

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

HAY CREEK ROYALTIES, LLC, on behalf
of itself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 19-CV-177-CVE-JFJ

ROAN RESOURCES LLC,

Defendant.

JUDGMENT

The matter comes on for consideration of Class Representative’s Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Brief in Support (Dkt. # 64). This is a class action lawsuit brought by Plaintiff Hay Creek Royalties, LLC, on behalf of itself and as representative of classes of owners (defined below), against Roan Resources, LLC (Defendant), for the alleged underpayment of royalty on gas and constituents and for failure to pay statutory interest on payments made outside the time periods set forth in the Production Revenue Standards Act, OKLA. STAT. tit. 52, § 570.1 et seq. (the PRSA) for oil and gas production proceeds from oil and gas wells in Oklahoma. On January 13, 2021, the Parties executed a Stipulation and Agreement of Settlement (Settlement Agreement) finalizing the terms of the Settlement.¹

¹ Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Order shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Settlement Agreement.

On January 25, 2021, the Court preliminarily approved the Settlement and issued an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Certifying the Classes for Settlement Purposes, Approving Form and Manner of Notice, and Setting Date for Final Fairness Hearing (Preliminary Approval Order). In the Preliminary Approval Order (Dkt. # 61), the Court, inter alia:

- a. certified the Settlement Classes for settlement purposes, finding all requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 have been satisfied with respect to the proposed Settlement Classes;
- b. appointed Plaintiff Hay Creek Royalties, LLC as Class Representative, Reagan E. Bradford and Ryan K. Wilson as Co-Lead Class Counsel, and David R. Gleason and Charles V. Knutter as Additional Class Counsel;
- c. preliminarily found: (i) the proposed Settlement resulted from extensive arm's-length negotiations; (ii) the proposed Settlement was agreed to only after Class Counsel had conducted legal research and discovery regarding the strengths and weaknesses of Class Representative's and the Settlement Classes' claims; (iii) Class Representatives and Class Counsel have concluded that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate; and (iv) the proposed Settlement is sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to warrant sending notice of the proposed Settlement to the Settlement Classes;
- d. preliminarily approved the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate and in the best interest of the Settlement Classes;
- e. preliminarily approved the form and manner of the proposed Notice and Summary Notice to be communicated to the Settlement Classes, finding specifically that such Notice and Summary Notice, among other information: (i) described the terms and effect of the Settlement; (ii) notified the Settlement Classes that Plaintiff's Counsel

will seek attorneys' fees, reimbursement of Litigation Expenses, and a Case Contribution Award for Class Representative's services; (iii) notified the Settlement Classes of the time and place of the Final Fairness Hearing; (iv) described the procedure for requesting exclusion from the Settlement; and (v) described the procedure for objecting to the Settlement or any part thereof;

- f. instructed the Settlement Administrator to disseminate the approved Notice to potential members of the Settlement Classes, to publish the Summary Notice, and to display documents related to the Settlement on an Internet website in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and in the manner approved by the Court;
- g. provided for the appointment of a Settlement Administrator;
- h. provided for the appointment of an Escrow Agent;
- i. set the date and time for the Final Fairness Hearing as April 28, 2021 at 10:00 A.M. in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma; and
- j. set out the procedures and deadlines by which Class Members could properly request exclusion from the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement or any part thereof.

After the Court issued the Preliminary Approval Order, due and adequate notice by means of the Notice and Summary Notice was given to the Settlement Classes, notifying them of the Settlement and the upcoming Final Fairness Hearing. On April 28, 2021, in accordance with the Preliminary Approval Order and the Notice, the Court conducted a Final Fairness Hearing to, inter alia:

- a. determine whether the Settlement should be approved by the Court as fair, reasonable, and adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Classes;
- b. determine whether the notice method utilized by the Settlement Administrator: (i) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (ii) constituted notice reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, the Settle-

ment, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement, their right to object to the Settlement or any part thereof, and their right to appear at the Final Fairness Hearing; (iii) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to such notice; and (iv) meets all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and any other applicable law;

c. determine whether to approve the Allocation Methodology, the Plan of Allocation, and distribution of the Net Settlement Fund to Class Members who did not timely submit a valid Request for Exclusion or were not otherwise excluded from the Settlement Class by order of the Court;²

d. determine whether a Judgment should be entered pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, inter alia, dismissing the Litigation against Defendant with prejudice and extinguishing, releasing, and barring all Released Claims against all Released Parties in accordance with the Settlement Agreement;

e. determine whether the applications for Plaintiff's attorneys' fees, reimbursement for Litigation Expenses, and Case Contribution Award to Class Representative are fair and reasonable and should be approved;³ and

f. rule on such other matters as the Court deems appropriate.

The Court, having reviewed the Settlement, the Settlement Agreement, and all related pleadings and filings, and having heard the evidence and argument presented at the Final Fairness Hearing, finds that Class Representative's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Brief in Support (Dkt. # 64) is **granted**, and it is therefore **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** as follows:

² The Court will issue a separate order pertaining to the allocation and distribution of the Net Settlement Proceeds among Class Members (the Plan of Allocation Order).

³ The Court will issue separate orders pertaining to Plaintiff's Counsel's request for attorneys' fees and reimbursement of Litigation Expenses and Administration, Notice, and Distribution Costs and Class Representative's request for a Case Contribution Award.

1. The Court, for purposes of this Final Judgment (Judgment), adopts all defined terms as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and incorporates them as if fully set forth herein.
2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this Litigation and all matters relating to the Settlement, as well as personal jurisdiction over Defendant and Class Members.
3. The Settlement Classes, which were certified in the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, are defined as follows:

For Class I:

All persons or entities, except as specifically excluded below, who are or were royalty owners in Class Wells, where Roan Resources, LLC or any of the Released Parties was the operator (or a working interest owner) who marketed its share of gas as to production on or before November 30, 2020, and royalties on such marketed gas was paid to such royalty owners or held in suspense by, or on behalf of, any of the Released Parties. The claims in this matter relate to royalty payments for gas and its constituents (such as residue gas, natural gas liquids, helium, nitrogen, or drip condensate).

Excluded from Class I are: (1) agencies, departments or instrumentalities of the United States of America, including but not limited to the U.S. Department of the Interior (the United States, Indian tribes, and Indian allottees); (2) the State of Oklahoma or any of its agencies or departments that own royalty interests; (3) the Released Parties and their affiliates, affiliated predecessors, and their employees, officers, and directors; (4) any publicly traded company or its affiliated entity that produces, gathers, processes, or markets gas; (5) persons or entities that Plaintiff's counsel are prohibited from representing under Rule 1.7 of the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct; (6) Turtle Creek Exploration, LLC, Gary Shores, Virginia Shores, Michael Kernen, Gladys Marie Wilkerson, Gladys Marie Wilkerson 1999 Trust, Chieftain Royalty Company, White Family Minerals, LLC, Kelsie Wagner, Kelsie Wagner Trust, and each of their relatives, affiliates, and/or trusts; and (7) officers of the Court.

For Class II:

All persons or entities, except as specifically excluded below, who received royalty or overriding royalty payments from Roan Resources, LLC or any of the Released Parties for oil and/or gas proceeds from the Class Wells, or whose royalty or overriding royalty oil and/or gas proceeds from the Class Wells were held in suspense by Roan Resources, LLC or any of the Released Parties, on or before November 30, 2020.

Excluded from Class II are: (1) agencies, departments or instrumentalities of the United States of America, including but not limited to the U.S. Department of the

Interior (the United States, Indian tribes, and Indian allottees); (2) the State of Oklahoma or any of its agencies or departments that own royalty interests; (3) the Released Parties and their affiliates, affiliated predecessors, and their employees, officers, and directors; (4) any publicly traded company or its affiliated entity that produces, gathers, processes, or markets gas; (5) persons or entities that Plaintiff's counsel are prohibited from representing under Rule 1.7 of the Oklahoma Rules of Professional Conduct; (6) Turtle Creek Exploration, LLC, Gary Shores, Virginia Shores, Michael Kernan, Gladys Marie Wilkerson, Gladys Marie Wilkerson 1999 Trust, Chieftain Royalty Company, White Family Minerals, LLC, Kelsie Wagner, Kelsie Wagner Trust, and each of their relatives, affiliates, and/or trusts; and (7) officers of the Court.

The Court finds that the above-defined Settlement Classes have been properly certified for the purposes of this Settlement. The Court finds that the persons and entities identified in the attached **Exhibit 1** have submitted timely and valid Requests for Exclusion and are hereby excluded from the foregoing Settlement Class, will not participate in or be bound by the Settlement, or any part thereof, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and will not be bound by or subject to the releases provided for in this Judgment and the Settlement Agreement.

4. At the Final Fairness Hearing on April 28, 2021, the Court fulfilled its duties to independently evaluate the fairness, reasonableness, and adequacy of, inter alia, the Settlement and the Notice of Settlement provided to the Settlement Classes, considering not only the pleadings and arguments of Class Representative and Defendant and their respective Counsel, but also the concerns of any objectors and the interests of all absent Class Members. In so doing, the Court considered arguments that could reasonably be made against, inter alia, approving the Settlement and the Notice of Settlement, even if such argument was not actually presented to the Court by pleading or oral argument.

5. The Court further finds that due and proper notice, by means of the Notice and Summary Notice, was given to the Settlement Classes in conformity with the Settlement Agreement and Preliminary Approval Order. The form, content, and method of communicating the Notice disseminated to the Settlement Classes and the Summary Notice published pursuant to the Settlement Agree-

ment and the Preliminary Approval Order: (a) constituted the best practicable notice under the circumstances; (b) constituted notice reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Litigation, the Settlement, their right to exclude themselves from the Settlement, their right to object to the Settlement or any part thereof, and their right to appear at the Final Fairness Hearing; (c) was reasonable and constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons and entities entitled to such notice; and (d) met all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, the due process protections of the State of Oklahoma, and any other applicable law. Therefore, the Court approves the form, manner, and content of the Notice and Summary Notice used by the Parties. The Court further finds that all Class Members have been afforded a reasonable opportunity to request exclusion from the Settlement Classes or object to the Settlement.

6. Pursuant to and in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, the Settlement, including, without limitation, the consideration paid by Defendant, the covenants not to sue, the releases, and the dismissal with prejudice of the Released Claims against the Released Parties as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, is finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate and in the best interests of the Settlement Classes. The Settlement Agreement was entered into between the Parties at arm's-length and in good faith after substantial negotiations free of collusion. The Settlement fairly reflects the complexity of the Claims, the duration of the Litigation, the extent of discovery, and the balance between the benefits the Settlement provides to the Settlement Classes and the risk, cost, and uncertainty associated with further litigation and trial. Serious questions of law and fact remain contested between the parties. The Settlement provides a means of gaining immediate valuable and reasonable compensation and forecloses the prospect of uncertain results after many more months or years of additional discovery and litigation. The considered judgment of the Parties, aided by experienced legal counsel, supports the Settlement.

7. By agreeing to settle the Litigation, Defendant does not admit, and instead specifically denies, that the Litigation could have otherwise been properly maintained as a contested class action, and specifically denies any and all wrongdoing and liability to the Settlement Classes, Class Representative, and Plaintiff's Counsel.

8. The Court finds that on January 27, 2021, Defendant caused notice of the Settlement to be served on the appropriate state official for each state in which a Class Member resides, and the appropriate federal official, as required by and in conformance with the form and content requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1715. See Dkt. # 63. In connection therewith, the Court has determined that, under 28 U.S.C. § 1715, the appropriate state official for each state in which a Class Member resides was and is the State Attorney General for each such state, and the appropriate federal official was and is the Attorney General of the United States. Further, the Court finds it was not feasible for Defendant to include on each such notice the names of each of the Class Members who reside in each state and the estimated proportionate share of each such Class Members to the entire Settlement as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1715(b)(7)(A); therefore, each notice included a reasonable estimate of the number of Class Members residing in each state and the estimated proportionate share of the claims of such Class Members to the Settlement. No appropriate state or federal official has entered an appearance or filed an objection to the entry of final approval of the Settlement. Thus, the Court finds that all requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 1715 have been met and complied with and, as a consequence, no Class Member may refuse to comply with or choose not to be bound by the Settlement and this Court's Orders in furtherance thereof, including this Judgment, under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1715.

9. The Released Claims are dismissed with prejudice as to the Released Parties. All Class Members who have not validly and timely submitted a Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator as directed in the Notice of Settlement and Preliminary Approval Order (a) are hereby

deemed to have finally, fully, and forever conclusively released, relinquished, and discharged all of the Released Claims against the Released Parties and (b) are barred and permanently enjoined from, directly or indirectly, on any Class Member's behalf or through others, suing, instigating, instituting, or asserting against the Released Parties any claims or actions on or concerning the Released Claims. Neither Party will bear the other's Party's litigation costs, costs of court, or attorney's fees.

10. The Court also approves the efforts and activities of the Settlement Administrator and the Escrow Agent in assisting with certain aspects of the administration of the Settlement, and directs them to continue to assist Class Representative in completing the administration and distribution of the Settlement in accordance with the Settlement Agreement, this Judgment, any Plan of Allocation approved by the Court, and the Court's other orders.

11. Nothing in this Judgment shall bar any action or claim by Class Representative or Defendant to enforce or effectuate the terms of the Settlement Agreement or this Judgment.

12. The Settlement Administrator is directed to refund to Defendant the funds attributable to Class Members who timely and properly submitted a Request for Exclusion or who were otherwise excluded from the Settlement Class by order of the Court in accordance with the terms and process of the Settlement Agreement.

13. Entering into or carrying out the Settlement Agreement, and any negotiations or proceedings related thereto, and the Settlement Agreement itself, are not, and shall not be construed as, or deemed to be evidence of, an admission or concession by any of the Parties to the Settlement Agreement. Further, this Final Judgment shall not give rise to any collateral estoppel effect as to the certifiability of any class in any other proceeding.

14. As separately set forth in detail in the Court's Plan of Allocation Order(s), the Allocation Methodology, the Plan of Allocation, and distribution of the Net Settlement Fund among Class Members who were not excluded from the Settlement Class by timely submitting a valid Request for

Exclusion or other order of the Court are approved as fair, reasonable and adequate, and Class Counsel and the Settlement Administrator are directed to administer the Settlement in accordance with the Plan of Allocation Order(s) entered by the Court.

15. The Court finds that Class Representative, Defendant, and their Counsel have complied with the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as to all proceedings and filings in this Litigation. The Court further finds that Class Representative and Class Counsel adequately represented the Settlement Class in entering into and implementing the Settlement.

16. Neither Defendant nor Defendant's Counsel shall have any liability or responsibility to Plaintiff, Plaintiff's Counsel, or the Settlement Class with respect to the Gross Settlement Fund or its administration, including but not limiting to any distributions made by the Escrow Agent or Settlement Administrator. Except as described in paragraph 6.19 of the Settlement Agreement, no Class Member shall have any claim against Plaintiff's Counsel, the Settlement Administrator, the Escrow Agent, or any of their respective designees or agents based on the distributions made substantially in accordance with the Settlement Agreement, the Court's Plan of Allocation Order(s), or other orders of the Court.

17. Any Class Member who receives a Distribution Check that he/she/it is not legally entitled to receive is hereby ordered to either (a) pay the appropriate portion(s) of the Distribution Check to the person(s) legally entitled to receive such portion(s) or (b) return the Distribution Check uncashed to the Settlement Administrator.

18. All matters regarding the administration of the Escrow Account and the taxation of funds in the Escrow Account or distributed from the Escrow Account shall be handled in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

19. Any order approving or modifying any Plan of Allocation Order, the application by Class Counsel for an award of attorneys' fees or reimbursement of Litigation Expenses, or the request

of Class Representatives for a Case Contribution Award shall be handled in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the documents referenced therein (to the extent the Settlement Agreement and documents referenced therein address such an order).

20. Plaintiff's Counsel, Plaintiff, and the Settlement Classes will only be liable for loss of any portion of the Escrow Account as described in paragraph 6.19 of the Settlement Agreement. Defendant shall have no liability for any such loss.

21. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, the Court (along with any appellate court with power to review the Court's orders and rulings in the Litigation) reserves exclusive and continuing jurisdiction to enter any orders as necessary to administer the Settlement Agreement, including jurisdiction to determine any issues relating to the payment and distribution of the Net Settlement Fund, and to enforce the Judgment.

22. In the event the Settlement is terminated as the result of a successful appeal of this Judgment or does not become Final and Non-Appealable in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement for any reason whatsoever, then this Judgment and all orders previously entered in connection with the Settlement shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated. The provisions of the Settlement Agreement relating to termination of the Settlement Agreement shall be complied with, including the refund of amounts in the Escrow Account to Defendant.

23. Without affecting the finality of this Judgment in any way, the Court (along with any appellate court with power to review the Court's orders and rulings in the Litigation) reserves exclusive and continuing jurisdiction to enter any orders as necessary to administer the Settlement Agreement, including jurisdiction to determine any issues relating to the payment and distribution of the Net Settlement Fund, to issue additional orders pertaining to, inter alia, Class Counsel's request for Plaintiff's attorneys' fees and reimbursement of reasonable Litigation Expenses and Class Representative's request for a Case Contribution Award, and to enforce this Final Judgment. Notwithstanding

the Court's jurisdiction to issue additional orders in this Litigation, this Judgment fully disposes of all claims as to Defendant and is therefore a final appealable judgment. The Court further hereby expressly directs the Clerk of the Court to file this Judgment as a final order and final judgment in this Litigation.

24. The purported objection filed on March 9, 2021 (Dkt. # 62), does not comply with the terms of the Court's Preliminary Approval Order with respect to objections. Setting that aside, the Court does not find the objection to have merit and it is expressly overruled. In the event any objector appeals this Order or any other rulings of this Court, such objector is hereby ordered to post a cash bond in an amount to be set by the Court sufficient to reimburse Class Counsel and Defendant's appellate fees and the lost interest to the Classes caused by the delay, at not less than two percent (2%) per annum.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 28th day of April, 2021.



CLAIRE V. EAGAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Approved as to Form:

/s/ Reagan E. Bradford

Reagan E. Bradford
Ryan K. Wilson
Bradford & Wilson PLLC
431 W. Main Street, Suite D
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 698-2770
Facsimile: (405) 234-5506
reagan@bradwil.com
ryan@bradwil.com

-and-

David R. Gleason, OBA #31066
Charles V. Knutter, OBA # 32035
Moricoli Kellogg & Gleason
211 N. Robinson
One Leadership Square, St. 1350
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Telephone: (405) 235-3357
Fax: (405) 232-6515
dgleason@moricoli.com
knutter@moricoli.com

CLASS COUNSEL

/s/ Stephen R. McNamara

Stephen R. McNamara, OBA #6071
Brian T. Inbody, OBA #17188
Hall, Estill, Hardwick, Gable, Golden
& Nelson, P.C.
320 South Boston Avenue, Suite 200
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103
Telephone: (918) 594-0400
Facsimile: (918) 594-0505

-and-

Travis P. Brown, OBA #20636
Lincoln C. Hatfield, OBA #32005
Scott R. Verplank, OBA #34041
MAHAFFEY & GORE, P.C.

300 N.E. 1st Street
Oklahoma City, OK 73104
Telephone: (405) 236-0478
Facsimile: (405) 236-1840
tbrown@mahaffeygore.com
lhatfield@mahaffeygore.com
sverplank@mahaffeygore.com

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

Exhibit 1

Seebell LLC
Citation 2002 Investment LP
Citation 2004 Investment LP
Citation 2004 Investment LTD
Citation Oil & Gas Corp.
Merit Energy Partners D-III LP
Merit Hugoton LP
Merit Partners LP
Ramsey Property Management LLC
Curtis W. Mewbourne, Trustee
GBK Corporation
GBK Investments LLC
Kaiser-Francis Anadarko LP
Kaiser-Francis Mid-Continent LP
Kaiser-Francis Oil Company
Kaiser-Francis Charitable Income Trust
Kaiser-Francis Special Account