	Superior Sources Sumorria, Sourcey or Sur	na Barbara, on 17 172022
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ACKERMANN & TILAJEF, P.C. Craig J. Ackermann (SBN 229832) cja@ackermanntilajef.com 1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 610 Los Angeles, California 90035 Telephone: (310) 277-0614 Facsimile: (310) 277-0635 MELMED LAW GROUP, P.C. Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218) jm@melmedlaw.com 1801 Century Park East, Suite 850 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 824-3828 Facsimile: (310) 862-6851	FILED SUPERIOR COURT of CALIFORNIA COUNTY of SANTA BARBARA 05/10/2022 Darrel E. Parker, Executive Officer BY Chavez, Terri Deputy Clerk
10 11	Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Proposed Settlement Class, the LWDA, and the Aggrieved Employees.	
12 13	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA FOR COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
14 15 16	ANA MARIA GUERRERO, an individual, on behalf of the State of California, as a private attorney general, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No: Case No. 18CV05341 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
17	Plaintiff,	FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
18 19	V.	Date: May 6, 2022 Time: 10:00 a.m.
20	ADVANCED VISION SCIENCE, INC., a California Corporation, and DOES 1 to 50, inclusive,	Dept: SB4 Judge: Hon. Donna Geck
21 22	Defendant.	
23		
24 25		
26		
27		
28		
	-1	-

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

Pursuant to CRC 2.259 this document has been electronically filed by the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara, on 4/14/2022

On May 6, 2022, the Court held a hearing on Plaintiff Ana Maria Guerrero's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs between Plaintiff and Defendant Advanced Vision Science, Inc., and DOES 1 to 50, inclusive ("Defendant") (collectively, the "Parties").

Due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members, and the Court having considered the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release (the "Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement"), all of the legal authorities and documents submitted in support thereof, all papers filed and proceedings had herein, all oral and written comments received regarding the proposed settlement, and having reviewed the record in this litigation, and good cause appearing, the Court GRANTS final approval of the Settlement and ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS:

- 1. All terms used in this Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement (the "Order") shall have the same meanings given as those terms are used and/or defined in the Parties' Settlement Agreement.¹
- 2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties to this litigation and subject matter jurisdiction to approve this Settlement and all exhibits thereto.
- 3. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally certifies the Class, as defined in the Agreement and as follows:
 - "...all current and former California non-exempt hourly-paid employees who are or were employed by Defendant in the State of California, from October 30, 2014, through July 30, 2021 (the "Class Period")".
- 4. The Court deems this definition sufficient for the purpose of California Rule of Court 3.765(a) and for the purpose of effectuating the Settlement.
- 5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of 132 Class Members exists and a well-defined community of interests exists in the questions of law and fact involved because in the context of the Settlement: (i) all related matters, predominate over any individual questions; (ii) the claims of the Plaintiff are typical of claims of the Class Members; and (iii) in negotiating, entering

into and implementing the Settlement, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interest of the Class Members.

- 6. The Court is satisfied that CPT Group, Inc., which functioned as the Settlement Administrator, completed the distribution of Class Notice to the Class in a manner that comports with California Rule of Court 3.766. The Class Notice informed 132 Class Members of the Settlement terms, their rights to do nothing and receive their settlement share, their rights to submit a request for exclusion, their rights to comment on or object to the Settlement, and their rights to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time to respond and to act were provided by each of these procedures.
- 7. Not a single Class Member filed or submitted a written objection to the Settlement as part of this notice process.
 - 8. Not a single Class Member opted out of the Settlement.
- 9. The Court hereby approves the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement, including the \$240,000.00 gross settlement amount, and finds that the Settlement Agreement is, in all respects, fair, adequate, and reasonable, consistent and compliant with all applicable requirements of the California Code of Civil Procedure, the California and United States Constitutions, including the Due Process clauses, the California Rules of Court, and any other applicable law, and in the best interests of each of the Parties and Class Members. The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms, and declares this Settlement Agreement to be binding on all Participating Class Members.
- 10. The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms and declares the Settlement Agreement to be binding on all Participating Class Members.
- 11. The Court finds that the Settlement Agreement has been reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations. The Court further finds that the Parties have conducted extensive investigation and research, and their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions.
- 12. The Court also finds that Settlement now will avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the

case. Additionally, after considering the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement in light of the challenges posed by continued litigation, and the Court concludes that Class Counsel secured significant relief for Class Members.

- 13. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Order a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither this Order, the Settlement Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement Agreement, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant.
- 14. The Court confirms Ana Maria Guerrero as Class Representative and finds her to be adequate.
- 15. The Court confirms Craig J. Ackermann and Avi Kreitenberg of Ackermann & Tilajef, P.C. and Jonathan Melmed of Melmed Law Group, P.C. as Class Counsel, and finds each of them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in similar class action litigation.
- 16. The terms of the Agreement, including the gross settlement amount of \$240,000.00, and the individual Settlement Shares, are fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and to each Class Member, and the Court grants final approval of the Settlement set forth in the Agreement, subject to this Order. The Court approves the following allocations, which fall within the ranges stipulated by and through the Settlement Agreement:
 - a. The \$7,500.00 designated for payment to CPT Group, Inc., the Settlement Administrator, is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Parties to make, the payment to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the Agreement.
 - b. The \$80,000.00 requested by Plaintiff and Class Counsel for the Class Counsel's attorneys' fees is fair and reasonable in light of the benefit obtained for the Class. The Court grants final approval of, awards, and orders the Class Counsel Fees Payment to be made in accordance with the Agreement.
 - c. The Court awards \$4,446.93 in litigation costs, an amount which the Court finds to be reflective of the reasonable costs incurred. The Court grants final approval of,

and orders the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment in this amount to be made in accordance with the Agreement, and divided between counsel in proportion with their respective costs expenditures.²

- d. The \$8,500.00 requested by Plaintiff for her Class Representative Payment is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Class Representative Payment to be made in accordance with the Agreement.
- e. The Court grants final approval of the \$10,000.00 PAGA payment, 75% of which shall be paid to the LWDA and orders the payment to be made in accordance with the Agreement.
- 17. The Court orders the Parties to comply with and carry out all terms and provisions of the Settlement, to the extent that the terms thereunder do not contradict or conflict with this Order, in which case the provisions of this Order shall take precedence and supersede the Settlement.
- 18. Nothing in the Settlement or this Order purports to extinguish or waive Defendant's rights to continue to oppose the merits of the claims in this Action or class treatment of these claims in this case if the Settlement fails to become final or effective, or in any other case without limitation. The Settlement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Order or the subsequent Judgment that Plaintiff has asked the Court to enter based on this Order a finding of the validity of any allegations against Defendant in the Court proceeding or any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither the Settlement nor this Order or the subsequent Court Judgment is a finding that certification of the Class is proper for any purpose or proceeding other than for settlement purposes.
 - 19. All Participating Class Members shall be bound by the Settlement and this Order,

² The Settlement Agreement contemplates litigation cost reimbursement in the amount of up to \$5,000.00 which was already preliminarily approved by this Court and noticed to the Class, however, Plaintiff's counsel is only requesting reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$4,446.93, with the balance added to the Net Settlement Amount to be distributed to the Participating Class Members.

including the Released Claims³ in favor of Defendant and the other Released Parties⁴ as set forth in the Agreement, and are permanently barred and enjoined from prosecuting against Defendants and the other Released Parties any and all of Class Members' Released Claims as defined in the Agreement.

- 20. Plaintiff and the 132 participating class members are bound to the release of claims against Defendants and the other Released Parties as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and is permanently barred from prosecuting against Defendants and the other Released Parties any and all of Plaintiffs' Released Claims as defined in the Agreement.
- 21. The Parties shall bear their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in the Settlement Agreement.
- 22. The Court approves the one hundred eighty (180) day period for cashing of checks. Any funds associated with stale checks that have not been cashed within ninety days (90) days will be deemed void and the Settlement Administrator will provide any funds remaining in the QSF as a result of uncashed checks to the California State Controller in accordance with California Unclaimed Property Law, including the administration of related tax reimbursements; and for such other tasks as the Parties mutually agree.
- 23. The Settlement Administrator, within five (5) days of the date of this Order, shall give notice to the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 3.771(b) of the California Rules of Court, by posting a copy of this order and judgment on its website for 60 days.
- 24. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h), the Court retains jurisdiction solely for purposes of implementing the terms of the settlement, such as requiring the filing of a final report on distributions made to the Class Members, enforcing the Settlement Agreement, addressing

³ "Released Claims" means all claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, arising from the same set of operative facts as those set forth in Plaintiff's LWDA letter and/or Plaintiff's Class and Representative Action Complaint, arising during the Class Period, including claims for Defendant's alleged violation of California Labor Code sections 201, 202, 203, 226, 226.7, 510, 512, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1199, as well as Sections 3, 7, 11 and 12 of IWC Wage Order No. 1, and section 17200 et Seq. of. the California Business and Professions Code, based on the foregoing, as well as any civil penalty claims predicated on the claims alleged in Plaintiff's LWDA letter and/or Complaint under PAGA, Labor Code 2699 et seq., including all underlying Labor Code violations alleged or that reasonably could have been alleged based on the facts and legal theories contained in the operative Complaint and the LWDA letter. (*See* S.A. ¶ 25).

⁴ "Released Parties" means Advanced Vision Science, Inc., its parents, subsidiaries, affiliated entities, past or present officers, directors, employees, agents, principals, heirs, representatives, accountants, auditors, consultants, insurers and reinsurers, and their respective successors and predecessors in interest, subsidiaries, affiliates, parents and attorneys, if any, and any entities that may be considered joint employers. (*See* S.A. ¶ 26).