

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE STATE OF OREGON
FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

RALPH LESPERANCE, individually, and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAE OREGON, INC.

Defendant.

Case No. 24CV06959

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

MOTIONS JUDGE: Judge Erik Bucher

WHEREAS, Plaintiff Ralph Lesperance ("Plaintiff" or "Representative Plaintiff") and Defendant JAE Oregon, Inc. ("Defendant" or "JAE Oregon"), by and through their respective counsel, entered into the Class Action Settlement Agreement ("Settlement Agreement");

WHEREAS, Plaintiff applied pursuant to ORCP 32 for an order preliminarily approving the proposed Settlement and preliminarily approving the form and method of notice set forth in the Settlement Agreement;

WHEREAS, this Court previously certified, for settlement purposes only, the following Settlement Class:

"All persons to whom JAE Oregon sent a notification letter regarding the Security Incident."

WHEREAS, the Court entered an order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement, approving the forms of notice to the Settlement Class, directing that notice be disseminated to Settlement Class Members, and scheduling a Final Approval Hearing (the "Preliminary Approval Order");

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order, the Claims Administrator disseminated notice to Settlement Class Members by United

1 States Mail and established a settlement website, toll-free telephone number, and case-specific
2 email address;

3 WHEREAS, the Declaration of Irvin Garcia regarding settlement administration
4 demonstrates compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order and establishes that the best notice
5 practicable under the circumstances was provided to Settlement Class Members;

6 WHEREAS, no Settlement Class Member submitted a request for exclusion from the
7 Settlement Class and no objections to the Settlement were filed;

8 WHEREAS, on April 20, 2026, the Court held a Final Fairness Approval Hearing to
9 determine whether the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and should receive
10 final approval pursuant to ORCP 32 D;

11 WHEREAS, on April 29, 2026, the Court issued an Opinion Letter, incorporated herein by
12 reference, addressing Plaintiff's motion for attorneys' fees, costs, and service award to determine
13 whether the requested award was reasonable to the pursuant to ORS 20.075 and ORCP 32; and

14 WHEREAS, the Court has considered the Settlement Agreement, the motion for final
15 approval, the declarations and submissions filed in support thereof, the arguments of counsel, the
16 reaction of the Settlement Class, and the entire record in this matter, and is otherwise fully advised
17 in the premises;

18 **THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:**

19 1. Terms capitalized herein and not otherwise defined shall have the meanings set
20 forth in the Settlement Agreement.

21 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over the Parties
22 and Settlement Class Members.

23 3. The Court reaffirms and adopts the findings and conclusions set forth in the
24 Preliminary Approval Order.

25 4. The Representative Plaintiff and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately
26 represented the interests of the Settlement Class in connection with the Settlement Agreement.

1 5. The Settlement Agreement was reached through good-faith, arm's-length
2 negotiations and is not the product of collusion.

3 6. The notice provided to Settlement Class Members constituted the best notice
4 practicable under the circumstances, satisfied the requirements of ORCP 32 and due process, and
5 fairly apprised Settlement Class Members of the terms of the Settlement Agreement and their
6 rights thereunder.

7 7. The Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and is hereby finally
8 approved in all respects pursuant to ORCP 32 D.

9 8. The Court finally certifies the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only.

10 9. The Court approves the benefits and claims process set forth in the Settlement
11 Agreement, including the reimbursement and credit monitoring benefits available to Settlement
12 Class Members pursuant to Sections 2 and 3 of the Settlement Agreement.

13 10. Upon the Effective Date of the Settlement Agreement, all Settlement Class
14 Members who did not validly exclude themselves from the Settlement shall be deemed to have
15 fully, finally, and forever released the Released Claims against the Released Persons as set forth
16 in Section 8 of the Settlement Agreement.

17 11. Settlement Class Members are permanently barred and enjoined from
18 commencing, prosecuting, or asserting any Released Claims against any Released Person.

19 12. The Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of \$65,000 and
20 litigation expenses in the amount of \$6,851.18, which the Court finds to be fair and reasonable
21 under ORCP 32 M and the circumstances of this litigation.

22 13. The Court awards Plaintiff Ralph Lesperance a Service Award in the amount of
23 \$1,000 in recognition of his efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class and participation in this
24 litigation.

25 14. This action is dismissed with prejudice, without costs except as otherwise provided
26 in the Settlement Agreement and further Orders of this Court.

15. Without affecting the finality of this Order, the Court retains continuing jurisdiction over all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation, enforcement, and consummation of the Settlement Agreement.

THERE BEING NO JUST REASON FOR DELAY, LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

6/17/2026 10:37:47 AM

Erik Bucher

Circuit Court Judge, Erik M. Bucher

1 DATED this 27th day of May, 2026.

2 /s/ Nathan Ring

3 Nathan Ring (OSB #172663)

4 **STRANCH, JENNINGS, & GARVEY, PLLC**

5 3100 W. Charleston Boulevard, Suite 208

6 Las Vegas, Nevada, 89102

7 Telephone: (732) 235-9750

8 lasvegas@stranchlaw.com

9 /s/ Lynn A. Toops

10 Lynn A. Toops (*pro hac vice*)

11 **COHEN & MALAD, LLP**

12 One Indiana Square, Suite 1400

13 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

14 Tel: (317) 636-6481

15 ltoops@cohenandmalad.com

16 /s/ J. Gerard Stranch

17 J. Gerard Stranch IV (023045) (*pro hac vice*)

18 **STRANCH, JENNINGS & GARVEY, PLLC**

19 223 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, Suite 200

20 Nashville, Tennessee 37203

21 Tel: (615) 254-8801

22 gstranch@stranchlaw.com

23 /s/ Samuel Strauss

24 Samuel Strauss (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

25 Raina Borrelli (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

26 **STRAUSS BORRELLI PLLC**

980 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1600

Chicago, IL 60611

Tel: (872) 263-1100

sam@straussborrelli.com

raina@straussborrelli.com

Counsel for Representative Plaintiff and the Class

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused to be served the foregoing **ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

on the following named person(s) on the date indicated below:

Elizabeth H. White, OSB No. 204729
Olivia C. Ashé, OSB No. 225795
elizabeth.white@klgates.com
olivia.ashe@klgates.com
Phone: 503.228.3200

☐ by Overnight Delivery
☐ by Facsimile
☐ by U.S. Mail with postage prepaid
☒ By OJD File & Serve
☒ by Email

Michael J. Stortz, *pro hac vice* forthcoming
K&L GATES LLP
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel: (415) 882-8011
michael.stortz@klgates.com

elizabeth.white@klgates.com
olivia.ashe@klgates.com
michael.stortz@klgates.com

Attorneys for Defendant JAE Oregon, Inc.

DATED this 28th day of May, 2026.

/s/ Nathan Ring
Nathan Ring (172663)
STRANCH, JENNINGS, & GARVEY, PLLC
3100 W. Charleston Boulevard, Suite 208
Las Vegas, Nevada, 89102
Telephone: (732) 235-9750
lasvegas@stranchlaw.com

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

In the Matter of:

Case No: 24CV06959

RALPH LESPERANCE

Plaintiff/Petitioner,

and

JAE OREGON, INC.

Defendant/Respondent.

**CERTIFICATE OF READINESS
UTCRC 5.100**

Certificate of Readiness under UTCRC 5.100

I certify this proposed judgment/order is ready for judicial signature because (*check all that apply*):

☐ Service is not required under UTCRC 5.100 (1)(c) because the other party has been found in **default** or an order of default is being requested with this proposed judgment/order; because this judgment/order is submitted **ex parte** as allowed by statute or rule; or this judgment/order is being submitted in **open court** with all parties present

☒ Each party affected by this judgment/order has **stipulated** to or **approved** the judgment/order, as shown by the signatures on the judgment/order, or by written confirmation sent to me.

☐ I have **served** (complete service section below) a copy of this judgment/order and the *Notice of Proposed Judgment/order* to all parties entitled to service. **And:**

☐ No objection has been served on me within the 7-day time frame.

☐ I received objections that I could not resolve with the other party despite reasonable efforts to do so. I have filed with the court a copy of the objections I received and indicated which objections remain unresolved.

☐ After conferring about objections, the other party agreed to file any remaining objection with the court.

Certificate of Service under UTCRC 5.100 (if applicable)

I certify that on (*date*) _____: I placed a true and complete copy of this proposed *Judgment/order* in the United States mail to (*name*) _____
at (*address*) _____

Date: May 28, 2026

Submitted by:

/s/ Nathan R. Ring

Nathan Ring

☐ Plaintiff/Petitioner ☐ Defendant/Respondent, Signature

Print Name

3100 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 208 Las Vegas, NV 89102 (725) 235-975

Contact Address

City, State, Zip Code

Contact Telephone

NOTICE OF PROPOSED JUDGMENT OR ORDER

To be sent to all other parties before submitting proposed Judgment or Order to the court for signature. Send the Judgment or Order to the other party with this Notice at least 7 days before submitting it to the court. This does not apply to judgments submitted with a Motion for Order of Default or after and Order of Default has been granted.

This notice is to inform you that you can object to the attached proposed *Judgment or Order*.

Uniform Trial Court Rule (UTCRC) 5.100¹ allows you to object to the proposed judgment or order. If you have no objections, you can sign the last page and return it to me.

If you do object to any of the terms of the judgment or order, you may:

1) Contact me within 7 days of the date of this notice. If you contact me and we are not able to resolve your objections after reasonable efforts, I will include your objections with the proposed judgment or order when I submit it to the court.

or

2) Submit your objections directly to the court. If you intend to submit your objections directly to the court, notify me within 7 days of the date of this notice so that I can inform the court of your intentions when I submit the proposed judgment or order. If you do object to the proposed order or judgment, you must contact me within 7 days of the date of this notice.

Date

Signature

Name (printed)

Contact Address

City, State, Zip Code

Contact Phone

¹ <http://courts.oregon.gov/OJD/programs/utcr/pages/utcrules.aspx>