

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Schweiger v. Ultra Clean Holdings, Inc.

No. 25-cv-02768-JSC (N.D. Cal. June 27, 2025) · No. No. 25-cv-02768-JSC · Decided June 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California grants Ergül İlaslan’s unopposed motion for appointment as lead plaintiff in a putative securities class action against Ultra Clean Holdings, Inc. and related defendants. The court finds that İlaslan has the largest financial interest, satisfies the adequacy and typicality requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and approves Rosen Law Firm P.A. as lead counsel.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jacqueline Scott Corley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 27, 2025
DOCKET	No. 25-cv-02768-JSC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Putative class action plaintiff Ofir Schweiger filed a securities-fraud complaint. Four putative class members moved for appointment as lead plaintiff and approval of lead counsel; after withdrawals and a statement of non-opposition, the court considered Mr. İlaslan's unopposed motion.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the PSLRA's statutory presumption favoring the movant with the largest financial interest who timely responds to notice and makes a prima facie showing of Rule 23 adequacy and typicality. The presumption may be rebutted only by proof that the presumptive lead plaintiff will not fairly and adequately protect the class or is subject to unique defenses.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court order

TOPICS

- securities fraud
- class actions
- civil procedure
- corporate law

PRACTICE AREAS

securities litigation

class actions

civil procedure

corporate law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Mr. İlaslan should be appointed lead plaintiff under the PSLRA.
2. Whether Mr. İlaslan's selection of Rosen Law as lead counsel should be approved.

HOLDINGS

1. Mr. İlaslan was entitled to the PSLRA's presumption of being the most adequate plaintiff because he timely moved in response to notice, demonstrated the largest financial interest in the litigation, and made a prima facie showing of adequacy and typicality under Rule 23. No competing movant rebutted that presumption.
2. The court approved Mr. İlaslan's selection of Rosen Law as lead counsel because the firm demonstrated extensive securities-fraud litigation experience and was a reasonable choice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court must appoint ‘as lead plaintiff the member or members of the purported plaintiff class that the court determines to be most capable of adequately representing the interests of class members.’” (Discussion I)

“This presumption ‘may be rebutted only upon proof by a member of the purported plaintiff class that the presumptively most adequate plaintiff—’” (Discussion I)

“‘[I]f the lead plaintiff has made a reasonable choice of counsel, the district court should generally defer to that choice.’” (Discussion II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The complaint alleges that Ultra Clean Holdings and two individual defendants made materially false and misleading statements and omissions that artificially inflated the company's stock price, violating the Securities Exchange Act and related regulations. Mr. İlaslan purchased 1,500 shares during the class period and claimed losses of \$23,580. The other movants either withdrew their motions, acknowledged that they lacked the largest financial interest, or filed a statement of non-opposition.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was instituted under Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act and related regulations. Following publication and filing of notice, multiple class members sought lead-plaintiff appointment. The court granted Mr. İlaslan's motion, appointed him class representative, approved Rosen Law as lead counsel, and directed the parties to meet and confer as required by a prior docket order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Cavanaugh, 306 F.3d 726, 729 (9th Cir. 2002)
- In re Mersho, 6 F.4th 891, 899-900 (9th Cir. 2021)
- Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp., 657 F.3d 970, 985 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Hessefort v. Super Micro Computer, Inc., 317 F. Supp. 3d 1056, 1061 (N.D. Cal. 2018)
- Ali v. Intel Corp., No. 18-cv-00507-YGR, 2018 WL 2412111, at *3 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2018)
- City of Dearborn Heights Act 345 Police & Fire Ret. Sys. v. Align Tech., Inc., No. 12-cv-06039-LHK, 2013 WL 2368059, at *4 (N.D. Cal. May 29, 2013)
- Cohen v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for N. Dist. of California, 586 F.3d 703, 712 (9th Cir. 2009)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/schweiger-v-ultra-clean-holdings-inc-0hx2cgak>