

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

CARL PALAZZOLO and ALBERT
FERRANDI, Individually and On
Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

FIAT CHRYSLER AUTOMOBILES
N.V., SERGIO MARCHIONNE,
RICHARD K. PALMER, and REID
BIGLAND,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-12803-LVP-SDD

Hon. Linda V. Parker

ORDER APPROVING PLAN OF ALLOCATION

WHEREAS, this matter came on for hearing on June 5, 2019 (the “Settlement Fairness Hearing”) on Lead Plaintiffs’ motion to determine whether the proposed plan of allocation of the Net Settlement Fund (“Plan of Allocation”) created by the Settlement achieved in the above-captioned class action (the “Action”) should be approved. The Court having considered all matters submitted to it at the Settlement Fairness Hearing and otherwise; and it appearing that notice of the Settlement Fairness Hearing substantially in the form approved by the Court was mailed to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort, and that a summary notice of the hearing substantially in the form approved by the Court was

published in *Investor's Business Daily* and transmitted over the *PR Newswire* pursuant to the specifications of the Court; and the Court having considered and determined the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed Plan of Allocation; and

WHEREAS, this Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated January 31, 2019 (ECF No. 66-2) (the "Stipulation"), and all capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Stipulation.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. **Jurisdiction**—The Court has jurisdiction to enter this Order and over the subject matter of the Action, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Parties and each of the Settlement Class Members.

2. **Notice**—Pursuant to and in compliance with Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby finds and concludes that due and adequate notice was directed to Settlement Class Members who could be identified with reasonable effort, advising them of the Plan of Allocation and of their right to object thereto, and a full and fair opportunity was accorded to Settlement Class Members to be heard with respect to the Plan of Allocation.

3. An aggregate of 100,344 copies of the Notice were mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and nominees, and there are no objections to the Plan of Allocation.

4. **Approval of Plan of Allocation**—The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Claimants as set forth in the Plan of Allocation mailed to Settlement Class Members provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Fund among Settlement Class Members with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity.

5. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Plan of Allocation is, in all respects, fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class. Accordingly, the Court hereby approves the Plan of Allocation proposed by Lead Plaintiffs.

6. **No Impact on Judgment**—Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Court's approval regarding any plan of allocation of the Net Settlement Fund shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment.

7. **Retention of Jurisdiction**—Exclusive jurisdiction is hereby retained over the Parties and the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to this Action, including the administration, interpretation, effectuation, or enforcement of the Stipulation and this Order.

8. **Entry of Order**—There is no just reason for delay in the entry of this Order

and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Linda V. Parker
LINDA V. PARKER
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 5, 2019