1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Joseph Lavi, Esq. (SBN 209776) Vincent C. Granberry, Esq. (SBN 276483) Eve Howe, Esq. (SBN 350007) Eric J. Naessig, Esq. (SBN 343081) LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP 8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200 Beverly Hills, California 90211 Telephone: (310) 432-0000 Facsimile: (310) 432-0001 Email: jlavi@lelawfirm.com vgranberry@lelawfirm.com ehowe@lelawfirm.com enaessig@lelawfirm.com Attorneys for Plaintiff LOBURDES VENTURA on behalf of herself and others similarly situated	FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 04/01/2025 Dawld W. Stayton, Executive Officer/Clerk of Court By: I. Arellanes Deputy HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS A	NGELES—CENTRAL DISTRICT
11	LOBURDES VENTURA, on behalf of herself and other aggrieved employees,	Case No.: 21STCV33483
12	Plaintiff,	CLASS AND PAGA ACTION
13	Vs.	[Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable
14	BLUE CHIP 2000 COMMERCIAL	Kenneth R. Freeman, Dept. 14]
15	CLEANING, INC.; and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,	
16 17	Defendants.	MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
18		Hearing Information:
19		Date: April 1, 2025 Time: 10:00 a.m.
20		Dept.: 14
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Plaintiff LOBURDES VENTURA ("Plaintiff") against Defendant BLUE CHIP

The above captioned action is a putative class action and representative lawsuit brought by

Defendant denies all alleged wrongdoing, denies any liability to the Plaintiff, to members of the putative class, and to allegedly aggrieved employees, and denies that Plaintiff's claims are appropriate for class or representative treatment.

On September 3, 2024, this Court entered an order granting preliminary approval of the class action settlement, resulting in preliminary certification of the following class for settlement purposes only: all non-exempt hourly employees who work or worked for Defendant in California from September 10, 2017, through March 17, 2023.

The Court further directed the Plaintiff to provide notice to the class, which informed absent class members about information about the settlement, including: (a) the proposed settlement, and the settlement's key terms; (b) the date, time and location of the Final Approval Hearing; (c) the right of any Class Member to object to the proposed settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; (d) the right of any class member to exclude themselves from the proposed settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; and (e) an explanation of the procedures for class members to participate in the proposed settlement.

The Court, upon notice having been given as required in the preliminary approval order, and having considered the proposed settlement agreement as well as all papers filed, hereby **ORDERS AND ENTERS JUDGMENT AS FOLLOWS**:

2728

- 1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and over the Parties, including all members of the settlement class.
- 2. The Court finds that the class is properly certified as a class for settlement purposes only.
- 3. The notice provided to the class members conforms with the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Civil Code section 1781, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, the Court's order granting preliminary approval, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all class members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the other class members. The notice was adequate, fully satisfied the requirements of due process, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances.
- 4. The Court finds the settlement was entered into in good faith, that the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and that the settlement satisfies the standards and applicable requirements for final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.
- 5. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, or by any other released party, nor is this Order and Judgment a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant or any other released party. Neither this Order and Judgment, 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 or any of the other released parties.
 - 6. No Class Members have objected to the terms of the Settlement.
- 7. One class member has requested to be excluded from the Settlement: Olegaria Canuz Ruiz De Gomez.
- 8. Defendant shall fund the gross settlement amount of Six Hundred Thirty Thousand Dollars (\$630,000.00), plus the amount necessary to pay Defendant's share of payroll taxes, all

within 14 days after all of the following have occurred: (1) The court gives final approval to the proposed settlement; (2) The court enters final judgment; and (3) The time within which to appeal any final judgment has expired.

- 8. In addition to any recovery that Plaintiff may receive under the Settlement, and in recognition of the Plaintiff's efforts on behalf of the settlement class, the Court hereby approves the payment of an incentive award to the Plaintiff in the amount of \$5,000.00, payable from the gross settlement amount pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 9. The Court approves the payment of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the sum of \$210,000.00, and the reimbursement of litigation expenses in the sum of \$17,319.42, both payable from the gross settlement amount and pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement. Both are reasonable amounts. The reasonableness of the fee award is determined based on a reasonable percentage of a common fund obtained for the class. The court also has considered the lodestar amount. Awarding fees on a percentage basis encourages efficient litigation practices and reflects the actual benefit obtained for the class.
- 10. The Court approves the payment of \$50,000.00 to civil penalties pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, payable from the gross settlement amount. Seventy-five percent of this amount, \$37,500.00, will be paid to the Labor Workforce Development Agency and twenty-five percent, \$12,500.00, will be paid to the Aggrieved Employees as defined in and pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 11. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of \$15,000.00 to CPT Group, Inc. for performance of settlement administration services pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement. This amount will be payable from the gross settlement amount and pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 12. The Court approves and orders funding of the settlement in compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement, including the payment and disbursement schedule.
- 13. Following 180 days after the settlement administrator mails the individual settlement payments to the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees; any monies and interest remaining from

1	uncashed checks shall be sent to the Controller of the State of California to be held in the class	
2	member's name until claimed pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, Code Civ. Proc. §§1500.	
3	14. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(g), the Court grants final approval of the	
4	Settlement Agreement and declares, that the Settlement Agreement binding on Plaintiff, all Class	
5	Members who have not opted out, and all Aggrieved Employees, all of whom will release the	
6	Released Parties from the released claims as set forth by the approved Settlement Agreement.	
7	15. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over all matters related to the administration and	
8	consummation of the terms of this Settlement, over the enforcement, construction and interpretation	
9	of the Settlement Agreement, over the enforcement, construction, and interpretation of the Final	
10	Judgment, including, but not limited to, the provisions therein enjoining any further litigation of	
11	Released Claims, and over the Representative Plaintiff and all Class Members (and their attorneys	
12	and law firms) in connection therewith.	
13	16. The Plaintiff shall file a report for the settlement administrator by	
14	}[[] A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	
15	to the class members and confirming the distribution of funds, indicating the total amount paid to the	
16	class members and confirming that all funds, including uncashed funds, have been disbursed.	
17	17. A non-appearance case review re Compliance with the Distribution is set for	
18	<u> </u>	
19	18. The Court hereby enters Judgment in the case, which will be res judicata as to the	
20	released claims of Plaintiffs, Class Members, and Aggrieved Employees.	
21		
22	IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.	
23	1 44B 4 B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	
24	Dated: 04/01/2025	
25	-Hon. Kenneth R. Freeman- Judge of the Superior Court	
26		
27		
28		