1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Raul Perez (SBN 174687) Raul.Perez @capstonelawyers.com Orlando Villalba (SBN 232165) Orlando.Villalba@capstonelawyers.com Helga Hakimi (SBN 257381) Helga.Hakimi@capstonelawyers.com Joey Parsons (SBN 340074) Joey.Parsons@capstonelawyers.com CAPSTONE LAW APC 1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 556-4811 Facsimile: (310) 943-0396 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Joseph Kelly and Gilbert R								
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA								
10	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO								
11	JOSEPH KELLY, individually, and on behalf of	Case No. CIVDS1812287							
12	other members of the general public similarly situated,	Assigned to the Hon. Jessica Morgan							
13	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSE D] ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL							
14	VS.	APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AND MOTION FOR							
15	ARIZONA PIPELINE COMPANY, an Arizona corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES, AND CLASS							
16	Defendants.	REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT PAYMENTS							
17		Date: March 4, 2024							
18		Time: 8:30 a.m. Place: Department S26							
19		Complaint Filed: May 21, 2018							
20		Trial Date: None Set							
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
	Page 1								
		ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AND MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS? FEES COSTS AND EXPENSES AND CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT PAYMENTS							

MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES, COSTS AND EXPENSES, AND CLASS REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT PAYMENTS

This matter came before the Court for a hearing on the Motion for Final Approval of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs and Expenses, and Class Representative Enhancement Payments (collectively, the "Motions"). Due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members as required by the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and the Court having reviewed the Motions, and determining that the settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable, and otherwise being fully informed and GOOD CAUSE appearing therefore, it is hereby ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. For the reasons set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order, which are adopted and incorporated herein by reference, this Court finds that the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court have been satisfied.
- 2. This Order hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the terms and conditions of the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release ("Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement"), together with the definitions and terms used and contained therein.
- 3. The Court finds that it has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and over all parties to the action, including all members of the Settlement Class.
- 4. The Class Notice fully and accurately informed Class Members of all material elements of the proposed settlement and of their opportunity to opt out or object; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of California and due process. The Class Notice fairly and adequately described the settlement and provided Class Members with adequate instructions and a variety of means to obtain additional information.
- 5. Class Members were given a full opportunity to participate in the Final Approval hearing, and all Class Members and other persons wishing to be heard have been heard. Accordingly, the Court determines that all Class Members who did not timely and properly opt out of the settlement are bound by this Order.
- 6. The Court has considered all relevant factors for determining the fairness of the settlement and has concluded that all such factors weigh in favor of granting final approval. In particular, the Court finds that the settlement was reached following meaningful discovery and investigation

conducted by Plaintiffs' Counsel; that the settlement is the result of serious, informed, adversarial, and arm's-length negotiations between the Parties; and that the terms of the settlement are in all respects fair, adequate, and reasonable.

- 7. In so finding, the Court has considered all evidence presented, including evidence regarding the strength of Plaintiffs' case; the risk, expense, and complexity of the claims presented; the likely duration of further litigation; the amount offered in settlement; the extent of investigation and discovery completed; and the experience and views of counsel. The Parties have provided the Court with sufficient information about the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled, as well as the impediments to recovery, to make an independent assessment of the reasonableness of the terms to which the Parties have agreed.
- 8. Accordingly, the Court hereby approves the settlement as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and expressly finds that the settlement is, in all respects, fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the best interests of the entire Settlement Class and hereby directs implementation of all remaining terms, conditions, and provisions of the Settlement Agreement. 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 by the settlement in light of the challenges posed by continued litigation, the Court concludes that the settlement provides Class Members with fair and adequate relief.
- 9. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant or by any other Released Party, nor is this Order a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant or any other Released Party. 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, waiver of defenses, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant or any of the other Released Parties.
- 10. With the exception of the seven individual who opted out of the Settlement Class, final approval shall be with respect to: All persons who worked for Defendants as non-exempt, hourly paid employees in the State of California at any time from May 23, 2014 through May 27, 2023.
 - 11. Plaintiffs Joseph Kelly and Gilbert Romero are adequate and suitable representatives and

are hereby appointed the Class Representatives for the Settlement Class. The Court finds that Plaintiffs' investment and commitment to the litigation and its outcome ensured adequate and zealous advocacy for the Settlement Class, and that their interests are aligned with those of the Settlement Class.

- 12. The Court hereby awards Plaintiffs Class Representative Enhancement Payments of \$10,000, each, for their service on behalf of the Settlement Class, and for agreeing to general releases of all claims arising out of their employment with Defendant.
- 13. The Court finds that the attorneys at Capstone Law APC have the requisite qualifications, experience, and skill to protect and advance the interests of the Settlement Class. The Court therefore finds that counsel satisfy the professional and ethical obligations attendant to the position of Class Counsel, and hereby appoints Capstone Law APC as counsel for the Settlement Class.
- 14. The settlement of civil penalties under PAGA in the amount of \$100,000 is hereby approved. Seventy-Five Percent (75%), or \$75,000, shall be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency. The remaining Twenty-Five Percent (25%), or \$25,000, will be paid to PAGA Members.
- 15. The Court hereby awards \$750,000 in attorneys' fees and \$26,270.51 in costs and expenses to Capstone Law APC. The Court finds that the requested award of attorneys' fees is reasonable for a contingency fee in a class action such as this; i.e., one-third of the common fund created by the settlement. Counsel have also established the reasonableness of the requested award of attorneys' fees via their lodestar crosscheck, and the Court finds that the rates and hours billed are fair and reasonable.
- The Court approves settlement administration costs and expenses in the amount of \$22,000 to CPT Group, Inc.
- 17. All Class Members were given a full and fair opportunity to participate in the Approval Hearing, and all members of the Settlement Class wishing to be heard have been heard. Members of the Settlement Class also have had a full and fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the proposed settlement and the class. Accordingly, the terms of the Settlement Agreement and of the Court's Order and Judgment shall be forever binding on all Participating Class Members. These Participating Class Members have released and forever discharged the Released Parties for any and all Released Class

All claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, reasonably arising from, or reasonably related to, the same set of operative facts as those set forth in the operative complaint during the Class Period, including, but not limited to, claims for violation of: (1) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 510 and 1198 (unpaid overtime); (2) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 1182.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, and 1198 (unpaid minimum wages); (3) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7, 512(a), and 1198 (failure to provide meal periods); (4) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 1198 (failure to provide rest periods); (5) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226.7 and 1198 (failure to provide recovery periods); (6) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 226(a), 1174(d), and 1198 (non-compliant wage statements and failure to maintain payroll records); (7) Cal. Lab. Code §§ 201 and 202 (wages not timely paid upon termination); (8) Labor Code § 1198 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Cal. Lab. Code § 11160 Subdivision 5(A) (failure to provide reporting time pay); (9) Cal. Lab. Code § 2802 (unreimbursed business expenses); (10) California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. (unlawful business practices); and (11) California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq. (unfair business practices).

- 18. Additionally, all PAGA Members and the LWDA have released and forever discharged the Released Parties for any and all Released PAGA Claims during the PAGA Period: All claims for civil penalties under California Labor Code §§ 2698, et seq., that were brought in the operative complaint or could reasonably have been brought based on the facts alleged in Plaintiffs' LWDA letter during the PAGA Period.
- 19. Judgment in this matter is entered in accordance with the above findings. Without affecting the finality of the Judgment, the Court shall retain exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the above-captioned action and the parties under Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 664.4, including all Participating Settlement Members and PAGA Members, for purposes of enforcing the terms of the Judgment entered herein.
- 20. The Court sets a compliance hearing for February 13, 2025 at 8:30 a.m., at which time the Court will consider evidence that the distribution process is complete and that a final accounting may be approved. Plaintiffs shall file a declaration from the Settlement Administrator regarding the completion of settlement administration activities no later than January 10, 2025, as well as an amended judgment regarding the distribution of unclaimed residuals to Worksafe.

	IT IS S	o or	DEREI	D, ADJUDGE	D, AND	DEC	REED	1
d:	3	4	24					1

Dated: 3 9 2

Hon. Jessica Morgan

San Bernardino County Superior Court Judge

Page 5

1

2

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28