

26

27

28



SEP 2 9 2023

By: V. Secaur

**ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVED** 

Superior Court of California, County of San Diego

08/21/2023 at 02:10:27 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court By Malka Manneh, Deputy Clerk

## SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

LOVELYN TADENA-CHUA, et al.,

Plaintiff,

V.

ACUMEN FISCAL AGENT, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2021-00052766-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Timothy B. Taylor Dept. 72

## **CLASS ACTION**

**(Proposed** ← Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement

Motion for Prelim. App. Hearing

Date:

September 29, 2023

Time:

1:30 p.m.

[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion and Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferraro]

Action Filed: December 17, 2021

This matter came on for hearing on September 29, 2023 at 1:30 p.m. in Department 72 of the above-captioned Court on Plaintiff's Motion Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Motion").

Having fully reviewed the Motion, the supporting Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferraro (and its exhibits), including the class action settlement agreement ("Settlement"), and the class notice attached as an exhibit to the Settlement ("Class Notice"), and in recognition of the Court's duties (to make a preliminary determination as to the reasonableness of any proposed class action settlement; to ensure proper notice is provided to all class members in accordance with due process requirements; and to set a Final Approval Hearing to consider the good faith, fairness, adequacy and reasonableness of the proposed Settlement), the Court makes the following determinations and orders:

- 1. The Court conditionally finds, for the purposes of approving this settlement only, the proposed class meets the requirements for certification under § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure: (a) the proposed class is ascertainable and so numerous joinder of all class members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed class, and a well-defined community of interest among members of the proposed class with respect to the subject matter of the class action; (c) the claims of the class representative are typical of the claims of the members of the proposed class; (d) the class representative appears to be adequate to serve in that role; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of settlement; and (f) counsel of record for the Plaintiff are qualified to serve as class counsel.
- 2. The Court finds, on a preliminary basis, the Settlement, incorporated by this reference in full, and made a part of this Order, appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which could ultimately be given final approval by this Court.
- 3. The Court further finds, on a preliminary basis, (a) the non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount is fair and reasonable to the class when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (b) sufficient investigation, research, and informal discovery, have been conducted such that counsel for the parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (c) settlement at this time will

avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks presented by further prosecution of the litigation; and (d) the proposed Settlement was reached through prudent and non-collusive negotiations facilitated by an experienced mediator.

- 4. Accordingly, good cause appearing, the Motion for Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement is **GRANTED**.
  - 5. Class members are therefore defined pursuant to the terms set forth in the Settlement.
- 6. The Court further finds the proposed Class Notice fairly and adequately advises class members of (a) pendency of the Settlement; (b) conditional class certification for settlement purposes only; (c) preliminary Court approval of the proposed Settlement; (d) the date, time and place of the Final Approval Hearing; (e) the terms of the proposed Settlement and the benefits available to the class under the Settlement; (f) their right to receive a proportionate share of the Net Settlement Amount without the need to return a claim form; (g) their right to request exclusion, and the procedures and deadline for doing so; (h) their right to object to the Settlement, and the procedure and deadline for doing so; and (i) their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.
- 7. The Court further finds the proposed Class Notice provides the best practicable notice to the Class and comports with the constitutional requirements, including those of due process.
- 8. The Court further finds that mailing of the Class Notice to the last known address of all class members with measures taken for verification of an address and skip tracing of bad addresses, as specifically described within the Settlement, constitutes an effective method of notifying class members of their rights with respect to the class action and the Settlement.
- Accordingly, for good cause, the Court APPROVES the Class Notice for distribution to the Class pursuant to the notice procedures set forth in full in the Settlement.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that:

- a. CPT Group be appointed the Administrator of the Settlement, as more specifically set forth in the Settlement;
  - b. Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers be appointed as class counsel;
  - c. Plaintiff Lovelyn Tadena-Chua be appointed as class representative;