

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

IN RE FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS  
CORPORATION STOCKHOLDERS  
LITIGATION

No. 3:17-cv-01617-VAB

**[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT APPROVING CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT**

WHEREAS, a consolidated securities class action is pending in this Court entitled *In re Frontier Communications Corporation Stockholders Litigation*, No. 3:17-cv-01617-VAB (the “Action”);

WHEREAS, (a) lead plaintiffs Arkansas Teacher Retirement System and Carlos Lagomarsino (collectively, “Lead Plaintiffs”), on behalf of themselves and the Settlement Class (defined below); and (b) defendant Frontier Communications Parent, Inc. (together with its subsidiaries, including Frontier Communications Corporation, “Frontier”),<sup>1</sup> and defendants Daniel J. McCarthy, John M. Jureller, Ralph Perley McBride, and John Gianukakis (collectively, the “Individual Defendants,” and together with Frontier, “Defendants”) (Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants, together, the “Parties”) have entered into a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement dated December 23, 2021 (the “Stipulation”) that provides for a complete dismissal with prejudice

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to paragraph 87 of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Confirming the Fifth Amended Joint Plan of Reorganization of Frontier Communications Corporation and Its Debtor Affiliates Pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code [Docket No. 1005] (“Confirmation Order”), *In re Frontier Communications Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 20-22476 (RDD), U.S. Bankruptcy Court at the Southern District of New York (“Bankruptcy Court”), Frontier Communications Parent, Inc. is the Debtor/Reorganized Debtor in connection with Securities Litigation claims.

of the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action on the terms and conditions set forth in the Stipulation, subject to the approval of this Court (the “Settlement”);

WHEREAS, unless otherwise defined in this Judgment, the capitalized terms herein shall have the same meaning as they have in the Stipulation;

WHEREAS, by Order dated January 18, 2022 (the “Preliminary Approval Order”), this Court: (a) found, pursuant to Rule 23(e)(1)(B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, that it (i) would likely be able to approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate under Rule 23(e)(2) and (ii) would likely be able to certify the Settlement Class for purposes of the Settlement; (b) ordered that notice of the proposed Settlement be provided to potential Settlement Class Members; (c) provided Settlement Class Members with the opportunity either to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class or to object to the proposed Settlement; and (d) scheduled a hearing regarding final approval of the Settlement;

WHEREAS, due and adequate notice has been given to the Settlement Class;

WHEREAS, the Court conducted a hearing on May 10, 2022 (the “Settlement Hearing”) to consider, among other things, (a) whether the terms and conditions of the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class, and should therefore be approved; and (b) whether a judgment should be entered dismissing the Action with prejudice as against Defendants; and

WHEREAS, the Court having reviewed and considered the Stipulation, all papers filed and proceedings held herein in connection with the Settlement, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement, and the record in the Action, and good cause appearing therefor;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

1. **Jurisdiction** – The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action, and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over all of the Parties and each of the Settlement Class Members.

2. **Incorporation of Settlement Documents** – This Judgment incorporates and makes a part hereof: (a) the Stipulation filed with the Court on December 27, 2021; and (b) the Notice and the Summary Notice, both of which were filed with the Court on April 5, 2022.

3. **Class Certification for Settlement Purposes** – The Court hereby certifies for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Action as a class action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of the Settlement Class consisting of all persons and entities who purchased or otherwise acquired shares of publicly traded common stock and Mandatory Convertible Preferred Stock of Frontier Communications Corporation (collectively, “Frontier Securities”) between April 25, 2016 and October 31, 2017, inclusive (the “Class Period”), and were allegedly damaged thereby. Excluded from the Settlement Class are: (i) Defendants and all Former Defendants; (ii) the Immediate Family Members of any Individual Defendant or any Former Defendant; (iii) any person who was an Officer, director, or partner of Frontier or any Former Defendant during the Class Period and any of their Immediate Family Members; (iv) any parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of Frontier or any Former Defendant; (v) any firm, trust, corporation, or other entity in which any Defendant, any Former Defendant, or any other excluded person or entity has, or had during the Class Period, a controlling interest; and (vi) the legal representatives, agents, affiliates, heirs, successors-in-interest, or assigns of any such excluded persons or entities. Also excluded from the Settlement Class are the persons and entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto who or which are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request.

4. **Settlement Class Findings** – For purposes of the Settlement only, the Court finds that each element required for certification of the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure has been met: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are so numerous that their joinder in the Action would be impracticable; (b) there are questions of law and fact common to the Settlement Class which predominate over any individual questions; (c) the claims of Lead Plaintiffs in the Action are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class; (d) Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have and will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Settlement Class; and (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the Action.

5. **Adequacy of Representation** – Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and for the purposes of the Settlement only, the Court hereby certifies Lead Plaintiffs Arkansas Teacher Retirement System and Carlos Lagomarsino as Class Representatives for the Settlement Class and appoints Lead Counsel Bernstein Litowitz Berger & Grossmann LLP as Class Counsel for the Settlement Class. The Court finds that Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have fairly and adequately represented the Settlement Class both in terms of litigating the Action and for purposes of entering into and implementing the Settlement and have satisfied the requirements of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a)(4) and 23(g), respectively.

6. **Notice** – The Court finds that the dissemination of the Notice and the publication of the Summary Notice: (a) were implemented in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order; (b) constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances; (c) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Settlement Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action; (ii) the effect of the proposed Settlement (including the Releases to be provided thereunder); (iii) Lead Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and

Litigation Expenses; (iv) their right to object to any aspect of the Settlement, the Plan of Allocation, and/or Lead Counsel's motion for attorneys' fees and Litigation Expenses; (v) their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement Class; and (vi) their right to appear at the Settlement Hearing; (d) constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to receive notice of the proposed Settlement; and (e) satisfied the requirements of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the United States Constitution (including the Due Process Clause), the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995, 15 U.S.C. § 78u-4, as amended, and all other applicable law and rules.

7. Defendants have complied with the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. §1715, *et seq.* ("CAFA"). Defendants timely mailed notice of the Settlement pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1715(b), including notices to the Attorney General of the United States of America, and the Attorneys General of each State. The CAFA notice contains the documents and information required by 28 U.S.C. §1715(b)(1)-(8). The Court finds that Defendants have complied in all respects with the notice requirements of CAFA.

8. **Final Settlement Approval and Dismissal of Claims** – Pursuant to, and in accordance with, Rule 23(e)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court hereby fully and finally approves the Settlement set forth in the Stipulation in all respects (including, without limitation: the amount of the Settlement; the Releases provided for therein; and the dismissal with prejudice of the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action), and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, and adequate to the Settlement Class. Specifically, the Court finds that: (a) Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel have adequately represented the Settlement Class; (b) the Settlement was negotiated by the Parties at arm's length; (c) the relief provided for the Settlement Class under the Settlement is adequate taking into account the costs, risks, and delay

of trial and appeal; the proposed means of distributing the Settlement Fund to the Settlement Class; and the proposed attorneys' fee award; and (d) the Settlement treats members of the Settlement Class equitably relative to each other. One objection to the Settlement, filed by Catherine L. Scott (ECF No. 200), was received. The Court has considered the objection filed by Ms. Scott and it is denied. The Parties are directed to implement, perform, and consummate the Settlement in accordance with the terms and provisions contained in the Stipulation.

9. The Action and all of the claims asserted against Defendants in the Action by Lead Plaintiffs and the other Settlement Class Members are hereby dismissed with prejudice. The Parties shall bear their own costs and expenses, except as otherwise expressly provided in the Stipulation.

10. **Binding Effect** – The terms of the Stipulation and of this Judgment shall be forever binding on Defendants, Lead Plaintiffs, and all other Settlement Class Members (regardless of whether or not any individual Settlement Class Member submits a Claim Form or seeks or obtains a distribution from the Net Settlement Fund), as well as their respective successors and assigns. The persons and entities listed on Exhibit 1 hereto are excluded from the Settlement Class pursuant to request and are not bound by the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

11. **Releases** – The Releases set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Stipulation, together with the definitions contained in paragraph 1 of the Stipulation relating thereto, are expressly incorporated herein in all respects. The Releases are effective as of the Effective Date. Accordingly, this Court orders that:

(a) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 12 below, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, Lead Plaintiffs and each of the other Settlement Class Members, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators,

predecessors, successors, and assigns in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged any and all Released Plaintiffs' Claims against Defendants and the other Defendants' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any and all Released Plaintiffs' Claims against any of the Defendants' Releasees. This Release shall not apply to any of the Excluded Plaintiffs' Claims (as that term is defined in paragraph 1(nn) of the Stipulation).

(b) Without further action by anyone, and subject to paragraph 12 below, upon the Effective Date of the Settlement, Defendants, on behalf of themselves, and their respective heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors, and assigns in their capacities as such, shall be deemed to have, and by operation of law and of this Judgment shall have, fully, finally, and forever compromised, settled, released, resolved, relinquished, waived, and discharged any and all Released Defendants' Claims against Lead Plaintiffs and the other Plaintiffs' Releasees, and shall forever be barred and enjoined from prosecuting any and all Released Defendants' Claims against any of the Plaintiffs' Releasees. This Release shall not apply to any of the Excluded Defendants' Claims (as that term is defined in paragraph 1(mm) of the Stipulation).

12. Notwithstanding paragraphs 11(a) – (b) above, nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action by any of the Parties to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Stipulation or this Judgment.

13. **Rule 11 Findings** – The Court finds and concludes that the Parties and their respective counsel have complied in all respects with the requirements of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in connection with the institution, prosecution, defense, and settlement of the Action.

14. **No Admissions** – Neither this Judgment, the Term Sheet, the Stipulation (whether or not consummated), including the exhibits thereto and the Plan of Allocation contained therein (or any other plan of allocation that may be approved by the Court), the negotiations leading to the execution of the Term Sheet and the Stipulation, nor any proceedings taken pursuant to or in connection with the Term Sheet, the Stipulation, and/or approval of the Settlement (including any arguments proffered in connection therewith): (a) shall be offered against any of the Defendants’ Releasees as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Defendants’ Releasees with respect to the truth of any fact alleged by Lead Plaintiffs or the validity of any claim that was or could have been asserted or the deficiency of any defense that has been or could have been asserted in this Action or in any other litigation, or of any liability, negligence, fault, or other wrongdoing of any kind of any of the Defendants’ Releasees or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Defendants’ Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation; (b) shall be offered against any of the Plaintiffs’ Releasees, as evidence of, or construed as, or deemed to be evidence of any presumption, concession, or admission by any of the Plaintiffs’ Releasees that any of their claims are without merit, that any of the Defendants’ Releasees had meritorious defenses, or that damages recoverable under the Complaint would not have exceeded the Settlement Amount or with respect to any liability, negligence, fault, or wrongdoing of any kind, or in any way referred to for any other reason as against any of the Plaintiffs’ Releasees, in any arbitration proceeding or other civil, criminal, or administrative action or proceeding, other than such proceedings as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of the Stipulation; or (c) shall be construed against any of the Releasees as an admission, concession, or

presumption that the consideration to be given under the Stipulation represents the amount which could be or would have been recovered after trial; *provided, however*, that the Parties and the Releasees and their respective counsel may refer to this Judgment and the Stipulation to effectuate the protections from liability granted hereunder and thereunder or otherwise to enforce the terms of the Settlement.

15. **Retention of Jurisdiction** – Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, this Court retains continuing and exclusive jurisdiction over: (a) the Parties for purposes of the administration, interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of the Settlement; (b) the disposition of the Settlement Fund; (c) any motion for an award of attorneys’ fees and/or Litigation Expenses by Lead Counsel in the Action that will be paid from the Settlement Fund; (d) any motion to approve the Plan of Allocation; (e) any motion to approve the Class Distribution Order; and (f) the Settlement Class Members for all matters relating to the Action.

16. Separate orders shall be entered regarding approval of a plan of allocation and the motion of Lead Counsel for an award of attorneys’ fees and Litigation Expenses. Such orders shall in no way affect or delay the finality of this Judgment and shall not affect or delay the Effective Date of the Settlement.

17. **Modification of the Agreement of Settlement** – Without further approval from the Court, Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants are hereby authorized to agree to and adopt such amendments or modifications of the Stipulation or any exhibits attached thereto to effectuate the Settlement that: (a) are not materially inconsistent with this Judgment; and (b) do not materially limit the rights of Settlement Class Members in connection with the Settlement. Without further order of the Court, Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants may agree to reasonable extensions of time to carry out any provisions of the Settlement.

18. **Termination of Settlement** – If the Settlement is terminated as provided in the Stipulation, this Judgment shall be vacated and rendered null and void, and shall be of no further force and effect, except as otherwise provided by the Stipulation, and this Judgment shall be without prejudice to the rights of Lead Plaintiffs, the other Settlement Class Members, and Defendants, and Lead Plaintiffs and Defendants shall revert to their respective positions in the Action as of immediately prior to the Parties’ agreement-in-principle to settle on September 30, 2021, as provided in the Stipulation.

19. **Entry of Final Judgment** – There is no just reason to delay the entry of this Judgment as a final judgment in this Action. Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court is expressly directed to immediately enter this final judgment in this Action.

SO ORDERED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2022.

---

The Honorable Victor A. Bolden  
United States District Judge

**Exhibit 1****List of Persons and Entities Excluded from  
the Settlement Class Pursuant to Request**

<b>Name</b>	<b>City, State</b>
1. Lynne A. Kline TOD Michele S. Armstrong Subject to STA TOD Rules	Davie, FL
2. Leonard & Eileen DeStefano	Drexel, Hill, PA
3. Thelma Niederbuhl	Bloomington, NY
4. Loretta Griffin	Oak Creek, WI
5. Carolann Coburn	Tonawanda, NY
6. R.L. Crigler	Chicago, IL
7. Estate of Nancy Akin	Minocqua, WI
8. Doris F. Killian	Bellingham, WA
9. Arnold L. Lehmann	Spokane, WA
10. Karen Foster	Foley, AL
11. Andrew W. Viola	White Plains, NY
12. Dennis Michael Erwin Mary Kathleen Erwin	Leawood, KS
13. Bernard A. Kroeger Alani Kroeger JT Ten	Lutz, FL
14. Blanche Shirley Miller Viroso	Denville, NJ
15. Allison Pierce	Rockport, ME
16. Edwin K. Suganuma & Jeanette Suganuma JT Ten	Honolulu, HI
17. Patricia Nottmeier Rauch	Columbia, IL
18. Elizabeth A. Laughlin	Washington, IL
19. John & Lilly J. Methratta	Martinez, CA

20. James T. Cook (William T. Cook & Anna G. Cook Revocable Trust UA 02/08/91)	Bensenville, IL
21. Lewandowski Family Living Tr. Jeanne M. Henderson, TTEE	Bay City, MI
22. Annamaria F. Demiris	Woodstock, GA
23. Richard R. Bidney	White Bear Township, MN
24. James G. McGlynn Katherine M. McGlynn Ten Com	West Mifflin, PA
25. Robert F. Englmeier	Ft. Pierce, FL
26. Mary E. Oskroba	Lombard, IL
27. Mary E. Oskroba & Loretta E. Oskroba JT Ten	Lombard, IL
28. John W. Vance	Columbus, OH
29. Dorthy L. Vance	Columbus, OH
30. Kathleen Hughes Fisher, TTEE For the Kathleen Hughes Fisher Trust dtd 05/27/2009	Fairfax, VA
31. S.K. Kashiwagi-McCaskey TTEE For Tsugio Fujimoto TR UA dtd 05/12/1993	Sacramento, CA
32. Camille A. Sheats	East Point, GA
33. Marian K. Murta Bell	Moscow, ID
34. Kathryn J. McCatherin	Jensen Beach, FL
35. Carollee E. Brue	Brodheadsville, PA
36. Edward F. Adams	Marietta, GA
37. William & Joyce Corder	Newark, OH
38. Randall S. Hart	Midwest City, OK
39. Katherine Barbara Doyle	Annadale, VA
40. Raymond Michalek	New York, NY

41. Ann Conde	East Patchogue, NY
42. Colette E. Hensley	Cosby, TN
43. Robert H. Massey Angela M. Wallace, Joint Tenant	Roanoke, VA
44. Eleanor B. Clayton	Winston-Salem, NC
45. Elizabeth Russitano	Ridge, NY
46. Jane A. Czarnota	Garnet Valley, PA
47. Mary Ann Johnson	Rockport, MA
48. James A. Burke	Alexandria, VA
49. Mary McKay	Wahoo, NE
50. Emily M. Clayton	Bosque Farms, NM
51. Charles E. Kern Jr. Heidi A. Kern	Oakland, MD
52. Dorthy Glomb	Somerset, NJ
53. Penni S. & Don C. Klick JT Ten	Anthem, AZ
54. Joshua Mayer	Colorado Springs, CO
55. Charles R. Maier	Wayne, NE
56. Marilyn A. Farr	Houston, TX
57. Lynn Griesmeyer	Rolling Meadows, IL
58. Alphonse Porpora	West Babylon, NY
59. Betty S. Lee	Princeton, WV
60. Bernadette Rowe	Ft. Washington, MD
61. Peyer Family Revocable Trust UAD June 6, 2015 Harold A. & Donna Lee Peyer, Co-TTEES	Kent, WA
62. Jo Ann Woodall	Mesa, AZ
63. Anthony Buccarelli	Hollywood, FL

64. Jack B. Lyle	West Melbourne, FL
65. Ronald Lee Paschal	High Point, NC
66. Estate of Dorothy A. Hare JoAnne M. Ludwig	Portland, OR
67. Jeline H. Ware	Carmichael, CA
68. Carol Gilmore	Grand Junction, CO
69. Diana Rank	Arma, KS
70. Susan G. Braman, TTEE Susan G. Braman Revocable Trust U/A 03/12/15	Titusville, FL
71. Carole S. Carthron	Alpharetta, GA
72. Joyce G. Sipiczky	Courtland, VA