Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc., Case No. 4:10-CV-04387-PJH (N.D. Cal.)

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

### NOTICE OF PENDENCY OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND HEARING DATE FOR COURT APPROVAL

### If you purchased Ben & Jerry's All Natural Ice Cream containing alkalized cocoa ("Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream") between September 28, 2006 and [DATE], you could get a payment from a class action settlement

A federal court authorized this notice. This is not a solicitation from a lawyer.

This notice (the "Notice") informs you of a proposed settlement of class action claims against *Ben & Jerry's, Homemade, Inc.* ("Unilever") and describes your rights as a potential settlement class member. Unilever has agreed, under the terms of the settlement, to provide you with the opportunity to submit a valid and timely claim form through which you may be eligible to receive monetary compensation as discussed below.

Your legal rights are affected whether you act, or don't act. Read this notice carefully.

Your Legal Rights and Options In This Lawsuit			
EVENT	DATE		
<b>SUBMIT A CLAIM:</b> The last date that your claim form must be postmarked if you wish to be eligible to possibly receive a payment under the terms of the settlement.			
<b>EXCLUDE YOURSELF:</b> The last date to submit your written request to be excluded from the settlement if you are not willing to be bound by it and do not want to be eligible to receive a payment.			
<b>OBJECT:</b> The last date to write to the Court about why you don't like the settlement.			
GO TO A HEARING: Ask to speak in Court about the fairness of the settlement.			
<b>Do Nothing:</b> Get no payment. Give up rights.			

• Any questions? Read on and visit [WEBSITE] or Call 1-800-XXX-XXXX

### **WHAT THIS NOTICE CONTAINS**

BASIC	INFORMATION PAGE 3
1.	Why has this notice been publicized?
2.	What is this lawsuit about?
3.	What is a class action and who is involved?
4.	Why is there a settlement?
<b>W</b> но і	s in the SettlementPage 4
5.	How do I know if I am part of the settlement?
6.	I'm still not sure if I am included.
7.	What is the Proposed Settlement?
8.	Do I Have to do Anything?
9.	When Will I Receive Payment?
10	. What am I Giving up by Participating in the Settlement?
THE LA	wyers Representing YouPage 5
11	. Who are Class Counsel and Who Do They Represent?
12	. Should I Get My Own Lawyer?
13	. Attorney's Fees and Class Representative Compensation
14	. Why are Class Counsel Recommending This Settlement?
WHAT	IF I Do Not Wish To Participate In The Settlement
15	. Your Right to Exclude Yourself From the Settlement
16	. How do I exclude myself from the Settlement?
	RIGHT TO OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND APPEAR AT
	NAL APPROVAL HEARINGPage 7
	. What is the difference between objecting and excluding?
	3. How Can I Object to the Settlement?
	. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the settlement?
20	Can I Appear at the Final Settlement Approval Hearing?
	Do Nothing Page 8
21	. What if I do nothing?
GETTIN	IG More Information
22	. Are any more details available?

### **BASIC INFORMATION**

### 1. Why has this notice been publicized?

This Notice, given pursuant to an order of the Court dated \_\_\_\_\_\_, describes a proposed settlement of a class action against *Unilever Foods, Inc.* in a lawsuit entitled, *Astiana, et al. v. Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc., No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH (N.D. Cal.)*.

This Notice provides a summary of the terms of the proposed settlement. It also explains the lawsuit, your potential legal rights under the settlement, what benefits may be available to you under the settlement, and how to get them. If you are a class member, your legal rights are affected whether you act or do not act so read this Notice carefully.

### 2. What is this lawsuit about?

These lawsuits were brought on behalf of consumers who purchased Ben & Jerry's All Natural Ice Cream products (collectively, the "Ice Cream Products"), which contained alkalized cocoa. The lawsuit alleges that Unilever has misrepresented its Ben & Jerry's brand Ice Cream products as being "all natural" despite the fact they contain alkalized cocoa - a non-natural processed ingredient that additionally contains potassium carbonate, a man made, synthetic ingredient. Unilever denies it did anything wrong, and asserts its product labels and marketing of its Ice Cream Products were truthful and consistent with applicable laws.

The named plaintiff is Skye Astiana, and the Defendant is Ben & Jerry's, Homemade, Inc. ("Unilever" or "Defendant").

### 3. What is a class action and who is involved?

In a class action, one or more people called Class Representatives (in this case Skye Astiana), sue on behalf of people who have similar claims. All individuals with similar claims are a Class or Class Members. One court resolves the issues for all Class Members, except for those who exclude themselves from the Class. United States District Court Judge Phyllis J. Hamilton is in charge of this class action.

### 4. Why is there a settlement?

The Court did not decide in favor of Plaintiffs or Defendants. Instead, both sides agreed to a settlement. That way, they avoid the cost of a trial, and the people affected will get compensation. The Class Representative and the attorneys think the settlement is best for everyone who was a member of the Class.

### Who Is in the Settlement?

To see if you will get money from this settlement, you first have to decide if you are a Class Member.

### 5. How do I know if I am part of the settlement?

You are a member of the proposed Settlement Class if you live in the United States and purchased Unilever Ice Cream Products between September 28, 2006 and (DATE). "Ice Cream Product" means Ben & Jerry's All Natural premium ice creams, yogurts, and sorbets containing alkalized cocoa including: (a) the following All Natural ice cream flavors: Banana Split, Boston Cream Pie, Brownie Batter, Cake Batter, Cheesecake Brownie, Cherry Garcia, Chocolate, Chocolate Chip Cookie Dough, Chocolate Fudge Brownie, Chocolate Macadamia, Chubby Hubby, Chunky Monkey, Dublin Mudslide, Fossil Fuel, Half Baked, Imagine Whirled Peace, Karamel Sutra, Milk & Cookies, Mint Chocolate Cookie, Mud Pie, Neapolitan Dynamite, New York Super Fudge Chunk, Oatmeal Cookie Chunk, Peanut Butter Cup, Phish Food, S'mores, Triple Caramel Chunk, Turtle Soup, and Vanilla Caramel Fudge; AND (b) the following All Natural frozen yogurt flavors: Froyo Cherry Garcia, Froyo Chocolate Fudge Brownie, Froyo Half-Baked; AND (c) the following All Natural popsicle flavors: Cherry Garcia, Fudgy Brownies, and Half Baked.

### 6. I'm still not sure if I am included.

If you are still not sure whether you are included, you can get free help at 800-XXX-XXXX or by visiting [WEBSITE], or by writing to the class counsel in this case, at the address listed in question 11.

### THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

### 7. What is the Proposed Settlement?

Since filing the action, the Plaintiff, through class counsel, has conducted an investigation and taken discovery of the facts and has analyzed the relevant legal and factual issues. Class counsel obtained substantial information about the challenged practices through this process.

The Parties have agreed to enter into a settlement agreement after an extensive exchange of information, a vigorous arms-length negotiation and a mediation before David Rotman, Esq., a professional mediator. If approved by the Court, the settlement agreement will result in dismissal of

1. The Settlement creates a settlement restitution of \$5,000,000. Under the Settlement, an eligible Class member who purchased up to and including three (3) units of Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products shall be entitled to receive compensation from the settlement restitution in the amount of two dollars (\$2.00) per unit.

Class members who claim more than three (3) units of Ice Cream Products must submit proof of purchase, such as a receipt or container label. If you are an eligible Class member and wish to receive this benefit, you must timely submit a completed Claim Form to the claims administrator as described below. The claims administrator will determine the validity of all claims, subject to review by the Court. The Claim Form is attached to this Notice.

All claims shall be submitted via regular mail, and there shall be a maximum of \$20.00 claimed per household.

- 2. Unilever will cease the use of the term "All Natural" in relation to Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products that contain alkalized cocoa. This change in labeling applies to new labels printed after the Effective Date of the settlement.
- 3. Any amount remaining from the settlement restitution, after subtracting claims made and paid, will be distributed through the Ben & Jerry's Foundation, the Unilever Foundation, or another affiliated Unilever charitable foundation, over a three-year period commencing on final approval.

### YOUR RIGHTS AND OPTIONS

You have to decide whether to stay in the Class or ask to be excluded, and you have to decide this now.

### 8. Do I Have to do Anything?

If you are an eligible Class member and you wish to receive monetary compensation for Unilever Ice Cream Products that you purchased, you need to complete and submit an authenticated claim form in a timely manner. This form is necessary to ensure that only eligible Class members receive a monetary benefit. The claim form is available at the Settlement Website at www. .com.

The fully completed certified claim form must be submitted via U.S. Mail to the claims
administrator at, P.O. Box
The deadline for submission of the claim form is []. The claim form
must be submitted by mail and postmarked on or before to be timely.
9. When Will I Receive Payment?
The Court will hold a final approved hearing on during which it will decide
whether it will finally approve all terms of the Settlement. If the Court approves the Settlement, there
may be appeals or other challenges. Checks will be mailed 35 days after the Court enters an order
finally approving the settlement and all appeals (if any) are resolved. The progress of approval process
and expected dates of payment will be updated periodically on the website and can also be obtained by
calling the claims administrator's toll free number. The entire process could take more than a year, so
please be patient.

### 10. What am I Giving up by Participating in the Settlement?

Unless you exclude yourself, you are staying in the Class, and that means that you can't sue, continue to sue, or be part of any other lawsuit against Unilever regarding the legal issues raised in this case. It also means that all of the Court's orders will apply to you and legally bind you. If you sign the claim form, you will agree to release claims generally described below.

The Settlement provides that once the Court enters an order finding the proposed Settlement fair, adequate, and reasonable and all appeals have been resolved or all appeals periods have expired, those Class members who have not timely requested exclusion from these actions shall be deemed to have and by operation of the final judgment shall have fully, finally and forever released, relinquished, and discharged all released claims as set forth below.

Specifically, the Settlement is intended to settle any and all known and unknown claims against Unilever associated with the sale and marketing of its Ice Cream Products as "all natural."

The release will extend to Unilever and its past or present directors, officers, employees, partners, principals, agents, predecessors, successors, assigns, parents, affiliated and sister corporations, subsidiaries, licensees, divisions, and related or affiliated entities.

If the Settlement is approved by the Court and not otherwise terminated, the Court will dismiss the action with prejudice, and bar the named Plaintiff and each Class member from prosecuting the released claims. As a result, once the judgment of the Court in accordance with this Settlement has become final, each of the Class members and their legal successors-in-interest shall be deemed to have forever given up any released claims against Unilever and the other released parties. If you do not elect

to exclude yourself from the Class, you will be deemed to have entered into this release and to have released the above-described claims. If the Settlement is not approved by the Court or does not become final for some other reason, the litigation will continue.

### THE LAWYERS REPRESENTING YOU

### 11. Who are Class Counsel and Who Do They Represent?

Class Counsel represent the Plaintiff and all persons who are members of the Class as it pertains to the claims alleged in this lawsuit. Class Counsel are:

Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.	Janet Lindner Spielberg
STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE	LAW OFFICE OF JANET
PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC	LINDNER SPIELBERG
429 Forbes Avenue, 17 <sup>th</sup> Floor	12400 Wilshire Blvd., Ste 400
Pittsburgh, PA 15219	Los Angeles, CA 90025
Michael D. Braun	
BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.	
10680 W. Pico Blvd., Suite 280	
Los Angeles, CA 90064	

### 12. Should I Get My Own Lawyer?

If you do not exclude yourself from the Class, you do not need to hire your own lawyer because Class Counsel is working on your behalf. But, if you want your own lawyer, you will have to pay that lawyer. For example, you can ask him or her to appear in Court for you if you want someone other than Class Counsel to speak for you.

### 13. Attorney's Fees and Class Representative Compensation

Counsel for the Class have pursued the Action on a contingent basis and have paid all costs of the Action. These attorneys have not yet been paid or recovered any of their expenses associated with the Action. As part of the Settlement, Class counsel will request that the Court award them attorneys' fees and expenses. They intend to request \$1,250,000 in attorneys' fees and reasonable costs. This amount is on top of the fund created to benefit the class and accordingly is non-dilutive of monies going to the Class. Class counsel's petition for fees and expenses will be filed with the court no later than \_\_\_\_\_\_, and may be reviewed by any interested party. The petition will be available at www.\_\_\_\_\_.com.

The petition will also request the payment of \$1,500 to compensate the Plaintiff for her efforts in the litigation, to be paid from the awarded attorneys' fees and expenses. The Court will determine the reasonableness of the attorneys' fee and expense request as well as the proposed Class Representative award at the fairness hearing.

### 14. Why are Class Counsel Recommending This Settlement?

Relative to the risks and costs of continuing the litigation, Class counsel believe this Settlement provides a favorable recovery which is in the best interest of the Class. Class counsel's collective evaluation in this regard is based on the extensive investigation and discovery they have undertaken, and upon their experience prosecuting similar cases.

Absent Settlement, the Plaintiff would have to survive a motion for summary judgment and if successful, still have the burden of establishing liability and the amount of damages at trial. The action involves many unresolved factual and legal issues, some of which could be decided against Plaintiff at or before trial, and which could jeopardize Plaintiff's ability to obtain a favorable judgment.

Moreover, even if a favorable judgment were obtained at trial, it could well produce less net recovery to the Class members than the present Settlement.

### WHAT IF I DO NOT WISH TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SETTLEMENT

### 15. Your Right to Exclude Yourself From the Settlement

If you are a Class member, you may elect to exclude yourself from the Class settlement. You may need to be excluded from the Class if you already have your own lawsuit against Unilever for misbranding its Ice Cream Products and want to continue with it, or if you want to preserve the right to sue Unilever on your own for Unilever's misbranding its Ice Cream Products. If you exclude yourself from the Class – which also means to remove yourself from the Class, and is sometimes called "opting-out" of the Class – you will not get any money or benefits from this lawsuit even if the Plaintiffs obtain it as a result of the trial or from any settlement that may or may not be reached between Unilever and the Plaintiff. However, you may then be able to sue or continue to sue Unilever for misbranding its Ice Cream Products. If you exclude yourself, you will not be legally bound by the Court's judgments in this class action.

If you start your own lawsuit against Unilever after you exclude yourself, you will have to hire and pay your own lawyer for that lawsuit, and you will have to prove your claims. If you do exclude yourself so you can start your own lawsuit against Unilever, you should talk to your own lawyer soon because your claims may be subject to a statute of limitations.

### 16. How do I exclude myself from the Settlement?

If you wish to be excluded from the Settlement Class, you must send a completed Request for Exclusion Form to the claims administrator via U.S. Mail to: [address] in a timely manner. The Request for Exclusion Form must be postmarked on or before \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to be effective. The Request for Exclusion must be personally signed by the Settlement Class Member requesting exclusion and contain a statement that indicates a desire to be excluded from the Settlement Class. Exclusions can only be filed individually—not on behalf of a group or class. If you exclude yourself from the Class and the proposed Settlement is finally approved, you will not be entitled to receive any benefits of the Settlement and will remain free to pursue any legal rights you may have against Unilever at your own expense, but the representative Plaintiff and her lawyers will not represent you as to any claims against Unilever.

### YOUR RIGHT TO OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT AND APPEAR AT THE FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

### 17. What is the difference between objecting and excluding?

Objecting is simply telling the Court that you don't like something about the Settlement. You can object only if you stay in the Class. Excluding yourself is telling the Court that you don't want to be part of the Class. If you exclude yourself, you have no basis to object because the case no longer affects you.

### 18. How Can I Object to the Settlement?

If you're a Class Member, you can object to the Settlement if you don't like any part of it. You can give reasons why you think the Court should not approve it. The Court will consider your views. To object, you must send a letter with the following information: (a) a heading which refers to the Action; (b) the objector's name, address, telephone number and e-mail address, and if represented by counsel, of your counsel; (c) a statement that the objector purchased Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products at issue in the lawsuit; the number of packages purchased, the date(s) of purchase and the location(s) of the purchase(s); (d) a statement whether the objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in person or through counsel, and, if through counsel, identifying counsel by name, address, and phone number; (e) a statement of the objection and the grounds supporting the objection; (f) a list of all persons who will be called to testify in support of the objection; (g) a list of other cases in which you or your counsel have appeared either as settlement objectors or as counsel for objectors during the preceding five (5) years; (h) copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (i) your signature, even if you are also represented by counsel.

Mail the objection to the following three places, postmarked no later than \_\_\_\_\_:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK	Unilever's Counsel	PLAINTIFFS' CLASS COUNSEL
United States District Court Northern District of California Clerk's Office 450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102	William L. Stern MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105	Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.  STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC 429 Forbes Avenue, 17th Floor Pittsburgh, PA 15219

### 19. When and where will the Court decide whether to approve the settlement?

The court will conduct a "Final Approval Hearing" at the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, located at the Oakland Courthouse, Courtroom 3 - 3rd Floor 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612 on \_\_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ a.m. (or at the dates and times to which the Court may, without further notice, reschedule the hearing). The purpose of the Final Approval Hearing will be to determine whether the proposed Settlement is fair, adequate, and proper and whether the Court should enter judgments approving the Settlement, awarding attorneys' fees and expenses, and dismissing the class action.

### 20. Can I Appear at the Final Settlement Approval Hearing?

You may attend the Final Approval Hearing, but your attendance is not required nor will it affect your eligibility to submit the claim form. You do not need to appear in Court, and you do not need to hire your own attorney to represent you in this case, although you are free to do so. Any Class member may appear at the Final Approval Hearing (also known as the "Fairness Hearing") in person or by a duly appointed authorized attorney and show cause, if any, why the Settlement should not be approved; provided that (except by special permission of the Court) no Class member shall be heard unless, on or before, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, the Class member files with the Court a written "Notice of Intent to Appear" to the clerk's address above, setting forth all of the Class member's objections to the Settlement, and mails copies of all such papers to Plaintiffs' and Unilever's counsel at the addresses specified in Paragraph 18.

### IF YOU DO NOTHING

### 21. What if I do nothing?

If you do nothing, you'll get no money from this settlement. But, unless you exclude yourself, you won't be able to start a lawsuit, continue with a lawsuit, or be part of any other lawsuit against Unilever about the legal issues in this case, ever again.

### **GETTING MORE INFORMATION**

## Yes. You can call 1-800-000-0000 toll free; write to \_\_\_\_\_\_ or visit the Settlement website at www.\_\_\_\_\_.com, where you will find answers to common questions about the Settlement, a claim form, plus other information to help you determine whether you are a Class Member and whether you are eligible for a payment.

PLEASE DO NOT TELEPHONE THE COURT OR THE CLERK OF THE COURT OR COUNSEL FOR UNILEVER FOR INFORMATION

## EXHIBIT B-4 TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

(EXHIBIT 4 TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT)

### **LEGAL NOTICE**

# If you purchased ice cream containing alkalized cocoa labeled Ben & Jerry's All Natural between September 28, 2006 and [DATE], or Breyers All Natural or Breyers Smooth & Dreamy ½ Fat All Natural between November 4, 2004 and [DATE]you could get a payment from a class action settlement

Para una notificación en Español, llamar o visitar nuestro website.

Two settlements have been proposed in class action lawsuits alleging that Ben & Jerry's Homemade, Inc. and Conopco, Inc. d/b/a UNILEVER, GOOD HUMOR-BREYERS, and BREYERS ("Unilever") mislabeled their ice cream products as "all natural" when they contained synthetic ingredients.

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California authorized this notice. Before any money is paid, the Court will have a hearing to decide whether to approve the settlements.

### WHO IS INCLUDED?

All consumers who purchased ice cream containing alkalized cocoa labeled Ben & Jerry's All Natural between September 28, 2006 and (DATE), or Breyers All Natural or Breyers Smooth & Dreamy ½ Fat All Natural between November 4, 2004 and (DATE).

### WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

The lawsuits claim that, Ben & Jerry's and Breyers have represented their Ice Cream products as being "all natural" despite the fact that they contain alkalized cocoa - a non-natural processed ingredient that contains potassium carbonate, a man made, synthetic ingredient.

### **WHAT DO THE SETTLEMENTS PROVIDE?**

The Settlements provide restitution of \$5,000,000 for Ben & Jerry's Class Members and \$2,500,000 for Breyers Class Members. Class Members who timely submit valid Claim Forms are entitled to receive a cash payment of

two dollars (\$2.00) per unit of Ben & Jerry's or Breyers Ice Cream purchased. Class members who claim for more than three (3) units of ice cream must submit proof of purchase.

The details of the Settlements are set forth fully in the Settlement agreements, which are available for review at www. .com.

### WHO REPRESENTS YOU?

The Court appointed the law firms Stember Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC, Braun Law Group, P.C., the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg and Gardy & Notis, LLP to represent you as "Class Counsel."

### WHAT ARE YOUR OPTIONS?

If you don't want to be legally bound by the Settlements, you must exclude yourself by \_\_\_\_\_\_, or you won't be able to sue, or continue to sue, Unilever or related parties about the legal claims in this case. If you exclude yourself, you can't get money from these settlements.

If you stay in either Settlement, you may object to it by \_\_\_\_\_. The detailed notice explains how to exclude yourself or object.

The Court will hold a hearing at \_\_\_\_\_ a.m. on [date] at the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, located at the Oakland Courthouse, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612 before the Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton in Courtroom 3, 3rd Floor. The Court will consider whether to approve the Settlements

### **LEGAL NOTICE**

and whether to grant Co-Lead Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and costs of \$1,250,000 for the Ben & Jerry's Settlement and \$625,000 for the Breyers Settlement. You do not need to retain an attorney or attend the hearing, although you have the right to do so.

### **HOW CAN I GET MORE INFORMATION?**

You can get a detailed notice and other information by calling toll free 1-800-XXX-XXXX, visiting <a href="www.-----com">www.-----com</a>, or writing to

CLAIM FORMS MUST BE POSTMARKED OR SUBMITTED ONLINE BY: DATE

<u>www.-----com</u> 1-800-XXX-XXXX

## EXHIBIT B-5 TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

(EXHIBIT 5 TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT)

5

3

6 7 8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

The Court has considered the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release, dated February 24, 2012 ("Settlement Agreement"), the joint motion for order preliminarily approving a class action settlement, directing the dissemination of notice, and setting a final settlement hearing, and all other papers filed in this action. The Court conducted a hearing on March 28, 2012, with regard to the proposed settlement of this action, and has fully considered the record of these proceedings, the representations, arguments, and recommendations of counsel for the moving parties, and the requirements of law. The matter having been submitted and good cause appearing therefore:

The Court finds as follows:

- 1. All defined terms contained herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Settlement Agreement executed by Plaintiff and Defendants and filed with this Court.
- 2. For purposes of settlement of the Action, the Court has subject matter and personal jurisdiction over the Parties, including all Settlement Class Members, and venue is proper.
- 3. The Plaintiff and Defendant, through their counsel of record in the Action, have reached an agreement to settle all claims in the Action.
- 4. The Settlement Agreement was entered into at arm's-length by experienced counsel and after extensive negotiations spanning over one year. The Settlement Agreement is not the result of collusion.
- 5. The Court preliminarily approves the Settlement as being within the realm of reasonableness to the Settlement Class, subject to further consideration at the Final Approval Hearing described below, defined as:

All persons in the United States who purchased Ben & Jerry's Unilever Ice Cream Products from September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Unilever and its employees, principals, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; (ii) any person who files a valid, timely

4 5

6

7 8

9

11

12

10

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

24

23

25

26 27

28

Request for Exclusion; and (iii) the Judges to whom the Action is assigned and any members of their immediate families.

- 6. The Court preliminarily concludes that, for the purposes of approving this settlement only and for no other purpose and with no other effect on the Action, should the proposed Settlement Agreement not ultimately be approved or should the Effective Date not occur, the proposed Rule 23(b)(2) and 23(b)(3) Settlement Class meets the requirements for certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: (a) the proposed Settlement Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Settlement Class is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed Settlement Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest among members of the proposed Settlement Class with respect to the subject matter of the Action; (c) the claims of Plaintiff Skye Astiana are typical of the claims of the members of the proposed Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiff Skye Astiana and the Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Settlement Class; (e) Unilever has engaged in a pattern of behavior subject to injunctive relief; and (f) for purposes of the Rule 23(b)(2) certification, injunctive relief predominates over monetary damages.
- 7. Class Counsel may apply to the District Court for an award of attorneys' fees and for reimbursement of expenses to be paid by Defendant. Class Counsel agrees to file its application for attorneys' fees and expenses and incentive award with the District Court a minimum of twenty-one days (21) prior to the deadline for objections as contemplated by Section VI.1.a of the Settlement Agreement in compliance with *In re Mercury Interactive* Corp. Sec. Litig., 618 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2010), to provide class members with sufficient time to file any objection they might have to the application.
- 8. Plaintiff Skye Astiana is hereby appointed as Class Representative. Janet Lindner Spielberg of the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg, Michael D. Braun, of the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Joseph N. Kravec, Jr., of Stember Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC are hereby appointed Class Counsel.

2

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

9. The Court also approves of the Parties' selection of Rust Consulting, Inc. to serve as the Claims Administrator for purposes of the settlement.

- 10. The Court approves the form and content of the Class Notice (attached hereto as Exhibit A). The Court finds that the publication of the Class Notice in the manner, timing, and form set forth in the Agreement satisfies due process. The foregoing is the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all Class Members entitled to such Class Notice. The Court authorizes the Parties to make non-material modifications to the Class Notice prior to publication if the Parties jointly agree that any such changes are necessary under the circumstances.
- If Settlement Class Members do not wish to participate in the Settlement, they 11. may exclude themselves. In order to opt out, Settlement Class Members must complete and send via United States mail to the Claims Administrator, at (an address supplied by the Claims Administrator), a Request for Exclusion that is post-marked no later than 45 days after the Notice Date (the "Opt Out Date"). The Request for Exclusion must be personally signed by the Settlement Class Member requesting exclusion and contain a statement that indicates a desire to be excluded from the Settlement Class. So-called "mass" or "class" opt-outs shall not be allowed. Any Class Member who does not opt out of the settlement in the manner just described shall be deemed to be part of the Settlement Class.
- 12. Any potential Settlement Class Member who does not opt out may object to the settlement. Those who wish to object to the settlement must do so in writing no later than the Objection Date (the date forty-five (45) days after the Notice Date). In order to object, the Settlement Class Member must file with the Court, and provide a copy to Co-Lead Counsel and Unilever's Counsel a document that includes the following: (a) a heading which refers to the Action; (b) the objector's name, address, and telephone number; (c) a statement that the objector purchased Ben & Jerry's Ice Cream Products at issue in the lawsuit; the number of packages purchased, the date(s) of purchase and the location(s) of the purchase(s); (d) a statement whether the objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, either in

3

2

56

8 9

7

11

12

10

131415

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28

phone number; (e) a statement of the grounds supporting the objection; (f) a list of all persons who will be called to testify in support of the objection; (g) a list of other cases in which the objector or objector's counsel have appeared either as settlement objectors or as counsel for objectors during the preceding five (5) years; (h) copies of any papers, briefs, or other documents upon which the objection is based; and (i) the objector's signature, even if he/she is represented by counsel. Any Class Member who does not object to the Settlement in the manner just described shall be deemed to have waived such objection and shall forever be foreclosed from making any objection to the fairness, adequacy, or reasonableness of the proposed Settlement or any provision of the Agreement.

Any objecting Class Member may appear, in person or by counsel, at the Final 13. Approval Hearing held by the Court, to show cause why the proposed Settlement should not be approved as fair, adequate, and reasonable, or object to any petitions for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses or Incentive Award. The objecting Class Member must file with the Clerk's Office of the Court, at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, a written notice of intent to appear at the Final Approval Hearing ("Notice of Intent to Appear") no later than the Objection Date or on such other date that may be set forth in the Class Notice. The Class Member must also mail copies of such papers to Plaintiffs' and Unilever's counsel. The Notice of Intent to Appear must include copies of any papers, exhibits, or other evidence that the objecting Class Member (or his/her/its counsel) will present to the Court in connection with the Final Approval Hearing. Any Class Member who does not provide a Notice of Intent to Appear in complete accordance with the deadlines and other specifications set forth in the Class Notice, shall be barred from speaking or otherwise presenting any views at the Final Approval Hearing. The agreed-upon procedures and requirements for filing objections in connection with the Final Approval Hearing are intended to ensure the efficient administration of justice and the orderly presentation of any Class Member's objection to the Settlement, in accordance with such Class Member's due process rights.

1			
2	Good cause appearing therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
3	1. Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Class Action		
4	Settlement A	agreement is preliminarily approved.	
5	2.	A Class, defined as follows, is hereby certified for purposes of preliminary	
6	approval:		
7 8		All persons in the United States who purchased Ben & Jerry's Unilever Ice Cream Products from September 28, 2006 through the date of Preliminary Approval of the Settlement.	
9	3.	Janet Lindner Spielberg of the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg, Michael	
10	D. Braun, of	the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Joseph N. Kravec, Jr., of Stember Feinstein	
11	Doyle Payne	& Kravec, LLC are hereby appointed as Class Counsel.	
12	4.	Plaintiff Skye Astiana is hereby appointed as Class Representative.	
13	5.	The Court appoints Rust Consulting, Inc. to serve as the Claims Administrator	
14	for purposes	of the settlement.	
15	6.	Notice of the settlement and the rights of Class Members to opt out of the	
16	settlement sl	nall be given by issuance of publication notice and posting of a webpage consistent	
17	with the tern	ns of the Settlement Agreement by the Notice Date (ninety-five days after the	
18	Preliminary	Approval Date).	
19	7.	Pursuant to Section XIII.5. of the Settlement Agreement, the Parties to the	
20	Settlement A	agreement and their counsel shall not make any public statements regarding the	
21	settlement de	escribing information unavailable in the public record, unless as otherwise allowed	
22	for in the Se	ttlement Agreement.	
23	8.	The parties shall file their motion for final approval of the classwide settlement	
24	on or by	, 2012.	
25	9.	Plaintiff shall file any motion for approval of attorneys' fees, expenses and an	
26	incentive aw	ard on or by, 2012.	
27	10.	The parties shall file supplemental briefing including responses to any	
28	objections to	the settlement on or by, 2012.	
	[PROPOSED]	ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION	

provisions of this Order, and reserves the right to enter additional orders to effectuate the fair [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CLASS ACTION CASE NO. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH

### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-6 Filed02/24/12 Page9 of 9 and orderly administration and consummation of the settlement and to resolve any and all disputes that may arise thereunder. DATED: \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2012 HONORABLE PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON United States District Court Judge

## EXHIBIT B-6 TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

(EXHIBIT 6 TO SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT)

### Case4:10-cv-04387-PJH Document75-7 Filed02/24/12 Page2 of 8

	11	
1 2	Michael D. Braun (167416) BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C. 10680 West Pico Blvd., Suite 280 Los Angeles, CA 90064 Telephone: (310) 836-6000	Janet Lindner Spielberg (221926) LAW OFFICES OF JANET LINDER SPIELBERG 12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 400 Los Angeles, CA 90025
3	Facsmile: (310) 836-6010	Telephone: (310) 392-8801 Facsimile: (310) 278-5938
4	Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. (admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> ) STEMBER FEINSTEIN DOYLE	
5	PAYNE & KRAVEC, LLC 429 Forbes Avenue 17th Floor	
6	Pittsburgh, PA 15219 Telephone: (412) 281-8400	
7	Facsimile: (412) 281-1007	
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff Astiana	
9	IN THE UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DIS	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11	SKYE ASTIANA on behalf of herself and all	Case No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH
12	others similarly situated,	DECLARATION OF MARK RAPAZZINI
13	Plaintiff, v.	
14	BEN & JERRY'S HOMEMADE, INC.,	
15	Defendant.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
	DECLARATION OF MARK RAPAZZINI	Case No. 4:10-cv-04387-PJH

I, Mark Rapazzini, declare the following of my own personal knowledge:

- 1. I am a Senior Vice President with Rust Consulting, Inc. ("Rust"), a company that handles the administration of class action settlements, class action notice processes, FSLA notice processes, claims administration, mass tort settlements, bankruptcy administrations, settlement administrations and distributions in the public sector, and other large complex matters requiring significant telephone support and data management processes, such as product recalls and data breaches. My business address is Rust Consulting, Inc., Steuart Tower, One Market Plaza, Suite 1275, San Francisco, California 94105.
- 2. On January 26, 2012, I was informed by Unilever's counsel that a notice publication plan was needed for the Breyer's and Ben & Jerry's settlements. At that time, I was provided with three possible magazines for Breyer's and three different possible magazines for Ben & Jerry's. The notice publication estimates I provided to Unilever's counsel in this matter include the two highest circulation magazines from the three Breyer's magazines (*Cooking Light* and *Country Living*), and the two highest circulation magazines from the three Ben & Jerry's magazines (*Entertainment Weekly* and *Rolling Stone*).
- 3. Attached as Exhibit A is a Notice Program Schedule that assumes Preliminary Approval occurs on or around March 28, 2012, and further assumes the Notice materials will be approved by the parties by April 2, 2012. The Notice will be published one time in each of the four magazines. The goal of the Notice Program Schedule is to have all media run as close together as possible, which provides a better impact if individuals can see the Notice in multiple publications within a shorter timeframe. The lead time is the final day a publication will accept reservations for the upcoming issue. For each of the individual publications, the lead time is as follows: *Cooking Light* 46 days; *Country Living* 51 days; *Entertainment Weekly* 19 days; and *Rolling Stone* 21 days. *Cooking Light* and *Country Living* are monthly publications and have longer leads times. Based on a March 28, 2012 hearing date, the earliest *Cooking Light* issue in which the Notice could be placed is July, 2012, which would go on sale to the public on June 15, 2012. The other three

publications are scheduled around Cooking Light's July, 2012 issue to ensure that the remaining Notices would appear within a four week timeframe with the other three publications going on sale to the public between May 22, 2012 and June 8, 2012. 4. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is demographic information for each of the four magazines listed above. The source of the demographic information contained in Exhibit B is GfK MRI's Survey of the American Consumer. I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on February 23, 2012 in Los Gatos, California. Mark Rapazzini

Mark Rapazzini 

### ATTACHMENT A

### **Notice Program Schedule**

**Unilever Settlement** 

2/23/2012



### **Paid Media Components**

Print Media	
Magazine(s)	
Cooking Light	
Country Living	
Entertainment Weekly	
Rolling Stone	

Janua Data	Mail/On agla Data		
Issue Date	Mail/On-sale Date		
July 2012	June 15, 2012		
June 2012	May 22, 2012		
June 15, 2012	June 8, 2012		
June 7, 2012	May 25, 2012		

### **Approval Timing**

Rust/KM requires formal engagement and payment in order to reserve any advertising space.

In order to comply with this schedule, Rust/KM must receive approval of notice materials by 04/02/12.

### ATTACHMENT B

### **Unilever Settlement - Magazine Demographics**

	Cooking Light	Country Living	Entertainment Weekly	Rolling Stone
Circulation	1,783,808	1,625,196	1,797,384	1,467,739
Readership*	11,172,000	11,139,000	10,889,000	11,895,000
Men/Women	16%/84%	23%/77%	42%/58%	60%/40%
Median Age	49.2	51.3	37.4	33.5
Median Household Income	\$74,700	\$57,500	\$63,500	\$64,800
Married	65.5%	64.2%	44.3%	35.1%
Attended/Graduated from College	49.6%	49.6%	55.3%	55.9%
White	82%	88%	67%	75%
African-American	10%	7%	19%	12%
Hispanic Descent	9%	5%	16%	17%

<sup>\*</sup>Readership: a magazine's circulation multiplied by the average number of people who read each copy.

Source: GfK MRI Fall 2011 Study (demographics) + magazine media kits (circulation/readership)