

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDREA SEWELL, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
STATE COMPENSATION
INSURANCE FUND,
Defendant.

Case No. 13-cv-00588-TEH

**ORDER RE: HEARING ON
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

This matter is scheduled for hearing on Plaintiffs' unopposed motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement on August 25, 2014. After reviewing the supplemental papers submitted in response to the Court's July 10, 2014 Order, the Court has additional questions about the proposed settlement:

1. The objection procedures set out in the Settlement Agreement and Proposed Order provide that objections shall be submitted to the Settlement Administrator whereas the proposed Class Notice states that objections shall be submitted to the Clerk of the Court. *Compare* Docket No. 46-1 at ¶¶ 85-93 (Memorandum of Understanding Regarding Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release), *and* Docket No. 58 ¶ 9 (Proposed Order), *with* Docket No. 58-1 at 4 (Class Notice providing for objection procedures). What explains this discrepancy?
2. If either the Settlement Agreement and Proposed Order, or the Class Notice, require amendment in response to Question 1, must the parties send amended notice to the relevant State and Federal officials in order to comply with 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b)?

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

The parties shall come to the August 25, 2014 hearing prepared to address these issues.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 08/20/14



THELTON E. HENDERSON
United States District Judge