

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**MARK NATHANSON**, Individually and on  
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

**POLYCOM, INC., et al.**,

Defendants.

Case No.: 13-cv-03476 YGR

**ORDER REQUIRING ADDITIONAL  
INFORMATION RE: UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS  
SETTLEMENT; CONTINUING HEARING**

Re: Dkt. No. 102

On January 8, 2016 plaintiff Mark Nathanson (“Lead Plaintiff”) filed an unopposed motion for preliminary approval of class action settlement. (Dkt. No. 102.) The Court has conducted an initial review of the motion and requires additional information prior to a hearing on the matter.

Specifically, the Court requires further explanation and justification concerning the following:

1. the rationale underlying the plan of allocation of the settlement funds;
2. whether class members must independently complete the schedule of transactions on the proof of claim form or if the administrator will pre-fill the form; and
3. the reason litigation expenses are in the range of \$200,000 when the parties have engaged in no discovery to date.

The Court also requests that Lead Plaintiff revise the proposed class notice (Dkt. No. 102-3) and proposed summary class notice (Dkt. No. 102-4) to provide more transparency and simplicity.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the proposed class notice, the first six pages thereof are especially cumbersome and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court recommends that counsel for Lead Plaintiff review class notices previously approved by the undersigned, including those approved in *Bernardino v. Target Corp., Inc.*, Civil Case No. 12-cv-04639 (Dkt. No. 51-1) and *Maritime Asset Mgt., LLC v. Neurogesx, Inc.*, Civil Case No. 12-cv-05034-YGR (Dkt. No. 94-1).

