JULIAN HAMMOND (SBN 268489) 1 ihammond@hammondlawpc.com POLINA BRANDLER (SBN 269086) pbrandler@hammondlawpc.com ARI CHERNIAK (SBN 290071) 3 acherniak@hammondlawpc.com HAMMONDLAW, P.C. 11780 W Sample Rd Suite 103 Coral Springs, FL 33065 5 (310) 601-6766 (310) 295-2385 (Fax) 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Putative Class 7

Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

MAR 0 5 2021

Cherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clork of Court Deputy Aktivin Lim

SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

TRACY GRANBERRY, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

VS.

8

9

AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY, a California Non-Profit Corporation,

Defendant.

Case No.: 19STCV28949

REVISED [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS **ACTION SETTLEMENT**

RECEIVED

MAR 0 3 2021

FILING WINDOW

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CASE NO. 19STCV28949

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' unopposed Motion for Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and for Approval of Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Class Representatives' Service Award. The motions, having been fully considered by the Court, is ruled upon as follows:

- 1. The Settlement Agreement is fully and finally approved and is hereby incorporated by reference and all defined terms therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Settlement Agreement
- 2. The Court finds that the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable based on the following: the Settlement was reached through arms'-length negotiations; investigation and discovery were sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently; counsel experienced in similar litigation; and the percentage of objectors is small.
- 3. The moving papers, declarations and exhibits attached thereto, filed on February 3, 2021, have provided this Court with "basic information about the nature and magnitude of the claims in question and the basis for concluding that the consideration being paid for the release of those claims represents a reasonable compromise" such that this Court is satisfied "that the consideration being received for the release of the class members' claims is reasonable in light of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims and the risks of the particular litigation." (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Company* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1802 ["So long as the record is adequate to reach 'an intelligent and objective opinion of the probabilities of success should the claim be litigated' and 'form' an educated estimate of the complexity, expense and likely duration of such litigation...it is sufficient."].)
- 4. Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(d), this Court makes final the conditional class certification contained in the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, and thus certifies a class defined as: "all current or former employees who performed the duties of an Adjunct Faculty member for APU in California during the Class Period, which is the period of time from August 19, 2015 through to October 19, 2020."
- 5. Plaintiff is appointed and designated, for all purposes, as the Class Representative, and HammondLaw, P.C., is appointed and designated as counsel for the Class. The Court finds that attorneys for the Class are experienced class action litigators and have expressed the view that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, which further supports approval of the Settlement.
- 6. The Court hereby finds that Class Notice has been sent to Class Members as previously ordered by the Court, and that such Notice fairly and adequately described the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement, the manner in which Class Members could object to or opt-out of the settlement; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; and complied fully with California Rule of Court

3.769, and all other applicable laws. Specifically, on November 9, 2020, counsel for Defendants provided CPT with a list of Settlement Class Members. The Class List contained 1,962 Settlement Class Members. On November 19, 2020, CPT conducted a National Change of Address (NCOA) search in an attempt to update the Settlement Class Members' addresses. On November 23, 2020, the Notice Packets were mailed via U.S. first class mail to all Settlement Class Members. As of February 2, 2021, 45 Notice Packets have been returned to CPT by the Post Office, of which 6 were provided a new address by the Post Office. CPT performed a skip-trace on 39 Notice Packets to locate a better address using Accurint, one of the most comprehensive address databases available. A total of 33 Notice Packets have been re-mailed to date. In addition, 16 notices were also forwarded by the Settlement Administrator. Ultimately, there are 12 Notice Packets undeliverable with no forwarding address, where no new addresses could be found through skip trace. Therefore, the Court finds that a full and fair opportunity has been afforded to Class Members to participate in the proceedings convened to determine whether the proposed Settlement Agreement should be given final approval. Accordingly, the Court hereby determines that all Settlement Class Members are bound by this Final Approval Order.

- 7. In response to the Notice, eighteen Class Members requested to be excluded from the Settlement. Those Class Members are: Karla Hays, Linda Byrd, Jini Cockroft, Rebecca Holmes, Lisa Lindsey Rehfeld, Elizabeth Smart, Rosemarie Santiago, David Hermon, Christine Phongdara, Steven Jung, Christina Burden, Kenneth Cairns, Nancy Shelton, Danielle Lascano, Elizabeth Eastman, Brian Croissant, Diane Wilson, and Christopher Green.
- 8. In response to the Notice, two Class Members submitted written objections to the Settlement. Objector Bonnie Copland's objection states she is "disappointed to receive notice of the class action suit" and goes on to indicate that she does not agree with the litigation, but does not state any actual grounds upon which she objects to the settlement. She neither states that the settlement is unfair, nor objects to any of its terms. Therefore, the Court overrules Ms. Copland's objection as she has not presented any grounds upon which to rule.
- 9. Objector Anne Wrotniewski objects to the fact that the litigation was filed in the first instance, but does not object to any portion of the settlement itself. She neither states that the settlement is unfair, nor objects to any of its terms. Therefore, the Court overrules Ms. Wrotniewski's objection as she has not presented any grounds upon which to rule.
- 10. The Court hereby finally and unconditionally approves the Settlement Agreement, and enters judgment, and specifically:
 - a. Approves the Gross Settlement of \$1,112,100;

- b. Approves the application for Class Representative's service award of \$7,500. Ms. Granberry's contributions to this litigation, include, but are not limited to, having numerous conversations with counsel, gathering documents, reviewing records, being available for mediation, and reviewing the settlement agreement. The Court finds that a Class Representative award of \$7,500 is reasonable under these circumstances.
- c. Approves Class Counsels' request for an award of \$370,700, representing 1/3 of the Goss Settlement Amount, as reasonable attorneys' fees. Counsel have provided the following lodestar information:

BILLER	RATE	HOURS	TOTAL
Hammond	\$750	107.5	\$80,625.00
Brandler	\$650	52.9	\$34,385.00
Cherniak	\$530	117.5	\$62,275.00
Baller	\$945	33.2	\$31,374
TOTAL		311.1	\$208,659.00

Therefore, counsel represent spending a total of 311.1 hours for a total lodestar of \$208,659 which would require a multiplier of 1.77 to yield the requested fee amount. Because the fee request represents a reasonable percentage of the settlement fund, the Court awards fees in the amount of \$370,000 which is also supported by the lodestar.

- d. All the costs appear to be reasonable in amount and all appear to have been necessary to the litigation. Therefore, the Court approves Class Counsel's request for reimbursement of litigation costs of \$13,684.69;
- a. Approves payment to CPT, Inc., the Settlement Administrator, of \$27,000 as costs of settlement administration; and
- b. Approves the allocation of \$35,000 as payment for penalties under the California Labor Code Private Attorney Generals Act ("PAGA"), and further approves of payment of \$26,250 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency for its portion of the PAGA penalties;
- c. Approves the payment from the Net Settlement of amounts determined by the Settlement Administrator to be due to Settlement Class Members. The Net Settlement totals \$666,965.31 which will remain to be distributed to Class Members who did not opt out. The average individual settlement payment will be approximately \$343.00. The highest individual settlement payment is \$3,211.70, and the lowest is \$4.08.

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Upon entry of this Order and the accompanying Judgment, each Settlement Class Member 11. releases Released Parties from all claims, debts, liabilities, demands, obligations, penalties, premium pay, guarantees, costs, expenses, attorney's fees, damages, actions or causes of action of whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, contingent or accrued, under any legal theory under state law for any alleged failure to pay all business expense reimbursements, wages due (including minimum wage and overtime wages), failure to pay for all hours worked (including off-the clock), failure to provide meal and authorize and permit rest periods, short/late meal and rest periods, failure to relieve of all duties during meal and rest periods, failure to timely pay wages and final wages and waiting time penalties, failure to furnish accurate wage statements including claims derivative and/or related to these claims, liquidated damages, and conversion of wages, up to and including the date of preliminary approval by the Court. The Release includes, claims that were raised, or that reasonably could have been raised based on the facts and allegations in the Complaint. The Release includes all claims and theories arising under the applicable regulations, Labor Code section 2802, Wage Orders and Labor Code, state wage and hour law, as well as claims under Business and Professions Code section 17200 et seq., and/or Labor Code section 2698 et seq. based on violations of the above Labor Code provisions ("Released Claims") This release applies to all claims arising at any point during the Class Period.
- 12. In addition to the Released Claims, Plaintiff shall be bound by a compete and general release of all claims under any and all applicable federal and state laws and/or regulations as to Released Parties, and shall also be bound by a California Civil Code section 1542 release and waiver of all claims known and unknown, without exception, except as may be prohibited by law, such as claims for workers' compensation benefits. California Civil Code section 1542 reads as follows: "A general release does not extend to claims that the creditor or releasing party does not know or suspect to exist in his or her favor at the time of executing the release and that, if known by him or her, would have materially affected his or her settlement with the debtor or released party."
- Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 384, before the entry of a judgment, the Court shall also set a compliance hearing for December 3, 2021 at 8:30 a.m. Within 5 court days of the hearing, the parties shall submit a report to the court including total amount paid to the Class, as well as a report about the status of any unresolved issues and any other matters appropriate to bring to the Court's attention. Within 30 days after the final report is filed with the Court, the parties shall prepare and file a stipulation and proposed order and Proposed Amended Judgment. The stipulation and proposed order shall include, inter alia, the amount of the distribution of unpaid cash residue, and unclaimed or abandoned funds to the non-party, the accrued interest on that sum and any other information required to be set forth

pursuant to Section 68520 of the Government Code, as incorporated into CCP Section 384.5. The stipulation shall be signed by counsel for the class, defendant's counsel and counsel for (or an authorized representative of) the non-party ("cy pres") recipient, Interdisciplinary Center for Healthy Workplaces. The stipulation shall include a statement to the effect that all interested persons are in accord with the amended judgment and have no objection to the entry of an amended judgment. If there are objections by any party, class counsel shall immediately notify the Court and the matter will be set for further hearing.

14. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h), the Court retains exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the litigation to enforcing the terms of the judgment, and supervising, implementing, interpreting, and enforcing this Final Approval Order and the Settlement Agreement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3-5-21

HON. ANN I. JONES // SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE