	Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 1 of 18
1	ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP
2	Daniel S. Drosman (CA SBN 200643) (Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Luke O. Brooks (CA SBN 212802) (Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
3	Ellen Gusikoff Stewart (CA SBN 144892) (Admitted pro hac vice) Jessica T. Shinnefield (CA SBN 234432) (Admitted pro hac vice)
4	Darryl J. Alvarado (CA SBN 253213) (Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) Christopher D. Stewart (CA SBN 270448) (Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
5	Hillary B. Stakem (CA SBN 286152) (Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) J. Marco Janoski Gray (CA SBN 306547) (Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
6	Ting H. Liu (CA SBN 307747) (Admitted pro hac vice) 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
7	San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/231-1058
8	619/231-7423 (fax) dand@rgrdlaw.com
9 10	lukeb@rgrdlaw.com elleng@rgrdlaw.com isbinnefield@rgrdlaw.com
10	jshinnefield@rgrdlaw.com dalvarado@rgrdlaw.com cstewart@rgrdlaw.com
11	hstakem@rgrdlaw.com mjanoski@rgrdlaw.com
12	tliu@rgrdlaw.com
14	Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs
15	[Additional counsel appear on signature page.]
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
18	Mark Smilovits, Individually and on Behalf) of All Others Similarly Situated,
19	Plaintiff, $()$ $(CLASS ACTION)$
20	vs.) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF (1) FINAL
21) APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT; (2) First Solar, Inc., Michael J. Ahearn, Robert) APPROVAL OF PLAN OF J. Gillette, Mark R. Widmar, Jens) ALLOCATION; (3) AWARD OF
22	Meyerhoff, James Zhu, Bruce Sohn and David Eaglesham,) ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES; AND (4) AWARD TO LEAD
23	Defendants.) §78u-4(a)(4)
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	4820-8122-8480.v1

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 23(e), Lead Plaintiffs 1 2 Mineworkers' Pension Scheme and British Coal Staff Superannuation Scheme (the 3 "Schemes" or "Lead Plaintiffs"), on behalf of themselves and the Class,¹ respectfully submit this reply in further support of: (1) Lead Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the 4 5 Settlement of this Litigation for \$350 million in cash and approval of the Plan of Allocation (ECF 715); and (2) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and payment of 6 7 expenses, including an award to Lead Plaintiffs for their time and expenses incurred in 8 representing the Class. ECF 716.

9 I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

10 Pursuant to the Court's March 2, 2020 Order Granting Preliminary Approval Pursuant 11 to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(1) and Permitting Notice to the Class ("Preliminary Approval 12 Order"), more than 848,100 copies of the Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action 13 ("Notice") and Proof of Claim and Release form ("Proof of Claim") (together, the "Claim Package") were mailed to potential Class Members and nominees. See Supplemental 14 15 Declaration of Ross D. Murray, submitted herewith. In addition, the Summary Notice was published in The Wall Street Journal and transmitted over Business Wire, and relevant 16 17 settlement-related documents were posted on the settlement website. See Declaration of 18 Ross D. Murray Regarding Notice Dissemination, Publication, and Distribution of the Net 19 Settlement Fund. ECF 721.²

Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel are pleased to report that the June 9, 2020 deadline
for objecting to the Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and fee requests having passed, only two
letters from Class Members were received, neither of which raises any substantive objection.

- 23
- 24 25

²⁶ Unless otherwise noted, all capitalized terms used herein are defined in the Stipulation of Settlement dated February 14, 2020. ECF 701.

 ^{27 12} In accordance with the Court's directive (ECF 724), the call-in information for the June 30, 2020 telephonic Final Approval Hearing was posted on the settlement website.

See Exs. 1 and 2, attached hereto.³ As such, they should be overruled. Four untimely 1 2 requests for exclusion from the Class were received during the settlement notice program. 3 The overwhelmingly favorable response from Class Members to the \$350 million 4 Settlement and Plan of Allocation is compelling support for their final approval. As set forth 5 in Lead Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Final Approval of Settlement and Plan of Allocation (ECF 715), the Settlement is an exceptional result, 6 7 achieved through more than seven years of determined, hard-fought litigation against highly 8 qualified opposing counsel. The Settlement amounts to 34% of estimated recoverable 9 damages, a far greater percentage than typically recovered in securities class actions. In both 10its terms and amount, the Settlement is in all respects fair, adequate, and reasonable, as is the 11 proposed Plan of Allocation.

12 Similarly, the fact that no substantive objections were raised as to Lead Plaintiffs' 13 requests for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses and awards reimbursing Lead Plaintiffs 14 for their expenditures and time strongly supports a finding that the requested awards are fair 15 and reasonable. The Court-approved Notice informed potential Class Members that Lead Counsel may seek a fee award not to exceed 19% of the gross settlement amount, litigation 16 17 costs and expenses of up to \$6 million, and awards to the Lead Plaintiffs not to exceed 18 100,000 in the aggregate pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78u-4(a)(4). See ECF 721-1. Each of the 19 awards sought in Lead Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of an 20 Award of Attorneys' Fees, Expenses, and Award to Lead Plaintiffs Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 21 §78u-4(a)(4) (ECF 716) is in fact less than the amount cited in the Notice, to which no Class 22 Members substantively objected. The Class's reaction, in addition to the extraordinary result 23 achieved by Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel, the substantial number of hours and resources 24 expended to achieve this result and the skill required to obtain it, weighs heavily in favor of 25 awarding the requested amounts.

26

Ms. Vinceri sought to exclude herself from the Class when that option was provided in late 2013-early 2014. In response to the Notice of Pendency, 288 timely and three untimely opt out requests were received by Gilardi and provided to the Court. See ECF 193-1.

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 4 of 18

1 2

II. THE REACTION OF THE CLASS STRONGLY SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION

3 The "reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement" is an important factor to be considered in assessing the adequacy of the settlement. See Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 4 5 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1998). The Ninth Circuit recognizes that when "the overwhelming majority of the class willingly approve[s] the offer and stay[s] in the class," 6 7 this "presents at least some objective positive commentary as to [the] fairness" of the 8 settlement. Id. at 1027. Indeed, "the absence of a large number of objections to a proposed 9 class action settlement raises a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class 10settlement action are favorable to the class members." In re Apollo Grp. Inc. Sec. Litig., 11 2012 WL 1378677, at *3 (D. Ariz. Apr. 20, 2012); see also Morgan v. Childtime Childcare, 12 Inc., 2020 WL 218515, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2020) ("Lack of objection speaks volumes for 13 a positive class reaction to the settlement."); Destefano v. Zynga, Inc., 2016 WL 537946, at 14 *13 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2016) ("[A] 'court may appropriately infer that a class action 15 settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable when few class members object to it.") (quoting Larsen v. Trader Joe's Co., 2014 WL 3404531, at *5 (N.D. Cal. July 11, 2014)). 16

17 Here, the reaction of the Class to the Settlement overwhelmingly supports final 18 approval. Pursuant to the Court's Notice Order, an extensive notice program was conducted. 19 The Notice advised the Class of the terms of the Settlement and of their rights and the 20 deadlines to (1) to receive their share of the Settlement by submitting a claim form; and (2) 21 to object to the Settlement and to indicate an intention to appear at the Final Approval 22 Hearing. The Notice also provided the date and time set for the final approval hearing, and 23 the binding effect of the judgment. ECF 721-1. As the Court found in approving the notice 24 program, "[t]he form and content of the notice program . . . and the methods set forth . . . for 25 notifying the Class of (a) the Settlement and its terms and conditions, (b) the Fee and Expense Application, and (c) the Plan of Allocation, me[t] the requirements Rule 23 of the 26 27 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and 28 due process, constitute[d] the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and []

constitute[d] due and sufficient notice to all Persons entitled thereto." ECF 709, ¶11. The 1 2 deadline for objecting to any aspect of the Settlement and the Plan of Allocation has now 3 passed, and only *two* objections were received – neither of which sets forth any specific 4 objection. Together, these two objectors purchased only 51 of the 2.935 billion First Solar 5 shares traded during the Class Period.⁴ This unquestionably positive response supports approval of the Settlement. See Hefler v. Wells Fargo & Co., 2018 WL 6619983, at *9 6 7 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2018) ("Even assuming some duplication, 10 objections represents a 8 minute fraction of the potential class, as does the 253 requests for exclusion.... Moreover, 9 the objectors have alleged ownership of a combined 452 shares, as compared to 1.1 billion 10shares affected.... This overwhelmingly positive response supports approval."), aff'd sub 11 nom. Hefler v. Pekoc, 802 F. App'x 285 (9th Cir. 2020); Arnold v. Fitflop USA, LLC, 2014 12 WL 1670133, at *8 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2014) (reaction to the settlement "presents the most 13 compelling argument favoring settlement" where only one objection was filed "indicating 14 that the vast majority of Class Members and other concerned parties are likely satisfied with 15 the resolution of [the] case"); Ciuffitelli v. Deloitte & Touche LLP, 2019 WL 6893018, at *5 (D. Or. Nov. 26, 2019) ("The absence of a significant number of class members seeking 16 17 exclusion or objecting weighs in favor of finding the settlement fair, reasonable, and 18 adequate."), adopted in full by 2019 WL 6840844 (D. Or. Dec. 16, 2019).

Moreover, no institutional investor objected, further supporting final approval. *Hefler*, 2018 WL 6619983, at *9; *see also Fleisher v. Phoenix Life Ins. Co.*, 2015 WL
10847814, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 9, 2015) (noting, in finding settlement fair, adequate and
reasonable, that "*not a single Class member objected*, and this is a Class that contains many
large and sophisticated investors who are all owners of million dollar-plus life insurance
policies.") (emphasis in original).

- 25
- 26

As noted above, Ms. Vinceri expressed her desire to be excluded from the Class in 2014, and has never made any request to opt back in to the Class. In fact, her April 12, 2020 letter makes quite clear that she does "not wish to participate." *See* Ex. 2 hereto.

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 6 of 18

1 2

3

III.

THE REACTION OF THE CLASS STRONGLY SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF LEAD COUNSEL'S REQUEST FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES AND AN AWARD TO LEAD PLAINTIFFS PURSUANT TO 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4)

The Notice provided in the more than 848,000 Claim Packages distributed to potential Class Members explained that Lead Counsel would seek a fee award not to exceed 19% of the gross settlement amount, litigation costs and expenses of up to \$6 million, and Lead Plaintiffs would seek an award of no more than \$100,000 in the aggregate pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4). ECF 721-1. Lead Counsel seeks an attorneys' fee award of 18.83% of the gross settlement amount, litigation costs and expenses of \$5,263,516.69, and \$42,591.42 in reimbursement to Lead Plaintiffs, plus interest on these amounts.

10 Lead Counsel's fee request is well within the acceptable range of awards for similar 11 class action litigations and is both fair and reasonable under the circumstances. This is 12 further evidenced by the fact that, although the Notice explained that Class Members were 13 entitled to object to the fee and expense awards, including how and when they could do so, 14 not a single substantive objection to the requested fee and expense award has been filed. 15 See, e.g., In re Omnivision Techs., Inc., 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036, 1048 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (noting 16 that class members' reaction may be "a determining factor in . . . determining the fee award" 17 and holding that this factor supported the requested award where no objection "raised any 18 concern about the amount of the fee"); Sudunagunta v. NantKwest, Inc., 2019 WL 2183451, 19 at *6 (C.D. Cal. May 13, 2019) ("The Court notes further that class members were notified 20 that Counsel would seek fees of up to 25% of the settlement amount, and that no class 21 member has objected to the requested fee.").

- 22
- 23
- 24 25

Moreover, "[a]s with the Settlement itself, the lack of objections from institutional investors 'who presumably had the means, the motive, and the sophistication to raise objections' weighs in favor of approval." *Hefler*, 2018 WL 6619983, at *15; *see also In re Rite Aid Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 396 F.3d 294, 305 (3d Cir. 2005) (noting, in affirming district court's fee award, that "a significant number of investors in the class were 'sophisticated'

27 28

26

institutional investors that had considerable financial incentive to object had they believed
 the requested fees were excessive").

3 Similarly, the absence of any objection to Lead Plaintiffs' request for an award under 15 U.S.C. §78u-4(a)(4) reimbursing them for reasonable costs and expenses in representing 4 5 the Class for the past seven-plus years also supports the approval of the request. The Notice informed Class Members that Lead Plaintiffs would seek an award of no more than \$100,000 6 7 in the aggregate, and no Class Member submitted a substantive objection. Ultimately, Lead 8 Plaintiffs sought an award of less than *half* that much – \$42,591.42, plus interest – a request 9 to which Class Members have not objected, further supporting a finding that the requested 10 expenses are reasonable. See Omnivision, 559 F. Supp. 2d at 1049 (finding it "appropriate to 11 reimburse Lead Plaintiff for their reasonable costs and expenses" where "[t]he Notice 12 adequately informed all potential Class Members that the Lead Plaintiffs would seek to 13 recover these costs, and no one objected").

14 **IV.**

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing and the entire record herein, Lead Plaintiffs respectfully
request that the Court grant final approval of the Settlement and Plan of Allocation as fair,
reasonable and adequate and in the best interests of the Class and grant Lead Counsel's
application for attorneys' fees, litigation costs and expenses and reimbursement of Lead
Plaintiffs' time and expenses.

20	DATED: June 23, 2020	Respectfully submitted,
21		ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP
22		Daniel S. Drosman
23		Luke O. Brooks Ellen Gusikoff Stewart Jessica T. Shinnefield
24		Darryl J. Alvarado
25		Christopher D. Stewart Hillary B. Stakem J. Marco Janoski Gray
26		Ting H. Liu
27		s/ Luke O. Brooks
28		LUKE O. BROOKS
	4820-8122-8480.v1	- 6 -

	Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC	Document 725	Filed 06/23/20	Page 8 of 18
1				
2		6: S	55 West Broadwa an Diego, CA 92	ay, Suite 1900 2101
3		T 6	55 West Broadwa an Diego, CA 92 elephone: 619/2 19/231-7423 (fax	31-1058)
4		L	ead Counsel for l	Plaintiffs
5		В	ONNETT FAIRI	BOURN FRIEDMAN
6		A K	ndrew S. Friedm evin Hanger (AZ	an (AZ005425) 2027346) k Road, Suite 300 6 74-1100
7		2: P	325 E. Camelbac hoenix, AZ 8501	k Road, Suite 300
8		T 6	elephone: 602/2 02/274-1199 (fax	74-1100 E)
9			iaison Counsel fo	
10				
11				
12 13				
13 14				
14				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	4820-8122-8480.v1	- 7	7 -	

EXHIBIT 1

May 10, 2020

United States District Court for the District of Arizona Sandra Day O'Connor United States Courthouse 401 West Washington Street Suite 623 Phoenix, AZ 85003-2156

Re: No. 2:12-cv-00555-DGC <u>CLASS ACTION</u> First Solar, Inc. Settlement

RECEIVED MAY 2 2 2020

To Whom It May Concern:

I object to the terms of the Settlement regarding the above referenced case and in all respects, requested attorneys' fees, costs charges and expenses, Lead Plaintiffs' request for awards for representing the Class and/or the Plan of Allocation.

As such, I opt out of the Settlement. I no longer wish to be engaged in any form or matter to the above referenced case and all communications henceforth shall cease and desist.

My activity with First Solar, Inc. securities is as follows (All transactions are through Morgan Stanley on my behalf and legally approved; account activity will not be divulged herein nor ever supplied by me in this matter or any other.):

Purchase 06/29/2009, 10 shares, cost \$1,634.40 Purchase 11/06/2009, 07 shares, cost \$ 837.69

Sale, 01/18/2011, 17 shares, proceeds \$2,486.45

Loss on investment activity, (\$5.64)

Please advise should any additional information be required.

Singerely, energie Jeanne I. Levesque

Cc: Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 c/o Daniel S. Drosman

> Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP 825 8th Avenue, New York, NY 10019 c/o Daniel Slifkin

EXHIBIT 2

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 12 of 18

Katherine A Vinceri

RECEIVED APR 1 6 2020

April 12, 2020

United States District Court for the District of Arizona Sandra Day O-Connor United States Courthouse 401 West Washington Street, Suite 623 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2156

RE: Objection - Class Action No. 2:12-cv-00555-DGC

Dear United States District Court for the District of Arizona,

I object to the terms of the Settlement of Class Action No. 2:12-cv-00555-DGC. I also object to the requested attorneys' fees, costs, charges and expenses, Lead Plaintiffs' request for awards for representing the Class and/or Plan of Allocation.

Enclosed please find documentation of my previous First Solar Inc. Common Stock (FSLR) transactions through Fidelity Investments.

I did not initiate this Class Action. I do not wish to participate.

Sincerely,

Katherine A. Vinceri

Enclosure: Fidelity Investments Transaction Confirmations (5 pages

CC: Lead Counsel - Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP First Solar Counsel - Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 13 of 18



FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER



Transaction Confirmation Confirm Date: May 6, 2008

Page 1 of 1

KATHERINE A VINCERI

Online Fidelit FAST(sm)-Automated Telephone 800-54 Customer Service 800-54

Fidelity.com 800-544-5555 800-544-6666

REFERENCE NO. 08127-500314	туре	REG.REP. W##	TRADE DATE 05-06-08	SETTLEMENT DATE 05-09-08	CUSIP NO. 336433107	ORDER NO. 08127-NOFSR	EXCH. NASDAQ	ORIG.
You Bought at Symbol: FSLR	7 282	.92	FIRST SOLAR	FIRST SOLAR INC COM		Principal Amo Commission Settlement Am		1,980.44 10.95 1,991.39

ALL ORDERS ARE UNSOLICITED UNLESS SPECIFIED ABOVE

FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER

90048682

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS PO BOX 770001 CINCINNATI OH 45277-0003 AMOUNT OF INVESTMENT \$

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 14 of 18



FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER

FBO KATHERINE A VINCERI

Transaction Confirmation Confirm Date: May 19, 2008

Page 1 of 1

KATHERINE A VINCERI

Online Fid FAST(sm)-Automated Telephone 800 Customer Service 800

Fidelity.com 800-544-5555 800-544-6666

REFERENCE NO. 08140-558789	TYPE	REG.REP. W##	TRADE DATE 05-19-08	SETTLEMENT DATE 05-22-08	CUSIP NO. 336433107	ORDER NO. 08140-PB3DD	EXCH. NASDAQ	ORIG.
You Bought at Symbol: FSLR	7 309	. 33	FIRST SOLAR	SECURITY DESCRIPTION and DISCLOSURES FIRST SOLAR INC COM WE HAVE ACTED AS AGENT.		Principal Amo Commission Settlement Am		2,165.31 10.95 2,176.26

90067058

ALL ORDERS ARE UNSOLICITED UNLESS SPECIFIED ABOVE

FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS PO BOX 770001 CINCINNATI OH 45277-0003 AMOUNT OF INVESTMENT \$

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 15 of 18



FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER



Transaction Confirmation Confirm Date: May 27, 2008

Page 1 of 1

KATHERINE A VINCERI

Online Fide FAST(sm)-Automated Telephone 800 Customer Service 800

Fidelity.com 800-544-5555 800-544-6666

REFERENCE NO.	TYPE	REG.REP.	TRADE DATE	SETTLEMENT DATE	CUSIP NO.	ORDER NO.	EXCH.	ORIG.
08148-587400	1	W##	05-27-08	05-30-08	336433107	08148-SQ40D	NASDAQ	
You Bought at Symbol: FSLR	5 267	. 57	FIRST SOLAR	SECURITY DESCRIPTION and DISCLOSURES		Principal Amo Commission Settlement An		1,337.85 10.95 1,348.80

90051642

ALL ORDERS ARE UNSOLICITED UNLESS SPECIFIED ABOVE

FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS PO BOX 770001 CINCINNATI OH 45277-0003 AMOUNT OF INVESTMENT \$

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 16 of 18



FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER



Transaction Confirmation Confirm Date: May 30, 2008

KATHERINE A VINCERI

Online FAST(sm)-Automated Telephone Customer Service

Fidelity.com 800-544-5555 800-544-6666

REFERENCE NO.	түре	REG.REP.	TRADE DATE	SETTLEMENT DATE	CUSIP NO.	ORDER NO.	EXCH.	ORIG.
08151-220221	1	W##	05-30-08	06-04-08	336433107	08151-KVMDL	NASDAQ	
You Bought at Symbol: FSLR	1(273	-	FIRST SOLAR			Principal Amo Commission Settlement Am		2,734.90 10.95 2,745.85

90040863

ALL ORDERS ARE UNSOLICITED UNLESS SPECIFIED ABOVE

FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER FBO KATHERINE A VINCERI

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS PO BOX 770001 CINCINNATI OH 45277-0003



address on this form.

If there are sufficient funds in your brokerage core account (or margin account), Fidelity will use those funds to cover the trade(s) on this confirm. If you wish to deposit additional money, use this deposit slip and make checks payable to: NATIONAL FINANCIAL SERVICES LLC. Deposits will be made to the account listed above. Please use the enclosed envelope or mail checks to the Fidelity

Page 1 of 1

Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 17 of 18



FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER FBO KATHERINE A VINCERI



Transaction Confirmation Confirm Date: June 4, 2008

KATHERINE A VINCERI

Online FAST(sm)-Automated Telephone Customer Service Fidelity.com 800-544-5555 800-544-6666

Page 1 of 1



REFERENCE NO.	TYPE	reg.rep.	TRADE DATE	SETTLEMENT DATE	CUSIP NO.	ORDER NO.	EXCH.	ORIG.
08156-327754	1	W##	06-04-08	06-09-08	336433107	08156-LZXOG	NASDAQ	
You Bought at Symbol: FSLR	5 250.	.75	FIRST SOLAR I			Principal Amo Commission Settlement Ar		1,253.75 10.95 1,264.70

LL	ORDERS	ARE	UNSOLICITED	UNLESS	SPECIFIED	ABOVE
----	--------	-----	-------------	--------	-----------	-------

FMT CO CUST IRA ROLLOVER

90043220

L

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS PO BOX 770001 CINCINNATI OH 45277-0003 AMOUNT OF INVESTMENT \$

EINT D

	Case 2:12-cv-00555-DGC Document 725 Filed 06/23/20 Page 18 of 18									
1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE									
2	I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on June 23, 2020, I authorized the									
3	electronic filing of the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system									
4	which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record.									
5	s/ Luke O. Brooks									
6	LUKE O. BROOKS									
7 8	ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diago, CA, 92101, 8498									
9	655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101-8498 Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax)									
10	E-mail: lukeb@rgrdlaw.com									
11 12										
12										
13										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
	4820-8122-8480.v1									