4		
7	ELECTRONICALL RECEIVED - 2/7/2024 5:	05 PM - By: Cola Iniguez Solorio, DEPUTY
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT MAR () 4 2024 BY JESSICA MORALES, DEPUTY
9	FOR THE COUNTY O	F SAN BERNARDINO
10 11	Gilbert Gonzales, an individual,	CASE NO. CIVSB2204728
12	Plaintiff,	[Assigned to Honorable Jessica Morgan, Department S-26]
13	VS.	CLASS ACTION
14	LRB Millwork & Casework, Inc., a California corporation; Rene Alberto Bernhardt, an individual; and Does 1-10, inclusive,	[PROPOSED] ORDER FINALLY
15 16	Defendants.	APPROVING CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
17		SETTLEMENT PURSUANT TO THE TERMS OF JOINT STIPULATION AND RELEASE OF CLASS ACTION
18		RELEASE OF CLASS ACTION
19		Date: March 4, 2024 [Reserved] Time: 8:30 a.m.
20 21		Dept.: S-26
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27 28		
28	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION	
	[PKOPOSED] OKDEK GKANTING FINAL APPKOVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION	

[PROPOSED] ORDER & JUDGMENT

Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of the proposed settlement of this Action on the terms set forth in the Joint Stipulation of Settlement and Release of Class Action (the "Settlement" or "Stipulation") came on for hearing on March 4, 2024.

In conformity with California Rules of Court, rule 3.769, with due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members (as defined in the Stipulation), and having considered the supplemental declaration of the Settlement Administrator, Stipulation, 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 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 and enters final judgment as follows:

- 1. All terms used in this order shall have the same meaning as used and/or defined in the Parties' Stipulation and Plaintiff's Motion for Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. A copy of the Stipulation is attached to the Declaration of Elliot J. Siegel in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement as **Exhibit 1** and is made a part of this Order.¹
- 2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties to this litigation and subject matter jurisdiction to approve the Settlement and all exhibits thereto.
 - 3. The Court finally certifies the Class as defined in the Stipulation and as follows:
 - "All current and former non-exempt, hourly employees of Defendants who worked at least one shift in California from March 28, 2018, to the date of Preliminary Approval of this Settlement, or September 27, 2023, whichever occurs first."
- 4. The Court deems this definition sufficient for the purpose of rule 3.765(a) of the California Rules of Court for the purpose of effectuating the Settlement.
- 5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of 66 Participating Class Members exists and a well-defined community of interest exists on the questions of law and fact involved because in the context of the Settlement: (i) all related matters, predominate over any individual questions;

¹ The Court previously granted preliminary approval of the Settlement on October 27, 2023

(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 finds that the Settlement 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.
- 7. The Court finds that the Settlement constitutes a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the Class's claims and will avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as the delay and risks to the Parties if they were to continue to litigate the case. After considering the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement, in light of the challenges posed by continued litigation, the Court concludes that Class Counsel secured significant relief for Class Members.
- 8. The Court hereby approves the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and finds that the Settlement 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.
- 9. 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 the prospective Class Members of the Settlement terms, their right to do nothing and receive their settlement share, their right to submit a request for exclusion, their rights to comment on or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval and Fairness 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. zero Class Member(s) filed written objections to the Settlement as part of this notice process; zero Class Member(s) filed a written statement of intention to appear at the Final Approval and Fairness Hearing; and zero Class Member(s) submitted a request for exclusion. Those Class

Members who requested exclusion, specifically none, will not be bound by the Settlement and will not receive any portion of the Net Settlement Amount.

- 10. The Court appoints Plaintiff Gilbert Gonzales as Class Representative and finds him to be adequate.
- 11. The Court appoints Elliot J. Siegel, Julian Burns King, and Brent R. Boos of King & Siegel LLP as Class Counsel, and finds each of them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in class action litigation.
- 12. The terms of the Settlement Agreement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$300,000.00 and the allocation for determining Individual Settlement Payments, are fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and to each Class Member, and the Court grants final approval of the Settlement as set forth in the Stipulation, subject to this Order.
- 13. The Court further approves the following distributions from the Gross Settlement Amount, which fall within the ranges stipulated by and through the Settlement Agreement:
 - a. The amount of \$10,000 designated for payment to the Settlement Administrator is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of it and orders the Parties to make the payment to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the Stipulation.
 - b. The amount requested by Plaintiff and Class Counsel for the Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, representing one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount or \$100,000.00 is fair and reasonable in light of the benefits obtained for the Class.² The Court grants final approval of, awards, and orders the Class Counsel fees payment to be made in accordance with the Stipulation.
 - c. The Court awards Class Counsel \$13,033.87 in litigation costs, which is an amount which the Court finds to be reflective of the actual and reasonable costs incurred.
 The Court grants final approval of Class Counsel's litigation expenses payment and orders

² Class Counsel's fee request is supported by its lodestar cross-check, and the Court finds that Class Counsel's time was spent reasonable and approves Class Counsel's hourly rates as fair and reasonable.

payment of this amount to be made in accordance with the Stipulation.

- d. The \$10,000.00 class representative incentive payment requested for Named Plaintiff is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of the payment and orders the payment to be made in accordance with the Stipulation.
- e. The Court approves of the \$25,000.00 allocation assigned for claims under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, and orders 75% thereof (*i.e.*, \$18,750.00) to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. The remainder is to be paid to the Aggrieved Employees per the Stipulation.
- 14. The Court orders the Parties to comply with and carry out all terms and provisions of the Stipulation, to the extent that the terms thereunder do not contradict this Order, in which case the provisions of this order shall take precedence and supersede the Stipulation.
- 15. All Participating Class Members shall be bound by the Settlement and this Order, including the release of claims as set forth in the Stipulation. In addition, the State of California and the Aggrieved Employees are bound by the Settlement and release of PAGA claims set forth in this Order and Judgment.
- 16. The Parties shall bear their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in this Order and the Stipulation.
- 17. All checks mailed to the Class Members must be cashed within 180 days after mailing.

 Any envelope transmitting a settlement distribution to a class member shall bear the notation,

 "YOUR CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CHECK IS ENCLOSED."
- 18. Plaintiff shall file with the Court a report regarding the status of distribution no later than fifty (50) days after all funds have been distributed.
- 19. The Court approves the California Bar's Justice Gap Fund, located at 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105, as the *cy pres* beneficiary and finds that it complies with all requirements under C.C.P. § 384(a)-(b). Per Section 384(b), the Court will amend this Judgment after Class Counsel provides the Court with the report regarding distribution of funds to direct that any uncashed funds be paid to the California Bar's Justice Gap Fund. Funds shall only be paid to

the Justice Gap Fund from those checks that remain uncashed after the Void Date and after the supplemental mailing set forth above.

- 20. No later than 10 days from this Order, the Settlement Administrator shall give notice of judgment to Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) by posting a copy of this Order and Final Judgment on its website assigned to this matter.
- 21. The Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the Action and the Settlement, including jurisdiction pursuant to rule 3.769(h) of the California Rules of Court and Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6, solely for purposes of (a) enforcing the Settlement, (b) addressing settlement administration matters, and (c) addressing such post-judgment matters as may be appropriate under court rules or applicable law.
- 22. This final judgment is intended to be a final disposition of the above-captioned action in its entirety and is intended to be immediately appealable. This final judgment resolves all claims released by the Settlement against Defendants.
- 23. The Court hereby sets a hearing date of 3.4.25 at 8.30 a.m./p.m. for a hearing on the final accounting and distribution of the settlement funds. Counsel shall file with the Court a report regarding the status of distribution at least five days before the hearing and not more than 21 days after the Void Date.³ Class Counsel shall also file with the report a proposed amended judgment that complies with C.C.P. § 384.5.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.

23 DAT

³ The report shall be in the form of a declaration from the Settlement Administrator and shall describe (i) the date the checks were mailed, (ii) the total number of checks mailed to class members, (iii) the average amount of those checks, (iv) the number of checks that remain uncashed, (v) the total value of those uncashed checks, (vi) the average amount of the uncashed checks, and (vii) the neture and date of the disposition of those unclaimed funds.

Hon. Jessica Morgan

San Bernardino County Superior Court Judge

nature and date of the disposition of those unclaimed funds.