

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION	:	Master File No. 12-md-02311
	:	Honorable Sean F. Cox
	:	
IN RE: BEARINGS CASES	:	
	:	
	:	2:12-cv-00501-SFC-RSW
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	:	2:15-cv-12068-SFC-RSW
DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS	:	2:15-cv-13932-SFC-RSW
	:	2:15-cv-13945-SFC-RSW

ORDER AND FINAL JUDGMENT

DALC Gear & Bearing Supply Corp., McGuire Bearing Company, Sherman Bearings, Inc., and Bearing Service, Inc. (the “Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class members, and Defendants JTEKT Corporation, JTEKT North America Corporation (formerly Koyo Corporation of U.S.A.), Koyo France SA, Koyo Deutschland GmbH, Nachi-Fujikoshi Corp., Nachi America Inc., Nachi Technology, Inc., Nachi Europe GmbH, NSK Ltd., NSK Americas, Inc., NSK Europe Ltd., NSK Corporation, NTN Corporation, NTN USA Corporation, NTN Wälzlager (Europa) GmbH, NTN-SNR Roulements SA, AB SKF, SKF GmbH, and SKF USA Inc (collectively, “Settling Defendants”), entered into a Settlement Agreement to fully and finally resolve the Settlement Class’s claims against Settling Defendants and the other Releasees. On February 23, 2021, the Court entered an Order preliminarily approving the settlement between the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs and the Settling Defendants and authorizing the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs to disseminate notice of the proposed settlement, the fairness hearing, and related matters, to the Settlement Class (the “Preliminary Approval and Notice Order”). Notice was provided to the Settlement Class pursuant to the Preliminary Approval and Notice Order, and the Court held a fairness hearing on June 10, 2021.

Having considered the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Proposed Settlement with the Settling Defendants, oral argument presented at the fairness hearing, and the complete record in this matter,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation.
2. Terms capitalized in this Order and Final Judgment and not otherwise defined herein have the same meanings as those used in the Settlement Agreement.
3. The Preliminary Approval and Notice Order outlined the form and manner by which the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs would (and subsequently did) provide the Settlement Class with notice of the settlement, the fairness hearing, and related matters. The notice program included individual notice via first class mail to members of the Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable efforts, as well as the publication of a summary notice in *Automotive News*; and an Informational Press Release targeting automotive industry trade publications was issued nationwide via PR Newswire's "Auto Wire," and via PR Newswire's "Machinery and Equipment" microlist. Finally, a copy of the Notice was (and remains) posted on-line at www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com/BearingsDistributor. Proof that mailing, publication, and posting conformed with the Notice Order has been filed with the Court. This notice program fully complied with Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, and the requirements of due process. It provided due and adequate notice to the Settlement Class.
4. The settlement was attained following an extensive investigation of the facts. It resulted from vigorous arm's-length negotiations, which were undertaken in good faith by counsel with significant experience litigating antitrust class actions.
5. The settlement was entered into by the parties in good faith.

6. Final approval of the settlement with Settling Defendants is hereby granted pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), because it is “fair, reasonable, and adequate” to the Settlement Class. In reaching this conclusion, the Court considered the complexity, expense, and likely duration of the litigation, the Settlement Class’s reaction to the settlement, and the result achieved.

7. The Settlement Class provisionally certified by the Court in its Preliminary Approval and Notice Order is hereby certified as a class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and is composed of: “All distributors that purchased bearings in the United States directly from one or more Defendant in the Bearings Actions (or their subsidiaries or affiliates) from and including January 1, 2000 through December 31, 2014 (the “Settlement Class Period”). Excluded from the class are the Defendants in the Bearings Actions and their present and former parents, subsidiaries, affiliates, and joint ventures.”

8. The Court adopts and incorporates herein all findings made under Rule 23 in its Preliminary Approval and Notice Order. The Court’s certification of the Settlement Class as provided herein is without prejudice to, or waiver of the rights of any Defendant to contest certification of any other class proposed in these coordinated actions. The Court’s findings in this Order shall have no effect on the Court’s ruling on any motion to certify any class in these actions or on the Court’s rulings concerning any Defendant’s motion, and no party may cite or refer to the Court’s approval of the Settlement Class as persuasive or binding authority with respect to any motion to certify any such class or any defendant’s motion.

9. The Action and all Released Claims are hereby dismissed with prejudice with respect to the Releasees and without costs. The Releasors are barred from instituting or prosecuting, in any capacity, an action or proceeding that asserts a Released Claim against any of

the Releasees. This dismissal applies only in favor of Settling Defendants and the other Releasees.

10. The Escrow Account, plus accrued interest thereon, is approved as a Qualified Settlement Fund pursuant to Internal Revenue Code Section 468B and the Treasury Regulations promulgated thereunder.

11. Neither the Settlement Agreement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, may be deemed or used as an admission of wrongdoing in any civil, criminal, administrative, or other proceeding in any jurisdiction.

12. This Order and Final Judgment does not settle or compromise any claims by the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs or the Settlement Class against any other Defendant or other person or entity other than the Settling Defendants and the other Releasees, and all rights against any other Defendant or other person or entity are specifically reserved.

13. Without affecting the finality of this Order and Final Judgment, the Court retains exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the enforcement of this Order and Final Judgment; (b) the enforcement of the Settlement Agreement; (c) any application for distribution of funds, attorneys' fees or reimbursement of expenses made by Plaintiffs' Counsel; and (d) the distribution of the settlement proceeds to Settlement Class members.

14. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54, the Court finds that there is no just reason for delay and hereby directs the entry of judgment as to the Settling Defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 10, 2021

s/Sean F. Cox
Sean F. Cox
U. S. District Judge