

## LEGAL NOTICE

**Political Subdivisions and Public Agencies in California, the University of California and the State Bar of California: If you at any time between March 1, 1995 and November 25, 2007 purchased a product containing a cathode ray tube, such as a television or a computer monitor, your rights may be affected by five settlements obtained by the California Attorney General.**

Read on for more information about this lawsuit and your rights and options.

- **What is this about?**

The Attorney General of California has brought a civil lawsuit against certain makers of cathode ray tubes (“CRTs”) alleging they were part of a price-fixing scheme that resulted in overcharges in the price of products that contained CRTs, such as televisions and computer monitors. Five settlements have been reached in *The State of California, et al. v. Samsung SDI, Co., Ltd., et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-11-515784.

Settling defendants include Hitachi, Ltd., Hitachi Displays, Ltd., Hitachi Electronic Devices (USA), Inc., Hitachi America, Ltd., and Hitachi Asia, Ltd. (collectively “Hitachi”); LG Electronics, Inc. (“LG”); Panasonic Corporation f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd., Panasonic Corporation of North America, Panasonic Consumer Electronic Co., Matsushita Electronics Corporation (Malaysia) SDN. BHD., MT Picture Display Co., Ltd. f/k/a Matsushita-Toshiba Picture Display Co., Ltd. (“MTPD”), and Beijing Matsushita Color CRT Co., Ltd. (collectively “Panasonic”); Samsung SDI, Co., Ltd. F/K/A Samsung Display Device Co. Ltd., Samsung SDI America, Inc., Samsung SDI Mexico, S.A. DE C.V., Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda., Shenzhen Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., Tianjin Samsung SDI Co., Ltd., and Samsung SDI (Malaysia) SDN. BHD. (collectively “Samsung”); Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc., P.T. Tosummit Electronics Devices Indonesia, and Toshiba Display Devices (Thailand) Company, Ltd. (collectively “Toshiba”). Hitachi, LG, Panasonic, Samsung, and Toshiba all deny the Attorney General’s allegations against them. The Court has not decided who is right.

- **Who is included in the class affected by these settlements?**

The Attorney General’s lawsuit seeks to recover money damages for the following groups of CRT purchasers: (a) California natural persons; (b) the State of California; and (c) the City and County of San Francisco, individually and on behalf of all non-federal local government entities, including the University of California and the State Bar of California, who purchased products containing CRTs.

Group (c) makes up the Settlement Class of Government Entities or Settlement Class. This class includes “all political subdivisions and public agencies in California (i.e., counties, cities, K-12 school districts, and utilities), plus the University of California and the State Bar of California, that have purchased CRTs and/or CRT products during the Relevant Period.” The “Relevant Period” is between March 1, 1995 and November 25, 2007. The term “political subdivisions” refers to local government entities, authorized under California law, that do not have statewide

jurisdiction. Each political subdivision is a “class member” of the Settlement Class. Likewise, the University of California and the State Bar also are “class members.”

The Attorney General’s Complaint currently identifies numerous political subdivisions and public agencies as “Plaintiffs,” including the City and County of San Francisco. Those Plaintiffs are all members of the Settlement Class. However, not all political subdivisions and public agencies affected have been identified as plaintiffs or class members. Unidentified plaintiffs in a class action are commonly referred to as unnamed class members. Recently, the Court appointed the California Attorney General to be the Class Counsel for all members of the Settlement Class. The Court also appointed the City and County of San Francisco to be their Class Representative.

- **What do the five settlements provide?**

Settling defendants have agreed to pay a combined \$4.95 million that will be used to pay civil fines and damages, the cost of settlement administration, as well as attorney’s fees and litigation costs not to exceed \$975,000. The settlements also provide for injunctive relief (agreements not to engage in price-fixing behavior), antitrust compliance, and cooperation with the Attorney General concerning the CRT price-fixing conspiracy, among other matters.

Since it would be impossible to distribute fairly the Settlement Fund to every class member, the Court has approved a *cy pres* distribution in the form of grants to some class members whose work addresses as near as possible the harm alleged in the lawsuit, i.e., that the CRT price-fixing scheme artificially raised prices for CRT-related products such as televisions and computer monitors. To that end, the Attorney General has allocated \$1,032,113.00 to be distributed via *cy pres* as technology-related grants. Class members may request a grant that involves the purchase of technological items representing the next generation after CRTs, such as tablets, smart phones, computer labs, or better sewer system video technology. While all class members may apply for grant funding, not all applicants will receive a grant. To ensure a diversity of grants for class members located in different areas and communities throughout the state, each grant will be in the amount of \$30,000, or thereabout. The Attorney General will retain a third-party grant administrator who will issue a request for grant applications, vet the candidates, recommend grantees to the Attorney General for awards, and after the court has approved the recipients the administrator will oversee the grant making process including reviewing reports regarding how the grant funds were spent to ensure that the grants are being used for the approved purposes. The administration cost for these grants will not exceed 9% of the total amount distributed.

- **What are the legal rights and options of each class member?**

Do Nothing: By doing nothing, you agree to be represented by the California Attorney General as Class Counsel and by the City and County of San Francisco as the Class Representative in this lawsuit. You also agree to the terms of the Attorney General’s Settlements with Hitachi, LG, Panasonic, Samsung, and Toshiba and, as such, agree to release with Hitachi, LG, Panasonic, Samsung, and Toshiba from this lawsuit in exchange for the benefits described above.

Opt-Out or Exclude Yourself from the Settlement Class: You have the right to exclude yourself from the Settlement Class. By excluding yourself from this group, you will not be legally bound by the Attorney General’s Settlements or the final judgment of her case, and you will retain your

right, if any, to sue Hitachi, LG, Panasonic, Samsung, and/or Toshiba on your own for the same conduct alleged in this lawsuit. Your exclusion request must be postmarked by May 30, 2016.

Object and/or Request to Appear at Fairness Hearing: If you do not opt-out of the Settlement Class, you have the right to: : (a) to object to the Attorney General's Settlements, the plan of distribution, attorneys' fees and costs, and awards to the other groups; and (b) to request to appear at the Fairness Hearing described below. Your objection, request to intervene, or request to appear must be postmarked by May 30, 2016.

- **The Fairness Hearing**

The Court will hold a Fairness Hearing to determine whether to grant final approval of the Settlements on September 27, 2016, beginning at 9:00 a.m., before Judge Curtis E.A. Karnow at 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102, in Department 304. The hearing may be adjourned, extended to another date and time or postponed without further notice.

**For more information, and complete instructions about how to act on your rights visit:**  
**[http://oag.ca.gov/consumers/crt\\_notice](http://oag.ca.gov/consumers/crt_notice)**