

John Nemelka filed an objection to the settlement date June 15, 2016, objecting to the caps on reimbursements for Class members whose timing chain or timing chain tensioners were repaired at independent service centers. ECF No. 100. Mr. Nemelka states that, in December 2015, he had his Class Vehicle repaired at an independent service center, rather than at his local BMW dealership, to "save money." *Id.* at 1. The repair cost \$1,778.45. *Id.* Mr. Nemelka correctly states that, had the repair been done at the BMW dealership, he would be entitled to a full reimbursement under the settlement terms. Because the repair was conducted by a third party, he is entitled to only \$970.

To repeat, Defendants informed Class members of the alleged timing chain and tensioner defect in October 2014 and instructed them to seek repairs, free of charge (and subject to a full reimbursement), at authorized MINI service centers. See ECF No. 86-6 Ex. 1. Plaintiffs explain that Defendants required a cap on reimbursements for repairs from third-party service centers because they have no control over the prices charged [*44] at third-party centers. Particularly in light of the early disclosure about repairs at authorized MINI service centers, the Court finds that the cap on reimbursements for repairs at independent service centers is not unreasonable.

p. Objection of James Jones

James Jones submitted an objection, dated June 19, 2016, that was filed in this Court on June 29, 2016. ECF No. 101. Mr. Jones objects to the settlement on three grounds: first, that the settlement does not provide relief for owners of Class Vehicles that have not yet displayed any defects; second, that the documentation requirement for reimbursement is unduly burdensome, especially for the owners of used Class Vehicles; and third, that the final approval hearing should not be held until the deadline to submit objections has expired.

The Court disagrees with Mr. Jones's first and second objections for the reasons already discussed; the settlement allows Class members to receive repairs and replacements of allegedly defective parts even if their vehicles have not displayed damage, and Class members are in a better position than Defendants to document their vehicles' histories. With regard to the third objection, the fairness hearing [*45] was held on July 14, 2016, after the July 1, 2016 deadline for N14 Class members to submit objections under the Court's supplemental notice program. See ECF No. 89.

q. Objection of Shirley M. Stipe-Zendle

Docket number 102, filed as an objection to the settlement on June 29, 2016, appears instead to be a claim for reimbursement for timing chain tensioner/timing chain repair or replacement submitted by Class member Shirley M. Stipe-Zendle. ECF No. 102. The document contains no objection to the settlement. Plaintiffs state that they have provided the document to the Claims Administrator for processing as a claim. ECF No. 107 at 7.

r. Objection of Julie A. Clifford

Julie Ann Clifford submitted an objection to the settlement that was filed on June 29, 2016. ECF No. 103. Ms. Clifford objects to the settlement on three grounds: (a) the documentation requirement for engine repair reimbursement unreasonably requires the

For internal use only