

**HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**

Sean R. Matt (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: (206) 623-7292  
Facsimile: (206) 623-0594  
sean@hbsslaw.com

*Counsel for Lead Plaintiff Ilya Trubnikov and  
Lead Counsel for the Settlement Class*

**BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER  
& GROSSMANN LLP**

John Rizio-Hamilton (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
Telephone: (212) 554-1400  
Facsimile: (212) 554-1444  
johnr@blbglaw.com

*Counsel for Lead Plaintiff Roofers' Pension  
Fund and Lead Counsel for the Settlement Class*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

IN RE PLANTRONICS, INC. SECURITIES  
LITIGATION

No. 4:19-cv-07481-JST

**[PROPOSED] ORDER  
APPROVING PLAN OF  
ALLOCATION AS MODIFIED**

Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar  
Courtroom: 6, 2nd Floor

1 This matter came on for hearing on August 21, 2025 (the “Settlement Hearing”) on Lead  
2 Plaintiffs’ motion to approve the proposed plan of allocation (“Plan of Allocation”) of the Net  
3 Settlement Fund created under the Settlement in the above-captioned class action (the “Action”).  
4 The Court having considered all matters submitted to it at the Settlement Hearing and otherwise;  
5 it appearing that: (i) the Notice of the Settlement Hearing (which included a summary of the  
6 Settlement as well as the full text of the proposed Plan of Allocation) (the “Notice”) was mailed  
7 to all Settlement Class Members who or which could be identified with reasonable effort  
8 substantially in the form approved by the Court; and (ii) a summary notice of the hearing  
9 substantially in the form approved by the Court was published in *The Wall Street Journal* and over  
10 *PR Newswire* pursuant to the specifications of the Court; and the Court having considered and  
11 determined the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed Plan of Allocation,

12 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

13 1. This Order approving the proposed Plan of Allocation incorporates by reference the  
14 definitions in the Stipulation of Settlement dated July 18, 2024 (ECF No. 230-1) (the “Stipulation”)  
15 and all terms not otherwise defined herein shall have the same meanings as set forth in the  
16 Stipulation.

17 2. The Court has jurisdiction to enter this Order approving the proposed Plan of  
18 Allocation, and over the subject matter of the Action and all Parties to the Action, including all  
19 Settlement Class Members.

20 3. Notice of Lead Plaintiffs’ motion for approval of the proposed Plan of Allocation  
21 was given to all Settlement Class Members who or which could be identified with reasonable  
22 effort. The form and method of notifying the Settlement Class of the motion for approval of the  
23 proposed Plan of Allocation satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
24 Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Private  
25 Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4, as amended, and all other applicable  
26 laws and rules, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and constituted due  
27 and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled thereto.  
28

4. Over 22,000 copies of the Notice, which included the Plan of Allocation, were mailed to potential Settlement Class Members and nominees, and no objections to the Plan of Allocation have been received.


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

6. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Plan of Allocation is, in all respects, fair and reasonable to the Settlement Class. Accordingly, the Court hereby approves the Plan of Allocation proposed by Lead Plaintiffs.

7. Any appeal or any challenge affecting this Order approving the Plan of Allocation shall in no way disturb or affect the finality of the Judgment.

8. There is no just reason for delay in the entry of this Order, and immediate entry by the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed.

SO ORDERED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2025.

  
THE HONORABLE JON S. TIGAR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE