IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO Judge Robert E. Blackburn

Civil Case No. 09-cv-00003-REB-BNB

MYA ADAMS, et al,

Plaintiffs,

٧.

APARTMENT INVESTMENT AND MANAGEMENT COMPANY, AIMCO PROPERTIES, LP., and AIMCO BETHESDA HOLDINGS, INC.,

Defendants.

ORDER RE: JOINT MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF COLLECTIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT

Blackburn, J.

The matter before me is the **Joint Motion For Approval of Collective Action Settlement** [#19]¹ filed May 26, 2009. After reviewing the motion and the record, I conclude that the motion should be approved, but only as to the parties in this case.²

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That the **Joint Motion For Approval of Collective Action Settlement** [#19] filed May 26, 2009, is **APPROVED**, but only as to the parties in this case, without

¹ "[#19]" is an example of the convention I use to identify the docket number assigned to a specific paper by the court's electronic case filing and management system (CM/ECF). I use this convention throughout this order.

 $^{^2}$ This qualification is required because the joint motion requests approval on behalf of 378 plaintiffs, only 38 of whom are named and included in this case. See Joint Motion [19] at 4, ¶ 12. Thus, my jurisdiction extends only to the parties in this case.

further hearing or argument³;

- 2. That the **Settlement Agreement** [#18] filed under seal on May 26, 2009, is **APPROVED**, but only as to the parties in this case, and its terms and provisions are **ORDERED IMPLEMENTED** effective forthwith, but only as to the parties in this case; and
- 3. That each party to this action **SHALL PERFORM** all relevant provisions of the **Settlement Agreement** [#18].

Dated May 28 2009, at Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:

Robert E. Blackbum

United States District Judge

³ The joint motion and concomitant **Settlement Agreement** [#18] filed under seal on May 26, 2009, are sufficiently circumstantiated; thus, obviating the necessity for an evidentiary hearing or oral argument.