

LABATON KELLER SUCHAROW LLP

THOMAS A. DUBBS (*pro hac vice*)
MICHAEL P. CANTY (*pro hac vice*)
THOMAS G. HOFFMAN, JR. (*pro hac vice*)
140 Broadway
New York, New York 10005
Telephone: (212) 907-0700
Facsimile: (212) 818-0477
Email: tdubbs@labaton.com
mcanty@labaton.com
thoffman@labaton.com

*Counsel for Lead Plaintiff the Public Employees
Retirement Association of New Mexico and Lead
Counsel for the Class*

**ADAMSKI, MORISKI, MADDEN,
CUMBERLAND & GREEN LLP**

JAMES M. WAGSTAFFE (#95535)
6633 Bay Laurel Place
Avila Beach, CA 93424
Telephone: (805) 543-0990
Facsimile: (805) 543-0980
Email: wagstaffe@ammcglaw.com

*Liaison Counsel for Lead Plaintiff the Public
Employees Retirement Association of New Mexico
and the Class*

[Additional counsel appear on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

IN RE PG&E CORPORATION SECURITIES
LITIGATION

Civil Action No. 5:18-cv-03509-EJD

**REPLY MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES IN FURTHER
SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF
ALLOCATION AND MOTION FOR AN
AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
PAYMENT OF EXPENSES**

Date: August 25, 2026

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

Courtroom: 4, 5th Floor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS	2
ARGUMENT	3
I. THE REACTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS STRONGLY SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION	3
II. THE REACTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS STRONGLY SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF LEAD COUNSEL’S FEE AND EXPENSE APPLICATION	5
III. CLAIM SUBMISSIONS TO DATE	5
CONCLUSION	6

Pursuant to Rule 23(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Lead Plaintiff Public Employees Retirement Association of New Mexico (“Lead Plaintiff” or “PERA”), on behalf of itself and named plaintiff York County on behalf of the County of York Retirement Fund, City of Warren Police and Fire Retirement System, and Defined Benefit Plan of the Mid-Jersey Trucking Industry and Teamsters Local 701 Pension and Annuity Fund (collectively, “Securities Act Plaintiffs,” and with Lead Plaintiff, “Plaintiffs”), and Lead Counsel Labaton Keller Sucharow LLP (“Lead Counsel”), respectfully submit this reply memorandum of law in further support of (i) Lead Plaintiff’s motion for final approval of the proposed Class Action Settlement and approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation (ECF No. 359) and (ii) Lead Counsel’s motion, on behalf of Plaintiffs’ Counsel, for an award of attorneys’ fees and payment of expenses (ECF No. 360) (together, the “Motions”).¹

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Now that the July 6, 2026 deadline for objecting or seeking exclusion from the Settlement Class has passed, Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel respectfully submit that the reaction of the Settlement Class to the Settlement, the proposed Plan of Allocation, and Lead Counsel’s Fee and Expense Application has been overwhelmingly positive. A total of 514,175 Postcard Notices have been disseminated to potential Settlement Class Members or their nominees through August 11, 2026, and there have been *no objections* and *only one* arguably sufficient request for exclusion. See Supplemental Declaration of Adam D. Walter Regarding (A) Dissemination of the Postcard Notice; (B) Report on Requests for Exclusion and Objections Received to Date; and (C) Claims Processed to Date, dated August 11, 2026, at ¶5, filed herewith (“Supp. Mailing Decl.”).

¹ The terms of the Settlement are set forth in the Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement, dated December 31, 2025 (the “Settlement Agreement,” ECF No. 332-2). All capitalized terms used herein are defined in the Settlement Agreement and have the same meanings as set forth therein. Unless otherwise noted, citations and internal quotations have been omitted.

1 Accordingly, Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel respectfully submit that this reaction by the
2 Settlement Class further demonstrates the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the
3 Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and Lead Counsel's Fee and Expense Application.

4 **STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS**

5 Pursuant to the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, the Claims Administrator has mailed
6 329,105 copies of the Postcard Notice, and emailed 185,070 links to the Settlement Website, to
7 all potential Settlement Class Members and/or their nominees identified to date. *See* Supp.
8 Mailing Decl. at ¶5. Further, the Claims Administrator caused the Summary Notice to be
9 published in *The Wall Street Journal* and released it over the internet via *PR Newswire*. *See*
10 Declaration of Adam D. Walter Regarding (A) Mailing of the Postcard Notice; (B) Publication of
11 the Summary Notice; and (C) Report on Requests for Exclusion and Objections Received to Date,
12 dated June 18, 2026, ("Initial Mailing Decl.") at ¶¶11-12; ECF No. 361-8. In addition, copies of
13 the long-form Notice, Claim Form, Settlement Agreement, and other Court documents were
14 posted on the website maintained for the Class Action,
15 www.PGECorporationSecuritiesLitigation.com, as well as the website of Lead Counsel.

16 Collectively, the notices provided important information about the Class Action and the
17 Settlement and stated that Lead Counsel would apply for an award of attorneys' fees in an amount
18 not to exceed 25% of the Settlement Fund and payment of Litigation Expenses in an amount not
19 to exceed \$5,715,000. *See* Initial Mailing Decl. Exs. A-C. The notices also apprised Settlement
20 Class Members of their right to seek exclusion from the Settlement Class or object to the proposed
21 Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or the Fee and Expense Application, and the July 6, 2026
22 deadline for doing so. The long-form Notice provided more detailed information about the Class
23 Action and Settlement, including the Plan of Allocation. Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel also
24 filed their opening papers in support of the Motions. Those papers—which are available on the
25 public docket (*see* ECF Nos. 359-361), the case website
26 (www.PGECorporationSecuritiesLitigation.com), and Lead Counsel's firm website—described

1 Lead Plaintiff's and Lead Counsel's views of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, work
2 performed in this litigation, and the fee and expense awards requested.

3 No objections have been filed with the Court or received by the Claims Administrator or
4 Lead Counsel. *See* Supp. Mailing Decl. at ¶7. Eleven requests for exclusion have been received,
5 but only one arguably provided the information needed to request exclusion, Exclusion Request
6 No. 9. *See* Initial Mailing Decl. at ¶17, Ex. F; Supp. Mailing Decl. at ¶6, Ex. A.²

7 To date, 179,698 claims have been received by the Claims Administrator. Supp. Mailing
8 Decl. at ¶9. The Claim deadline was July 6, 2026, and processing and review are ongoing.

9 **ARGUMENT**

10 **I. THE REACTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS** 11 **STRONGLY SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF THE** 12 **SETTLEMENT AND PLAN OF ALLOCATION**

13 Following a thorough notice program, no Settlement Class Member objected to any aspect
14 of the Settlement or the Plan of Allocation.³ “[T]he absence of a large number of objections to a
15 proposed class action settlement raises a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class
16 settlement action are favorable to class members.” *Pardi v. Tricida, Inc.*, 2025 WL 2988737, at
17 *8 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 23, 2025); *see also Destefano v. Zynga Inc.*, 2016 WL 537946, at *13 (N.D.
18 Cal. Feb. 11, 2016) (“By any standard, the lack of objection of the Class Members favors approval
19 of the Settlement.”).

20
21 ² Few of the requests provided the required letter for requesting exclusion, only three provided
22 any trading information, two provided trading information that did not show trading during the
23 Class Period, and only Exclusion Request No. 9 provided Class Period trading information.

24 ³ The RKS Claimants privately settled their claims against PG&E and did not object to the
25 Settlement. *See* Reorganized Debtors' Status Report, Bankruptcy Dkt No. 15049 (“At the March
26 19, 2026, status conference, the Court directed PG&E and the RKS Claimants to submit a
27 proposed scheduling order. Since that status conference, PG&E and each of the RKS Claimants
28 have entered into agreements to resolve their securities claims.”).

1 The absence of objections from institutional investors and pension funds is also
 2 noteworthy. That these sophisticated Settlement Class Members—which were active in these
 3 proceedings and have the resources to carefully evaluate the Settlement and object if it were
 4 appropriate to do so—have not objected to the Settlement (or the Plan of Allocation or Fee and
 5 Expense Application) provides further evidence of the fairness of the Settlement. *See, e.g., Crews*
 6 *v. Rivian Auto., Inc.*, 2026 WL 1459828, at *4 (C.D. Cal. May 20, 2026) (“Class members here
 7 include many sophisticated institutional investors like Plaintiffs. Yet, out of over 650,000
 8 submitted claims, only three objectors have come forward.... The Court therefore finds that the
 9 reaction of the class favors final approval.”); *In re Extreme Networks, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2019 WL
 10 3290770, at *9 (N.D. Cal. July 22, 2019) (“Many potential class members are sophisticated
 11 institutional investors; the lack of objections from such institutions indicates that the settlement
 12 is fair and reasonable.”).

13 The lack of objections also supports approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation. *See In*
 14 *re Stable Rd. Acquisition Corp Sec. Litig.*, 2024 WL 3643393, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2024)
 15 (“Moreover, to date, no Settlement Class Members have objected to the Plan of Allocation....
 16 The Court thus approves the Plan of Allocation.”); *see also In re Heritage Bond Litig.*, 2005 WL
 17 1594403, at *12 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005) (“In light of the lack of objectors to the plan of
 18 allocation at issue, and the competence, expertise, and zeal of counsel in bringing and defending
 19 this action, the Court finds the plan of allocation as fair and adequate.”); *Atlas v. Accredited Home*
 20 *Lenders Holding Co.*, 2009 WL 3698393, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2009) (noting the
 21 “predominantly positive response” to the plan of allocation where only two objections to it were
 22 submitted).

23 Similarly, the low number of requests for exclusion reflects favorably on approval of the
 24 Settlement and offers clear support for the Court’s final approval. Here, there were only 11
 25 requests for exclusion, only *one* of which is arguably sufficient. *See* Initial Mailing Decl. at ¶17,
 26 Ex. F; Supp. Mailing Decl. at ¶6, Ex. A; *see also, In re Splunk Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2024 WL 923777,
 27 at *8 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2024) (“Here, the reaction of the class was favorable. No class member
 28

1 objected to the settlement, and only 11 individuals have requested to be excluded from the class
 2 This factor therefore favors approval.”); *see also Longo v. OSI Sys., Inc.*, 2022 WL
 3 22995096, at *7 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 31, 2022) (“[A] low number of exclusions representing a small
 4 fraction of shares in the public float also supports the reasonableness of a securities class action
 5 settlement.”); *Zynga, Inc.*, 2016 WL 537946, at *14 (same).

6 **II. THE REACTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CLASS**
 7 **STRONGLY SUPPORTS APPROVAL OF LEAD**
 8 **COUNSEL’S FEE AND EXPENSE APPLICATION**

9 Not one Settlement Class Member objected to Lead Counsel’s Fee and Expense
 10 Application. The fact that there have been no objections is strong evidence that the requests are
 11 fair and reasonable. *See, e.g., Plumbers & Pipefitters Loc. Union #295 Pension Fund v. CareDx,*
 12 *Inc.*, 2025 WL 3546227, at *12 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 4, 2025) (“[T]he fact that no Class Members
 13 objected weighs in favor of approving the attorneys’ fees award.”); *see also Heritage Bond*, 2005
 14 WL 1594389, at *15 (“The presence or absence of objections . . . is also a factor in determining
 15 the proper fee award.”); *In re Volkswagen “Clean Diesel” Mktg., Sales Pracs., and Prods. Liab.*
 16 *Litig.*, 2017 WL 1047834, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 17, 2017) (considering the strong positive
 17 response as a factor favoring the requested fee).

18 * * *

19 Accordingly, Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel respectfully submit that this reaction by the
 20 Settlement Class further demonstrates the fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the
 21 Settlement, Plan of Allocation, and Lead Counsel’s Fee and Expense Application.

22 **III. CLAIM SUBMISSIONS TO DATE**

23 The notices and Claim Form notified Settlement Class Members that, in order to qualify
 24 for a payment from the Net Settlement Fund, a Claim Form must be submitted to the Claims
 25 Administrator by July 6, 2026. As of August 11, 2026, the Claims Administrator has received
 26 179,698 claims. *See Supp. Mailing Decl.* at ¶9. Of the claims received, approximately 411 are
 27 paper claims that were mailed, 1,899 were uploaded through the Settlement Website’s claim
 28 portal, and 177,388 were submitted electronically by institutional and nominee filers. *See id.* The

1 eligible claims identified to date represent approximately 198,895,027 allegedly damaged shares
2 of PG&E common stock. *Id.* at ¶10.

3 These figures are provisional and provided for informational purposes only. *Id.* at ¶8.
4 Although the claim submission deadline has passed and a substantial amount of claims processing
5 has been completed, claimants with deficient claims will have the opportunity to cure their claims
6 and all claims are subject to further analysis, quality assurance reviews, and audits. *Id.*

7 CONCLUSION

8 For the reasons set forth herein and the opening papers filed in support of the Motions,
9 Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel respectfully request that the Court approve the proposed
10 Settlement and Plan of Allocation as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and approve the Fee and
11 Expense Application. Three proposed orders are submitted herewith: a proposed Final Order and
12 Judgment, negotiated by the Parties; a proposed Order Approving Plan of Allocation; and a
13 proposed Order Awarding Attorneys' Fees, Litigation Expenses, and PSLRA Award.

14
15 Dated: August 11, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

LABATON KELLER SUCHAROW LLP

17 By: /s/ Thomas G. Hoffman, Jr.
18 Thomas A. Dubbs (*pro hac vice*)
19 Michael P. Canty (*pro hac vice*)
20 Thomas G. Hoffman, Jr. (*pro hac vice*)
21 140 Broadway
22 New York, NY 10005
23 Telephone: (212) 907-0700
24 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477
25 tdubbs@labaton.com
26 mcanty@labaton.com
27 thoffman@labaton.com

*Counsel for Lead Plaintiff the Public Employees
Retirement Association of New Mexico and Lead
Counsel for the Class*

26 JAMES M. WAGSTAFFE (#95535)
27 ADAMSKI, MORISKI, MADDEN,
CUMBERLAND & GREEN LLP
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 3835
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-3835

Physical Address: 6633 Bay Laurel Place
Avila Beach, CA 93424
Telephone: (805) 543-0990
Facsimile: (805) 543-0980
wagstaffe@ammcglaw.com

Liaison Counsel for PERA and the Class

WILLOW E. RADCLIFFE (#200089)
KENNETH J. BLACK (#291871)
HADIYA K. DESHMUKH (#328118)
HAILEY S. ZANUTTO (#358143)
**ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP**
Post Montgomery Center
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: 415-288-4545
willowr@rgrdlaw.com
kennyb@rgrdlaw.com
hdeshmukh@rgrdlaw.com
hzanutto@rgrdlaw.com

Additional Counsel for the Securities Act Subclass

THOMAS C. MICHAUD
**VANOVERBEKE, MICHAUD &
TIMMONY, P.C.**
79 Alfred Street
Detroit, MI 48201
Telephone: (313) 578-1200
Facsimile: (313) 578-1201
tmichaud@vmtlaw.com

Additional Counsel for the Securities Act Subclass

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 11, 2026, I authorized the electronic filing of the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all registered participants only.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 11, 2026.

/s/ Thomas G. Hoffman, Jr.

Thomas G. Hoffman, Jr.