UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION IN RE GOOGLE PLAY DEVELOPER Case No. 3:20-CV-05792-JD ANTITRUST LITIGATION [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPER PLAINTIFFS' **MOTION FOR FINAL** SETTLEMENT APPROVAL Hon. James Donato

This matter has come before the Court to determine whether there is any cause why this Court should not approve the Developer Plaintiffs' ("Plaintiffs") settlement with Defendants Google LLC, Google Ireland Ltd., Google Commerce Ltd., Google Asia Pacific Pte. Limited, and Google Payment Corp. ("Google"). The Court, having reviewed Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Settlement Approval ("Motion"), the Amended Settlement Agreement, the pleadings and other papers on file in this action, the statements of counsel and the parties, and all statements made at the final approval hearing, hereby finds that the Amended Settlement Agreement should be approved. Accordingly, the Court enters this Order of Final Approval.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation, and all actions within this litigation (collectively, the "Action") and over the parties to the Amended Settlement Agreement, including all members of the Settlement Class, as defined below, and Defendant Google.
- 2. For purposes of this Order, except as otherwise set forth herein, the Court incorporates the definitions contained in the Amended Settlement Agreement and Release ("Amended Settlement Agreement"). *See* ECF No. 229-1, Ex. B. The Court hereby finally approves and confirms the settlement set forth in the Amended Settlement Agreement, and finds that said settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including with respect to each of the factors enumerated in Rule 23(e)(2).
- 3. The following class ("Settlement Class") is certified for settlement purposes only, pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure:

All former or current U.S. Developers that meet each of the following criteria: (a) sold an application or in-app product (including subscriptions) for a non-zero price between August 17, 2016 and December 31, 2021; (b) paid Google a service fee greater than 15% on at least one such transaction between August 17, 2016 and December 31, 2021; and (c) earned Proceeds between U.S. \$0 and U.S. \$2,000,000.00 through Google Play in every calendar year between and inclusive of 2016 and 2021. Solely for Settlement Class definition purposes, the 2016 calendar year shall consist of August 17, 2016

through December 31, 2016. Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing, excluded from the Settlement Class are (a) directors, officers, and employees of Google or its subsidiaries and affiliated companies, as well as Google's legal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns; (b) the Court, the Court staff, as well as any appellate court to which this matter is ever assigned and its staff; (c) Defense Counsel, as well as their immediate family members, legal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns; (d) any Developers who validly request exclusion ("opt out") from the Settlement Class; and (e) any other individuals or entities whose claims already have been adjudicated to a final judgment.

- 4. The Court finds the prerequisites to a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) have been satisfied for settlement purposes only by the Settlement Class in that:
 - (a) there are at least tens of thousands of geographically dispersed Settlement Class members, making joinder of all members impracticable;
 - (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over individual issues;
 - (c) the claims or defenses of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims or defenses of the Settlement Class;
 - (d) the Class Representatives will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Settlement Class, and have retained counsel experienced in antitrust class action litigation who have, and will continue to, adequately represent the Settlement Class; and
 - (e) resolution through class settlements is superior to individual settlements.
- 5. The Court finds that this Action may be maintained as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3), for settlement purposes only, because: (i) questions of fact and law common to members of the Settlement Class predominate over any questions affecting only the claims of individual members; and (ii) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.
- 6. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(g), the Court hereby confirms that Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP, Sperling & Slater, LLC, and Hausfeld LLP are appointed as Settlement Class Counsel, and that the named Plaintiffs, Pure Sweat Basketball, Inc., LittleHoots,

LLC, Peekya App Services, Inc., and Scalisco LLC, are appointed to serve as the Class Representatives on behalf of the Settlement Class.

- 7. Plaintiffs' notice of the Settlement to the Settlement Class was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The notice satisfied due process, provided adequate information to the Settlement Class of all matters relating to the Settlement, and satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(c)(2) and (e)(1).
- 8. Certain members of the Settlement Class timely and validly requested exclusion from the Settlement Class, and therefore they are excluded from the Settlement Class. These persons and entities are reflected in the attached **Exhibit A** to this order. Such persons and entities are not included in or bound by this Order as it relates to the Settlement for which they opted out. Such persons and entities are not entitled to any recovery of the settlement proceeds obtained through this Settlement.
- 9. Without affecting the finality of this Order in any way, this Court hereby retains continuing, exclusive jurisdiction over the settlement and the Amended Settlement Agreement, including:
 - (a) implementation of the settlement and Amended Settlement Agreement;
 - (b) disposition of the Settlement Fund and distribution to members of the Settlement Class pursuant to further orders of this Court;
 - (c) determining service awards and attorneys' fees, costs, expenses, and interest;
 - (d) the Action until Final Judgment contemplated hereby has become effective and each and every act agreed to be performed by the parties all have been performed pursuant to the Amended Settlement Agreement;
 - (e) hearing and ruling on any matters relating to the plan of allocation of settlement proceeds;
 - (f) all parties to the Action and Released Parties, for the purpose of enforcing and administering the Amended Settlement Agreement and the mutual releases and other documents contemplated by, or executed in connection with, the Amended Settlement Agreement; and

Case 3:20-cv-05792-JD Document 252-2 Filed 05/03/23 Page 5 of 6

(g) any other proceedings concerning the administration, interpretation,
consummation, and enforcement of this settlement.
10. The Court finds, pursuant to Rules 54(a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure, that Final Judgments of Dismissal with prejudice as to Defendant Google
("Judgment") should be entered forthwith and further finds that there is no just reason for delay in
the entry of the Judgment, as a Final Judgment, in accordance with the Amended Settlement
Agreement.
IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED:
HONORABLE JAMES DONATO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEVELOPER PLS.' MOT. FOR FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL – 4
Case No. 3:20-CV-05792-JD
010803-11/2237993 V1

EXHIBIT A – VALID EXCLUSION REQUESTS

No.	Party
1	Applied Vanilla Studios
2	Granite Nutrition LLC
3	Val-U-Pro Consulting Group
4	Phantomalert Inc.
5	Fotoborn Media
6	Brainstorm Games LLC
7	Seeds Software