

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 3:16-cv-3087-MAS-LHG

District Judge Michael A. Shipp

Magistrate Judge Lois H. Goodman

Special Master Dennis M. Cavanaugh, U.S.D.J.
Ret.

**REPLY MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF
(I) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENTS
AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION; AND (II) LEAD COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES**

James E. Cecchi
CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
(973) 994-1700

Hannah Ross
James A. Harrod
Jai K. Chandrasekhar
James M. Fee
BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER
& GROSSMANN LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
(212) 554-1400

*Lead Counsel, Interim Class Counsel, and
Counsel for Plaintiffs AirConditioning and
Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust
Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San
Antonio, and Plumbers Local Union No. 1
Welfare Fund*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE SETTLEMENTS, PLAN OF ALLOCATION, AND MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES WARRANT THIS COURT'S APPROVAL	2
A.	The Court-Approved Robust Notice Program	2
B.	The Settlement Class's Reaction Supports Approval of the Settlements and Plan of Allocation	4
C.	The Settlement Class's Reaction Also Supports Approval of Lead Counsel's Request for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses	5
III.	PLAINTIFFS AND VALEANT HAVE AMENDED ONE ASPECT OF THE VALEANT STIPULATION.....	6
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>In re AremisSoft Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 210 F.R.D. 109 (D.N.J. 2002).....	4
<i>In re AT&T Corp.</i> , 455 F.3d 160 (3d Cir. 2006).....	5
<i>Beneli v. BCA Fin. Servs., Inc.</i> , No. 16-2737, 2018 WL 734673 (D.N.J. Feb. 6, 2018)	5
<i>Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 4776626 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2017).....	4
<i>In re Cendant Corp. Litig.</i> , 264 F.3d 201 (3d Cir. 2001).....	4
<i>Destefano v. Zynga, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 537946 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2016)	5
<i>In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine/Fenfluramine/Dexfenfluramine) Prod. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2017 WL 2838257 (E.D. Pa. June 30, 2017).....	5
<i>Girsh v. Jepson</i> , 521 F.2d 153 (3d Cir. 1975).....	4
<i>In re Lucent Techs., Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , 307 F. Supp. 2d 633 (D.N.J. 2004)	4
<i>In re Nat'l Football League Players Concussion Injury Litig.</i> , 821 F.3d 410 (3d Cir. 2016).....	4
<i>Rodriguez v. Infinite Care, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 6804430 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 17, 2016)	4
<i>In re Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance ERISA Litig.</i> , 2012 WL 1964451 (D.N.J. May 31, 2012).....	6
<i>In re Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance Sec. Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 5505744 (D.N.J. Oct. 1, 2013).....	4
<i>Varacallo v. Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 226 F.R.D. 207 (D.N.J. 2005).....	5
<i>In re Veeco Instruments Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2007 WL 4115809 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2007).....	5

Plaintiffs AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City (“Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class, and Lead Counsel respectfully submit this reply memorandum of law in further support of (i) Plaintiffs’ motion for final approval of the Settlements and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation (ECF No. 199), and (ii) Lead Counsel’s motion for an award of attorneys’ fees and payment of Litigation Expenses (ECF No. 200) (together, the “Motions”).¹

I. INTRODUCTION

As detailed in Plaintiffs’ and Lead Counsel’s opening papers in support of the Motions (ECF Nos. 199-201) (“Opening Papers”), the proposed Settlements—providing for an aggregate cash payment of \$23,125,000 in exchange for the resolution of all claims asserted in the Action against Defendants—represent an excellent result for the Settlement Class. The Settlements take into account the risks and complexities of continued litigation and are the result of extensive arm’s-length negotiations between experienced counsel. Likewise, Lead Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees and Litigation Expenses is fair and reasonable, especially considering the result achieved for the Settlement Class, the caliber of work performed, the risks of litigation, and comparable fee and expense awards.

¹ Capitalized terms used herein shall have the meanings contained in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc., dated August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 194-2), as amended on November 22, 2021 (“Valeant Stipulation”); the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with the Philidor Defendants dated August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 195-2) (“Philidor Defendants Stipulation”); or in the Joint Declaration of James A. Harrod and James E. Cecchi in Support of (I) Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Settlements and Plan of Allocation; and (II) Lead Counsel’s Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and Litigation Expenses (ECF No. 201).

Pursuant to the Court's two Orders Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Providing for Notice (ECF Nos. 196, 197) (the "Preliminary Approval Orders"), the Claims Administrator, under the supervision of Lead Counsel, conducted an extensive notice program, including mailing the Notice Packet to over 41,000 potential Settlement Class Members. In response to this notice program, *no member of the Settlement Class has objected to any aspect of either Settlement, or the Plan of Allocation, or Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees.* In addition, only six (6) requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class were received. As explained further below, the overwhelmingly positive reaction of the Settlement Class further demonstrates that the proposed Settlements, the Plan of Allocation, and the request for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses should be approved.

II. THE SETTLEMENTS, PLAN OF ALLOCATION, AND MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND LITIGATION EXPENSES WARRANT THIS COURT'S APPROVAL

In their Opening Papers, Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel amply demonstrated why the Settlements, the Plan of Allocation, and the request for attorneys' fees, Litigation Expenses, and service awards for Plaintiffs, are fair and reasonable and warrant approval. Now that the time for objecting or requesting exclusion has passed, the Settlement Class's reaction also clearly supports approval.

A. The Court-Approved Robust Notice Program

In accordance with the Court's Preliminary Approval Orders, the Court-authorized Claims Administrator, A.B. Data, Ltd. ("A.B. Data"), conducted an extensive notice campaign, including mailing notice of the Settlements to 41,424 potential Settlement Class Members, publishing a summary notice over the *PR Newswire*, placing ads on relevant Internet websites, and posting relevant information and documents—including Plaintiffs' and Lead Counsel's Opening Papers—

on a dedicated settlement website, www.ValeantTPPSettlement.com. See Supplemental Declaration of Eric J. Miller Regarding: (A) Mailing of the Notice and Claim Form; and (B) Report on Requests for Exclusion Received (“Supp. Miller Decl.”) attached hereto as Exhibit A, as well as the previously filed Declaration of Eric J. Miller dated October 27, 2021 (ECF No. 201-6) (“Initial Miller Decl.”).

The foregoing notice efforts have informed Settlement Class Members of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and the requested fees and Litigation Expenses, as well as Settlement Class Members’ options in connection with the Settlements and the deadline for submitting an objection or requesting exclusion from the Settlement Class. See, e.g., Initial Miller Decl., Ex. A.

Following this robust notice campaign, there have been *no objections* to any aspect of either of the Settlements, the Plan of Allocation, or the motion for attorneys’ fees and expenses. In addition, only six requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class have been received, representing a minuscule fraction of the 41,424 Notices mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and further underscoring the positive reaction of the Settlement Class. See Supp. Miller Decl. ¶¶ 2, 4. Specifically, five (5) entities have requested exclusion from the Settlement Class with respect to both the Valeant Settlement and the Philidor Defendants Settlement and one (1) entity has requested exclusion only with respect to the Philidor Defendants Settlement. See *id.* ¶ 4. Several of the requests indicate that that entity requesting exclusion had no eligible purchases of Valeant-branded drugs in the Class Period or *de minimis* amounts. See *id.* at Exs. 2, 4, and 5.²

² Certain of the requests for exclusion were postmarked before but received after the November 11, 2021 deadline, or did not provide information on the total dollar amount of eligible purchases of Valeant-branded drugs as requested in the Notice. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court approve all of the requests for exclusion despite any such deficiencies.

B. The Settlement Class’s Reaction Supports Approval of the Settlements and Plan of Allocation

The Third Circuit instructs district courts to consider the reaction of the class in determining whether to approve a class action settlement. *See Girsh v. Jepson*, 521 F.2d 153, 157 (3d Cir. 1975). Under *Girsh*, courts consider whether “the number of objectors, in proportion to the total class, indicates that the reaction of the class to the settlement is favorable.” *In re Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance Sec. Litig.*, 2013 WL 5505744, at *2 (D.N.J. Oct. 1, 2013); *see also In re Nat’l Football League Players Concussion Injury Litig.*, 821 F.3d 410, 439 (3d Cir. 2016) (finding this factor favored settlement where only approximately 1% of class members objected and approximately 1% of class members opted out).

The absence of any objections from Settlement Class Members strongly supports a finding that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *See In re Cendant Corp. Litig.*, 264 F.3d 201, 235 (3d Cir. 2001) (the “vast disparity between the number of potential class members who received notice of the Settlement and the number of objectors creates a strong presumption . . . in favor of the Settlement”); *Castro v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc.*, 2017 WL 4776626, at *4 n.3 (D.N.J. Oct. 23, 2017) (“the lack of objectors provides a strong indication that the settlement is fair and reasonable”); *Rodriguez v. Infinite Care, Inc.*, 2016 WL 6804430, at *4 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 17, 2016) (the lack of any objections by class members was “persuasive evidence of the fairness and adequacy of the proposed settlement, and weighs in favor of a final approval”); *In re Lucent Techs., Inc., Sec. Litig.*, 307 F. Supp. 2d 633, 643 (D.N.J. 2004) (“[U]nanimous approval of the proposed settlement by the class members is entitled to nearly dispositive weight.”).

The lack of objections also supports approval of the Plan of Allocation. *See, e.g., id.* at 649 (“The favorable reaction of the Class supports approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation. . . . [N]o Class Member has objected to the Plan of Allocation.”); *In re AremisSoft Corp. Sec. Litig.*,

210 F.R.D. 109, 127 (D.N.J. 2002) (same); *In re Veeco Instruments Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2007 WL 4115809, at *14 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 7, 2007) (“not one class member has objected to the Plan of Allocation which was fully explained in the Notice of Settlement sent to all Class Members. This favorable reaction of the Class supports approval of the Plan of Allocation.”).

Similarly, the fact that only six requests for exclusion were received following extensive notice efforts—including the mailing of over 41,000 Notices—further supports approval of the Settlements. *See, e.g., Varacallo v. Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 226 F.R.D. 207, 251 (D.N.J. 2005) (where only 0.06% of the class members opted out of the settlement favored approval of the settlement); *Destefano v. Zynga, Inc.*, 2016 WL 537946, at *14 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11, 2016) (finding that a low number of exclusions supports the reasonableness of a class action settlement).

C. The Settlement Class’s Reaction Also Supports Approval of Lead Counsel’s Request for Attorneys’ Fees and Litigation Expenses

The reaction of the Settlement Class also supports Lead Counsel’s motion for attorneys’ fees and Litigation Expenses, and Plaintiffs’ requests for service awards for their contributions to the Action. Here, the lack of any objections is strong evidence that the requested attorneys’ fees and expenses sought are reasonable. *See, e.g., In re AT&T Corp.*, 455 F.3d 160, 170 (3d Cir. 2006) (“the absence of substantial objections by class members to the fees requested by counsel strongly supports approval”); *Beneli v. BCA Fin. Servs., Inc.*, No. 16-2737, 2018 WL 734673, at *17 (D.N.J. Feb. 6, 2018) (the absence of objections “strongly supports approval of Class Counsel’s requested fee award”); *In re Diet Drugs (Phentermine/Fenfluramine/Dexfenfluramine) Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 2017 WL 2838257, at *3 (E.D. Pa. June 30, 2017) (“the absence of any objection is indicative of the fairness of the [fee] petition”). The absence of any objections to the fees is of particular note because many of the Third-Party Payors in the Settlement Class are large, sophisticated institutions, with the capacity to submit an objection if they believed it necessary. *See, e.g., In re*

Schering-Plough Corp. Enhance ERISA Litig., 2012 WL 1964451, at *6 (D.N.J. May 31, 2012) (“The lack of objections to the requested attorneys’ fees supports the request, especially because the settlement class includes large, sophisticated institutional investors.”).

Accordingly, the favorable reaction of the Settlement Class provides strong support for approval of the Settlements, the Plan of Allocation, and Lead Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees and Litigation Expenses.

III. PLAINTIFFS AND VALEANT HAVE AMENDED ONE ASPECT OF THE VALEANT STIPULATION

Since the submission of Plaintiffs’ Opening Papers, Plaintiffs and Valeant have amended one aspect of the Valeant Stipulation, in a way that narrows the scope of the release that Settlement Class Members will be providing to Valeant under the Stipulation. Certain members of the Settlement Class raised concerns that “Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” as defined in the original Valeant Stipulation could potentially release claims against Valeant for overpayment of Valeant-branded drugs that were unrelated to the alleged Philidor scheme. That was not intended by the parties and, accordingly, they agreed to the following amendment of the term “Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” in ¶ 1(mm) of the Valeant Stipulation:

“Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” means all claims and causes of action of every nature and description, whether known claims or Unknown Claims, whether arising under federal, state, common or foreign law, that Plaintiffs or any other member of the Settlement Class: (i) asserted in the Action, or (ii) could assert or could have asserted against Valeant in this or any other forum, whether known or unknown that arise out of, are based upon, or relate to any payments made or costs incurred ~~alleged payment by Plaintiffs for Valeant-branded drugs or costs incurred~~ for Valeant-branded drugs during the Class Period allegedly resulting from wrongful conduct related to Philidor. For the avoidance of doubt, Released Plaintiffs’ Claims do not include: (i) any claims asserted or that may be asserted against the Philidor Defendants; (ii) any claims relating to the enforcement of the Settlement; (iii) any claims by any governmental entity that arise out of any governmental investigation of Valeant relating to the wrongful conduct alleged in the Action; and (iv) any claims of any person or entity who or which submits a request for exclusion that is accepted by the Court.

The executed Amendment to the Stipulation of Settlement (“Amendment”) is attached hereto as Exhibit B. Because the Amendment does not limit the rights of any Settlement Class Members (and, in fact, increases them by narrowing the scope of the release they will be granting under the Valeant Settlement), no further mailed notice to Settlement Class Members of the Amendment is necessary. A copy of the Amendment will be posted to www.ValeantTPPSettlement.com.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and those set forth in their Opening Papers, Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel respectfully request that the Court approve the Settlements, the Plan of Allocation, and Lead Counsel’s request for attorneys’ fees and Litigation Expenses, as well as the requested service awards to Plaintiffs. A proposed Order Granting Final Approval of the Settlements and Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses, and Certifying Settlement Class is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

Dated: November 24, 2021

**CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.**

/s/James E. Cecchi

James E. Cecchi
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: (973) 994-1700
Facsimile: (973) 994-1744
JCecchi@carellabyrne.com

***Lead Counsel, Interim Class Counsel, and
Local Counsel for Plaintiffs AirConditioning
and Refrigeration Industry Health and
Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health
Care Fund, San Antonio, and Plumbers
Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund***

**BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER &
GROSSMANN LLP**

Hannah Ross
James A. Harrod
Jai K. Chandrasekhar
James M. Fee
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
Telephone: (212) 554-1400
Facsimile: (212) 554-1444

*Lead Counsel, Interim Class Counsel, and
Counsel for Plaintiffs AirConditioning and
Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare
Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care
Fund, San Antonio, and Plumbers Local
Union No. 1 Welfare Fund*

BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE

Jeffrey W. Golan
Jeffrey A. Barrack
3300 Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 963-0600

*Counsel for Plaintiff the Detectives
Endowment Association of New York City*

**COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL
PLLC**

Julie Goldsmith Reiser
S. Douglas Bunch
1100 New York Ave, N.W.
East Tower, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 408-4600

- and -

Christopher Lometti
Joel P. Laitman
88 Pine Street, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10005
Telephone: (212) 838-7797

***Counsel for Plaintiff New York Hotel Trades
Council & Hotel Association of New York
City, Inc. Health Benefits Fund***

#3067094

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 24, 2021, I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Support of (I) Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Settlements and Plan of Allocation; and (II) Lead Counsel's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses, and its attachments, to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system. Notice of this filing will be sent to counsel of record by operation of the Court's electronic filing system.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Dated: November 24, 2021

s/ James E. Cecchi
James E. Cecchi
**CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN,
BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.**
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: (973) 994-1700
Facsimile: (973) 994-1744
jcecchi@carellabyrne.com

*Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs and
the Settlement Class*

Exhibit A

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 16-3087 (MAS)(LHG)

**SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF ERIC J. MILLER REGARDING:
(A) MAILING OF THE NOTICE AND CLAIM FORM; AND
(B) REPORT ON REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION RECEIVED**

I, ERIC J. MILLER, declare as follows:

1. I am a Senior Vice President of A.B. Data, Ltd.'s Class Action Administration Company ("A.B. Data"). Pursuant to the Court's August 17, 2021 Orders Preliminarily Approving Settlement and Providing for Notice (ECF Nos. 196 and 197) (the "Preliminary Approval Orders"), A.B. Data was appointed by the Court to act as the Claims Administrator in connection with the Settlements of the above-captioned action (the "Action").¹ I submit this Declaration as a supplement to my earlier declaration, the Declaration of Eric J. Miller Regarding: (A) Mailing of the Notice and Claim Form; (B) Publication of the Summary Notice; and (C) Report on Requests for Exclusion Received to Date, dated October 27, 2021 (ECF No. 201-6) (the "Initial Mailing Declaration"). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and, if called as a witness, could and would testify competently thereto.

¹ Unless otherwise defined herein, all capitalized terms have the meanings set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. dated August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 194-2), as amended on November 22, 2021 (the "Valeant Stipulation") and the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with the Philidor Defendants dated August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 195-2) (the "Philidor Defendants Stipulation").

MAILING OF THE NOTICE PACKET

2. As stated in my Initial Mailing Declaration, A.B. Data has mailed a total of 41,424 copies of the Notice and Claim Form (together, the “Notice Packet”) to potential Settlement Class Members.

TELEPHONE HELPLINE AND WEBSITE

3. A.B. Data continues to maintain the toll-free telephone number (1-877-888-6363) and interactive voice response system to accommodate any inquiries from potential members of the Settlement Class with questions about the Action and the Settlements. A.B. Data also continues to maintain the settlement website (www.ValeantTPPLitigation.com) to assist members of the Settlement Class. On October 29, 2021, A.B. Data posted to the website copies of the papers filed in support of Plaintiffs’ motion for final approval of the Settlements and Plan of Allocation and Lead Counsel’s motion for attorneys’ fees and expenses. A.B. Data will continue maintaining and, as appropriate, updating the website and toll-free telephone number until the conclusion of the administration.

REPORT ON REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSION RECEIVED

4. The Notice informed potential members of the Settlement Class that requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class were to be mailed or otherwise delivered, addressed to Valeant TPP Settlements, EXCLUSIONS, c/o A.B. Data, Ltd., P.O. Box 173001, Milwaukee, WI 53217, such that they were received by no later than November 11, 2021. A.B. Data has been monitoring all mail delivered to that post office box. A.B. Data has received five (5) requests for exclusion from the Settlement Class with respect to both the Valeant Settlement and Philidor Defendants Settlement, and one (1) request for exclusion from the Settlement Class with respect to the Philidor Defendants Settlement only. The requests for exclusion are attached hereto as Exhibits 1 through 6. Exhibit 7 is a summary list of the five (5) entities that have submitted requests for exclusion in connection with the Valeant Settlement and their respective

cities and states. Exhibit 8 is a summary list of six (6) entities that have submitted requests for exclusion in connection with the Philidor Defendants Settlement and their respective cities and states.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 23rd day of November, 2021, at Palm Beach Gardens, FL.



ERIC J. MILLER

Exhibit 1

Valeant - 54493

127334721



NOV 16 2021



LOWEY DANNENBERG

November 11, 2021

Via Hand Delivery


Valeant TPP Settlements
EXCLUSIONS
c/o AB Data, Ltd.
P.O. Box 173052
Milwaukee, WI 53217

**Re: *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor
Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG) (D.N.J.)**

To Whom It May Concern,

Enclosed please find a corrected copy of Aetna, Inc.'s Notice of Exclusion from the August 5, 2021 Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with the Philidor Defendants. Please substitute this version for the version hand-delivered yesterday.

Very truly yours,

DocuSigned by:

B88AA0363A5F44C...
Peter St. Phillip

www.lowey.com

44 South Broadway, Suite 1100, White Plains, NY 10601 (p) 914-997-0500 (f) 914-997-0035
Four Tower Bridge, 200 Barr Harbor Drive, Suite 400, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2977 (p): 610-941-2760 (f): 610-862-9777

**Aetna Inc.'s Notice of Exclusion from the August 5, 2021 Stipulation
and Agreement of Settlement with the Philidor Defendants
(Corrected Copy)**

Class Member Aetna Inc., on behalf of itself and its health plan sponsor affiliates and subsidiaries¹ (collectively, "Aetna") requests exclusion from the Settlement Class in *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG) (D.N.J.), only to the extent of the August 5, 2021 Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with the Philidor Defendants. ECF No. 195-2. Class Member Aetna accepts the August 5, 2021 Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with the Valeant Defendants. ECF No. 194-2.

Aetna's address and telephone number is:

151 Farmington Avenue
Hartford, CT 06156
(800) 872-3862

The name and contact number of the appropriate contact person is:


Matthew Varzally
(215) 668-7895

Aetna will promptly supplement this Notice of Exclusion with the "total dollar amount that [it] paid or incurred to purchase or reimburse purchases of

¹ Aetna Inc.'s affiliates and subsidiaries collectively provide health insurance products and related services to over 30 million Americans.

Valeant-branded drugs purchased from or fulfilled by Philidor or a Philidor
Network Pharmacy from January 2, 2013 through November 9, 2015.”

Executed on: November 11, 2021
White Plains, New York

By: 
Peter St. Phillip
Authorized Representative of Aetna Inc.



FOLEY

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5306

VALEANT TPP SETTLEMENTS
EXCLUSIONS
C/O AB DATA LTD.
P.O. BOX 173052
MILWAUKEE, WI 53217

071141-0621
7721 (ATM)

Exhibit 2

127334716



NOV 08 2021

CPS

Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc.
8543 Riverland Ave. S.W.
Navarre, Ohio 44662
Phone: (330) 756-2043
Fax: (330) 756-3144
Email: mritterbeck@cpstankassist.com

10/29/2021

RE: Request for Exclusion

To Whom It May Concern:

Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc. requests exclusion from the Settlement Class in *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS) (LHG)(D.N.J).

Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc. incurred costs less than \$75.00 between 1/2/13 and 11/9/15.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Ritterbeck", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Ritterbeck
Vice President

ting, Inc.
e

CLEVELAND OH 440

1 NOV 2021 PM 6 L

VALEANT TPP SETTLEMENTS
EXCLUSIONS

C/O A.B. DATA, LTD.

P.O. BOX 173001

MILWAUKEE, WI 53217

53217-801201

|||||

Exhibit 3

127334722



NOV 16 2021



Wayne Wiesen

Senior Vice President
General Counsel and Secretary

October 29, 2021

Via Certified Mail

Valeant TPP Settlements
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.
P. O. Box 173001
Milwaukee, WI 53217

Re: *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*
United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
Case No.: 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)

Dear Sir or Madam:

Please be advised that Citation Oil & Gas Corp. ("COGC") located at 14077 Cutten Road, Houston, Texas 77069-2212 (telephone number 281-891-1000, email address vendor@cogc.com and EIN: 74-2163444) hereby requests exclusion from the Settlement Class in *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)(D.N.J.). COGC hereby waives any right and claim to any settlement payment in connection with any settlement of the above-referenced case. COGC further understands that it will be its responsibility to pursue any claim it may have, if it so desires at its own expense.

Very truly yours,

Citation Oil & Gas Corp.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Wayne Wiesen", is written over a printed name and title.

Wayne Wiesen
Senior Vice President

FWW/rwb

CERTIFIED MAIL™

neopost
11/12/2021

FIRST-CLASS MAIL


US POSTAGE \$006.76⁰



ZIP 77069
041L12205329

Citation Oil & Gas Corp.
14077 Cutten Rd.
Houston Texas 77069

USPS CERTIFIED MAIL



9214 8901 9403 8358 9291 23

VALEANT TPP SETTLEMENTS
EXCLUSIONS
C/O: A B DATA LTD
PO BOX 173001
MILWAUKEE WI 53217-8012




Exhibit 4

Valeant - 54493

127334717



NOV 09 2021



November 2, 2021

Valeant TPP Settlements
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.
P.O. Box 173001
Milwaukee, WI 53217

To whom it may concern:

Corporate One Federal Credit Union located at 8700 Orion Place, Columbus, Ohio 43240 request exclusion from the Settlement Class in *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third Party Payor Litigation, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)(D.N.J.)*. Corporate One has no claims for this class action.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Delmar Huff". The signature is stylized with a large, looped initial "D".

Delmar Huff
General Counsel
Corporate One Federal Credit Union

11/2/21 10:15 AM
316-600-1111
2011 11/2/21

COLUMBUS OH 430

2 NOV 2021 PM 5 L

Valeant TPP Settlements
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.
P.O. Box 173001
Milwaukee, WI 53217

53217-801201



Exhibit 5

127334718



NOV 15 2021



1195 River Road, P.O. Box 302
Marietta, PA 17547-0302
Phone: (717) 426 - 1931
www.DonegalGroup.com

VIA U.S. First Class Mail

November 4, 2021

TO: Valeant TPP Settlements
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.
P.O. Box 173001
Milwaukee, WI 53217

RE: *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*
No. 15-3087-(MAS)(LHG)(D.N.J)

Dear Claims Administrator:

Please allow this letter to serve as a written request of Donegal Mutual Insurance Company ("Company"), IRS EIN: 23-1336198, to be excluded from the Valeant Settlement Class in the case of *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation* No. 15-3087-(MAS)(LHG)(D.N.J) – to the extent that the Company is a member of the TPP Class.

At this time, the Company is unable to confirm the relevant brand reimbursements for the time periods as noted in the Approved Notice Regarding Valeant TPP Settlement, received on September 15, 2021 – and therefore any or all may be applicable.

If you have any questions, please call our paralegal at 800.877.0600, x 7630.


Sincerely,

DONEGAL MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

By: Thomas Richards
Thomas Richards
Vice President of Claims, Casualty Claims

GAL[®]
GROUP

TA, PA 17547-0302



Valeant TPP Settlement
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.
P.O. Box 17300 /
Milwaukee, WI 53217

5321738012 B050





Exhibit 6

Valeant - 54493

127334719



NOV 16 2021

**Renewal
by Andersen**



WINDOW REPLACEMENT an Andersen Company

Valeant TPP Settlements
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Data, Ltd.
P.O. Box 173001
Milwaukee, WI 53217

Friday November 5th, 2021

Ref: Request for Exclusion from Settlement Class In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third Party Payor Litigation, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS) (LHG) (D.N.J)

Dear Claims Administrator,

I, Juan Pablo Perez, on behalf of Windows LLC, hereby request the exclusion from the above referenced civil action. For any further notice, please refer to my contact information included with my signature below.

Sincerely,

Juan Pablo Perez

Email: jp@windowsbyrba.com

Phone: 317-669-9150

Renewal
by Andersen.

WINDOW REPLACEMENT



an Andersen Company

1320 City Center Drive
Suite 350
Carmel, IN 46032

www.rbamidwest.com



INDIANAPOLIS IN 460
8 NOV 2021 PM 3 L

9514 7065 6566 1312 7644 20

RETURN RECEIPT

Valeant TPP Settlement
EXCLUSIONS
c/o A.B. Date, LTD
P.O. Box 173001
Milwaukee, WI 53217



U.S. POSTAGE

\$7.38

FCM LETTER

46032 0000

Date of sale

11/08/21

08 2SSK

796711108155746

11486337

53217-801201



FOLD HERE

PLACE THIS LABEL TO THE LEFT OF THE POSTAGE

Exhibit 7

Exhibit 7

Requests for Exclusion – Valeant Settlement

1. Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc.
Navarre, OH
2. Citation Oil & Gas Corp.
Houston, TX
3. Corporate One Federal Credit Union
Columbus, OH
4. Donegal Mutual Insurance Company
Marietta, PA
5. Windows LLC
c/o Renewal by Andersen Window Replacement
Carmel, IN

Exhibit 8

Exhibit 8

Requests for Exclusion – Philidor Defendants Settlement

1. Aetna Inc., on behalf of itself and
its health plan sponsor affiliates and subsidiaries
Hartford, CT
2. Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc.
Navarre, OH
3. Citation Oil & Gas Corp.
Houston, TX
4. Corporate One Federal Credit Union
Columbus, OH
5. Donegal Mutual Insurance Company
Marietta, PA
6. Windows LLC
c/o Renewal by Andersen Window Replacement
Carmel, IN

Exhibit B

EXECUTION COPY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)

AMENDMENT TO THE STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT OF SETTLEMENT

This Amendment to the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. dated as of August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 194-2) (the “Stipulation”), is made and entered into by and among Plaintiffs, on behalf of themselves and the Settlement, and defendant Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc., (the “Settling Parties”) by and through their respective counsel.


1. The Settling Parties hereby agree that the definition of “Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” set forth in ¶ 1(mm) of the Stipulation is amended to read:

“Released Plaintiffs’ Claims” means all claims and causes of action of every nature and description, whether known claims or Unknown Claims, whether arising under federal, state, common or foreign law, that Plaintiffs or any other member of the Settlement Class: (i) asserted in the Action, or (ii) could assert or could have asserted against Valeant in this or any other forum, whether known or unknown that arise out of, are based upon, or relate to any payments made or costs incurred for Valeant-branded drugs during the Class Period allegedly resulting from wrongful conduct related to Philidor. For the avoidance of doubt, Released Plaintiffs’ Claims do not include: (i) any claims asserted or that may be asserted against the Philidor Defendants; (ii) any claims relating to the enforcement of the Settlement; (iii) any claims by any governmental entity that arise out of any governmental investigation of Valeant relating to the wrongful conduct alleged in the Action; and (iv) any claims of any person or entity who or which submits a request for exclusion that is accepted by the Court.

2. The Settling Parties hereby agree that the proposed Judgment Approving Class Action Settlement (attached hereto as Exhibit A) replaces and supersedes the version of the Judgment originally attached to the Stipulation.


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Settling Parties have caused this Amendment to the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. to be executed, by their duly authorized attorneys, dated as of November 22, 2021.

**CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.**

By: 

James E. Cecchi
5 Becker Farm Road
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: (973) 994-1700
Facsimile: (973) 994-1744
JCecchi@carellabyrne.com

**BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER &
GROSSMANN LLP**

By: 

James A. Harrod
Hannu Koss
Jai Chandrasekhar
James M. Fee
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
Telephone: (212) 554-1400
Facsimile: (212) 554-1444

Lead Counsel and Interim Class Counsel

**SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT
LLP**

By: 

Paul C. Curnin

Craig S. Waldman
425 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Telephone: (212) 455-200
Facsimile: (212) 455-2502

***Counsel for Defendant Valeant
Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. (now
known as Bausch Health Companies Inc.)***

Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT APPROVING CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, a consolidated class action is pending in this Court captioned *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG) (the “Action”);

WHEREAS, (a) plaintiffs AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc. Health Benefits Fund, and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class (defined below); and (b) defendant Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. (now known as Bausch Health Companies Inc.) (“Valeant”) have entered into a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated August 4, 2021, that was amended on November 22, 2021 (as amended, the “Stipulation”), that provides for a complete dismissal with prejudice of the claims asserted against Valeant in the Action on the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation, subject to the approval of this Court (the “Settlement”);

WHEREAS, unless otherwise defined in this Judgment, the capitalized terms herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation (as amended);

WHEREAS, by Order dated August 17, 2021 (the “Preliminary Approval Order”), this Court: (a) found, pursuant to Rule 23(e)(1)(B), that it (i) would likely be able to finally approve

the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate under Rule 23(e)(2), (ii) would likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of the Settlement, and (iii) would likely be able to certify Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoint Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP and Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Settlement pursuant to Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (b) ordered that notice of the proposed Settlement be provided to potential Settlement Class Members; (c) provided Settlement Class Members with the opportunity either to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or to object to the proposed Settlement; and (d) scheduled a hearing regarding final approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, due and adequate notice has been given to the Settlement Class;

WHEREAS, the Court conducted a hearing on December 2, 2021 (the “Settlement Hearing”) to consider, among other things, (a) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and should therefore be approved; and (b) whether a judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice as against Valeant; and

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered the Stipulation, all papers filed and proceedings held herein in connection with the Settlement, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing therefor;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. **Jurisdiction** – For purposes of effectuating the Settlement, the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action, and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Settling Parties and each of the Settlement Class Members.

2. **Incorporation of Settlement Documents** – This Judgment incorporates and makes a part hereof: (a) the Stipulation filed with the Court on August 5, 2021, and its Amendment filed with the Court on November 24, 2021; and (b) the Notice and the Summary Notice, both of which were filed with the Court on October 28, 2021.

3. **Class Certification for Settlement Purposes** – The Court hereby certifies, for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the Settlement Class consisting of all health insurance companies, health maintenance organizations, self-funded health and welfare benefit plans, other Third-Party Payors, and any other health benefit provider in the United States of America or its territories, that paid or incurred costs for Valeant's branded drug products in connection with a claim submitted by Philidor, a claim submitted by any pharmacy in which Philidor had a direct or indirect ownership interest, or a claim by any pharmacy for which the amount sought for reimbursement was alleged to be inflated as a result of Defendants' allegedly fraudulent scheme, during the Class Period, and allegedly suffered damages thereby. Excluded from the Settlement Class are Pharmacy Benefit Managers, Defendants, Defendants' successors and assigns, and any entity in which any Defendant has or had a controlling interest. [Also excluded from the Settlement Class are any persons or entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto who or which are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request.]

4. **Settlement Class Findings** – For purposes of the Settlement only, the Court finds that each element required for certification of the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been met: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Action would be impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over any individual questions; (c) the claims of Plaintiffs in the Action are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Settlement Class; and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the Action.

5. **Adequacy of Representation** – Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Court hereby appoints Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoints Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP and Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class both in terms of litigating the Action and for purposes of entering into and implementing the Settlement and have satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) and 23(g), respectively.

6. **Notice** – The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation

Expenses; (iv) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (v) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and (vi) their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable law and rules. The Court further finds that the notice requirements set forth in the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, have been satisfied.

7. **Final Settlement Approval and Dismissal of Claims** – Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation in all respects (including, without limitation, the amount of the Settlement, the Releases provided for therein, and the dismissal with prejudice of the Action), and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable and adequate to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class. Specifically, the Court finds that (a) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have adequately represented the Settlement Class; (b) the Settlement was negotiated by the Settling Parties at arm's length between experienced counsel representing the interests of Plaintiffs, Valeant, and the Settlement Class; (c) the relief provided for the Settlement Class under the Settlement is adequate taking into account the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal, the proposed means of distributing the Settlement Fund to the Settlement Class; and the proposed attorneys' fee award; and (d) the Settlement treats members of the Settlement Class equitably relative to each other. The Settling Parties are directed to implement, perform, and consummate the Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions contained in the Stipulation.

8. All of the claims asserted against Valeant in the Action by Plaintiffs and the other Settlement Class Members are hereby dismissed with prejudice as to Valeant. The Settling Parties shall bear their own costs and expenses, except as expressly provided in the Stipulation or otherwise agreed.

9. **Binding Effect** – The terms of the Stipulation and of this Judgment shall be forever binding on Valeant, Plaintiffs, and all other Settlement Class Members (regardless of whether or not any individual Settlement Class Member submits a Claim Form or seeks or obtains a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund), as well as their respective successors and assigns. [The persons and entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request and are not bound by the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.]

10. **Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 11 below, upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns, in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim against Valeant and the other Settling Defendant's Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees.

(b) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 11 below, upon the Effective Date, Valeant, on behalf of itself, and its respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns, in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendant's Claim against Plaintiffs and the other Plaintiffs' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendant's Claims against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees. [This Release shall not apply to any person or entity listed on Exhibit 1 hereto.]

11. Notwithstanding paragraphs 10(a) – (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action by any of the Settling Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

12. **Use of this Judgment** – Neither this Judgment, the Valeant Term Sheet, the Stipulation (whether or not consummated and whether or not approved by the Court), including the exhibits thereto and the Plan of Allocation contained therein (or any other plan of allocation that may be approved by the Court), the negotiations leading to the execution of the Valeant Term Sheet and the Stipulation, nor any proceedings taken pursuant to or in connection with the Valeant Term Sheet, the Stipulation, or the approval of the Settlement (including any arguments proffered in connection therewith):

(a) shall be offered against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees as evidence of, or construed as or deemed to be evidence of, any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees with respect to the truth of any fact alleged by Plaintiffs or the validity of any claim that was or could have been asserted or

the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in this Action or in any other litigation, or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation;

(b) shall be offered against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees that any of their claims are without merit, that any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees had meritorious defenses, or that damages recoverable under the Amended Complaint would not have exceeded the Settlement Amount or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Stipulation; or

(c) shall be construed against any of the Releasees as an admission, concession, or presumption that the consideration to be given hereunder represents the amount which could be or would have been recovered after trial;

provided, however, that the Settling Parties and the Releasees and their respective counsel may refer to this Judgment and the Stipulation to effectuate the protections from liability granted hereunder and thereunder or to otherwise to enforce the terms of the Settlement.

13. **Retention of Jurisdiction** – Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the Settling Parties for purposes of the administration, interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of the Settlement; (b) the disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) any motion for an award of attorneys’ fees and/or Litigation Expenses by Class Counsel in the Action that will be paid from the Settlement Fund; (d) any motion to approve the Plan of Allocation; (e) any motion to approve the Class Distribution Order; and (f) the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to the Action.

14. Separate orders shall be entered regarding approval of a plan of allocation and the motion of Class Counsel for an award of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses. Such orders shall in no way affect or delay the finality of this Judgment and shall not affect or delay the Effective Date of the Settlement.

15. **Modification of the Agreement of Settlement** – Without further approval from the Court, Plaintiffs and Valeant are hereby authorized to agree to and adopt such amendments or modifications of the Stipulation or any exhibits attached thereto to effectuate the Settlement that: (a) are not materially inconsistent with this Judgment; and (b) do not materially limit the rights of Settlement Class Members in connection with the Settlement. Without further order of the Court, Plaintiffs and Valeant may agree to reasonable extensions of time to carry out any provisions of the Settlement.

16. **Termination of Settlement** – If the Settlement is terminated as provided in the Stipulation or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Judgment shall be vacated, rendered null and void, and be of no further force and effect, except as otherwise provided by the Stipulation, and this Judgment shall be without prejudice to the rights of Plaintiffs, the other Settlement Class Members, and Valeant, and the Settling Parties shall revert to their respective

positions in the Action immediately prior to the execution of the Valeant Term Sheet on July 13, 2021 and shall promptly confer on a new scheduling stipulation to govern further proceedings in the Action, as provided in the Stipulation.

17. **Entry of Final Judgment** – There is no just reason to delay the entry of this Judgment as a final judgment in this Action. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed to immediately enter this final judgment in this Action.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of _____, 2021.

The Honorable Michael A. Shipp
United States District Judge

Exhibit 1

[List of Persons and Entities Excluded from the Settlement Class Pursuant to Request]

Exhibit C

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
FINAL APPROVAL OF THE
SETTLEMENTS AND MOTION FOR
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES,
AND CERTIFYING SETTLEMENT
CLASS**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of the Settlements and Plan of Allocation under Rule 23(e) (the "Motion"). The Motion sought final approval of two class action settlements: (1) the "Valeant Settlement" with Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. (now known as Bausch Health Companies Inc.) ("Valeant") on the terms set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc., dated August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 194-2), and amended on November 22, 2021 (the "Valeant Stipulation"); and (2) the separate "Philidor Defendants Settlement" with Philidor Rx Services, LLC, Andrew Davenport, and the Estate of Matthew S. Davenport (collectively, the "Philidor Defendants") on the terms set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement with the Philidor Defendants dated August 4, 2021 (ECF No. 195-2) ("Philidor Defendants Stipulation"). The Motion also sought approval of the proposed plan for allocating the net proceeds of the Settlements ("Plan of Allocation" or "Plan"); and certification of the Settlement Class for purposes of effectuating the Settlements.

WHEREAS, the Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlements on August 17, 2021 (ECF Nos. 196, 197) (the "Preliminary Approval Orders"). The Preliminary Approval Orders provisionally certified the Settlement Class, approved and directed the dissemination of notice of the Settlements to the Settlement Class, preliminarily approved the Settlements, and set a date and

time for the Settlement Hearing for the Court to consider whether the Valeant Settlement and Philidor Defendants Settlements should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate, pursuant to Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure;

WHEREAS, on December 2, 2021, the Court held a Settlement Hearing, at which time the Parties, and those who timely submitted their notices of intent to appear at the hearing, were given the opportunity to be heard in support of and/or in opposition to the Settlements;

WHEREAS, the Court, has reviewed and considered all of the papers submitted in connection with the Motion, and all of the arguments presented at the Settlement Hearing;

WHEREAS, this Court has fully considered the record and the requirements of law, and good cause appearing;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED that the Valeant Settlement is hereby FINALLY APPROVED and the Philidor Defendants Settlement is FINALLY APPROVED. The Court further finds and orders as follows:

1. This Court, for the purposes of this Order, adopts all defined terms as set forth in the Valeant Stipulation and Philidor Defendants Stipulation.
2. This Court finds that it has jurisdiction over the Action and the Parties for purposes of settlement and asserts jurisdiction over the Plaintiffs for purposes of considering and effectuating the Settlements.
3. This Court previously reviewed and approved the proposed methods for giving notice of the Settlements to Settlement Class Members. The Court has again reviewed the notice program conducted and finds that Settlement Class Members received the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Court specifically finds that, as they were distributed, the Notice,

Claim Form and Summary Notice (ECF No. 201-6, Exs. A, C) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23(c)(2), Rule 23(e)(1), and due process as to the Settlements.

4. The Court finds that the Settlements were entered into in good faith by experienced counsel and only after extensive arm's-length negotiations between experience counsel and, in the case of the Valeant Settlement, with the assistance of an experienced mediator, Jed D. Melnick, Esq. of JAMS. The Settlements are not the result of collusion.

5. This Court finds that the requirements of Rule 23(a) are satisfied for settlement purposes only, as follows:

(a) Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1), the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable;

(b) Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2) and 23(c)(1)(B), the Court determines that there are common issues of law and fact for the Settlement Class;

(c) Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3), the claims of Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class Members; and

(d) Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4), Plaintiffs have fairly and adequately protected and represented the interests of all Settlement Class Members, and the interests of Plaintiffs are not antagonistic to those of the Settlement Class. Plaintiffs are represented by counsel who are experienced and competent in the prosecution of complex class action litigation.

6. The Court further finds that the requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are satisfied for settlement purposes only, as follows:

(a) Questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class Members, as stated above, predominate over questions that may only affect individual Settlement Class Members;

(b) A class action is superior to all other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy; and

(c) The Settlement Class is ascertainable.

7. The Court, having found that all requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and (b)(3) have been satisfied for settlement purposes only, certifies the Settlement Class as follows:

all health insurance companies, health maintenance organizations, self-funded health and welfare benefit plans, other Third-Party Payors, and any other health benefit provider in the United States of America or its territories, that paid or incurred costs for Valeant's branded drug products in connection with a claim submitted by Philidor, a claim submitted by any pharmacy in which Philidor had a direct or indirect ownership interest, or a claim by any pharmacy for which the amount sought for reimbursement was alleged to be inflated as a result of Defendants' allegedly fraudulent scheme, during the Class Period, and allegedly suffered damages thereby.

Excluded from the Settlement Class are Pharmacy Benefit Managers, Defendants, Defendants' successors and assigns, and any entity in which any Defendant has or had a controlling interest.

8. Also excluded from the Settlement Class are any persons or entities who excluded themselves from the Settlement Class pursuant to request. A list of the Settlement Class Members who have timely opted out of the Settlement Class in connection with the Valeant Settlement and who therefore are not bound by the Valeant Settlement is attached as Exhibit 1 to the proposed Judgment approving the Valeant Settlement (attached hereto as Exhibit A). A list of the Settlement Class Members who have timely opted out of the Settlement Class in connection with the Philidor Defendants Settlement and who therefore are not bound by the Philidor Defendants Settlement is attached as Exhibit 1 to the proposed Judgment approving the Philidor Defendants Settlement

(attached hereto as Exhibit B). All other Settlement Class Members are subject to all provisions of the Settlements and this Court's order entering the Settlements.

9. Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlements set forth in the respective Stipulations in all respects (including, without limitation, the amount of the Settlements, the Releases provided for therein, and the dismissal with prejudice of the Action), and finds that the Settlements are, in all respects, fair, reasonable and adequate to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class. The Court finds the Settlements to be fair, reasonable, and adequate after due consideration of all of the factors listed in Rule 23(e)(2). Lead Counsel and Plaintiffs have adequately represented the class and the Settlements were vigorously negotiated at arm's length. The relief provided for the Settlement Class in both Settlements is adequate, taking into account the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal, the effectiveness of proposed methods of distributing relief to the Settlement Class, including the method of processing Settlement Class Members' Claims, and the award of attorney's fees and costs, and the Settlements treat class members equitably relative to each other

10. In finding the Settlements to be fair, reasonable, and adequate, the Court has also assessed the Settlements under the nine factors identified in Third Circuit precedent for determining whether a class settlement is reasonable and fair. *See Girsh v. Jepson*, 521 F.2d 153, 157 (3d Cir. 1975); *In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.*, 579 F.3d 241, 257-58 (3d Cir. 2009). It has also examined the additional factors identified in *In re Prudential Insurance Co. of America Sales Practices Litigation*, 148 F.3d 283, 323 (3d Cir. 1998), for further assessment of whether final approval is appropriate. The Court finds that each *Girsh* factor, and each applicable *Prudential Insurance* factor, supports approval of the Settlements.

(a) The complexity, expense, and likely duration of the litigation. This case presents complex factual and legal questions that, absent settlement, would have to be resolved through extensive proceedings for which the outcome is uncertain, including expert discovery, contested class certification proceedings, summary judgment briefing, *Daubert* challenges, and a complicated, lengthy trial of any claims that would survive summary judgment. An appeal would almost certainly follow any judgment obtained at trial, thereby further delaying this case's final resolution for a period of months or even years. As such, it is clear that litigation of this matter would be time-consuming, uncertain, and expensive and that approval of the Settlements would secure a prompt and efficient resolution of the class's claims permitting substantial recovery without further litigation, delay, expense, or uncertainty.

(b) The reaction of the Settlement Class to the Settlements. Settlement Class Members' reaction to the Settlements is overwhelmingly positive. There have been no objections to the Settlements and the total number of opt outs received is only six (6), in comparison to over 41,000 Notices mailed, clearly indicating overwhelming support for the Settlements from the Settlement Class.

(c) The stage of the proceedings and the amount of discovery completed. Before the Settlements were reached, the Parties had been engaged in litigation for over four years. The Settlements were reached only after extensive litigation, which included the filing of two consolidated complaints, the second of which was filed after an eighteen-month stay during the pendency of a criminal trial against Defendant Andrew Davenport; motion practice regarding Defendant Davenport's motion to stay; motion practice regarding the Court's appointment of a Special Master; Plaintiffs' successful opposition to Defendants' second round of motions to dismiss, after the first round of motions to dismiss was mooted by the litigation stay; and extensive

discovery, including review and analysis of more than 8.6 million pages of documents produced to Plaintiffs by Defendants and third parties, successful opposition to the Philidor Defendants' motion to quash a document subpoena, and participation in 39 depositions that were coordinated with the Valeant securities actions and required multiple two-day depositions. These proceedings represent years of sustained advocacy by counsel, which gave them a proper understanding of the Action's merits before they negotiated the Settlements.

(d) The risks of establishing liability and the risks of establishing damages. The risks surrounding a trial on the merits are always considerable. Absent the Settlements, many obstacles could have prevented the class from obtaining any recovery, even before reaching trial. Plaintiffs faced considerable risk in facing summary judgment and class certification motions. Even if Plaintiffs were able to maintain the Action beyond summary judgment and class certification, Plaintiffs' methods for determining and calculating their alleged damages has been vigorously disputed by Valeant. Plaintiffs' ability to establish both liability and damages hinges in large part on expert testimony, which is admissible only if it meets the requirements of the Federal Rules of Evidence and *Daubert*. Accordingly, without a settlement, the Court would need to resolve a "battle of the experts" that could result in exclusion of the principal evidence supporting Plaintiffs' claims. Plaintiffs had no guarantee that they would make it to trial, win at trial, and/or win on appeal. Even if they did win at trial and on appeal, relief for the Settlement Class was likely years away as a result of the lengthy litigation process. The Settlements eliminate these risks, cut through the delay, and provide immediate and significant benefits to Settlement Class Members. The substantial and immediate relief provided to the Settlement Class under the Settlements weighs heavily in favor of their approval compared to the inherent risk of continued litigation, trial, and appeal.

(e) The risks of maintaining class action status through trial. When the Parties reached their agreements to settle, a class had not yet been certified. The risks of certifying the class and maintaining the class action through trial also support approval of the Settlements. The motion for class certification would have been contested as Defendants were expected to argue that individualized differences among class members and individualized issues of proximate cause and damages should preclude class certification. In addition, if this Court certified a class under Rules 23(a) and (b) and the case proceeded to trial, the Court would still retain the authority to decertify or modify the class during trial if it became unmanageable or class certification was otherwise found to be inappropriate. This factor therefore weighs in favor of approving the Settlements.

(f) The ability of Defendants to withstand a greater judgment. The Third Circuit has explained that the mere fact that defendants “could afford to pay more” in a judgment than they are agreeing to pay in a settlement “does not mean that [defendants are] obligated to pay any more than what [the] class members are entitled to under the theory of liability that existed at the time the settlement was reached.” *In re Warfarin Sodium Antitrust Litig.*, 391 F.3d 516, 538 (3d Cir. 2004). Thus, regardless of whether Valeant could withstand a judgment greater than the amount of the Valeant Settlement, the proposed Valeant Settlement represents a fair, reasonable, and adequate payment under the Settlement Class Members’ theories of liability and in light of the risks of the litigation. Moreover, with respect to the Philidor Defendants Settlement this factor strongly supports approval, because Philidor is a defunct entity with minimal assets; Matthew Davenport is deceased, and his Estate has limited assets; and Andrew Davenport is subject to a multi-million-dollar forfeiture order as a result of his criminal conviction. Accordingly, Plaintiffs

believed that the prospect of obtaining any significantly larger recovery from the Philidor Defendants was remote.

(g) The range of reasonableness of the Settlements in light of the best possible recovery and in light of all the attendant risks of litigation. To assess the last two *Girsh* factors, the Third Circuit requires a comparison of “the amount of the proposed settlement” with “the present value of damages plaintiffs would likely recover if successful, appropriately discounted for the risks of not prevailing.” *Warfarin*, 391 F.3d at 538. Reference points for this analysis include estimates of the recoverable damages submitted by the parties’ experts, *see id.*, and the relief sought in the complaint, *In re Gen. Motors Corp. Pick-up Truck Fuel Tank Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 55 F.3d 768, 810 (3d Cir. 1995), *cert. denied sub nom., Gen. Motors Corp. v. French*, 516 U.S. 824 (1995). The Parties did not agree on the methodology to determine damages in the Action, the assumptions to be used, or the amount that would be recoverable if liability were established. Plaintiffs’ damages expert has estimated that the maximum reasonably recoverable damages ranged from \$169 million to \$242 million and that if Defendants prevailed on just some of their expected arguments related to damages, the maximum damages would have been reduced to an amount not more than \$100 million. The \$23,125,000 recovered in the Settlements, therefore, represents a recovery of 9.6% to 23.1% of the likely damages if Plaintiffs prevailed on liability at trial, which Plaintiffs’ Counsel believe is highly favorable in light of the substantial risks of establishing liability here. Notably, Plaintiffs expected Defendants to contend that Plaintiff could not prove that Settlement Class Members had suffered any cognizable damages. Accordingly, the Settlements represent a substantial recovery, particularly in light of the risks and costs of litigation. This factor therefore weighs in favor of approving the Settlements.

(h) Applicable Prudential Insurance factors. The Third Circuit in *Prudential Insurance* also instructed district courts to consider, “when appropriate,” other factors. *See* 148 F.3d at 323. The *Prudential Insurance* factors applicable here also support finally approving the Settlements. As discussed above, discovery has been extensive and establishes that the Settlements represent an appropriate “assess[ment of] the probable outcome of a trial on the merits of liability and individual damages.” *Id.* In addition, here, the Settlement Class Members had “the right to opt out of the settlement[s].” *Id.* Further, “the procedure for processing individual claims under the settlement is fair and reasonable.” *Id.* And the Settlements’ “provisions for attorneys’ fees are reasonable.” *Id.*

11. In light of its analysis of the *Girsh* and *Prudential Insurance* factors, the Court finds that the Settlements are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and in the best interests of the Settlement Class. The Court fully approves all terms of the Settlements. The terms of the Settlements and this Final Approval Order are binding on Plaintiffs and all Settlement Class Members to the fullest extent provided for in the Stipulations.

12. **Valeant Settlement Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Valeant Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Valeant Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Subject to paragraph 14 below, upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released,

resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim (as defined in the Valeant Stipulation) against Valeant and the other Settling Defendant's Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees.

(b) Subject to paragraph 14 below, upon the Effective Date, Valeant, on behalf of itself, and its respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendant's Claim against Plaintiffs and the other Plaintiffs' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendant's Claims against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees. This release shall not apply to any person or entity listed in Exhibit 1.

13. **Philidor Defendants Settlement Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Philidor Defendants Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Philidor Defendants Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Subject to paragraph 14 below, upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released,

resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim (as defined in the Philidor Defendants Stipulation) against the Philidor Defendants and the other Settling Defendant's Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees.

(b) Subject to paragraph 14 below, upon the Effective Date, the Philidor Defendants, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendant's Claim against Plaintiffs and the other Plaintiffs' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendant's Claims against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees. This release shall not apply to any person or entity listed in Exhibit 2.

14. Notwithstanding paragraphs 12 and 13 above, nothing in this Order shall bar any action by any of the Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulations or this Final Order.

15. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Claimants as set forth in the proposed Plan of Allocation set forth in the Notice provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Net Settlement Funds among Settlement Class Members with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Plan of

Allocation proposed by Plaintiffs is, in all respects, fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class Members, and approves the Plan of Allocation.

16. The Court has carefully reviewed Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses and hereby awards attorneys' fees to Lead Counsel for all Plaintiffs' Counsel in the amount of 30% of the Settlement Funds (or \$6,937,500.00, plus interest earned thereon) and total Litigation Expenses of \$720,335.39 (to be paid from the Valeant Settlement Fund and Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund in proportion to those funds' relative sizes). Lead Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded amongst Plaintiffs' Counsel in a manner which they, in good faith, believe reflects the contributions of such counsel to the institution, prosecution, and settlement of the Action.

17. The Court finds that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded is fair and reasonable under either the "percentage-of-recovery" or lodestar method. In making this award of attorneys' fees and costs, the Court has considered the factors enumerated in *Gunter v. Ridgewood Energy Corp.*, 223 F.3d 190, 195 n.1 (3d Cir. 2000) and *Prudential Insurance*, 148 F.3d at 339 and found that:

- (a) numerous Settlement Class Members who are eligible for payments will benefit from the Settlements that occurred due to the efforts of Lead Counsel;
- (b) the requested fee has been reviewed and approved as reasonable by Plaintiffs that actively supervised the Action;
- (c) copies of the Notice were mailed to over 41,000 potential Settlement Class Members stating that Lead Counsel would apply for attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 30% of the Settlement Funds, Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed \$750,000, and service awards for Plaintiffs in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, and no

objections to the requested attorneys' fees, Litigation Expenses, or service awards were received;

(d) Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted the litigation and achieved the Settlements with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(e) This Action involved complex factual and legal issues, and, in the absence of the Settlements, would involve further lengthy proceedings with an uncertain resolution if the case were to proceed;

(f) The risk of nonpayment was high, particularly given the complexity of the case, because Lead Counsel pursued this case on a contingent basis and received no compensation during the duration of the litigation;

(g) Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted over 16,200 hours, with a lodestar value of over \$9,438,000 to achieve the Settlements;

(h) The amount of fees requested is consistent with awards in similar cases and supported by public policy; and

(i) The amount of costs requested is fair and reasonable and necessary for the prosecution and settlement of the Action.

18. Each of the Plaintiffs, AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City, is awarded a service award of \$20,000 in compensation for its efforts in prosecuting the claims in the Action, to be paid from the Valeant Settlement Fund and Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund in proportion to their relative

sizes. The service awards are in addition to any payments that Plaintiffs may be eligible for under the Plan of Allocation of the Net Settlement Funds of the Settlements.

19. The Parties and their counsel are ordered to implement and to consummate the Valeant Settlements according to their terms and provisions.

20. The Parties are authorized, without further approval from the Court, to agree to and to adopt such amendments, modifications, and expansions of the Settlements: (i) as are consistent with the Final Approval Order and the Final Judgments, and (ii) which do not limit the rights of Settlement Class Members under the Settlements.

21. In the event that the Valeant Settlement does not become effective according to the terms of the Valeant Stipulation, this Final Approval Order shall be rendered null and void as provided by the Stipulations, the Final Approval Order shall be vacated, all orders entered in connection herewith shall be null and void to the extent provided by and in accordance with the Stipulations, and the Parties will be returned to their respective positions in the Action as of July 13, 2021.

22. In the event that the Philidor Defendants Settlement does not become effective according to the terms of the Philidor Defendants Stipulation, this Final Approval Order and other orders entered in connection herewith shall be rendered null and void only as they relate to the Philidor Defendants Settlement to the extent provided by and in accordance with the Philidor Defendants Stipulation, and the parties to the Philidor Defendants Stipulation will be returned to their respective positions in the Action as of July 13, 2021.

23. Without affecting the finality of this Final Approval Order and the Final Judgments in any way, the Court expressly retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over the Action, the Parties, and the Settlement Class, and the administration, enforcement, and

interpretation of all terms of the Settlements, this Final Approval Order, and the Final Judgments, and to continue to preside over any unsettled claims.

24. By this Order, the undersigned approves and recommends that the District Court (Hon. Michael A. Shipp) enter the Judgments embodying the relief described above,

Separate judgments consistent with this Order will issue pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58. The proposed judgments are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of December, 2021.

Hon. Dennis M. Cavanaugh (Ret.)
Special Master

Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT APPROVING CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, a consolidated class action is pending in this Court captioned *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG) (the “Action”);

WHEREAS, (a) plaintiffs AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc. Health Benefits Fund, and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class (defined below); and (b) defendant Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. (now known as Bausch Health Companies Inc.) (“Valeant”) have entered into a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated August 4, 2021, that was amended on November 22, 2021 (as amended, the “Stipulation”), that provides for a complete dismissal with prejudice of the claims asserted against Valeant in the Action on the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation, subject to the approval of this Court (the “Settlement”);

WHEREAS, unless otherwise defined in this Judgment, the capitalized terms herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation (as amended);

WHEREAS, by Order dated August 17, 2021 (the “Preliminary Approval Order”), this Court: (a) found, pursuant to Rule 23(e)(1)(B), that it (i) would likely be able to finally approve

the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate under Rule 23(e)(2), (ii) would likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of the Settlement, and (iii) would likely be able to certify Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoint Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP and Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Settlement pursuant to Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (b) ordered that notice of the proposed Settlement be provided to potential Settlement Class Members; (c) provided Settlement Class Members with the opportunity either to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or to object to the proposed Settlement; and (d) scheduled a hearing regarding final approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, due and adequate notice has been given to the Settlement Class;

WHEREAS, the Court conducted a hearing on December 2, 2021 (the “Settlement Hearing”) to consider, among other things, (a) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and should therefore be approved; and (b) whether a judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice as against Valeant; and

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered the Stipulation, all papers filed and proceedings held herein in connection with the Settlement, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing therefor;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. **Jurisdiction** – For purposes of effectuating the Settlement, the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action, and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Settling Parties and each of the Settlement Class Members.

2. **Incorporation of Settlement Documents** – This Judgment incorporates and makes a part hereof: (a) the Stipulation filed with the Court on August 5, 2021, and its Amendment filed with the Court on November 24, 2021; and (b) the Notice and the Summary Notice, both of which were filed with the Court on October 28, 2021.

3. **Class Certification for Settlement Purposes** – The Court hereby certifies, for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the Settlement Class consisting of all health insurance companies, health maintenance organizations, self-funded health and welfare benefit plans, other Third-Party Payors, and any other health benefit provider in the United States of America or its territories, that paid or incurred costs for Valeant's branded drug products in connection with a claim submitted by Philidor, a claim submitted by any pharmacy in which Philidor had a direct or indirect ownership interest, or a claim by any pharmacy for which the amount sought for reimbursement was alleged to be inflated as a result of Defendants' allegedly fraudulent scheme, during the Class Period, and allegedly suffered damages thereby. Excluded from the Settlement Class are Pharmacy Benefit Managers, Defendants, Defendants' successors and assigns, and any entity in which any Defendant has or had a controlling interest. Also excluded from the Settlement Class are any persons or entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto who or which are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request.

4. **Settlement Class Findings** – For purposes of the Settlement only, the Court finds that each element required for certification of the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been met: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Action would be impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over any individual questions; (c) the claims of Plaintiffs in the Action are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Settlement Class; and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the Action.

5. **Adequacy of Representation** – Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Court hereby appoints Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoints Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP and Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class both in terms of litigating the Action and for purposes of entering into and implementing the Settlement and have satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) and 23(g), respectively.

6. **Notice** – The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation

Expenses; (iv) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (v) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and (vi) their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable law and rules. The Court further finds that the notice requirements set forth in the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, have been satisfied.

7. **Final Settlement Approval and Dismissal of Claims** – Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation in all respects (including, without limitation, the amount of the Settlement, the Releases provided for therein, and the dismissal with prejudice of the Action), and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable and adequate to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class. Specifically, the Court finds that (a) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have adequately represented the Settlement Class; (b) the Settlement was negotiated by the Settling Parties at arm's length between experienced counsel representing the interests of Plaintiffs, Valeant, and the Settlement Class; (c) the relief provided for the Settlement Class under the Settlement is adequate taking into account the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal, the proposed means of distributing the Settlement Fund to the Settlement Class; and the proposed attorneys' fee award; and (d) the Settlement treats members of the Settlement Class equitably relative to each other. The Settling Parties are directed to implement, perform, and consummate the Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions contained in the Stipulation.

8. All of the claims asserted against Valeant in the Action by Plaintiffs and the other Settlement Class Members are hereby dismissed with prejudice as to Valeant. The Settling Parties shall bear their own costs and expenses, except as expressly provided in the Stipulation or otherwise agreed.

9. **Binding Effect** – The terms of the Stipulation and of this Judgment shall be forever binding on Valeant, Plaintiffs, and all other Settlement Class Members (regardless of whether or not any individual Settlement Class Member submits a Claim Form or seeks or obtains a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund), as well as their respective successors and assigns. The persons and entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request and are not bound by the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

10. **Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 11 below, upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim against Valeant and the other Settling Defendant's Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees.

(b) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 11 below, upon the Effective Date, Valeant, on behalf of itself, and its respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendant's Claim against Plaintiffs and the other Plaintiffs' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendant's Claims against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees. This Release shall not apply to any person or entity listed on Exhibit 1 hereto.

11. Notwithstanding paragraphs 10(a) – (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action by any of the Settling Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

12. **Plan of Allocation** – The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Claimants as set forth in the proposed Plan of Allocation set forth in the Notice provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Valeant Net Settlement Fund among Settlement Class Members with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Plan of Allocation proposed by Plaintiffs is, in all respects, fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class Members, and approves the Plan of Allocation.

13. **Attorneys' Fees and Expenses** – The Court has carefully reviewed Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses and hereby awards attorneys' fees to Lead Counsel for all Plaintiffs' Counsel in the amount of 30% of the Valeant Settlement Fund (or \$6,900,000.00, plus interest earned thereon) and total Litigation Expenses of \$720,335.39 (to be

paid from the Valeant Settlement Fund and Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund in proportion to those funds' relative sizes). Lead Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded amongst Plaintiffs' Counsel in a manner which they, in good faith, believe reflects the contributions of such counsel to the institution, prosecution, and settlement of the Action.

14. The Court finds that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded is fair and reasonable under either the "percentage-of-recovery" or lodestar method. In making this award of attorneys' fees and costs, the Court has considered the factors enumerated in *Gunter v. Ridgewood Energy Corp.*, 223 F.3d 190, 195 n.1 (3d Cir. 2000) and *Prudential Insurance*, 148 F.3d at 339 and found that:

(a) numerous Settlement Class Members who are eligible for payments will benefit from the Settlements that occurred due to the efforts of Lead Counsel;

(b) the requested fee has been reviewed and approved as reasonable by Plaintiffs that actively supervised the Action;

(c) copies of the Notice were mailed to over 41,000 potential Settlement Class Members stating that Lead Counsel would apply for attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 30% of the Settlement Funds, Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed \$750,000, and service awards for Plaintiffs in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, and no objections to the requested attorneys' fees, Litigation Expenses, or service awards were received;

(d) Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted the litigation and achieved the Settlements with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(e) This Action involved complex factual and legal issues, and, in the absence of the Settlements, would involve further lengthy proceedings with an uncertain resolution if the case were to proceed;

(f) The risk of nonpayment was high, particularly given the complexity of the case, because Lead Counsel pursued this case on a contingent basis and received no compensation during the duration of the litigation;

(g) Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted over 16,200 hours, with a lodestar value of over \$9,438,000 to achieve the Settlements;

(h) The amount of fees requested is consistent with awards in similar cases and supported by public policy; and

(i) The amount of costs requested is fair and reasonable and necessary for the prosecution and settlement of the Action.

15. Each of the Plaintiffs, AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City, is awarded a service award of \$20,000 in compensation for its efforts in prosecuting the claims in the Action, to be paid from the Valeant Settlement Fund and Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund in proportion to their relative sizes. The service awards are in addition to any payments that Plaintiffs may be eligible for under the Plan of Allocation of the Net Settlement Funds of the Settlements.

16. **Use of this Judgment** – Neither this Judgment, the Valeant Term Sheet, the Stipulation (whether or not consummated and whether or not approved by the Court), including the exhibits thereto and the Plan of Allocation contained therein (or any other plan of allocation

that may be approved by the Court), the negotiations leading to the execution of the Valeant Term Sheet and the Stipulation, nor any proceedings taken pursuant to or in connection with the Valeant Term Sheet, the Stipulation, or the approval of the Settlement (including any arguments proffered in connection therewith):

(a) shall be offered against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees as evidence of, or construed as or deemed to be evidence of, any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees with respect to the truth of any fact alleged by Plaintiffs or the validity of any claim that was or could have been asserted or the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in this Action or in any other litigation, or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation;

(b) shall be offered against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees that any of their claims are without merit, that any of the Settling Defendant's Releasees had meritorious defenses, or that damages recoverable under the Amended Complaint would not have exceeded the Settlement Amount or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or

proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Stipulation; or

(c) shall be construed against any of the Releasees as an admission, concession, or presumption that the consideration to be given hereunder represents the amount which could be or would have been recovered after trial;

provided, however, that the Settling Parties and the Releasees and their respective counsel may refer to this Judgment and the Stipulation to effectuate the protections from liability granted hereunder and thereunder or to otherwise to enforce the terms of the Settlement.

17. **Retention of Jurisdiction** – Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the Settling Parties for purposes of the administration, interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of the Settlement; (b) the disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) any motion for an award of attorneys’ fees and/or Litigation Expenses by Class Counsel in the Action that will be paid from the Settlement Fund; (d) any motion to approve the Plan of Allocation; (e) any motion to approve the Class Distribution Order; and (f) the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to the Action.

18. Separate orders shall be entered regarding approval of a plan of allocation and the motion of Class Counsel for an award of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses. Such orders shall in no way affect or delay the finality of this Judgment and shall not affect or delay the Effective Date of the Settlement.

19. **Modification of the Agreement of Settlement** – Without further approval from the Court, Plaintiffs and Valeant are hereby authorized to agree to and adopt such amendments or modifications of the Stipulation or any exhibits attached thereto to effectuate the Settlement that: (a) are not materially inconsistent with this Judgment; and (b) do not materially limit the rights of

Settlement Class Members in connection with the Settlement. Without further order of the Court, Plaintiffs and Valeant may agree to reasonable extensions of time to carry out any provisions of the Settlement.

20. **Termination of Settlement** – If the Settlement is terminated as provided in the Stipulation or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Judgment shall be vacated, rendered null and void, and be of no further force and effect, except as otherwise provided by the Stipulation, and this Judgment shall be without prejudice to the rights of Plaintiffs, the other Settlement Class Members, and Valeant, and the Settling Parties shall revert to their respective positions in the Action immediately prior to the execution of the Valeant Term Sheet on July 13, 2021 and shall promptly confer on a new scheduling stipulation to govern further proceedings in the Action, as provided in the Stipulation.

21. **Entry of Final Judgment** – There is no just reason to delay the entry of this Judgment as a final judgment in this Action. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed to immediately enter this final judgment in this Action.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of _____, 2021.

The Honorable Michael A. Shipp
United States District Judge

Exhibit 1

List of Persons and Entities Excluded from the Settlement Class Pursuant to Request

1. Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc.
Navarre, OH
2. Citation Oil & Gas Corp.
Houston, TX
3. Corporate One Federal Credit Union
Columbus, OH
4. Donegal Mutual Insurance Company
Marietta, PA
5. Windows LLC
c/o Renewal by Andersen Window Replacement
Carmel, IN

Exhibit B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN RE VALEANT PHARMACEUTICALS
INTERNATIONAL, INC. THIRD-PARTY
PAYOR LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG)

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT APPROVING CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

WHEREAS, a consolidated class action is pending in this Court captioned *In re Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. Third-Party Payor Litigation*, Civil Action No. 16-3087-(MAS)(LHG) (the “Action”);

WHEREAS, (a) plaintiffs AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc. Health Benefits Fund, and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class (defined below); and (b) defendants Philidor Rx Services, LLC (“Philidor”), Andrew Davenport, and the Estate of Matthew S. Davenport (collectively, the “Philidor Defendants”) have entered into a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated August 4, 2021 (the “Stipulation”), that provides for a complete dismissal with prejudice of the claims asserted against the Philidor Defendants in the Action on the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation, subject to the approval of this Court (the “Settlement”);

WHEREAS, unless otherwise defined in this Judgment, the capitalized terms herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation;

WHEREAS, by Order dated August 17, 2021 (the “Preliminary Approval Order”), this Court: (a) found, pursuant to Rule 23(e)(1)(B), that it (i) would likely be able to finally approve

the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate under Rule 23(e)(2), (ii) would likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of the Settlement, and (iii) would likely be able to certify Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoint Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP and Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Settlement pursuant to Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; (b) ordered that notice of the proposed Settlement be provided to potential Settlement Class Members; (c) provided Settlement Class Members with the opportunity either to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or to object to the proposed Settlement; and (d) scheduled a hearing regarding final approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, due and adequate notice has been given to the Settlement Class;

WHEREAS, the Court conducted a hearing on December 2, 2021 (the “Settlement Hearing”) to consider, among other things, (a) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and should therefore be approved; and (b) whether a judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice as against the Philidor Defendants; and

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered the Stipulation, all papers filed and proceedings held herein in connection with the Settlement, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing therefor;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

1. **Jurisdiction** – For purposes of effectuating the Settlement, the Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action, and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Settling Parties and each of the Settlement Class Members.

2. **Incorporation of Settlement Documents** – This Judgment incorporates and makes a part hereof: (a) the Stipulation filed with the Court on August 5, 2021; and (b) the Notice and the Summary Notice, both of which were filed with the Court on October 28, 2021.

3. **Class Certification for Settlement Purposes** – The Court hereby certifies, for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the Settlement Class consisting of all health insurance companies, health maintenance organizations, self-funded health and welfare benefit plans, other Third-Party Payors, and any other health benefit provider in the United States of America or its territories, that paid or incurred costs for Valeant's branded drug products in connection with a claim submitted by Philidor, a claim submitted by any pharmacy in which Philidor had a direct or indirect ownership interest, or a claim by any pharmacy for which the amount sought for reimbursement was alleged to be inflated as a result of Defendants' allegedly fraudulent scheme, during the Class Period, and allegedly suffered damages thereby. Excluded from the Settlement Class are Pharmacy Benefit Managers, Defendants, Defendants' successors and assigns, and any entity in which any Defendant has or had a controlling interest. Also excluded from the Settlement Class are any persons or entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto who or which are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request.

4. **Settlement Class Findings** – For purposes of the Settlement only, the Court finds that each element required for certification of the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23 of the

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been met: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Action would be impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over any individual questions; (c) the claims of Plaintiffs in the Action are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Settlement Class; and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the Action.

5. **Adequacy of Representation** – Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Court hereby appoints Plaintiffs as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoints Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP and Carella, Byrne, Cecchi, Olstein, Brody & Agnello, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class both in terms of litigating the Action and for purposes of entering into and implementing the Settlement and have satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) and 23(g), respectively.

6. **Notice** – The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (iv) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation and/or Class Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (v) their right to exclude

themselves from the Settlement Class; and (vi) their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), and all other applicable law and rules. The Court further finds that the notice requirements set forth in the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715, have been satisfied.

7. **Final Settlement Approval and Dismissal of Claims** – Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation in all respects (including, without limitation, the amount of the Settlement, the Releases provided for therein, and the dismissal with prejudice of the Action), and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable and adequate to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class. Specifically, the Court finds that (a) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have adequately represented the Settlement Class; (b) the Settlement was negotiated by the Settling Parties at arm's length between experienced counsel representing the interests of Plaintiffs, the Philidor Defendants, and the Settlement Class; (c) the relief provided for the Settlement Class under the Settlement is adequate taking into account the costs, risks, and delay of trial and appeal, the proposed means of distributing the Settlement Fund to the Settlement Class; and the proposed attorneys' fee award; and (d) the Settlement treats members of the Settlement Class equitably relative to each other. The Settling Parties are directed to implement, perform, and consummate the Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions contained in the Stipulation.

8. All of the claims asserted against the Philidor Defendants in the Action by Plaintiffs and the other Settlement Class Members are hereby dismissed with prejudice as to the Philidor

Defendants. The Settling Parties shall bear their own costs and expenses, except as expressly provided in the Stipulation or otherwise agreed.

9. **Binding Effect** – The terms of the Stipulation and of this Judgment shall be forever binding on the Philidor Defendants, Plaintiffs, and all other Settlement Class Members (regardless of whether or not any individual Settlement Class Member submits a Claim Form or seeks or obtains a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund), as well as their respective successors and assigns. The persons and entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request and are not bound by the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

10. **Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 11 below, upon the Effective Date, Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Plaintiffs' Claim against the Philidor Defendants and the other Settling Defendants' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Settling Defendants' Releasees.

(b) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 11 below, upon the Effective Date, the Philidor Defendants, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs,

executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns (and assignees of the foregoing), in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged each and every Released Defendants' Claim against Plaintiffs and the other Plaintiffs' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any or all of the Released Defendants' Claims against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees. This Release shall not apply to any person or entity listed on Exhibit 1 hereto.

11. Notwithstanding paragraphs 10(a) – (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action by any of the Settling Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

12. **Plan of Allocation** – The Court hereby finds and concludes that the formula for the calculation of the claims of Claimants as set forth in the proposed Plan of Allocation set forth in the Notice provides a fair and reasonable basis upon which to allocate the proceeds of the Valeant Net Settlement Fund among Settlement Class Members with due consideration having been given to administrative convenience and necessity. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Plan of Allocation proposed by Plaintiffs is, in all respects, fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class Members, and approves the Plan of Allocation.

13. **Attorneys' Fees and Expenses** – The Court has carefully reviewed Lead Counsel's application for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses and hereby awards attorneys' fees to Lead Counsel for all Plaintiffs' Counsel in the amount of 30% of the Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund (or \$37,500.00, plus interest earned thereon) and total Litigation Expenses of \$720,335.39 (to be paid from the Valeant Settlement Fund and Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund in proportion to those funds' relative sizes). Lead Counsel shall allocate the attorneys' fees awarded

amongst Plaintiffs' Counsel in a manner which they, in good faith, believe reflects the contributions of such counsel to the institution, prosecution, and settlement of the Action.

14. The Court finds that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded is appropriate and that the amount of attorneys' fees awarded is fair and reasonable under either the "percentage-of-recovery" or lodestar method. In making this award of attorneys' fees and costs, the Court has considered the factors enumerated in *Gunter v. Ridgewood Energy Corp.*, 223 F.3d 190, 195 n.1 (3d Cir. 2000) and *Prudential Insurance*, 148 F.3d at 339 and found that:

(a) numerous Settlement Class Members who are eligible for payments will benefit from the Settlements that occurred due to the efforts of Lead Counsel;

(b) the requested fee has been reviewed and approved as reasonable by Plaintiffs that actively supervised the Action;

(c) copies of the Notice were mailed to over 41,000 potential Settlement Class Members stating that Lead Counsel would apply for attorneys' fees in an amount not to exceed 30% of the Settlement Funds, Litigation Expenses in an amount not to exceed \$750,000, and service awards for Plaintiffs in an amount not to exceed \$100,000, and no objections to the requested attorneys' fees, Litigation Expenses, or service awards were received;

(d) Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted the litigation and achieved the Settlements with skill, perseverance, and diligent advocacy;

(e) This Action involved complex factual and legal issues, and, in the absence of the Settlements, would involve further lengthy proceedings with an uncertain resolution if the case were to proceed;

(f) The risk of nonpayment was high, particularly given the complexity of the case, because Lead Counsel pursued this case on a contingent basis and received no compensation during the duration of the litigation;

(g) Plaintiffs' Counsel devoted over 16,200 hours, with a lodestar value of over \$9,438,000 to achieve the Settlements;

(h) The amount of fees requested is consistent with awards in similar cases and supported by public policy; and

(i) The amount of costs requested is fair and reasonable and necessary for the prosecution and settlement of the Action.

15. Each of the Plaintiffs, AirConditioning and Refrigeration Industry Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Fire and Police Health Care Fund, San Antonio, Plumbers Local Union No. 1 Welfare Fund, New York Hotel Trades Council & Hotel Association of New York City, Inc., and the Detectives Endowment Association of New York City, is awarded a service award of \$20,000 in compensation for its efforts in prosecuting the claims in the Action, to be paid from the Valeant Settlement Fund and Philidor Defendants Settlement Fund in proportion to their relative sizes. The service awards are in addition to any payments that Plaintiffs may be eligible for under the Plan of Allocation of the Net Settlement Funds of the Settlements.

16. **Use of this Judgment** – Neither this Judgment, the Term Sheet, the Stipulation (whether or not consummated and whether or not approved by the Court), including the exhibits thereto and the Plan of Allocation contained therein (or any other plan of allocation that may be approved by the Court), the negotiations leading to the execution of the Term Sheet and the Stipulation, nor any proceedings taken pursuant to or in connection with the Term Sheet, the

Stipulation, or the approval of the Settlement (including any arguments proffered in connection therewith):

(a) shall be offered against any of the Settling Defendants' Releasees as evidence of, or construed as or deemed to be evidence of, any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Settling Defendants' Releasees with respect to the truth of any fact alleged by Plaintiffs or the validity of any claim that was or could have been asserted or the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in this Action or in any other litigation, or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Settling Defendants' Releasees or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Settling Defendants' Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation;

(b) shall be offered against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees that any of their claims are without merit, that any of the Settling Defendants' Releasees had meritorious defenses, or that damages recoverable under the Amended Complaint would not have exceeded the Settlement Amount or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Stipulation; or

(c) shall be construed against any of the Releasees as an admission, concession, or presumption that the consideration to be given hereunder represents the amount which could be or would have been recovered after trial;

provided, however, that the Settling Parties and the Releasees and their respective counsel may refer to this Judgment and the Stipulation to effectuate the protections from liability granted hereunder and thereunder or to otherwise to enforce the terms of the Settlement.

17. **Retention of Jurisdiction** – Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the Settling Parties for purposes of the administration, interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of the Settlement; (b) the disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) any motion for an award of attorneys’ fees and/or Litigation Expenses by Class Counsel in the Action that will be paid from the Settlement Fund; (d) any motion to approve the Plan of Allocation; (e) any motion to approve the Class Distribution Order; and (f) the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to the Action.

18. Separate orders shall be entered regarding approval of a plan of allocation and the motion of Class Counsel for an award of attorneys’ fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses. Such orders shall in no way affect or delay the finality of this Judgment and shall not affect or delay the Effective Date of the Settlement.

19. **Modification of the Agreement of Settlement** – Without further approval from the Court, Plaintiffs and the Philidor Defendants are hereby authorized to agree to and adopt such amendments or modifications of the Stipulation or any exhibits attached thereto to effectuate the Settlement that: (a) are not materially inconsistent with this Judgment; and (b) do not materially limit the rights of Settlement Class Members in connection with the Settlement. Without further

order of the Court, Plaintiffs and the Philidor Defendants may agree to reasonable extensions of time to carry out any provisions of the Settlement.

20. **Termination of Settlement** – If the Settlement is terminated as provided in the Stipulation or the Effective Date of the Settlement otherwise fails to occur, this Judgment shall be vacated, rendered null and void, and be of no further force and effect, except as otherwise provided by the Stipulation, and this Judgment shall be without prejudice to the rights of Plaintiffs, the other Settlement Class Members, and the Philidor Defendants and the Settling Parties shall revert to their respective positions in the Action on July 13, 2021 and shall promptly confer on a new scheduling stipulation to govern further proceedings in the Action, as provided in the Stipulation.

21. **Entry of Final Judgment** – There is no just reason to delay the entry of this Judgment as a final judgment in this Action. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed to immediately enter this final judgment in this Action.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of _____, 2021.

The Honorable Michael A. Shipp
United States District Judge

Exhibit 1

List of Persons and Entities Excluded from the Settlement Class Pursuant to Request

1. Aetna Inc., on behalf of itself and
its health plan sponsor affiliates and subsidiaries
Hartford, CT
2. Central Painting & Sandblasting, Inc.
Navarre, OH
3. Citation Oil & Gas Corp.
Houston, TX
4. Corporate One Federal Credit Union
Columbus, OH
5. Donegal Mutual Insurance Company
Marietta, PA
6. Windows LLC
c/o Renewal by Andersen Window Replacement
Carmel, IN