Electronically FILED

By Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
ON 10/14/2024

By /s/ Nelson, Ashlee

Deputy Clerk

Electronically RECEIVED

10/4/2024

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
SAN MATEO COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

ALABAMA DOE 1, ALABAMA DOE 2, INDIANA DOE, MISSOURI DOE, and FLORIDA DOE, Individually, and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No.: 20-CIV-03699

SG

[PROF OSED] SECOND AMENDED FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

On July 13, 2023, the Court granted final approval of the class action settlement between Plaintiffs Alabama Doe 1, Alabama Doe 2, Indiana Doe, Missouri Doe, and Florida Doe (collectively, "Plaintiffs or "Class Representatives"), and Gilead Sciences, Inc.'s ("Defendant" or "Gilead"). On January 11, 2024, the Court entered an amended final approval order and judgment (the "Amended Final Approval Order"). The Court ordered that by October 8, 2024, the Parties file with the Court a status update as to (i) how the Settlement Fund moneys have been distributed, or the status of the distribution if it is not yet completed; and (ii) a proposed amended judgment, including the amount of the funds due to be distributed to the *cy pres* recipient, Positive Women's Network-USA.

Having reviewed the Parties' October 4, 2024 Joint Status Report and the declaration of the Settlement Administrator attached thereto, and in conformity with Code of Civil Procedure section 384, the Court finds good cause to AMEND its Amended Final Approval Order:

FINDINGS:

- 1. Unless otherwise specified, defined terms in the Settlement Agreement have the same definition as used in this Final Approval Order and Judgment.
- 2. In its January 19, 2023 Order, the Court provisionally certified the Class for settlement purposes and appointed Class Representatives.
- 3. The Court finds the Settlement was entered into in good faith, that it is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and that it satisfies the standards and applicable requirements for final approval of class action settlements under California law, including the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.
 - 4. The Parties have adequately performed their obligations under the Settlement Agreement.
- 5. The Settlement Administrator provided notice to the Settlement Class Members in compliance with Section 3 of the Agreement, California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Rules of Court, Rules 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and any other applicable law. The notice: (a) fully and accurately informed Settlement Class Members about the lawsuit and Settlement; (b) provided sufficient information so that Settlement Class Members were able to decide whether to accept the benefits offered, opt-out and pursue their own remedies, or object to the proposed Settlement; (c) provided procedures for Settlement Class Members to file written objections to the

proposed Settlement, to appear at the Fairness Hearing, and to state objections to the proposed Settlement; and (d) provided the time, date and place of the final Fairness Hearing.

- 6. There were no objections to the Settlement.
- 7. An award of \$1,333,333.33 in attorneys' fees to Co-Lead Class Counsel is fair and reasonable in light of the nature of this case, Co-Lead Class Counsel's experience and efforts in prosecuting this Action, and the benefits obtained for the Settlement Class.
- 8. An award of up to \$31,000 in reimbursement of Class Counsel's documented out-of-pocket costs is fair and reasonable.
- 9. A service award to Plaintiffs Alabama Doe 1, Alabama Doe 2, Indiana Doe, Missouri Doe, and Florida Doe in the amount of \$5,000 (each) is fair and reasonable in light of Plaintiffs' risks in commencing this Action as Class Representatives, especially considering the risks to their personal privacy in maintaining this Action, the time and effort spent by Plaintiffs in developing and litigating this Action as the Class Representatives, and Plaintiffs' public interest service. Plaintiffs' service awards are supported by the declarations of the Plaintiffs filed on July 11, 2023.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

- 1. The Court finally approves the Settlement as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 2. Class Members. For Settlement purposes, the Class Members are defined as "all persons to whom a Mailer was sent by Gilead between April 15 and April 30, 2020, and that was not returned as undeliverable by the United States Postal Service." (Settlement Agreement § 1.1(X).)
- 3. **Binding Effect of Order**. This Order applies to all claims or causes of action settled under the Settlement Agreement and binds all Class Members.
- 4. **Release**. Plaintiffs and all Class Members are, upon the Effective Date, deemed to have released and discharged the Released Parties from the Released Claims set forth in Section 6 of the Settlement Agreement. Persons who timely and properly excluded themselves are not Class Members and not bound by this Final Order.
- 5. Class Relief. The Settlement Administrator has issued a payment and supplemental payment to each eligible Class Member in accordance with Section 4 of the Settlement Agreement and the Amended Final Approval Order. Within fourteen (14) days of this Order, the amounts remaining after

[PROPOSED] SECOND AMENDED FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT CASE NO. 20-CIV-03699

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

27

28