

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

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

ARTHUR FULFORD, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOGITECH, INC., a California corporation,

Defendant

No. C-08-2041 MMC

**ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANT TO
FILE SUPPLEMENT TO STATEMENT OF
COMPLIANCE**

Before the Court is defendant's Statement of Compliance and Response to
Objections ("Statement"), filed February 19, 2010, submitted in connection with plaintiff's
Motion for Final Settlement Approval, also filed February 19, 2010.

In its Statement, defendant has not identified the number of claims made by class
members; rather, defendant asserts it should not be required to publicly set forth such
number. Defendant also states, however, it has no objection "to provid[ing] the number of
claims to the Court, upon the Court's request, for the Court's in camera review, prior to or
during the Fairness Hearing on March 5, 2010." (See Statement at 4:3-5.)

The number of claims made by class members bears on the adequacy of the
proposed settlement. See In re Mego Financial Corp. Sec. Litig., 213 F. 3d 454, 458 (9th
Cir. 2000) (identifying, as factor to consider when determining adequacy of proposed

1 settlement, "the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement").
2 Consequently, the Court finds it appropriate to direct defendant to supplement its
3 Statement by setting forth the number of claims made.

4 Accordingly, defendant is hereby DIRECTED to file, no later than March 2, 2010 at
5 4:00 p.m., a supplement to its Statement and, specifically, to state therein the number of
6 claims made. In light of defendant's assertion that such information should not be publicly
7 disclosed, the Court will allow defendant to file such supplement under seal.¹

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: February 23, 2010

11 
12 MAXINE M. CHESNEY
13 United States District Judge

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

¹By the instant order, the Court has not ruled on whether the number of claims is the
28 type of information that should not be made publicly available. Said issue will be
addressed at the March 5, 2010 hearing.