Richard Lyon (Cal. Bar No. 229288)
rick@dovel.com
Simon Franzini (Cal. Bar No. 287631)
simon@dovel.com
Jonas B. Jacobson (Cal. Bar No. 269912)
jonas@dovel.com
Grace Bennett (Cal. Bar No. 345948)
grace@dovel.com
DOVEL & LUNER, LLP
201 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 600
Santa Monica, California 90401
Telephone: (310) 656-7066
Facsimile: (310) 656-7069

Kevin Kneupper, Esq. (CA SBN 325413)
kevin@kneuppercovey.com
A. Cyclone Covey, Esq. (CA SBN 335957)
cyclone@kneuppercovey.com
KNEUPPER & COVEY, PC
17011 Beach Blvd., Ste. 900
Huntington Beach, CA 92647-5998
Tel: (512) 420-8407

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRISTAN HURD and KEN DIMICCO, each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

G.SKILL INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISE CO., LTD., G.SKILL USA, INC., NEUTECK, INC., and RACERSPEED, INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-00685-SSS-MARx

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

NOTE CHANGES MADE BY COURT

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Motion"). Having considered the Settlement Agreement ("Settlement" or "Agreement"), the Motion, all accompanying declarations and exhibits, and all supporting legal authorities and documents, the Court GRANTS the Motion, subject to the following findings and orders. Except as otherwise indicated, capitalized terms shall have the same meaning as ascribed in the Agreement.

1. The Court preliminarily certifies the Settlement Class, as defined in §1.30 of the agreement, for the purposes of settlement only. The Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Settlement Class satisfies the requirements of Rules 23(a) and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: (a) the Settlement Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class; (c) Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Plaintiffs and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Settlement Class; (e) the questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class predominate; and (f) a class action is a superior method to adjudicate this dispute.

2. The Court preliminarily appoints Plaintiffs Tristan Hurd and Ken Dimicco as Class Representatives of the Settlement Class.

3. The Court preliminarily appoints Dovel & Luner, LLP and Kneupper Covey, PC as Class Counsel under Rule 23(g).

4. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement are fair, reasonable and adequate. The Court finds that each of the factors under Rule 23(e) favor preliminary approval: (a) the Class Representatives and Class Counsel have adequately represented the class; (b) the Settlement was negotiated at arm's length; (c) the relief provided for the class is adequate, taking into account the applicable factors under Rule 23(e)(2)(c); and (d) the proposal treats class members equitably relative to each other. The Court finds that none of the signs of collusion set forth in *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig*., 654 F.3d 935, 947 (9th Cir. 2011)—a disproportionate distribution of the settlement fund to counsel, a clear sailing provision, or a reverter provision—are present in the Settlement.

5. The Court approves the proposed notice plan, including the form and content of the notice and the method of its dissemination as set forth in the Agreement. The Court finds that the notice plan complies with the requirements of due process and Rule 23, including that it provides for the best

notice that is practicable under the circumstances. The Court finds that the notice fully apprises Settlement Class Members of their rights under the Settlement.

6. The Court appoints Angeion Group as Settlement Administrator, and authorizes the Settlement Administrator to implement the notice plan as set forth in the Agreement.

7. The Court approves the proposed claims procedure, including the substance of the claim form, as set forth in the Agreement.

8. The Court approves the proposed procedures for objections and requests for exclusion as set forth in the Agreement.

9. The Court orders the following schedule.

Event	Date
Notice Date, as defined in §1.19 of the Agreement	No later than 30 days after entry of the order granting Preliminary Approval 2/6
Plaintiffs to file a Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Incentive Awards	14 days before Objection/Exclusion Deadline
Objection/Exclusion Deadline	60 days after Notice Date 4/7
Claims Deadline	60 days after Notice Date 4/7
Plaintiffs to file a Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement	No earlier than 21 days after Claims Deadline
Final Approval Hearing	June 5, 2026 at 2:00 p.m.

10. The Court hereby sets a Final Approval Hearing on June 5, 2026 at 2:00 p.m. in Courtroom 2 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, located at 3470 Twelfth Street, Riverside, California 92501. The Court may continue or adjourn the Final Approval Hearing without further notice to Settlement Class Members.

11. By entering this order, the Court makes no determination on the merits of Plaintiffs' allegations. Neither the Agreement nor any related documents or communications will be construed or used in any proceeding as an admission or evidence of wrongdoing or liability on the part of Defendants.

12. If for any reason the Court does not execute and file a final approval order, or if the Effective Date of the Settlement does not occur for any reason, the Parties will be restored to the status quo ante as set forth in the Agreement. In such event, the Settlement Class will be deemed vacated, and the certification of the Settlement Class for settlement purposes will not be considered or used in connection with any class certification proceedings.

13. All proceedings in the Action are stayed except as necessary to implement the Settlement.

14. The Court retains jurisdiction over the Action and the Parties for purposes of the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 7, 2026

HON. SUNSHINE S. SYKES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Public court record.

This copy was downloaded from https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cacd.842716/gov
on 2026-10-19 and is hosted, unaltered, for reference at
https://chimo.ai/class-action/g-skill-memory

Court: United States District Court for the Central District of California
Case number: 2:22-cv-00685-SSS-MAR
Filed: 2026-01-07

Chimo hosts public court records for readers' reference; documents are
unaltered copies from the court docket or the court-approved settlement website.