

1 Adam J. Zapala (State Bar No. 245748)
 Elizabeth T. Castillo (State Bar No. 280502)
 2 Tamarah P. Prevost (State Bar No. 313422)
COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP
 3 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
 Burlingame, CA 94010
 4 Telephone: (650) 697-6000
 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577
 5 azapala@cpmlegal.com
 ecastillo@cpmlegal.com
 6 tprevost@cpmlegal.com

7 *Interim Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs*

8

9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

10

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12

13

**IN RE RESISTORS ANTITRUST
LITIGATION**

Case No. 3:15-cv-03820-JD

14

This Document Relates to:

**DECLARATION OF TAMARAH P.
PREVOST IN SUPPORT OF INDIRECT
PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
SETTLEMENTS WITH ALL
DEFENDANTS**

15

All Indirect Purchaser Actions

16

17

18

Date: December 12, 2019

Time: 10:00 a.m.

19

Place: Courtroom 11, 19th Floor

Judge: Hon. James Donato

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 I, Tamarah P. Prevost, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of California and
3 admitted to practice in this Court. I am a senior associate with the law firm of Cotchett, Pitre &
4 McCarthy, LLP (“CPM”). The matters described herein are based on my personal knowledge,
5 and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.

6 2. I make this Declaration in support of IPPs’ Motion for Final Approval of
7 Settlements with Defendants: (1) Panasonic Corporation and Panasonic Corporation of North
8 America; (2) KOA Corporation and KOA Speer Electronics, Inc.; (3) ROHM Co. Ltd. and
9 ROHM Semiconductor U.S.A., LLC; (4) Kamaya Electric Co., Ltd. and Kamaya Inc.; and (5)
10 Hokuriku Electric Industry Co. and HDK America, Inc. (collectively, “Settling Defendants”).

11 3. On September 20, 2019, my office received a purported objection filed by John D.
12 Joyce, Dkt. 556. The postmark on the objection was dated July 19, 2019, which was prior to
13 Class Counsel filing its motion for attorneys’ fees. In the class notice, Class Counsel informed
14 the Class that it would seek no more than 30% of the settlement fund in attorneys’ fees. When
15 the motion was actually filed, Class Counsel sought less, only 25% of the settlement fund. It
16 appeared to me that the objection was based off of the information contained in the class notice,
17 and not based on what Class Counsel had actually submitted to the Court.

18 4. After having reviewed Mr. Joyce’s objection, I telephoned him on or about
19 September 26, 2019 using the phone number listed by him in the objection (781-575-1890). The
20 purpose of my telephone call was to inform him that Class Counsel had actually sought 25% of
21 the settlement fund, and not the 30% listed in the class notice. No one answered my telephone
22 call, but I left a voicemail message introducing myself, and offering to answer any questions Mr.
23 Joyce had about this case or settlement. I asked if he could call me back, so we could discuss the
24 nature of his objection, so I could better understand it.

25 5. Not having received a response, I called Mr. Joyce again, on or about September
26 30, 2019.

