	Case 4:14-cv-05083-SAB	ECF No. 106	filed 07/21/16	PageID.1107	Page 1 of 5
1 2 3 4					
5					
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON				
8	TERESA FARRIS, et al.,				
10	Plain	tiffs	NO 4·14	-cv-5083-SAB	
11	v.	,	1(0, 1,1)		
12	FRANKLIN COUNTY, et al., ORDER GRANTING				
13	Defendants. APPROVAL OF CLASS				SS
14			SETTLE	MENT	
15					
16	On July 20, 2016, the Court held a Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e) fairness hearing				
17	considering final approval of the Class Settlement. Plaintiffs were represented by				
18	Rhona Taylor. Defendants were represented by Dale Kamerrer. Previously, this				
19	Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement, certified the class, and				
20	ordered notice. ECF No. 98.				
21	The Court has reviewed both parties' filings regarding the Motion for Final				
22	Approval of Class Action Settlement, ECF No. 99, considered the oral				
23	presentations made by counsel, and is fully informed. No objections from any				
24	class member were received by any party. In deciding whether to grant final				
25	approval of the class action settlement, this Court considered the following				
26	factors: (1) the strongth of the plaintiff's asset (2) the pick expanse				
2728	(1) the strength of the plaintiff's case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial; (4) the amount				

ORDER GRANTING APPROVAL OF CLASS SETTLEMENT # 1

offered in settlement; (5) the extent of discovery completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7) the presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of the class members of the proposed settlement.

Churchill Village, L.L.C. v. General Electric, 361 F.3d 566, 575 (9th Cir. 2004). The Court is satisfied the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement were the result of good faith, arm's length settlement negotiations between competent and experienced counsel for both Plaintiffs and Defendants. The Court approves the Settlement Agreement in full with three minor modifications indicated in ¶ 8 below.

Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED:**

- **1.** Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, ECF No. 99, is **GRANTED**.
- **2.** For purposes of this litigation, the Court has subject matter and personal jurisdiction over the parties, including all class members.
- 3. The Parties have provided adequate notice to the plaintiff class in a manner consistent with this Court's April 28, 2016 Order Granting Class

 Certification and Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement, ECF No. 94, as amended by the Order Amending Order Granting Class Certification and Preliminary Approval of Class Certification, ECF No. 98, filed on June 22, 2016. The notice, as implemented, met the requirements of due process and was reasonable under the circumstances. The notice was reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise class members of the pendency of the action, the terms of the Settlement Agreement, and their right to appear and/or object to the settlement. Further, the notice was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice.

28

- **4.** The Court has determined that a full opportunity has been provided to the class members to object to the terms of the settlement and otherwise participate in the Fairness Hearing. No class member filed or served an objection to the settlement and no class member chose to participate in the Fairness Hearing.
- 5. The Court has carefully considered all the papers, evidence, and arguments before it and has made its independent judgments that: (a) plaintiffs and class members face significant risks if this litigation were to proceed; (b) the possibility of a greater ultimate result is speculative and any such result would only occur after considerable delay; (c) the terms of the Settlement Agreement, as amended by this Order in ¶8, provide substantial and meaningful benefits to the class; (d) the settlement is the product of meaningful investigation into the facts and circumstances surrounding the defendants' policies and practices related to their operation of the Franklin County Correctional Center; (e) the settlement complies with the Prison Litigation Reform Act provision, 18 U.S.C. § 2626(a)(1)(A); (f) the settlement negotiations were extensive, at arm's length with the assistance of United States Magistrate Judges James P. Hutton (ret.) and John T. Rodgers and without any collusion; (g) the reaction by the class has been in favor of the settlement; and (h) experienced class counsel support the settlement.
- 6. Accordingly, having considered the foregoing; the costs, risks, and delays of continued litigation versus the benefits provided by the settlement; and based on this Court's knowledge of this litigation, the Court finds and concludes that the settlement is in the best interests of the class and is fair, reasonable, and adequate as to all class members. The Court therefore enters judgment in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

27

25

28

- 7. The representative plaintiffs and the plaintiff class have not sought monetary damages in this action. The defendants have denied, and continue to deny liability for the allegations in the complaints. The Court finds that none of the representative plaintiffs nor any of the plaintiff class are barred from seeking monetary damages in any other appropriate action involving any of the defendants or any other third parties regarding the same facts, transactions or occurrences alleged in this case and based upon the same or similar causes of action. If such claims are made in a different action by any representative plaintiff or member of the plaintiff class, neither the plaintiff nor the defendant in any such action should be subject to claim or issue preclusion related to liability or damages or should be barred from asserting any allegation, claim, damage, or defense.
- 8. The settlement and the terms of the Settlement Agreement are granted final approval with the following modifications:
 - a. The monitor, as described in Part B of the Settlement Agreement, shall be in place, by stipulation filed with this Court, within thirty days of the date of this Order.
 - b. If a stipulation cannot be reached within thirty days, the parties shall schedule a hearing with the Court within forty days of this Order.
 - c. The parties shall file a written agreement with the monitor concerning the monitor's roles and responsibilities within thirty days of the selection of a monitor. The Court shall review the monitor agreement and provide its approval.
- **9.** The Parties are hereby directed to proceed with and complete implementation of the settlement agreement, as modified by ¶ 8 of this Order.

- **10.** All parties are bound by this Order and Judgment and by the Settlement Agreement, as modified by ¶8 of this Order.
- 11. Without affecting the finality of this Order and Judgment, the Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the parties and their counsel, including all class members and their counsel, with respect to the execution, administration, and enforcement of the Settlement Agreement and this Order, including the entry of any additional orders as may be necessary and appropriate relating to any and all issues including appeals.

The Court will monitor this Settlement Agreement very closely and, absent unusual and unexpected circumstances, will not grant requests to extend the deadlines or alter the obligations to which the parties have agreed.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Clerk is hereby directed to enter this Order, enter judgment, and to provide copies to counsel.

DATED this 21st day of July 2016.



Stanley A. Bastian United States District Judge