1 THE HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA 10 11 GRAYS HARBOR ADVENTIST Case No. C05-5437 RBL CHRISTIAN SCHOOL, a Washington 12 non-profit organization, GREG G. BOGDANOVICH, an individual, MARY 13 LAFOREST, an individual, and BRUCE [PROPOSED] ORDER (1) GRANTING KELLY, an individual, on behalf of PRELIMINARY APPRÒVAL TO THE 14 themselves and all others similarly situated, PROPOSED SETTLEMENT; (2) PROVISIONALLY CERTIFYING THE 15 Plaintiff, PROPOSED SETTLEMENT CLASS; (3) APPROVING THE PROPOSED NOTICE 16 PLAN AND FORMS OF NOTICE; AND (4) SCHEDULING THE FINAL FAIRNESS 17 CARRIER CORPORATION, a Delaware HEARING corporation, 18 Defendant. 19 Nov. 20, 2007 Date: 20 Time: 8:30 a.m. Courtroom: B 21 Hon. Ronald B. Leighton Judge: 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING

1

4 5

6

7 8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

27

26

28

The parties have submitted for this Court's review a proposed Class Action Settlement Agreement resolving all claims in this action against Defendant Carrier Corporation. Having conducted a hearing regarding the reasonableness of proceeding with the proposed Settlement and having reviewed the Settlement Agreement, Plaintiffs' Motion for an Order Granting Preliminary Approval to the Proposed Class Action Settlement, and the files and records of this case, the Court now FINDS, CONCLUDES, and ORDERS as follows:

CERTIFICATION OF SETTLEMENT CLASS

This Court previously certified a statewide litigation class of Washington consumers. Case 3:05-cv-05437-RBL, Doc. No. 100 (May 1, 2007) (hereinafter "WA Class Cert. Order"). Solely for the purpose of effectuating the proposed Settlement, Plaintiffs have proposed conditional certification of the following Settlement Class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 (the "Class"):

> All individuals and entities in the United States who currently own a Carrier 90% high efficiency condensing furnace manufactured between January 1, 1989 and the date of final approval of the Settlement and equipped with a polypropylene-laminated secondary heat exchanger, and former owners of such furnaces whose furnaces experienced CHX failure. Excluded from the Class are: (i) all persons to the extent that they properly and timely opt out pursuant to the Settlement agreement in this matter; (ii) the judge to whom this action is assigned and any member of the judge's immediate family; (iii) government entities; and (iv) all claims for personal injury, wrongful death, or emotional distress.

This Rule 23 Class alleges four causes of action: actionable misrepresentation, breach of express warranty, violation of the Washington consumer statute, and unjust enrichment. Specifically, the Class alleges that starting in 1989, Carrier began manufacturing and selling high efficiency condensing furnaces with a defective condensing heat exchanger ("CHX"). Plaintiffs allege that Carrier was aware of this alleged defect and concealed that fact and the fact that the CHX would not last the expected and warranted 20-year period.

Carrier maintains that its CHXs made of PPL-coated steel are not defective. In support, Carrier submitted data from its warranty database which Carrier asserts show that only 1.6% of its CHXs made of PPL-coated steel in furnaces sold nationally since 1989 have actually failed.

6

4

9

14

12

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28 Carrier contends that the failure rate on the CHXs in the Team 40 furnaces made since 1993 will be less than 5% over a 20 year period. Carrier maintains that this is lower than the rate of failure on CHXs in furnaces made out of stainless steel made by competitors. Carrier also contends that it has lived up to its limited warranty, providing free parts but not free labor, just as the warranty explicitly provided.

The Court hereby FINDS and CONCLUDES that the proposed nationwide Class satisfies all of the requirements for certification under Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3). Provisional certification of a nationwide class is appropriate in part because Carrier does not object to class certification in the context of this Settlement. The Court takes guidance in its consideration of certification issues from Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998).

Numerosity: This Court has already ruled that a class of Washington consumers is sufficiently numerous to satisfy the numerosity requirement. (WA Class Cert. Order 3.) The parties agree that some three million U.S. consumers nationwide purchased the furnaces at issue in this matter and that tens of thousands of those consumers paid to repair or replace their furnaces as a direct result of CHX failure. As such, the Class is sufficiently numerous (approximately 3 million persons) that joinder is impracticable.

Common Questions of Law and Fact: The test for common questions of law and fact is "qualitative rather than quantitative—one significant issue common to the class may be sufficient to warrant certification." See Olson v. Tesoro, 2007 WL 2703053 *2 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 12, 2007) (citing Dukes v. Wal-Mart, Inc., 474 F.3d 1214, 1225 (9th Cir. 2007)). As this Court previously found, the members of the Class share common issues of fact and law regarding (1) whether the CHXs were defective: (2) whether Carrier knew or should have known about the defect; (3) whether Carrier had a duty to disclose that defect; (4) whether Carrier concealed that defect from the class; (5) whether the facts that were allegedly not disclosed were material; and (6) whether the alleged failure to disclose violated the Washington Consumer Protection Act. (WA Class Cert. Order 3.)

Typicality: Representative claims are typical of the class claims if they are "reasonably coextensive with those of the absent class members." Dukes, 474 F.3d at 1232 (citing Hanlon,

150 F.3d 1011, 1020). As this Court found in ruling on Plaintiffs' motion for certification of a Washington litigation class, the named Plaintiffs' have asserted claims which are typical of the other class members' claims in that each class member (1) owns or owned a Carrier highefficiency furnace, (2) alleges that Carrier concealed a known defect in the CHX, and (3) allegedly suffers injury from a defective furnace that will fail prematurely. (WA Class Cert. Order 3-4.)

Adequacy: The named Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class they represent, since their interests are co-extensive with those of Class members, and, as this Court previously ruled in certifying a statewide litigation Class in this matter, the Plaintiffs have retained experienced counsel to represent them. (WA Class Cert. Order 4.)

Common Questions Predominate: As this Court has previously held, "common questions predominate here. One common question is whether Carrier's furnaces are defective by design, regardless of any individual factors such as installation, maintenance, or type of fuel used. Another core issue is whether and when Carrier knew about the defect, and whether it had a duty to disclose that fact to consumers." (WA Class Cert. Order 5.) Class treatment here, in the context of the Settlement, will facilitate the favorable resolution of all Class members' claims.

Superiority: Given the large numbers of Class members and the multitude of common issues present, use of the class device is also the most efficient and fair means of adjudicating the claims that arise out of Carrier's alleged misconduct. Class treatment in the settlement context is superior to multiple individual suits or piecemeal litigation because it greatly conserves judicial resources and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication. For these reasons, the superiority requirement is satisfied.

Because certification of the Rule 23 Class is proposed in the context of a settlement, the Court need not inquire whether the case, if tried as a class action, would present intractable management problems. Accordingly, and for the reasons set forth above, the Court hereby CERTIFIES the Rule 23 Classes under Rule 23(a) and Rule 23(b)(3).

II. APPOINTMENT OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVES AND CLASS COUNSEL

The Court finds that Class Representatives Grays Harbor Adventist Christian School,

25

26

27

28

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 Greg Bogdanovich, Mary Laforest, and Bruce Kelly, as well as proposed additional Class Representatives Mark Neuser, Arlan and Marcia Hinkelmann, Jeff Dougherty, Frank Zinn, Harvey Opaleski, and James Nogosek have claims typical of absent class members belonging to the nationwide Class and are adequate representatives of those class members. The Court appoints all of the above-mentioned Plaintiffs to serve as Class Representatives.

The Court finds that Tousley Brain Stephens, PLLC; Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein LLP; Cullen Weston Pines & Bach LLP; and Heins Mills & Olson PLC have, separately and collectively, extensive experience and expertise in prosecuting complex class cases involving defective products. The Court appoints these firms as Class Counsel.

III. PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

The Court has reviewed the terms of the Settlement Agreement, including the cash reimbursement and enhanced warranty provisions, the plan of allocation and the release of claims. The Court has also read and considered the declaration of Kim Stephens in support of preliminary approval. Based on review of those papers, and the Court's familiarity with this case, the Court concludes that the proposed Settlement is the result of extensive, arms-length negotiations between the parties after Class Counsel had investigated the claims and become familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of Plaintiffs' case. The assistance of an experienced mediator in the settlement process confirms that the settlement is non-collusive. Based on all of these factors, the Court concludes that the proposed settlement has no obvious defects and is within the range of possible settlement approval, such that notice to the Class is appropriate.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE FORM AND MANNER OF DISTRIBUTING NOTICE AND **CLAIM FORM**

The Parties have also submitted for this Court's approval a proposed Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement ("Long Notice"), an abbreviated notice for publication in newspapers and magazines ("Publication Notice"), and a proposed Claim Form, each of which the Court has carefully reviewed. The Court FINDS and CONCLUDES as follows:

The proposed Long Notice and Short Notice are sufficient in detail to provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances. Each of the proposed forms of Notice allows Class

1

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

members a full and fair opportunity to consider the proposed Settlement. The proposed plan for distributing the forms of Notice and Claim Form likewise is a reasonable method calculated to reach as many individuals as reasonably possible who would be bound by the Settlement. The Independent Claims Administrator will distribute the Long Notice and Claim Form to Settlement Class members for whom the parties possess mailing addresses by First Class United States Mail. It is estimated that the mailing will reach approximately 475,000 Class members and that the publication will reach 80.51% of homeowners nationwide. In addition, Carrier furnace distributors across the country will receive the Long Notice and a cover letter explaining the Settlement and asking for their cooperation in reaching affected Class members. A press release describing the Settlement will be issued nationwide and the Publication Notice will appear in approximately 979 newspapers in large cities and small towns throughout the country via weekend newspaper supplements. The forms of Notice and other documents will also be available online at www.FurnaceClaims.com. The website will be registered with hundreds of search engines to ensure that it is easy to find on the web. There is no additional method of distribution that would be reasonably likely to notify Class Members who may not receive notice pursuant to the proposed distribution plan.

The forms of Notice fairly, plainly, accurately, and reasonably inform Class members of: (1) appropriate information about the nature of this litigation, the Settlement Class definition, the identity of Class Counsel, and the essential terms of the Settlement, including the cash reimbursement available as well as the forward-looking enhanced warranty; (2) appropriate information about Class Counsel's forthcoming application for attorneys' fees and the proposed service payments to Class Representatives; (3) appropriate information about how to participate in the Settlement; (4) appropriate information about this Court's procedures for final approval of the Settlement, and about Class members' right to appear through counsel if they desire; (5) appropriate information about how to challenge or opt-out of the Settlement, if they wish to do so; and (6) appropriate instructions as to how to obtain additional information regarding this litigation and the Settlement.

1

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

Similarly, the proposed Claim Form allows eligible claimants a full and fair opportunity to submit a claim for proceeds in connection with the Settlement. The Claim Form fairly, accurately, and reasonably informs potential claimants that failure to complete and submit a Claim Form, in the manner and time specified, shall constitute a waiver of any right to obtain cash reimbursement pursuant to the Settlement terms. As such, the proposed plan for distributing the forms of Notice and Claim Form ("Notice Materials") will provide the best notice practicable, satisfies the notice requirements of Rule 23(e), and satisfies all other legal and due process requirements.

V. PROCEDURES FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT

Fairness Hearing

The Court hereby schedules a hearing to determine whether to grant final certification of the Rule 23 Settlement Class and final approval of the Settlement Agreement (including the monetary and warranty relief, payment of attorneys' fees and costs, and service payments to the Class Representatives) (the "Fairness Hearing") for April 22, 2008.

В. Deadline to Request Exclusion from the Settlement

Class Members may exclude themselves from, or opt-out of, the Settlement. Any request for exclusion must be in the form of a written "opt-out" statement sent to the Claims Administrator. To be effective, any opt-out statement must be sent to the Claims Administrator via First Class United States Mail, facsimile, or the equivalent, postmarked no later March 21, 2008—which is 30 days after the last appearance of the Publication Notice. Only those Class Members who request exclusion in the time and manner set forth herein shall be excluded from the Settlement. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3) and (c)(2), the terms and provisions of the Settlement shall have no binding effect on any person who makes a timely request for exclusion in the manner required by this Order.

The Claims Administrator shall date stamp the original of any opt-out statement and serve copies on both Class Counsel and counsel for Carrier via facsimile and overnight delivery within five (5) business days of receipt of such statements. Class Counsel shall file copies of all timely requests for exclusion, not timely rescinded, with

4

1

5 6

7

8 9

11 12

10

14 15

13

16 17

18 19

20

22 23

21

24 25

26 27

28

the Court prior to the Fairness Hearing.

Class Members shall be permitted to withdraw or rescind their opt-out statements by submitting a "rescission of opt-out" statement to the Claims Administrator. The rescission of opt-out statement shall include the following language:

I previously submitted an opt-out statement seeking exclusion from the Settlement. I have reconsidered and wish to withdraw my opt-out statement. I understand that by rescinding my opt-out I may be eligible to receive an award from the Settlement fund and may not bring a separate legal action against Carrier Corp. with respect to the Released Claims.

The right to rescind a prior opt-out statement extends to Washington residents who opted out of the statewide litigation Class certified by this Court on May 1, 2007.

A Class Member wishing to submit such a rescission statement shall sign and date the statement and cause it to be delivered to the Claims Administrator no later than April 21, 2008—which is 60 days after the last appearance of the Publication Notice.

The Claims Administrator shall stamp the date received on the original of any rescission of opt-out statement and serve copies on Class Counsel and counsel for Carrier via facsimile and overnight delivery within five (5) business days of receipt of such statements. Class Counsel shall file copies of all timely rescissions of opt-out statements with the Court no later than two (2) business days prior to the date of the Fairness Hearing.

C. Defendant's Right to Rescind Agreement

If the number of individuals who opt-out of the Settlement in the manner provided in this Order exceeds 5,000, Carrier may, at its option, rescind this Settlement. Carrier must notify Class Counsel of a decision to withdraw in writing within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of the total number of opt-outs, which will occur after the deadline for submitting requests for exclusions. If Carrier exercises this option, all of Carrier's obligations under the Settlement Agreement shall cease to be of any force and effect, and the Settlement Agreement and any order entered in connection therewith shall be vacated, rescinded, canceled, and annulled, and the parties shall return to the status quo in the

9

12 13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

Civil Action as if the parties had not entered into the Settlement Agreement. In addition, in such event, the Settlement Agreement and all negotiations, Court orders, and proceedings related thereto shall be without prejudice to the rights of any and all parties thereto, and evidence relating to the Settlement Agreement and all negotiations shall not be admissible or discoverable in the Civil Action or otherwise.

D. Deadline for Filing Objections to Settlement

Any Class Member who wishes to object to the fairness, reasonableness or adequacy of the Settlement must do so in writing. Class Members who have timely objected to the Settlement in writing may also appear at the Fairness Hearing. To be considered, any objection to the final approval of the Settlement must state the basis for the objection and be mailed to the Clerk of the Court, Class Counsel, and Counsel for Carrier, at the addresses provided in the Notice, via First Class United States Mail, postage prepaid, postmarked no later than March 21, 2008—which is 30 days after the last appearance of the Publication Notice. Any Class Member who does not timely file and serve such a written objection shall not be permitted to raise such objection, except for good cause shown, and any Class Member who fails to object in the manner prescribed herein shall be deemed to have waived, and shall be foreclosed from raising, any such objection.

If objections are filed, Class Counsel or counsel for Carrier may engage in discovery concerning the filed objections prior to the Fairness Hearing.

E. **Deadline for Submitting Claims Forms**

A Class Member who does not opt out may participate fully in the Settlement. To receive any cash reimbursement, such a Class Member must properly and timely complete a Claim Form in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. To be effective, the Claim Form must be sent to the Claims Administrator at the address provided in the Notice postmarked no later than August 1, 2008, or electronically submitted by that date. Failure to postmark a completed Claim Form by the deadline

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

17

16

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

shall bar the Class Member from receiving any monetary award pursuant to the proposed Settlement. Class Members who do not file timely and valid Claim Forms shall nonetheless be bound by the judgment and release in this action as set forth in the proposed Settlement Agreement, unless that Class Member timely opts out of the Settlement.

It shall be the sole responsibility of each Class Member who seeks a monetary award to notify the Claims Administrator if the Class Member changes his or her address. Failure of a Class Member to keep the Claims Administrator apprised of his or her address may result in the claim being denied or forfeited.

Deadline for Submitting Motion Seeking Final Approval F.

No later than thirty-five (35) days before the Fairness Hearing, Plaintiffs shall file a Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement. On or before one week before the Fairness Hearing, the Parties may file with the Court reply brief(s) responding to any filed objections.

G. Deadline for Petition for Attorneys' Fees

Class Counsel shall file with this Court their petition for an award of attorneys' fees and reimbursement of expenses no later than thirty-five (35) days before the Fairness Hearing. Class Counsel may file a reply to any opposition memorandum filed by any objector no later than one week before the Fairness Hearing.

PLAINTIFFS' AND CLASS MEMBERS' RELEASE VI.

If, at the Fairness Hearing, this Court grants final approval to the Settlement, the Named Plaintiffs and each individual member of the Rule 23 Settlement Class who does not timely opt-out will release claims, as set forth in Settlement Agreement and Claim Form, by operation of this Court's entry of the Judgment and Final Approval, regardless of whether he or she submits a Claim Form or receives any share of the Settlement fund.

IN LIGHT OF THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The proposed Settlement is hereby PRELIMINARILY APPROVED. Final

The Claims Administrator shall take all reasonable steps to obtain

28

26

27

Materials to all known Class Members and Carrier dealers at their last known address or

at the most recent address that may have been obtained through the NCOA.

G.

1	the correct address of any Class Members and/or Carrier dealers for whom the Notice
2	Materials are returned by the post office as undeliverable and otherwise to provide the
3	Notice. The Claims Administrator will trace all returned undeliverable Notice Materials
4	and re-mail to the most recent address available. The Claims Administrator shall
5	promptly notify Class Counsel and counsel for Carrier of any mail sent to Class Members
6	that is returned as undeliverable after the first mailing as well as any such mail returned
7	as undeliverable after any subsequent mailing(s).
8	H. In the event a Claim Form is submitted timely but is deficient in
9	one or more aspects, the Claims Administrator shall return the Claim Form to the
10	claimant with a notice explaining the deficiencies and stating that the claimant shall have
11	forty-five (45) days from the date of the deficiency notice to correct the deficiencies and
12	resubmit the Claim Form. A copy of the deficiency notice shall be sent to Class Counsel.
13	If necessary, claimants will be provided a second deficiency notice to correct any
14	deficiencies concerning resubmitted Claim Forms, which will be governed by the same
15	timeliness requirements as the first deficiency notice.
16	I. Class Counsel shall provide the Court, at least five (5) days prior to
17	the Fairness Hearing, a declaration from the Claims Administrator of due diligence and
18	proof of mailing and publication of the Notice.
19	J. The Claims Administrator shall take all other actions in
20	furtherance of claims administration as are specified in the Settlement Agreement.
21	6. US Bank is hereby appointed Claims Administrator to carry out the duties
22	set forth in this Order and the Settlement Agreement.
23	7. Further settlement proceedings in this matter shall proceed according to
24	the following schedule:
25	March 4, 2008: Deadline to file Plaintiffs' Motion for Final
26	Approval and Award of Attorneys' Fees
27	March 21, 2008: Last day to opt out or object to the Settlement
28	April 1, 2008: Deadline to file Reply Memorandum in Support of

Final Approval and Award of Attorneys' Fees @ April 22, 2008: @ 9:00 am @ ... Fairness Hearing IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 20,2007 The Hon. Ronald B. Leighton United States District Judge