

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 12-md-02311  
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

---

IN RE: BEARINGS

Case No. 2:14-cv-13356-MOB-MKM  
Case No. 2:14-cv-00507-MOB-MKM

---

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO  
TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER  
CASES

---

**TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS' SECOND MOTION FOR  
APPROVAL OF ALLOCATION PLAN FOR SETTLEMENTS PRELIMINARILY  
APPROVED BY THE COURT**

The Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs (“TEDPs”) hereby move the Court for approval of a Plan of Allocation for bearings at issue in the second and final round of settlements between the TEDPs and the Settling Defendants in the *Bearings* case. The proposed Allocation Plan is the same plan that the Court previously approved for TEDPs’ first round of *Bearings* settlements. *See* Case No. 14-cv-00507, ECF. No. 58 (March 31, 2017) (approving the same allocation plan in TEDPs’ earlier *Bearings* case settlements). This Motion is based upon the argument and authority set forth in the Memorandum of Law submitted in support of this Motion, exhibits, and any oral argument that may be held.

TEDPs respectfully request that this Motion be heard at the same time as TEDPs’ Motion for Final Approval and Motion for Award of Attorney’s Fees, currently scheduled for Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 11:15 a.m.

Dated: September 7, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Manly Parks

Wayne A. Mack (PA Bar #46654)

J. Manly Parks (PA Bar #74647)

Sean P. McConnell (PA Bar #307740)

Andrew R. Sperl (PA Bar #311467)

Erica Lee Fruiterman (PA Bar #317289)

William Shotzbarger (PA Bar #320490)

**DUANE MORRIS LLP**

30 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Phone: (215) 979-1000

Fax: (215) 979-1020

wamack@duanemorris.com

jmparks@duanemorris.com

spmccconnell@duanemorris.com

arsperl@duanemorris.com

efruiterman@duanemorris.com

wshotzbarger@duanemorris.com

*Class Counsel for Truck and Equipment  
Dealer Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 12-md-02311  
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

---

IN RE: BEARINGS

Case No. 2:14-cv-13356-MOB-MKM  
Case No. 2:14-cv-00507-MOB-MKM

---

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO  
TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER  
CASES

---

**TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN  
SUPPORT OF SECOND MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF ALLOCATION PLAN FOR  
SETTLEMENTS PRELIMINARILY APPROVED BY THE COURT**

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED**

1. Whether the Court should approve a Plan of Allocation for hearings for the final round of settlements that is the same as the Plan of Allocation for earlier settlements that the court previously approved?

**Suggested Answer: Yes.**

**CONTROLLING OR MOST APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES**

- *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litigation*, No. 08-MD-01952, 2011 WL 6209188 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011)

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
BACKGROUND .....	1
I. The Plan of Allocation of Bearings Involved in the Settlements.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. The Court Should Approve the Allocation Plan.....	2
CONCLUSION.....	5

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>In re Aetna, Inc.</i> , No. Civ. A. MDL 1219, 2001 WL 20928 (E.D. Pa. Jan.4, 2001) .....	3
<i>In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.</i> , 218 F.R.D. 508 (E.D. Mich. 2003) .....	3
<i>In re Ikon Office Solutions Sec. Litig.</i> , 194 F.R.D. 166 (E.D. Pa. 2000) .....	3
<i>Meijer, Inc. v. 3M</i> , Civ. No. 04-5871, 2006 WL 2382718 (E.D. Pa. 2006) .....	3
<i>In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 08-MD-01952, 2011 WL 6209188 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011) .....	3
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 30.....	4

## **INTRODUCTION**

Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs (“TEDPs”) seek approval of a plan of allocation (the “Allocation Plan”) for the final three *Bearings* case settlements for which the Court has granted preliminary approval. *See* Case No. 2:14-cv-00507, ECF Nos. 66-67, 71 (granting preliminary approval to TEDPs’ settlements with SKF USA Inc., the Nachi Defendants, and NSK Defendants). Through this Motion, TEDPs respectfully request that the Court approve the Allocation Plan being submitted with this Motion as Exhibit A. The Allocation Plan is the same plan that the Court previously approved for TEDPs’ first round of *Bearings* settlements. *See* Case No. 14-cv-00507, ECF. No. 58 (March 31, 2017) (approving the same allocation plan in TEDPs’ earlier *Bearings* case settlements). The Allocation Plan was developed using information obtained during discovery in this case and from cooperating settling Defendants. TEDPs’ allocation consultant, RG/2 Claims Administration, also was involved in the development of the Allocation Plan and supports its approval.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **I. The Plan of Allocation of Bearings Involved in the Settlements**

The terms of certain of the Truck and Equipment Dealer settlements preliminarily (and finally) approved by the Court require cooperation from certain settling Defendants.<sup>1</sup> Using information obtained from such cooperation and through discovery, TEDPs’ counsel and their allocation consultant, RG/2 Claims Administration, developed the Allocation Plan for fairly

---

<sup>1</sup> TEDPs’ settlement agreements with the JTEKT Defendants, Schaeffler Defendants, and Nachi Defendants all required attorney proffers from JTEKT, Schaeffler, and Nachi. TEDPs’ settlement agreement with the NTN Defendants, on the other hand, required more limited cooperation from NTN. TEDPs’ settlement agreement with the NSK Defendants and SKF USA Inc. did not require cooperation because of the point in time at which these settlements were reached.



distributing the settlement proceeds to eligible members of the Truck and Equipment Dealer settlement classes and support its approval.

Counsel for TEDPs used information available about the parts and brands targeted by anticompetitive conduct to devise a point-based system that provides greater weight to the purchase of brands for which there is more significant evidence that efforts were made to fix, and artificially stabilize, prices for industrial and automotive bearings used in those vehicles. (*See* Proposed Allocation Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A.) The Allocation Plan uses an approach similar to the allocation plan the Court previously approved for TEDPs' settlements in the *Wire Harnesses* and *Occupant Safety Systems* cases. *See, e.g.*, Case No. 14-cv-14451, Doc. No. 126 (Order granting approval to prior allocation plans). Additionally, this Allocation Plan is the same plan that the Court previously approved for TEDPs' first round of *Bearings* settlements. *See* Case No. 14-cv-00507, ECF. No. 58.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. The Court Should Approve the Allocation Plan.**

TEDPs request that the Court approve the Allocation Plan for this final round of settlements in *Bearings*. The Allocation Plan fairly and equitably distributes the net settlement proceeds to members of the Settlement Classes who submit claim forms for new vehicles and affected component parts purchased in the Included States.<sup>2</sup> It uses information available about the parts and brands targeted by anticompetitive conduct and applies a point-based system that provides greater weight to the purchase of brands for which there is evidence that efforts were

---

<sup>2</sup> The Included States are as follows: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

made to artificially stabilize and fix prices for automotive and industrial bearings used in those vehicles. (*See* Ex. A).

The Allocation Plan provides a scoring system for vehicles and parts purchased by eligible Truck and Equipment Dealers. (*Id.*). Every eligible dealership that submits a valid claim will receive a minimum allocation of ten points under the Allocation Plan, thereby ensuring some proportional recovery by every such member of the Settlement Classes. (*Id.*)

The Allocation Plan provides a fair and reasonable method for distributing the settlement funds, provides eligible members of the Settlement Classes with information about how the calculations will be made, and therefore should be approved by the Court. *See In re Cardizem CD Antitrust Litig.*, 218 F.R.D. 508, 531 (E.D. Mich. 2003). “Approval of a plan of allocation of a settlement fund in a class action is governed by the same standards of review applicable to approval of the settlement as a whole; the distribution plan must be fair, reasonable and adequate.” *In re Packaged Ice Antitrust Litig.*, No. 08-MD-01952, 2011 WL 6209188, at \*15-16 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 13, 2011) (quoting *Meijer, Inc. v. 3M*, Civ. No. 04-5871, 2006 WL 2382718, at\*17 (E.D. Pa. 2006)); *In re Ikon Office Solutions Sec. Litig.*, 194 F.R.D. 166, 184 (E.D. Pa. 2000)).

“Courts generally consider plans of allocation that reimburse class members based on the type and extent of their injuries to be reasonable.” *In re Packaged Ice*, 2011 WL 6209188, at \*15-16 (quoting *In re Aetna, Inc.*, No. Civ. A. MDL 1219, 2001 WL 20928, at \*12 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 4, 2001)); *Cardizem*, 218 F.R.D. at 531 (approving a plan as fair and reasonable that adopted a pro rata method for calculating each class member's share of the settlement fund). The approach used by the Allocation Plan provides reimbursement to the eligible members of the Settlement Classes based on the relative extent of injury the TEDPs believe they sustained. The

Allocation Plan assigns weighted point scores based on the volume of purchases of affected vehicles and bearings.

Vehicles and bearings for which there is significant evidence of coordinated bid and pricing activity receive more weight. Through written discovery, extensive document review, Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(1) and 30(b)(6) depositions, attorney proffers, confidential witness interviews, and other forms of cooperation, TEDPs discovered substantial evidence of coordination by certain Defendants for certain bearings. This coordination was often tied to five price increase requests from Defendants to the original equipment manufacturers (“OEMs”) in 2004, 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2010. The basis of these price increase requests was the rising price of steel. TEDPs allege—and possess substantial evidence showing that—Defendants coordinated these price increase requests to the OEMs. This coordination occurred at meetings through formal channels such as the Japanese Bearing Industry Association Policy Committee and “the Secretariat,” and through less formal meetings such as dinners, drinks, coffee, golf outings, fishing trips, *et cetera*. Additionally, TEDPs possess evidence of certain Defendants respecting one another’s “commercial rights” by not competitively pursuing requests for quotation from an OEM that was historically supplied by another Defendant.

Specifically, in this case, the Truck and Equipment OEMs outlined in Exhibit A were believed to be affected by Defendants’ price-fixing the most. Thus, the makes in Exhibit A reflect vehicles that TEDPs believe were most affected by the cartel conspiracy, and, therefore, the dealers of those trucks and equipment should receive a higher allocation of settlement funds. Schedule A within Exhibit A lists four truck manufacturers—Hino, Isuzu, Mitsubishi Fuso, and UD Trucks—known as the “Four Japanese Diesel/Truck Companies.” TEDPs possess the most evidence regarding these four predominantly (or exclusively) truck manufacturers being affected

by the cartel conspiracy at issue. Similarly, Schedule B within Exhibit A lists other truck manufacturers, along with agricultural and construction equipment manufacturers. While these makes were certainly affected by the conspiracy, that evidence is not as strong as the evidence TEDPs possess for the four Japanese Diesel/Truck Companies. Therefore, TEDPs have allocated more weight to the four companies in Schedule A.

This approach provides a fair and reasonable method for allocating more money to those Truck and Equipment dealers who sold more of the affected bearings and vehicles. The Allocation Plan ensures that every valid claimant will receive some payment, the amount of which will depend on the number of valid claims submitted. The Allocation Plan also permits claims for replacement parts. The Allocation Plan and claims process are also designed to minimize the burden on Truck and Equipment Dealers in making a claim. However, these claims will be subject to audit by the settlement administrator.

Accordingly, TEDPs believe that the Court should approve the attached Allocation Plan for the Truck and Equipment Dealer settlements involving Bearings, which the Court has already approved in connection with the first round of *Bearings* case settlements.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, TEDPs respectfully request that the Court grant approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation submitted with this motion. TEDPs also respectfully request that this Motion be heard at the same time as TEDPs' Motion for Final Approval and Motion for Award of Attorney's Fees, currently scheduled for Wednesday, September 13, 2017 at 11:15 a.m.

Dated: September 7, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Manly Parks

Wayne A. Mack (PA Bar #46654)

J. Manly Parks (PA Bar #74647)

Sean P. McConnell (PA Bar #307740)

Andrew R. Sperl (PA Bar #311467)

Erica Lee Fruiterman (PA Bar #317289)

William Shotzbarger (PA Bar #320490)

**DUANE MORRIS LLP**

30 S. 17<sup>th</sup> Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Phone: (215) 979-1000

Fax: (215) 979-1020

wamack@duanemorris.com

jmparks@duanemorris.com

spmconnell@duanemorris.com

arsperl@duanemorris.com

efruiterman@duanemorris.com

wshotzbarger@duanemorris.com

*Class Counsel for Truck and Equipment  
Dealer Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, J. Manly Parks, hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of Truck and Equipment Dealer Plaintiffs' Second Motion (and Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion) for Approval of Allocation Plan for Settlements Preliminarily Approved by the Court to be served via email upon all registered counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF system on September 7, 2017.

/s/ J. Manly Parks

J. Manly Parks

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master File No. 12-md-02311 Hon. Marianne O. Battani
IN RE: BEARINGS	Case No. 2:14-cv-13356-MOB-MKM Case No. 2:14-cv-00507-MOB-MKM
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER CASES	

**INDEX OF EXHIBITS TO  
TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER PLAINTIFFS' SECOND MOTION FOR  
APPROVAL OF ALLOCATION PLAN FOR SETTLEMENTS PRELIMINARILY  
APPROVED BY THE COURT**

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Description</u>
A	Proposed Allocation Plan

# **EXHIBIT A**



**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

IN RE: AUTOMOTIVE PARTS  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 12-md-02311  
Hon. Marianne O. Battani

IN RE: BEARINGS

Case No. 2:14-cv-13356-MOB-MKM  
Case No. 2:14-cv-00507-MOB-MKM

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO  
TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER  
CASES

**PROPOSED / PENDING COURT APPROVAL DISTRIBUTION / ALLOCATION PLAN  
TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT DEALER WIRE HARNESS SETTLEMENTS**

This distribution / allocation plan (“Allocation Plan”) will be applied to the Truck and Equipment Dealer settlements in the Bearings case. The Allocation Plan includes allowances based on pro rata distributions and utilizes a “weighted” point system that recognizes instances of alleged collusion and bid-rigging. To the extent practicable, the principles applied here will be applied to settlements benefitting Truck and Equipment Dealers for other vehicle parts cases in this litigation. Each parts case will have its own plan of distribution and/or allocation. This proposed plan will, if approved by the Court, govern the Bearings case.

***Settlement Coverage:***

The Allocation Plan will allocate the net proceeds of each of the Bearings Settlements to:

- (1) Dealers who purchased Trucks & Equipment,<sup>1</sup> defined generally as medium- and heavy-duty trucks, buses, commercial vehicles (excluding automobiles, vans, sports utility vehicles, crossovers or pickup trucks, and/or similar motor vehicles sold by automobile dealers), all-terrain vehicles, construction equipment, mining equipment, agricultural equipment, railway vehicles, materials-handling vehicles, and other similar vehicles, that were subject to alleged coordinated activity on bids for component parts;
- (2) Dealers who purchased subsequent Trucks & Equipment that were subject to alleged coordinated activity on price-fixing for component parts;

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrase “Trucks & Equipment” is expressly defined in each of the individual settlement agreements, as is the precise parameters of the settlement class.

- (3) Dealers who purchased Trucks & Equipment whose manufacturers experienced multiple instances of alleged coordinated activity on price-fixing for component parts;
- (4) Dealers who purchased other Trucks & Equipment; and
- (5) Dealers who purchased component parts subject to allegedly coordinated activity.

This Allocation Plan is subject to Court approval and may be revised with Court approval if new relevant information becomes available. In addition, there may be supplements and additions to the list of Trucks and Equipment appended hereto, without Court approval.

Payments will take into account the number and type of new Trucks and Equipment and covered component parts that a Dealer purchased during the periods set forth in the Settlement Class definitions.

Only new Trucks and Equipment purchased are eligible for inclusion. Used and pre-owned Trucks and Equipment that a Dealer purchased at any time will not be included in or counted towards the allocation.

***Weighted Point Allocations:***

Allocations will be determined on a *pro rata* basis using a “weighted” value for each new covered vehicle or vehicle part that Dealers purchased between January 1, 2000 and November 16, 2016:<sup>2</sup>

- Each new unit of the makes of vehicles identified Schedule A, for which there was significant evidence of coordinated activity affecting the price of a part used in that make, purchased by an eligible member of the Settlement Class will be assigned **300 points**;
- Each new unit of the makes of vehicles identified Schedule B, for which there was evidence of coordinated activity effecting the price of a part used in that make, purchased by an eligible member of the Settlement Class will be assigned **200 points**
- Each new unit of any other model of Truck or Equipment vehicle purchased by an eligible member of the Settlement Class during the Class Period that is not covered by the preceding two paragraphs will be assigned **100 points**;
- Each new replacement bearing (for Trucks and Equipment only) purchased by an eligible member of the Settlement Class during the Class Period will be assigned **25 points**;
- Each eligible member of the Settlement Class that submits a valid claim and purchased at least one new Truck or Equipment vehicle during the Class Period in the states listed in the settlement documents will receive a minimum allocation of **10 points**.

---

<sup>2</sup> The time periods covered by the settlements vary slightly by the date of execution of the settlement agreement. The specific end dates are set forth in the respective settlement agreements.

*Important Note:* The maximum payment for any claimant will depend on the application of the principles of allocation set forth herein and the total amount of each settlement fund, after expenses.

More details about the anticipated distribution of the settlement funds are available in the papers filed with the Court in support of settlement approval, which are available on the settlement website, [www.TruckDealerSettlement.com](http://www.TruckDealerSettlement.com). In order to receive a payment, a claimant must file a valid and timely claim. The settlement web site and claim form provide additional details about how to submit a claim. Further information is available at [www.TruckDealerSettlement.com](http://www.TruckDealerSettlement.com) or by calling the Settlement Administrator at [1-866-742-4955](tel:1-866-742-4955).

*Two Truck & Equipment Allocation charts are attached. The allocation information provided in these charts was not compiled or approved by Settling Defendants and is not to be construed as evidence or an admission against any Settling Defendants that they participated in coordinated activities with respect to the listed manufacturers or models of vehicles.*

**Schedule A**

The following makes of Trucks and Equipment will be assigned 300 points for each new unit purchased by an eligible member of the Settlement Class:

<b>Truck &amp; Equipment Make</b>
Isuzu
Hino
Mitsubishi Fuso
UD Trucks f/k/a Nissan Diesel

**Schedule B**

The following makes of Trucks and Equipment will be assigned 200 points for each new unit purchased by an eligible member of the Settlement Class:

<b>Truck &amp; Equipment Make</b>
Komatsu
Hitachi Construction Machinery
Yanmar
Kubota
John Deere
Caterpillar
Case New Holland (including Case IH, New Holland Agriculture, Case Construction, and New Holland Construction)
Toyota Forklifts
Mitsubishi Heavy Industries
General Motors
Ford
Yamaha all terrain vehicles (“ATVs”)
Suzuki ATVs