

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

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION	:	CASE NO. 12-MD-02311 HON. MARIANNE O BATTANI
	:	
In Re: FUEL INJECTION SYSTEMS	:	Case No. 2:13-cv-02201-MOB-MKM
	:	
THIS RELATES TO:	:	Case No. 2:15-cv-11827-MOB-MKM
	:	
ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS	:	Case No. 2:15-cv-13423-MOB-MKM
	:	

ORDER AND FINAL JUDGMENT

Vitec L.L.C. (the “Direct Purchaser Plaintiff”) on behalf of itself and the Settlement Class members, and Defendants DENSO Corporation, DENSO International America, Inc., DENSO Korea Corporation (f/k/a separately as DENSO International Korea Corporation and DENSO Korea Automotive Corporation), DENSO Automotive Deutschland GmbH, DENSO Products and Services Americas, Inc. (f/k/a DENSO Sales California, Inc.), ASMO Co., Ltd., ASMO North America, LLC, ASMO Greenville of North Carolina, Inc. and ASMO Manufacturing, Inc. (collectively, “DENSO”), entered into a Settlement Agreement to fully and finally resolve the Settlement Class’s claims against DENSO and the other Releasees. On April 24, 2019, as amended May 23, 2019, the Court entered Orders granting preliminary approval of the proposed DENSO settlement (the “Preliminary Approval Orders”). By Order dated June 6, 2019, the Court authorized the Direct Purchaser Plaintiff to disseminate notice of proposed settlements with the MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC, HIAMS, MITSUBA, and DENSO Defendants, the fairness hearing, and related matters to the Settlement Classes (the “Notice Order”). Notice was provided

to the DENSO Settlement Class pursuant to the Notice Order and the Court held a fairness hearing on October 3, 2019.

Having considered the Direct Purchaser Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Proposed Settlements with the MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC, HIAMS, MITSUBA, and DENSO 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 Notice Order outlined the form and manner by which the Direct Purchaser Plaintiff would provide the DENSO 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 DENSO Settlement Class who could be identified through reasonable efforts, as well as the publication of a summary notice in *Automotive News*; an online banner notice appeared over a 21-day period on www.AutoNews.com, the digital version of *Automotive News*; and an Informational Press Release targeting automotive industry trade publications was issued nationwide via PR Newswire's "Auto Wire." Finally, a copy of the Notice was (and remains) posted on-line at www.autopartsantitrustlitigation.com. 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 DENSO 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 DENSO is hereby granted pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e), because it is "fair, reasonable, and adequate" to the DENSO Settlement Class. In reaching this conclusion, the Court considered the complexity, expense, and likely duration of the litigation, the DENSO Settlement Class's reaction to the settlement, and the result achieved.

7. The DENSO Settlement Class provisionally certified by the Court in its Preliminary Approval Orders is hereby certified as a class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and is composed of: "All individuals and entities who purchased Fuel Injection Systems in the United States directly from one or more Defendant(s) (or their subsidiaries, affiliates, or joint ventures) from January 1, 2000 through March 12, 2018. Excluded from the Settlement Class are Defendants, their present and former parent companies, subsidiaries, and affiliates, federal governmental entities and instrumentalities of the federal government, and states and their subdivisions, agencies and instrumentalities." The Court adopts and incorporates herein all findings made under Rule 23 in its Preliminary Approval Orders.

8. 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 entities identified on Exhibit "A" hereto have timely and validly requested exclusion from the DENSO Settlement Class and, therefore, are excluded. Such entities are not included in or bound by this Order and Final Judgment. Such entities are not entitled to any recovery from the settlement proceeds obtained through this settlement.

10. 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 DENSO and the other Releasees.

11. 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.

12. 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.

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

14. 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 made by Plaintiff's Counsel; and (d) the distribution of the settlement proceeds to Settlement Class members.

15. 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 DENSO.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Marianne O. Battani
HON. MARIANNE O. BATTANI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: October 15, 2019

EXHIBIT A

AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION, CASE NO. 12-MD-02311, FUEL INJECTION SYSTEMS, 2:13-CV-02201-MOB-MKM, 2:15-CV-11827-MOB-MKM, 2:15-CV-13423-MOB-MKM

REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION FROM THE DIRECT PURCHASER DENSO SETTLEMENT CLASS

<p>DAIMLER TRUCKS NORTH AMERICA LLC</p> <p>SUZUKI Suzuki Motor of America, Inc. and Suzuki Motor Corporation, along with companies in which Suzuki Motor Corporation directly or indirectly owns the majority of voting rights, excluding Maruti Suzuki India Limited</p> <p>FORD Ford Motor Company and its wholly owned divisions, subsidiaries and affiliates</p> <p>BMW BMW Manufacturing Co., LLC, along with its parent company (Bayerische Motoren Werke Aktiengesellschaft) and affiliated entities (including BMW of North America, LLC and BMW Consolidation Services Co., LLC)</p> <p>SUBARU OF INDIANA AUTOMOTIVE, INC.</p> <p>NISSAN Nissan Motor Co., Ltd. and Nissan North America, Inc., including their subsidiaries and majority-owned affiliates</p> <p>SUBARU Subaru Corporation f/k/a Fuji Heavy Industries Ltd. Subaru of America, Inc.</p> <p>MITSUBISHI MOTORS NORTH</p>	<p>TOYOTA Toyota Motor North America, Inc. Toyota Motor Engineering & Manufacturing North America, Inc. Toyota Motor Sales U.S.A., Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Mississippi, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Indiana, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Kentucky, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing Toyota Motor Corporate Service Toyota Motors of America Toyota Motor Manufacturing de Baja California, S. de R.L. de C.V. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, West Virginia, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Alabama, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Texas, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Canada, Inc. Toyota Motor Corporation Toyota Motor Engineering New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc. Bodine Aluminum, Inc. TABCO, Inc. Canadian Autoparts Toyota Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing de Guanajuato, S.A. de C.V. Toyota Motor Manufacturing California, Inc. Toyota Motor Manufacturing, Northern Kentucky, Inc.</p> <p>HONDA American Honda Motor Co., Inc. Honda of America Mfg., Inc. Honda R&D Americas, Inc. Honda Mfg. of Indiana, LLC</p>
--	---

AMERICA, INC.

GENERAL MOTORS

General Motors LLC,
General Motors Company, and
General Motors Holdings LLC (“GM”), along
with all their subsidiaries (in which GM
directly or indirectly owns 50% or more of
the voting rights) and majority owned
affiliates