

1  
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  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

In re RIPPLE LABS INC. LITIGATION

Case No. 4:18-cv-06753-PJH

This Document Relates To:  
All Actions

**[PROPOSED] ORDER AMENDING  
NOVEMBER 12, 2024 ORDER  
GRANTING JOINT MOTION FOR  
ENTRY OF JUDGMENT AND STAY AS  
MODIFIED BY THE COURT (ECF NO.  
442)**

Pursuant to Plaintiff’s foregoing Unopposed Motion, and for good cause shown, this Court GRANTS the Unopposed Motion to Amend November 12, 2024 Order Granting Joint Motion For Entry of Judgment and Stay as Modified by the Court (ECF No. 442). The Court finds, based on the record and for the reasons provided by the Parties in their Joint Motion for Entry of Final Judgment and to Stay (ECF No. 437), that there is no just reason to delay entry of judgment pursuant to Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as to Plaintiff’s class claims that were resolved

1 in Defendants’ favor in the Court’s Order and Opinion Granting In Part and Denying In Part  
2 Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 419). The instruction to the Clerk to enter  
3 judgment in Defendants’ favor on Plaintiff’s following four class claims stands:

- 4 1. Violation of Section 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act (Title 15 U.S.C. § 77l(a)(1)) against  
5 defendants for the unregistered offer and sale of securities;
- 6 2. Violation of Section 15 of the Securities Act (Title 15 U.S.C. § 77o) against defendant  
7 Ripple and defendant Garlinghouse for control person liability for the primary violation  
8 of Title 15 U.S.C. § 77l(a)(1);
- 9 3. Violation of California Corporations Code § 25503 against defendants for a primary  
10 violation of § 25110’s restriction on the offer or sale of unregistered securities;
- 11 4. Violation of California Corporations Code § 25504 against defendant Ripple and  
12 defendant Garlinghouse for control person liability in connection with defendants’  
13 primary violation of § 25110.

14 Plaintiff’s Fourth Claim for Relief under § 25501 against defendant Ripple and defendant  
15 XRP II and § 25504.1 against defendant Ripple and defendant Garlinghouse, *see* First Am. Compl.  
16 ¶¶ 197–206, remains STAYED until the final resolution of any and all appeals of the class claims.  
17 Within 30 days after final resolution of the appeal of the class claims, the parties shall file a joint  
18 motion to lift the stay on the docket in this case.

19  
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21  
22 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_, 2024

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 THE HONORABLE PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
25 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
26  
27  
28