

1. The Court hereby certifies a class solely for the purposes of settlement under Federal Rules of Procedure 23(a) and 23(b)(3) as defined in the Settlement Agreement and Release, ECF No. 69-3 Ex. 1, as amended by the Court's Orders of June 15, 2016, ECF No. 89, and June 21, 2016, ECF No. 95;
2. The individuals who submitted timely notices of their intent to opt out of the settlement class, see ECF No. 107-1 Ex. C, are hereby excluded from the settlement class and are not bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement and Release or this Order;
3. The Court hereby grants final approval to the Settlement Agreement and Release, ECF No. 69-3 Ex. 1, as amended by the Court's Orders of June 15, 2016, ECF No. 89, and June 21, 2016, ECF No. 95;
4. Defendants shall pay Class Counsel, as appointed in the Court's January 6, 2016 Order, ECF No. 72, the sum of \$2,100,000 as attorneys' fees and expenses; and
5. Defendants shall pay \$4,000 each to the Named Plaintiffs Joshua Skeen, Laurie Freeman, Scott Lamb, Gina Romaggi, Emmanuel Nomikos, Gregory Abbott, Vicki [*86] Blasucci, Scott Bookhout, Michelle Colberg, Kevin Kebabjian, Marta Motel, Ginger Roach, James Stoecker, Heather Swango, Patricia Curran, Maryanne Howland, Candi Sossa, and Richard Kahn as service awards.

Date: 26 July 2016

/s/ William H. Walls

William H. Walls

Senior United States District Court Judge

**Citibank, N.A., etc., Appellant, vs. Martin and Jitka Olsak,
Appellees.**

No. 3D15-1032

COURT OF APPEAL OF FLORIDA, THIRD DISTRICT

**208 So. 3d 227; 2016 Fla. App. LEXIS 17683; 41 Fla. L. Weekly D
2658**

November 30, 2016, Opinion Filed

PRIOR HISTORY: [*1] An Appeal from the Circuit Court for Monroe County, Lower Tribunal No. 09-1063-K. Donald C. Evans, Senior Judge.

CASE SUMMARY:

OVERVIEW: HOLDINGS: [1]-In a foreclosure action, reversal was required because the trial court based its standing conclusion exclusively on an expert's legal opinions regarding matters of questionable relevance, and opinion testimony of experts amounting to conclusions of law was inadmissible because the determination of such questions was exclusively within the trial court's province; [2]-Furthermore, while the expert testified that

For internal use only