## JUDGMENT AND FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, this class action is the result of the consolidation of four separate class actions, to wit, *Carmen Andrews v. The Gap, Inc., Et Al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-18-567237, *Laurie Munning v. The Gap, Inc., Et Al.*, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California Case No. 4:16-cv-3804, *Caron Coladonato v. The Gap, Inc., Et Al.*, U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey Case No. 1:17-cv-11998, and *Michael Pallagrosi v. The Gap., Inc., Et Al.*, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California Case No. 4:17-cv-5905 (collectively, the "Actions");

WHEREAS, the term "Action" in the singular refers to Carmen Andrews v. The Gap, Inc., Et Al., San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-18-567237, as the consolidated successor of all of the Actions;

WHEREAS, in this Judgment, the term "Plaintiffs" refers collectively to Carmen Andrews, Laurie Munning, Caron Coladonato and Michael Pallagrosi, and the term "Defendants" refers collectively to The Gap, Inc., Gap (Apparel), LLC, Gap International Sales, Inc., Banana Republic, LLC, and Banana Republic (Apparel), LLC, and the term "Parties" refers collectively to all Plaintiffs and all Defendants;

WHEREAS, on or about January 30, 2019, the Plaintiffs and the Defendants consummated an Agreement Of Settlement And Release ("Agreement," Settlement Agreement" or "Sett. Agr.") to settle and dispose of all of the Actions and/or the claims asserted therein;

WHEREAS, unless otherwise specified, a defined term in this Judgment has the same definition as the term in the Settlement Agreement;

WHEREAS, on May 10, 2019, the San Francisco Superior Court (the "Court") preliminarily approved the Settlement Agreement, and, on July 9, 2019, entered a superseding Amended Order preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement (with July 9, 2019, being the date of "Preliminary Approval" as that term is used in the Class definition);

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

27

28

WHEREAS, on October 11, 2019, the Court held a Fairness Hearing on whether to grant final approval of the Settlement Agreement and on whether to grant Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion For Final Approval Of Class Action Settlement and Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion For Award Of Attorneys' Fees And Costs;

WHEREAS, as part of the Fairness Hearing, the Court reviewed all objections submitted to the Court objecting to the final approval of the Settlement Agreement;

WHEREAS, the Court now enters this Judgment And Final Approval Of Class Action Settlement ("Judgment");

NOW, THEREFORE, the Court FINDS as follows:

#### **FINDINGS:**

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action and of all matters relating to the Settlement Agreement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Parties and each of the Class Members.
- 2. The Court OVERRULES the objection to the Settlement Agreement filed by Cedric Corum, who objected on the grounds that he should not be required to search for copies of receipts to prove purchases and that he would like more in settlement than \$6 or \$12 in Settlement Purchase Certificates. The Court FINDS that the Settlement Agreement's request for a copy of a receipt or a credit or debit card transaction record to receive more than one Settlement Purchase Certificate (Sett. Agr. § 3.5) is a reasonable request and that, as discussed below, the value of the Settlement Purchase Certificates (Sett. Agr. § 2.2) is fair and reasonable in light of all of the circumstances.
- 3. The Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion For Final Approval Of Class Action Settlement. The Court finds that the Settlement Agreement was entered in good faith, that it is fair, reasonable and adequate, and that it satisfies the standards and applicable requirements

for final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rule of Court 3.769.

- 4. The Parties adequately performed their obligations under the Agreement.
- 5. Defendants provided notice to Class Members in compliance with Section 3.3 of the Settlement Agreement, California Code of Civil Procedures section 382, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the United States and California constitutions, and any other applicable law. The notice: (a) fully and accurately informed Class Members about the lawsuit and Settlement Agreement, (b) provided sufficient information so that Class Members were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the proposed Settlement Agreement, (c) provided procedures for Class Members to file written objections to the proposed Settlement Agreement, to appear at the hearing, and to state objections to the proposed Settlement Agreement, and (d) provided the time, date and place of the final Fairness Hearing.
- 6. The Court GRANTS Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion For Award Of Attorneys' Fees And Costs. An award of Two Million Nine Hundred Seventy Thousand Dollars (USD\$2,970,000.00) in attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel is fair and reasonable in light of the nature of this case, Class Counsel's experience and efforts in prosecuting this Action, and the benefits obtained for the Class.
- 7. An incentive award to Carmen Andrews, Laurie Munning, Caron Coladonato and Michael Pallagrosi in the amount of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (USD\$2,500.00) each is fair and reasonable in light of: (a) Plaintiffs' risks (including financial, professional, and emotional) in commencing each of the Actions as a class representative, (b) the time and effort spent by Plaintiffs in litigating this action as the class representative, and (c) Plaintiffs' service in the public interest.

# NOW, THEREFORE, the Court hereby ORDERS, DECREES and ENTERS JUDGMENT as follows:

- 8. Final Approval. The Court GRANTS final approval of the Settlement Agreement, which is incorporated herein by reference. (Plaintiffs and Defendants are authorized to adopt and implement such amendments or modifications of the Settlement Agreement as the Parties mutually deem expedient provided that such amendments or modifications are not materially inconsistent with this Judgment and do not materially restrict the rights of Class Members.)
- 9. Class Certification. For purposes of settling this Action, the Court hereby certifies this Action to be a class action in which the terms "Class" and "Class Members" are defined as:

  All United States citizens who made one or more in-store or online

All United States citizens who made one or more in-store or online purchase(s) at a Gap Outlet, Gap Factory Store or a Banana Republic Factory Store located in the United States between May 24, 2010, and July 9, 2019, inclusive.

- 10. Binding Effect of Judgment. This Judgment applies to all claims or causes of action settled under the Settlement Agreement and binds all Class Members including those who did not properly request exclusion under Paragraph 7 of the Amended Order Re: Class Action Settlement And Provisional Class Certification, filed July 9, 2019. This Judgment does not bind persons who filed timely and valid requests for exclusion. Attached as Exhibit A is a list of persons who properly requested to be—and hereby are—excluded from the Settlement Agreement.
- 11. Release. Plaintiffs and all Class Members who did not properly request exclusion are: (a) deemed to have released and discharged each Defendant from all claims arising out of or asserted in this Action and claims released under the Settlement Agreement, and (b) barred and permanently enjoined from asserting, instituting or prosecuting, either directly or indirectly, such claims.

16. Judgment. Having approved the Settlement Agreement after the final Fairness Hearing, the Court hereby enters this Final Approval Of Class Action Settlement as a judgment pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h). After the entry of this Judgment, this Court shall retain jurisdiction over the Parties to enforce the terms of the Judgment and the Settlement Agreement pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h) and California Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6. Dated: October 11, 2019 HON. RICHARD B. ULMER, JR. Judge of the \$an Francisco Superior Court ETHAN P. SCHUMAN 

#### EXHIBIT A

Persons Excluded From The Settlement Agreement (Source: Exhibit B to the Second Supplemental Declaration of Brian Devery)

4					
5		First Name	Last Name	Exclusion	Timely/Late
	1	JENACIE	KLINGER	8/16/2019	Timely
6	2	ROCHELLE	RAGLIN	8/16/2019	Timely
7	3	ERI	SATO	8/20/2019	Timely
	4	HEATHER RAE	GIANDREA	8/20/2019	Timely
8	5	TOSHIMI	GILBERT	8/22/2019	Timely
	6	MINDY	HIGLEY	8/22/2019	Timely
9	7	GREGORY	CORDREY	8/28/2019	Timely
	8	MICHEL	ALLER	8/28/2019	Timely
10	9	ERIN	EDSTROM	8/28/2019	Timely
11	10	NANCY	KLINGER	8/28/2019	Timely
	11	KATHERINE	KIM	8/28/2019	Timely
12	12	ORCHI	ANANNYA	8/29/2019	Timely
13	13	THELMA	HICKERT	8/29/2019	Timely
	14	YANELKYS	SUAREZ	8/29/2019	Timely
14	. 15	BRITTANY	MILLS	9/5/2019	Timely
	16	GARBRIELRG	ANELLO	9/5/2019	Timely
15	17	LAURA	TORRESAN	9/5/2019	Timely
16	18	ROMINA	CORAGLIO	9/5/2019	Timely
	19	TONI	CLEMENTS	9/10/2019	Timely
17	20	BRITTANY	DIXON MARSHALL	9/10/2019	Timely
	21	SAMANTHA	GRAHAM	9/12/2019	Timely
18	22	LORI A	HOWELL	9/12/2019	Timely
19	23	STEPHANIE	POBIEGLO	9/16/2019	Timely
	24	GIORGIO	CALDARONE	9/1/2019	Timely
20	25	KRYSTLE	BRODEUR	8/24/2019	Timely
_	26	MATTHEW	HAYDEN	9/19/2019	Timely
21	27	AMY	HAYDEN	9/19/2019	Timely
22	28	ANNA LYNN	LUGAY	9/25/2019	Timely
	29	KLARISSA	TRAVERS	8/30/2019	Timely
23	30	CAROLINA	HERRERA	9/20/2019	Timely
	31	EDVIS	SHAHBAZIAN	9/24/2019	Timely
24	32	SORAIA	JIWA	9/18/2019	Timely
25	33	JINY	UNG	9/27/2019	Not Timely
	i				

26

27

28

2