



















UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	2:18-cv-04258-SVW-GJS	Date	April 18, 2019
Title	<i>Lucy Chi v. University of Southern California et al.</i>		

contemplated to be lodged after preliminary approval and before final approval. *See, e.g., Lane v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. C 08–3845 RS, 2009 WL 3458198, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2009) (denying motion for leave to intervene because the intervenors “failed to establish any significantly protectable interest incumbent in an opportunity to object to preliminary approval as opposed to the right to object to final approval”). Therefore, the Court will not allow permissive intervention under Rule 24(b) at this time or at the time of a renewed motion for preliminary approval.

**IV. Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, the Court DENIES without prejudice Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary approval and motion to appoint a special master. To be sure, the Court takes no issue with the substantive terms of settlement between Plaintiffs and Defendants, and the Court believes that the proposed settlement, as is, ultimately may be fair and reasonable under the prevailing standards. The Court raises these points in its effort to seek analytical clarity in order to satisfy its burden to determine whether to give notice of the proposed settlement to the class pursuant to Rule 23(e)(1)(A), and the Court aims to ensure that the parties’ agreement does not present any undisclosed or unaddressed concerns that could impair the settlement process after preliminary approval.

Accordingly, the parties are ordered to file renewed motions for preliminary approval and for appointment of a special master within 30 days of this Order, addressing the Court’s concerns with the proposed settlement and proposed notice to class members articulated above. If the parties require additional time to finalize a new settlement agreement and/or motion for preliminary approval in light of this Order, the parties may so notify the Court prior to or on that date.

Lastly, as stated above, the Court ORDERS the parties to submit for *in camera* review all documents pertaining to the complaints against Dr. Tyndall received by USC, within 7 days of the date of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

\_\_\_\_\_  
:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PMC  
\_\_\_\_\_