EXHIBIT A TO JASNOCH DECLARATION

Case 2|14-cv-02910-MWF-MRW Document 91-1 Filed 12/09/16 Page 2 of 32 Page ID

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Settlement (the "Stipulation") is made and entered into by and among the following Settling Parties (as defined herein), each by and through its/his respective counsel: (i) Plaintiffs Marc Hagan ("Hagan") and the City of Irving Supplemental Benefit Plan ("City of Irving") (collectively, "California Plaintiffs") in the above-captioned consolidated shareholder derivative action ("California Action"), and plaintiff Jeffery Kocen ("Kocen" or "Delaware Plaintiff") in Kocen v. Chopra, No. 11291-VCL (Del. Ch.) ("Delaware Action"); (ii) Nominal Defendant OSI Systems, Inc. ("OSI" or the "Company"); and (iii) Deepak Chopra, William Ballhaus, David Feinberg, Steven Good, Meyer Luskin, Ajay Mehra, and Alan Edrick (collectively, the "Individual Defendants"). This Stipulation is intended by the Settling Parties to fully, finally, and forever compromise, resolve, discharge, and settle the Released Claims (as defined herein), upon the terms and subject to the conditions set forth herein.

Subject to the approval of this Court, this Stipulation and Agreement of

BACKGROUND I.

Factual Background A.

OSI is a Delaware corporation headquartered in Hawthorne, California. OSI sells products and provides related services in diversified markets, including homeland security, healthcare, defense, and aerospace. The Company's security division, Rapiscan, supplies security and inspection systems and services to domestic and international customers, including the Transportation Security Administration ("TSA") and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security ("DHS").

In September 2009, the TSA awarded Rapiscan a contract for orders of its Advanced Imaging Technology ("AIT") full-body scanners. Subsequently, in response to concerns over the detailed "naked body" images produced by AIT scanners, TSA issued a \$5 million order to Rapiscan for the development of Automated Target Recognition ("ATR") privacy software that would modify the

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

machine's images to display generic, cartoon-like figures.

In September 2011, Rapiscan delivered a version of its initial software for TSA's testing showed that Rapiscan's software had certain testing by TSA. defects. TSA notified Rapiscan on August 7, 2012 that it planned to deploy the software, and would defer correction of the software "bugs" to a later stage. The next day, Rapiscan requested that TSA delay deployment until an updated software version could be released. On November 9, 2012, TSA issued a "show-cause" letter to Rapiscan, expressing concerns that Rapiscan had not timely disclosed certain issues relating to its software development, and questioning whether Rapiscan had manipulated the operational test. In January 2013, Rapiscan and TSA reached agreement to resolve the issues raised in the show-cause letter. This agreement called for Rapiscan to terminate its ATR software development contract with the TSA, but permitted Rapiscan's overall AIT contract with the TSA to continue and the TSA to continue to utilize previously purchased AIT units in other venues.

On May 20, 2013, OSI learned that DHS had issued a Notice of Proposed Debarment to Rapiscan initiating a formal inquiry as to whether Rapiscan should be debarred (meaning, prevented from contracting with the U.S. Government) in light of the ATR software issues. On June 21, 2013, OSI and DHS entered into an Administrative Agreement, reflecting DHS's conclusion that debarment was not appropriate based upon Rapiscan's implementation of certain corporate reforms, which "provide[d] adequate assurance that Rapiscan's current and future dealing with the Government w[ould] be conducted responsibly." In particular, as noted in the Administrative Agreement, prior to 2013 the Company had adopted numerous policies, procedures, and controls relating to oversight, federal regulations, risk assessment, monitoring, and training, and had agreed to further bolster its policies to reflect best practices moving forward. After a review of the matter, the DHS did

3 4

> 5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28 not conclude that the Company engaged in any fraud, violation of law, or breach of contract.

Plaintiffs allege that additional issues regarding Rapiscan's products persisted. Plaintiffs allege that Rapiscan was using unapproved X-ray generators that were in violation of Rapiscan's governmental contracts that prohibited configuration changes to OSI's scanners without prior TSA approval. September 2013, TSA awarded Rapiscan a \$67.1 million delivery order for AT-2 baggage scanner units. In October 2013, the new Rapiscan management team discovered and promptly disclosed to TSA that a prior Rapiscan team had been installing an upgraded generator component in Rapiscan's AT-2 units without having secured TSA's advance approval. On November 20, 2013, TSA issued a second "show-cause" letter to OSI. TSA terminated Rapiscan's September 2013 delivery order. After a review of the matter, the DHS did not suspend or debar Rapiscan.

B. Procedural Background

1. The Derivative Actions

On April 15, 2014, Hagan commenced the first shareholder derivative action on behalf of OSI and against the Individual Defendants. The Hagan action was assigned to Judge Fitzgerald and asserted three claims: (1) breach of fiduciary duties for disseminating false and misleading information; (2) breach of fiduciary duties for failing to maintain adequate internal controls; and (3) unjust enrichment.

On December 29, 2014, the City of Irving commenced the second shareholder derivative action on behalf of OSI. City of Irving's complaint followed a shareholder demand for books and records pursuant to 8 Del. C. §220 that was made on February 11, 2014. This case was also assigned to Judge Fitzgerald and asserted claims for breach of fiduciary duty.

On February 26, 2015, the Court granted the California Plaintiffs' motion to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

stay in the derivative actions.

consolidate the two derivative actions, appointed Hagan and City of Irving as Co-Lead Plaintiffs, appointed Bottini & Bottini, Inc., The Shuman Law Firm, and Scott+Scott, Attorneys at Law, LLP as Co-Lead Counsel, and stayed the California Action pending entry of a ruling on the motion to dismiss in the securities class action captioned Roberti v. OSI Systems, Inc., Case No. 13-cv-09174- MWF-VBK (the "Federal Securities Class Action"), also assigned to Judge Fitzgerald. The next day, on February 27, 2015, Judge Fitzgerald entered an order denying the motion to dismiss in the Federal Securities Class Action, which in effect lifted the

The California Plaintiffs filed a consolidated complaint on August 25, 2015, which alleges that the Defendants breached their fiduciary duties by: (1) failing to correct problems with the Company's internal controls, practices, and procedures; (2) failing to implement an adequate compliance program at the Company; and (3) issuing false and misleading statements regarding the existence of an adequate compliance program.

On July 14, 2015, Kocen commenced the third shareholder derivative action on behalf of OSI in the Delaware Chancery Court. Kocen had initially made a books and records demand pursuant to 8 Del. C. §220 on January 31, 2014 and subsequently made several follow up demands in 2014 and 2015. complaint alleged two causes of action against Defendants for breach of fiduciary duties by: (1) failing to implement an adequate compliance program and to monitor any such program in compliance with Caremark, and (2) issuing misleading statements to the Company's shareholders.

The Individual Defendants have denied and continue to deny each and all of the claims alleged or asserted in the Actions. The Individual Defendants have

Kocen is represented by Safirstein Metcalf LLP (as successor to Morgan & Morgan, P.C.) and Hung G. Ta, Esq. PLLC. Rigrodsky & Long, P.A. is local counsel in the Delaware action.

5

6

7

9

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

expressly denied and continue to deny all charges of wrongdoing or liability against them and maintain that at all times they appropriately and in good faith fulfilled their fiduciary duties to the Company and its shareholders and complied with all applicable laws and regulations.

Litigation Progress and Extensive Settlement Negotiations

Counsel for the Settling Parties engaged in extensive efforts to resolve this matter. In early fall 2015, the Parties discussed efforts to reach a global resolution of both the California Action and the Delaware Action, and ultimately agreed to participate in a mediation in New York, New York, before the Honorable Layn R. Phillips (Ret.).

During September 2015, prior to mediation, the Plaintiffs engaged an expert in corporate governance – Professor Daniel Morrissey of Gonzaga University School of Law - to review the allegations in their complaint and provide recommendations on potential governance reforms. In consultation with their expert, the Plaintiffs drafted a settlement demand that included a set of corporate governance reforms that they believed would prevent the recurrence of the alleged wrongdoing by Defendants.

The Parties scheduled the mediation before Judge Phillips for December 14, 2015. Delaware Plaintiff submitted his initial settlement proposal on October 20, 2015, and California Plaintiffs submitted theirs on October 23, 2015. Company responded on November 3, 2015. On November 10, 2015, Plaintiffs submitted an additional counterproposal, to which the Company responded on November 18, 2015. After additional telephonic discussion, Plaintiffs cancelled the mediation on the grounds that the parties were too far apart. On February 10, 2016, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss and in the alternative a motion to stay the California Action and a motion to dismiss the Delaware Action. The California Plaintiffs filed an opposition on March 11, 2016, and Defendants filed their reply

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

20

19

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

on April 1, 2016. The Delaware Plaintiff filed his opposition on April 4, 2016 and Defendants filed their reply on May 3, 2016.

Around the same time, the parties renewed their settlement discussions in an attempt to learn whether a reasonable resolution could be reached. On March 18, 2016, the parties participated in an all-day mediation in New York with Judge Phillips. Substantial negotiations took place throughout the day, and numerous drafts of settlement offers and counteroffers were exchanged. Although the parties reached agreement on a number of terms for corporate governance reforms, no settlement was reached. The Settling Parties continued their negotiations in the months following the mediation and after extensive, arm's-length negotiations reached agreement in principle on material terms for corporate governance reforms.

On July 7, 2016, the California Plaintiffs, Delaware Plaintiff, OSI, and the Individual Defendants signed a Term Sheet for Settlement of Derivative Actions ("Term Sheet"). At that time, the Settling Parties had not yet discussed the amount of attorneys' fees to be paid to Plaintiffs' Counsel (as defined herein) for the benefit conferred upon OSI through the settlement.

II. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS AND THE BENEFITS OF SETTLEMENT

Plaintiffs' Counsel conducted an investigation relating to the claims and the underlying events alleged in the Actions (as defined herein), including, but not limited to: (1) propounding shareholder books and records inspection demands under 8 Del. C. §220 to OSI, and receiving and reviewing approximately one thousand pages of documents produced by OSI in response to such demands, including board minutes and other internal books and records obtained from the Company; (2) reviewing and analyzing OSI's public filings with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC"), press releases, announcements, transcripts of investor conference calls, and news articles; (3) reviewing securities

10

11

18 19 20

21

17

22 23 24

25 26 27

analyst, business, and financial media reports about the Company and the industry; (4) reviewing and analyzing filings in the Federal Securities Class Action; (5) researching the applicable law with respect to the claims asserted (or which could be asserted) in the Actions and the potential defenses thereto; (6) researching corporate governance issues; (7) researching, drafting, and filing complaints and opposition to motion to dismiss or stay; (8) preparing settlement demands and mediation statements; (9) participating in an all-day mediation; (10) retaining an expert in corporate governance to review the allegations in the complaint and consulting that expert regarding potential governance reforms; and (11) engaging in settlement discussions with counsel for OSI and the Individual Defendants.

Plaintiffs' Counsel have engaged in substantial litigation efforts regarding the claims asserted in the Actions. This includes both of the shareholder inspection demands, the initial complaints filed by each of the plaintiffs, and the consolidated complaint filed by the California Plaintiffs in the California Action. In addition, the motion to dismiss or stay was fully briefed in the California and Delaware Plaintiffs' Counsel have also engaged in extensive settlement Actions. negotiations, including for several months prior to the mediation, at the all-day mediation in New York on March 18, 2016, and for more than three months following the mediation.

Plaintiffs' Counsel believe that the claims asserted in the Actions have merit and that their investigation supports the claims asserted. Without conceding the merit of any of Defendants' defenses, and in light of the benefits of the settlement as well as to avoid the potentially protracted time, expense, and uncertainty associated with continued litigation, including potential trial(s) and appeal(s), Plaintiffs have concluded that it is desirable that the Actions be fully and finally settled in the manner and upon the terms and conditions set forth in this Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel recognize the significant risk, Stipulation.

expense, and length of continued proceedings necessary to prosecute the Actions against the Individual Defendants through trial(s) and through possible appeal(s). Plaintiffs' Counsel have also taken into account the uncertain outcome and the risk of any litigation, especially complex litigation such as the Actions, as well as the difficulties and delays inherent in such litigation. Based on their evaluation, and in light of what Plaintiffs' Counsel believe to be the significant benefits conferred upon the Company and the Current OSI Shareholders (as defined herein) as a result of the Settlement, Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel have determined that the Settlement is in the best interests of Plaintiffs, OSI, and the Current OSI Shareholders, and have agreed to settle the Actions upon the terms and subject to the conditions set forth herein.

III. DEFENDANTS' DENIALS OF WRONGDOING AND LIABILITY

No Plaintiff has made a litigation demand on OSI's Board, and OSI has asserted that the respective complaints in the California Action and the Delaware Action do not contain allegations demonstrating that such demand would have been futile. The Individual Defendants have denied and continue to deny that they have committed or attempted to commit any violations of law, any breaches of fiduciary duty owed to OSI, or any wrongdoing whatsoever and expressly maintain that they diligently and scrupulously complied with any and all fiduciary and other legal duties. However, to avoid the costs, disruption and distraction of further litigation, and without admitting that Plaintiffs have standing to bring any claims in either of the Actions, the validity of any allegation made in these Actions, or any liability with respect thereto, Defendants have concluded that it is desirable that the claims against them be settled and dismissed on the terms reflected in this Stipulation.

Neither this Stipulation, nor any of its terms or provisions, nor entry of the Judgment, nor any document or exhibit attached to or referred to in this

3 4

5

7

6

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

Stipulation, nor any action taken to carry out this Stipulation, is or may be construed or used as evidence of the validity of any of the Released Claims (defined herein), or as an admission by or against Individual Defendants of any fault, wrongdoing, or concession of liability whatsoever.

TERMS OF STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT OF SETTLEMENT IV.

Plaintiffs (on behalf of themselves and derivatively on behalf of OSI), the Individual Defendants, and nominal defendant OSI, by and through their respective counsel or attorneys of record, hereby stipulate and agree that, subject to approval by the Court, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.1, the Actions and the Released Claims shall be finally and fully compromised, settled, and released, and the Actions shall be dismissed with prejudice, with full preclusive effect, as to all Settling Parties, upon the terms and subject to the conditions set forth herein as follows:

1. **Definitions**

As used in this Stipulation, the following terms have the meanings specified below:

- "Actions" shall mean the California Action and the Delaware Action as 1.1 defined herein.
- "Audit Committee" means the Audit Committee of the Board of 1.2 Directors of OSI.
 - 1.3 "Board" means the OSI Board of Directors.
- "California Action" means the action captioned In re OSI Sys., Inc. 1.4 Deriv. Litig., Lead case No. 2:14-cv-02910-MWF-VBK, pending in the United States District Court for the Central District of California.
- "California Plaintiffs" means plaintiffs Marc Hagan and City of Irving 1.5 Supplemental Benefit Plan.
 - 1.6 "Current OSI Shareholders" means, for purposes of this Stipulation, any

- 2
- 3 4
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20
- 21 22
- 23
- 24 25
- 26
- 27

- Persons (defined below) who owned OSI common stock as of the date of this Stipulation and who continue to hold their OSI common stock as of the date of the Settlement Hearing.
- "Defendants" means: (i) Nominal Defendant and (ii) Individual Defendants.
- 1.8 "Defendants' Counsel" means Latham & Watkins LLP, 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000, San Francisco, CA 94111.
- "Delaware Action" means the action captioned Kocen v. Chopra, et al., 1.9 No. 11291-VCL, pending in the Delaware Court of Chancery.
 - "Delaware Plaintiff" means plaintiff Jeffery Kocen.
- "Effective Date" means the first date by which all of the events and conditions specified in ¶ 6.1 herein have been met and have occurred.
- 1.12 "Fee and Expense Award" means any sum paid to Plaintiffs' Counsel for their attorneys' fees and expenses as an award by this Court in recognition of the benefits conferred upon OSI via the Actions.
- 1.13 "Federal Securities Class Action" means Roberti v. OSI Systems, Inc., No. CV 13-9174-MWF (MRW) (C.D. Cal.).
- 1.14 "Final" means the time when a judgment that has not been reversed, vacated, or modified in any way is no longer subject to appellate review, either because of disposition on appeal and conclusion of the appellate process (including potential writ proceedings) or because of passage, without action, of time for seeking appellate or writ review. More specifically, it is that situation when (1) either no appeal or petition for review by writ has been filed and the time has passed for any notice of appeal or writ petition to be timely filed from the Judgment; or (2) if an appeal has been filed, the court of appeals has either affirmed the judgment or dismissed that appeal and the time for any reconsideration or further appellate review has passed; or (3) a higher court has granted further appellate review and that court

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

17

16

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- has either affirmed the underlying Judgment or affirmed the court of appeal's decision affirming the Judgment or dismissing the appeal or writ proceeding.
- 1.15 "Individual Defendants" means Deepak Chopra, William Ballhaus, David Feinberg, Steven Good, Meyer Luskin, Ajay Mehra, and Alan Edrick, all of whom are current or former members of the Board and/or senior officers of OSI.
- 1.16 "Judgment" means the final order and judgment to be rendered by this Court, substantially in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C.
- 1.17 "Nominal Defendant," "OSI," or the "Company" means OSI Systems, Inc. and includes all of its subsidiaries, predecessors, successors, affiliates, officers, directors, employees, and agents.
- "Notice" means the Notice of Pendency and Proposed Settlement of Shareholder Actions, substantially in the form of Exhibit B-1 attached hereto.
- "Person" or "Persons" means an individual, corporation, limited liability corporation, professional corporation, partnership, limited partnership, limited liability partnership, association, joint stock company, estate, legal representative, trust, unincorporated association, government or any political subdivision or agency thereof, and any business or legal entity, and their spouses, heirs, predecessors, successors, representatives, or assignees.
- 1.20 "Plaintiffs" means, collectively, Marc Hagan, the City of Irving Supplemental Benefit Plan, and Jeffery Kocen.
- "Plaintiffs' Counsel" means: (i) Bottini & Bottini, Inc., 7817 Ivanhoe Avenue, Suite 102, La Jolla, CA 92037; (ii) The Shuman Law Firm, 1 Montgomery Street, Suite 1800, San Francisco, CA 94104; (iii) Scott+Scott, Attorneys at Law, LLP, 655 North Central Avenue, 17th Floor, Glendale, CA 91203; (iv) Safirstein Metcalf LLP, 1250 Broadway, 27th Floor, New York, NY 10001 and (v) Hung G. Ta, Esq. PLLC, 250 Park Avenue, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10177.
 - 1.22 "Preliminary Approval Order" means the Order to be entered by this

Court, substantially in the form of Exhibit B attached hereto, including, *inter alia*, preliminarily approving the terms and conditions of the Settlement as set forth in this Stipulation, directing that Notice be provided to Current OSI Shareholders, and scheduling a Settlement Hearing to consider whether the Stipulation and Fee and Expense Award should be finally approved.

1.23 "Related Persons" means each of a Person's immediate family members and current, former, or future parents, subsidiaries, associates, affiliates, partners, joint venturers, officers, directors, principals, shareholders, members, agents, representatives, employees, attorneys, financial or investment advisors, consultants, accountants, investment bankers, commercial bankers, trustees, engineers, insurers, co-insurers, reinsurers, heirs, assigns, executors, general or limited partners or partnerships, personal or legal representatives, estates, administrators, predecessors, successors, advisors, and/or any other individual or entity in which a Person has or had a controlling interest or which is or was related to or affiliated with a Person.

1.24 "Released Claims" means, collectively, all actions, suits, claims, causes of action, demands, rights, liabilities, damages, costs, expenses, matters and issues known, contingent or absolute, suspected or unsuspected, disclosed or undisclosed, liquidated or unliquidated, matured or unmatured, accrued or unaccrued, apparent or unapparent, and causes of action of every nature, including both known claims and Unknown Claims (as defined herein), whether based on federal, state, local statutory or common law or any other law, rule or regulation, that have been or that might have been asserted by any Releasing Persons individually or derivatively on behalf of OSI against any Released Persons that are based upon, arise out of or relate to: (i) any allegations, claims, disclosures, events, facts, circumstances, conduct, failures to act, matters, occurrences, omissions, representations, statements, or transactions which were alleged, set forth, referred to or that could have been or could be asserted in the Actions, including without limitation allegations relating to the Individual

- Defendants' performance of their duties as officers and/or directors of OSI, any action taken or alleged to have been taken or not taken by the Individual Defendants as identified in the complaints in the Actions, or transactions in OSI securities; and (ii) the settlement of the Actions, including the payments provided for in this Stipulation, and the reasonable attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses incurred in defense thereof. Released Claims shall not include claims to enforce the Settlement.
 - 1.25 "Released Persons" means Defendants and their Related Persons.
- 1.26 "Releasing Persons" means Plaintiffs, any other Current OSI Shareholder, and Plaintiffs' Counsel.
- 1.27 "Settling Parties" means, collectively, each of the Plaintiffs (on behalf of themselves and derivatively on behalf of OSI), each of the Individual Defendants, and Nominal Defendant.
 - 1.28 "Settlement" means the settlement documented in this Stipulation.
- 1.29 "Settlement Hearing" means a hearing by this Court to review this Stipulation and determine: (i) whether to enter the Judgment; and (ii) all other matters properly before this Court.
- 1.30 "Summary Notice" means the Summary Notice of Pendency and Proposed Settlement of Shareholder Derivative Actions, substantially in the form of Exhibit B-2 attached hereto.
- 1.31 "Unknown Claims" means any and all claims that were alleged or could have been alleged in the Actions by Plaintiffs, OSI, or any OSI shareholder derivatively on behalf of OSI, which he, she, or it does not know or suspect to exist in his, her, or its favor at the time of the release of the Released Persons, including claims which, if known by him, her, or it, might have affected his, her, or its settlement with and release of the Released Persons, or might have affected his, her, or its decision not to object to this Settlement. With respect to any and all Released Claims, the Settling Parties stipulate and agree that, upon the Effective Date, the

Plaintiffs and OSI shall expressly waive, and each of OSI's shareholders by operation of the Judgment shall have expressly waived, the provisions, rights, and benefits of California Civil Code §1542, which provides:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM OR HER MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

The Settling Parties acknowledge that they may discover facts in addition to or different from those now known or believed to be true by them with respect to the Released Claims, but it is the intention of the Settling Parties to completely, fully, finally, and forever compromise, settle, release, discharge, and extinguish any and all of the Released Claims known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, contingent or absolute, accrued or unaccrued, apparent or unapparent, which now exist, or heretofore existed, or may hereafter exist, and without regard to the subsequent discovery of additional or different facts.

2. Terms of the Settlement

2.1 Corporate Governance Reforms

As a result of the Settlement, OSI and the Board shall enact the corporate governance measures ("Settlement Reforms") set forth in Section 1 of Exhibit A, to the extent that such Reforms have not already been adopted and implemented, no more than 180 days after the Judgment becomes Final, in accordance with the terms of Exhibit A.

2.2 Benefit to OSI

The Settling Parties agree that the Settlement Reforms confer a substantial and material benefit to OSI and Current OSI Shareholders.

3. Procedure for Implementing the Settlement

3.1 Promptly after the execution of this Stipulation, Plaintiffs' Counsel shall

- submit the Stipulation together with its exhibits to this Court and shall apply for entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, substantially in the form of Exhibit B attached hereto, requesting, *inter alia*: (i) preliminary approval of the Settlement set forth in this Stipulation; (ii) approval of the method of providing notice of pendency and proposed Settlement to Current OSI Shareholders; (iii) approval of the forms of Notice attached hereto as Exhibit B-1 and Exhibit B-2; and (iv) a date for the Settlement Hearing.
- Approval Order, OSI shall: (1) cause a copy of the Summary Notice, substantially in the form attached hereto, to be published twice in the national edition of the *Investors' Business Daily*; (2) post the Notice, this Stipulation and Exhibit A to the Stipulation on the Investor Relations page of the OSI website http://investors.osi-systems.com/, which posting shall be maintained through the date of the Settlement Hearing; and (3) include a statement in each quarterly report (10-Q) filed with the SEC beginning on the date the Court grants preliminary approval though the date the Settlement becomes Final which explains that these shareholder derivative actions have settled and received preliminary approval and directs stockholders to the Company's Investor Relations website for additional information, including the Notice and Stipulation of Settlement. OSI shall cause to be paid all costs of such publishing and posting.
- 3.3 Within fourteen (14) days of the Court's entry of the Preliminary Approval Order, California Plaintiffs' Counsel shall cause copies of the Notice to be posted on their respective websites. California Plaintiffs shall cause to be paid all costs of such posting.
- 3.4 The Settling Parties believe the content and manner of such procedures constitute adequate and reasonable notice to Current OSI Shareholders pursuant to applicable law.

- 3.5 Plaintiffs' Counsel shall request that this Court hold the Settlement Hearing after the posting and publishing procedures described above in ¶¶ 3.2 and 3.3 are followed.
- 3.6 Within five (5) business days of the date that the Judgment becomes Final, the Delaware Plaintiff shall file a dismissal with prejudice of the Delaware Action with respect to Defendants (as defined herein) and shall otherwise use his reasonable best efforts to take, or cause to be taken, all actions, and to do, or cause to be done, all things reasonably necessary, proper, and appropriate to secure dismissal with prejudice of the Delaware Action with respect to Defendants (as defined herein). In the interim, the Settling Parties shall cooperate to, at a minimum, secure a postponement of any hearing or trial date(s) while this Settlement is under consideration by this Court.
- 3.7 Pending the Court's determination as to final approval of the Settlement, Releasing Persons are barred and enjoined from commencing, prosecuting, instigating, or in any way participating in the commencement or prosecution of all claims arising out of, relating to, or in connection with the institution, prosecution, assertion, settlement, or resolution of the Actions or the Released Claims.

4. Releases

4.1 Upon the Effective Date, the Releasing Persons shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Judgment shall have, completely, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged the Released Claims (including Unknown Claims) against the Released Persons and any and all claims arising out of, relating to, or in connection with, the defense, settlement, or resolution of the Actions against the Released Persons. The Releasing Persons shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Judgment shall have, covenanted not to sue any Released Person with respect to such Released Claims, and shall be permanently barred and enjoined

- from instituting, commencing, or prosecuting the Released Claims against the Released Persons except to enforce the releases and other terms and conditions contained in this Stipulation and/or the Judgment entered pursuant thereto.
- 4.2 Upon the Effective Date, each of the Released Persons shall be deemed to have, and by operation of the Judgment shall have, completely, fully, finally, and forever released, relinquished, and discharged Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel from all claims (including Unknown Claims) arising out of, relating to, or in connection with, the institution, prosecution, assertion, settlement, or resolution of the Actions or the Released Claims.
- 4.3 Nothing herein shall in any way impair or restrict the rights of any Settling Party to enforce the terms of the Stipulation.

5. Plaintiffs' Counsel's Attorneys' Fees and Expenses

5.1 Plaintiffs and the Defendants have agreed that the amount of the Fee and Expense Award to be paid to Plaintiffs' Counsel in recognition of the benefits provided to OSI and the Current OSI Shareholders as a result of the initiation, prosecution, pendency, and settlement of the Actions shall be \$1,600,000. Such amount has been determined in a binding arbitration conducted by Hon. Layn Phillips (Ret.). Plaintiffs shall make an omnibus application for fees and expenses before this Court only, and no other Court. The distribution and allocation of the Fee and Expense Award between and among Plaintiffs' Counsel is not of concern to Defendants, and any dispute among Plaintiffs' Counsel as to the proper allocation shall be submitted separately to Judge Phillips for final, binding, expedited, cost-effective and non-appealable arbitration. Any resolution of such a dispute among Plaintiffs' Counsel shall not in any way implicate Defendants or increase the amount to be paid by or on behalf of Defendants, and Defendants and their insurers shall not be responsible for any fees, costs, or expenses incurred by Plaintiffs in connection with the determination of any such allocation, including but not limited to charges by

- 5.2 This Settlement is not contingent on an agreement as to the Fee and Expense Award or an agreement as to the allocation of such a fee between and among Plaintiffs' Counsel. Any failure by the Court to approve the amount of such fees and expenses shall not affect the validity of the terms of the Settlement. Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Counsel may not cancel or terminate the Stipulation or the Settlement based on the Court's or any appellate court's ruling with respect to attorneys' fees and expenses.
- 5.3 Defendants agree not to oppose any fee and expense application by Plaintiffs' Counsel in an amount not to exceed the amount of \$1,600,000, which was determined by Judge Phillips.
- 5.4 Defendants shall cause the Fee and Expense Award to be paid within fifteen (15) business days after the later to occur of (i) the Judgment, approving the Settlement and the Fee and Expense Award, becomes Final; and (ii) receipt by Defendants and their insurance carrier(s) of Plaintiffs' Counsel's W-9(s) and wire transfer instructions.
- 5.5 Payment of the Fee and Expense Award in the amount approved by this Court shall constitute full, complete and final payment for all of Plaintiffs' Counsel's services in the Actions, including fees and expenses that have been incurred or will be incurred in connection with the filing and prosecution of the Actions and the resolution of the claims alleged therein.
- 5.6 Upon payment of the Fee and Expense Award, Defendants and their insurer(s) shall be discharged from any further liability for payment of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees, costs or expenses in the Actions.
- 5.7 Defendants and Defendants' Counsel shall have no responsibility for the allocation of the Fee and Expense Award among Plaintiffs' Counsel.
 - 5.8 In the event that the Judgment fails to become Final, or, as the result of

9

10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

- any proceeding or successful collateral attack, the Fee and Expense Award is reduced or reversed, if the Settlement itself is voided by any party as provided herein or by the terms of the Settlement, or if the Settlement is later reversed by any court of competent and valid jurisdiction, then it shall be Plaintiffs' Counsel's several obligation to make appropriate refunds to the Defendants or any insurers that made payments of any portion of the Fee and Expense Award within fifteen (15) business days.
- Except as otherwise provided herein or except as provided pursuant to 5.9 indemnification or insurance rights, each of the Settling Parties shall bear his, her, or its own costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees.
- 5.10 Plaintiffs may apply to this Court for the payment of reasonable service awards, not to exceed five thousand dollars (\$5,000) to each Plaintiff, in recognition of their efforts in achieving the benefits for OSI ("Service Awards"). Any Service Awards approved by this Court shall be paid from the portion of the Fee and Expense Award distributed to Plaintiffs' Counsel. Defendants agree not to oppose the payment of such Service Awards and shall not be liable for any portion thereof. Plaintiffs' application to this Court for Service Awards shall not increase the Fee and Expense Award to be distributed to Plaintiffs' Counsel.

6. Conditions of Settlement, Effect of Disapproval, Cancellation, or **Termination**

- The Effective Date of the Stipulation shall be conditioned on the 6.1 occurrence of all of the following events:
 - approval of the Settlement by OSI; (a)
- (b) approval of the Settlement and approval of the method of providing notice of pendency and proposed Settlement to Current OSI Shareholders by the Court, following notice to Current OSI Shareholders as set forth above;
- entry of the Judgment, substantially in the form set forth as (c) Exhibit C annexed hereto, approving the Settlement, without awarding costs to any

- (d) Payment of the Fee and Expense Award;
- (e) the passing of the date upon which Judgment has become Final; and
 - (f) dismissal with prejudice of the Delaware Action.
- 6.2 If any of the conditions specified in \P 6.1 are not met, then the Stipulation shall be canceled and terminated subject to \P 6.3, and the Settling Parties shall be restored to their respective positions prior to execution of the Term Sheet, unless counsel for the Settling Parties mutually agree in writing to proceed with the Stipulation.
- 6.3 If for any reason the Effective Date of the Stipulation does not occur, or if the Stipulation is in any way canceled, terminated or the Judgment fails to become Final in accordance with the Stipulation's terms: (a) all Settling Parties and Released Persons shall be restored to their respective positions prior to execution of the Term Sheet; (b) all releases delivered in connection with the Stipulation shall be null and void, except as otherwise provided for in the Stipulation; (c) the Fee and Expense Award shall not be paid or shall be refunded, as the case may be; and (d) all negotiations, proceedings, documents prepared, and statements made in connection herewith shall be without prejudice to the Settling Parties, shall not be deemed or construed to be an admission by any of the Settling Parties of any act, matter, or proposition, and shall not be used in any manner for any purpose in any subsequent proceeding in the Actions or in any other action or proceeding.

7. Miscellaneous Provisions

7.1 Plaintiffs' Counsel agree that within thirty (30) days of the Effective Date, they will return to the producing party all discovery material obtained from such producing party, including all documents produced by any of the Defendants or any of the Released Persons in the Actions (herein "Discovery Material"), or destroy

subject to the requirement that Plaintiffs' Counsel shall not disclose any information contained or referenced in the Discovery Material to any person except pursuant to court order or agreement with Defendants. The Settling Parties agree to submit to the Court any dispute concerning the return or destruction of Discovery Material.

7.2 The Settling Parties: (i) acknowledge that it is their intent to consummate this Stipulation; and (ii) agree to act in good faith and cooperate to take

consummate this Stipulation; and (ii) agree to act in good faith and cooperate to take all reasonable and necessary steps to expeditiously implement the terms and conditions of the Stipulation.

- 7.3 The Settling Parties agree that the terms of the Settlement were negotiated in good faith by the Settling Parties, and reflect a settlement that was reached voluntarily after consultation with competent legal counsel. The Settling Parties will request that the Judgment will contain a finding that during the course of the Actions, the Settling Parties and their respective counsel at all times complied with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, California Code of Civil Procedure § 128.7, and all other similar rules of professional conduct. The Settling Parties reserve their right to rebut, in a manner that the parties determine to be appropriate, any contention made in any public forum that the Actions were brought or defended in bad faith or without a reasonable basis.
- 7.4 Each of the Individual Defendants expressly denies and continues to deny all allegations of wrongdoing or liability against himself or herself arising out of or relating to any conduct, statements, acts, or omissions alleged, or which could have been alleged, in the Actions. Neither the Stipulation (including any exhibits attached hereto) nor the Settlement, nor any act performed or document executed pursuant to or in furtherance of the Stipulation or the Settlement: (a) is or may be

- 7.5 With respect to any press or public statements, the Settling Parties, Plaintiffs' Counsel and Defendants' Counsel agree that words to the following effect will be utilized to describe the resolution: the matter was resolved to both sides' mutual satisfaction with no admissions of liability. Nothing in this clause shall prevent OSI from complying with all legal, regulatory, and/or judicial requirements, including the rules and regulations applicable to filing reports with the SEC. Furthermore, nothing in this Paragraph shall prevent the Settling Parties, Plaintiffs' Counsel and Defendants' Counsel from discussing the Settlement or making any other public statements, in accordance with this Paragraph's requirements, about the Settlement in connection with the settlement process including all proceedings and matters relating thereto.
 - 7.6 The exhibits to the Stipulation are material and integral parts hereof and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

are fully incorporated herein by this reference.

or written, with respect to such matters.

3

The Stipulation may be amended or modified only by a written 7.7 instrument signed by or on behalf of all the Settling Parties or their respective

4

successors-in-interest. 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

7.8 The Stipulation and the exhibits attached hereto represent the complete and final resolution of all disputes among the Settling Parties with respect to the Actions, constitute the entire agreement among the Settling Parties, and supersede any and all prior negotiations, discussions, agreements, or undertakings, whether oral

- 7.9 The Stipulation and the Settlement shall be binding upon, and inure to the benefit of, the successors and assigns of the Settling Parties and the Released Persons. The Settling Parties agree that this Stipulation will run to their respective successors-in-interest, and they further agree that any planned, proposed, or actual sale, merger, or change-in-control of OSI shall not void this Stipulation, and that in the event of a planned, proposed, or actual sale, merger, or change-in-control of OSI, they will continue to seek final approval of this Stipulation expeditiously, including but not limited to the Settlement terms reflected in this Stipulation and any Fee and Expense Award.
- 7.10 The Stipulation and the exhibits attached hereto shall be considered to have been negotiated, executed, and delivered, and to be wholly performed, in the State of California, and the rights and obligations of the Settling Parties to the Stipulation shall be construed and enforced in accordance with, and governed by, the internal, substantive laws of California without giving effect to that State's choice-oflaw principles.
- 7.11 No representations, warranties, or inducements have been made to any party concerning the Stipulation or its exhibits other than the representations, warranties, and covenants contained and memorialized in such documents.

27

28

///

Case 2	e 2 14-cv-02910-MWF-MRW Document 91-1 Filed 12/09 #:1392	9/16 Page 27 of 32	Page ID	
1				
2				
3	III	enforcement of the terms of this Stipulation, and the Settling Parties and their counsel		
4	II .	submit to the jurisdiction of this Court solely for purposes of implementing and		
5	III	enforcing this Stipulation and related Settlement.		
6	III	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Settling Parties hereto have caused the		
7	Stipulation to be executed, by their duly auth	Stipulation to be executed, by their duly authorized attorneys, dated as of		
8	9 hov. 23, 2016.			
9	May 22			
10	,	lly submitted,		
11	ka 11	BOTTINI, INC. Bottini Jr.		
12		olesnikov		
13	Mun	15 Cl 1300 6	~	
14		Bottini, Jr.	N	
15	7817 Ivani	hoe Avenue, Suite	102	
16	Tolophone	CA 92037 : 858-914-2001		
17	Facsimile:	858-914-2002		
18	THE SHILM	AN LAW FIRM		
19	Kip B. Shu			
20				
21	Vin D. Ch.	ıman		
22	1 Montgor	nery Street, Suite 1	800	
24	San Franci	sco, California 94 : (303) 861-3003		
25	Facsimile:	(303) 484-4886		
26	T1 C1	an Law Firm		
27	Rusty E. G	lenn, Esq.		
28	000 17111 5	treet, Suite 2800 ver, CO 80202		
20	25			
	STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT OF SI	ETTLEMENT		

Case 2:	14-cv-02910-MWF-MRW	Document 91-1 #:1394	Filed 12/09/16 Page 29 of 32 Page ID
1			Scott+Scott, Attorneys at Law, LLP Judith S. Scolnick
2			000 010
3			Judith S. Scolnick
4			Judiui S. Scomick
5			The Helmsley Building 230 Park Avenue, 17 th Floor
6			230 Park Avenue, 17 th Floor New York, NY 10169
7			Telephone: (212) 223-6444 Facsimile: (212) 223-6334
8	=		1 desimile. (212) 223 0334
9			SCOTT+SCOTT, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLP John T. Jasnoch (281605)
10			655 North Central Ave., 17th Floor
11			Glendale, CA 91203
12			Telephone: 213-985-1274 Facsimile: 213-985-1278
13	a 8		
14			Co-Lead Counsel for California Plaintiffs Marc Hagan and City of Irving
15			Supplemental Benefit Plan
16	DATED.	2016	SAFIRSTEIN METCALF LLP
17	DATED:	, 2016	Peter Safirstein
18			
19			Peter Safirstein
20			1050 D 1 07/1 FI
21			1250 Broadway, 27th Floor New York, NY 10001
22	ç.		Telephone: 212-201-2845
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
			26
	STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT OF SETTLEMENT		

Case 2	14-cv-02910-MWF-MRW	Document 91-1 #:1395	Filed 12/09/16 Page 30 of 32 Page ID
1			Scott+Scott, Attorneys at Law, LLP Judith S. Scolnick
2			Juditar 5. Scottien
3			
4			Judith S. Scolnick
5			The Helmsley Building
6			230 Park Avenue, 17th Floor
7			New York, NY 10169 Telephone: (212) 223-6444
8			Facsimile: (212) 223-6334
9			SCOTT+SCOTT, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLP
10			John T. Jasnoch (281605)
11			655 North Central Ave., 17th Floor Glendale, CA 91203
12			Telephone: 213-985-1274
			Facsimile: 213-985-1278
13 14			Co-Lead Counsel for California
:			Plaintiffs Marc Hagan and City of Irving
15			Supplemental Benefit Plan
16	DATED: November 2	<u>1,</u> 2016	SAFIRSTEIN METCALF LLP
17			Peter Saffrstein
18			Mell ////
19			Peter Safirstein
20			1250 Broadway, 27th Floor
21			New York, NY 10001
22			Telephone: 212-201-2845
23			
24			
25			
26	A Company of the Comp		
27			
28			26
		TIPULATION AND A	GREEMENT OF SETTLEMENT

Case 4	114-CV-02910-WWVF-WRVV	#:1396	Filed 12/09/10 Page 31 0/32 Page 1D	
1	DATED: November 23	2016	HUNG G. TA, ESQ. PLLC	
2			10.	
3			Juga	
4			Hung G. Ta	
5			250 Park Avenue, 7th Floor	
6			New York, NY 10177 Telephone: 646-453-7290	
7				
8			Attorneys for Delaware Plaintiff Jeffery Kocen	
9	DATED:,	2016	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP	
10			Peter A. Wald	
11				
12			Peter A. Wald	
13			505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000	
14			San Francisco, CA 94111-6538 Telephone: 415-391-0600	
15			Facsimile: 415-395-8095	
16			Attorneys for Defendants Deepak	
17 18			Chopra, William Ballhaus, David	
19			Feinberg, Steven Good, Meyer Luskin, Ajay Mehra, and Alan Edrick, and	
20			Nominal Defendant OSI Systems, Inc.	
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	Con	DI II ATIONI AND AC	27	
	STI	STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT OF SETTLEMENT		

Case 2:14	1-cv-02910-MWF-MRW	Document 91-1 #:1397	Filed 12/09/16 Page 32 of 32 Page ID
1	DATED:	_, 2016	HUNG G. TA, ESQ. PLLC
2			
3			II C. T
4	0.00		Hung G. Ta
5			250 Park Avenue, 7th Floor
6			New York, NY 10177 Telephone: 646-453-7290
7			Attornoon for Doloron Dlointiff
8			Attorneys for Delaware Plaintiff Jeffery Kocen
9	DATED: November 23	2016	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
10	DATED. 100000 J.	2, 2010	Peter A. Wald
11			Tita de titals
12			Peter A. Wald
13			505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
14			San Francisco, CA 94111-6538
15			Telephone: 415-391-0600 Facsimile: 415-395-8095
16			
17			Attorneys for Defendants Deepak Chopra, William Ballhaus, David
18			Feinberg, Steven Good, Meyer Luskin,
19			Ajay Mehra, and Alan Edrick, and Nominal Defendant OSI Systems, Inc.
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			27
	STIPULATION AND AGREEMENT OF SETTLEMENT		