

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	3
ARGUMENT	6
I. THE COURT SHOULD ENTER AN ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL TO THE PROPOSED NORTEL I SETTLEMENT	6
A. The Proposed Settlement is Fair, Reasonable and Adequate.....	6
1. The Complexity, Expense and Likely Duration of the Litigation.....	8
2. The Reaction of the Class to the Settlement	10
3. The Stage of Proceedings and the Amount of Discovery Completed.....	11
4. Risks of Establishing Liability.....	12
5. Risks of Establishing Damages.....	13
6. Risks of Maintaining Class Action Through Trial.....	14
7. The Ability of Defendants to Withstand a Greater Judgment.....	15
8. The Range of Reasonableness of the Settlement Funds in Light of the Best Possible Recovery	16
9. The Range of Reasonableness of the Settlement Fund to a Possible Recovery in Light of All the Attendant Risks of Litigation.....	16
B. The Settlement Negotiations Were Procedurally Fair	17
II. THE PROPOSED PLAN OF ALLOCATION IS FAIR, REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE AND SHOULD BE APPROVED	19
CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

In re Am. Bank Note Holographics, Inc. Sec. Litig.,
127 F. Supp. 2d 418 (S.D.N.Y. 2001)..... *passim*

In re Austrian & German Bank Holocaust Litig.,
80 F. Supp. 2d 164 (S.D.N.Y. 2000).....11

In re Blech Sec. Litig.,
No. 94-7696, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 23170 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 27, 2002).....10

Carson v. Am. Brands, Inc.,
450 U.S. 79 (1981).....12

Chatelain v. Prudential-Bache Sec., Inc.,
805 F. Supp. 209 (S.D.N.Y. 1992).....17

D'Amato v. Deutsche Bank,
236 F.3d 78 (2d Cir. 2001).....6, 18

Detroit v. Grinnell Corp.,
495 F.2d 448 (2d Cir. 1974).....7, 12, 13

Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo.,
544 U.S. 336 (2005).....9, 13

Ernst & Ernst v. Hochfelder,
425 U.S. 185 (1976).....12, 13

In re Global Crossing Sec. & ERISA Litig.,
225 F.R.D. 436 (S.D.N.Y. 2004)12, 13, 18

Greebel v. FTP Software, Inc.,
939 F. Supp. 57 (D. Mass. 1996) *aff'd*, 194 F.3d 185 (1st Cir. Mass. 1999).....7

Hicks v. Stanley,
No. 01-10071 2005 WL 2757792 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 24, 2005).....8

In re Ivan F. Boesky Sec. Litig.,
948 F.2d 1358 (2d Cir. 1991).....6

Lentell v. Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.,
396 F.3d 161 (2d Cir. 2005).....9, 13

In re Lloyd's Am. Trust Fund Litig.,
No. 96-1262 (RWS), 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22663 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 26, 2002)12, 13

<i>Maley v. Del Global Techs. Corp.</i> , 186 F. Supp. 2d 358 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).....	6, 14, 19
<i>In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.</i> 187 F.R.D. 465 (S.D.N.Y. 1998)	14
<i>New York v. Nintendo of Am., Inc.</i> , 775 F. Supp. 676 (S.D.N.Y. 1991).....	17
<i>In re Nortel Networks Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 01-1855, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 15702 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2003).....	1, 14
<i>In re PaineWebber Ltd. P'ships Litig.</i> , 171 F.R.D. 104 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)	11, 15, 17, 19
<i>In re Sterling Foster & Co., Sec. Litig.</i> , 238 F. Supp. 2d 480 (E.D.N.Y. 2002)	17
<i>Strougo v. Bassini</i> , 258 F. Supp. 2d 254 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).....	17
<i>In re Sumitomo Copper Litig.</i> , 189 F.R.D. 274 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)	9
<i>TSC Indus., Inc. v. Northway, Inc.</i> , 426 U.S. 438 (1976).....	12, 13
<i>Thompson v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.</i> , 216 F.R.D. 55 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)	8
<i>Trief v. Dun & Bradstreet Corp.</i> , 840 F. Supp. 277 (S.D.N.Y. 1993).....	17
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Visa U.S.A. Inc.</i> , 396 F.3d 96 (2d Cir.), <i>cert denied</i> , 125 S. Ct. 2277 (2005).....	6, 7, 8
<i>In re Warner Commc'ns Sec. Litig.</i> , 618 F. Supp. 735 (S.D.N.Y. 1985), <i>aff'd</i> , 798 F.2d 35 (2d Cir. 1986)	7, 11, 14, 15
<i>Weinberger v. Kendrick</i> , 698 F.2d 61 (2d Cir. 1982).....	7, 17

OTHER AUTHORITIES

<i>Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth</i> § 21.612 (2004).....	17
---	----

