11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, CASE NO.: SCV258850 4 Signed for all purposes to the Honorable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 5 Plaintiffs, 6 V 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., 8 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 9 Image: Solo prime: Solo prim: Solo prime: Solo prim:				
2 WEINBERG, ROCER & ROSENTELD A Professional Corporation 1375 55" Street FEB 0 9 2072 3 Professional Corporation 1375 55" Street EmeryVille, CA 94608 4 Telephone (510) 337-1003 Event of Superior Corput of California. Controlices@unioncounsel.net 6 countrolices@unioncounsel.net Costence@unioncounsel.net 7 Attomeys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 7 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 8 DEFINIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, 5 I 6 v 9 Matted, 9 Defendant. 9 Image: Defendant.				
2 WEINBERG, ROCER & ROSENTELD A Professional Corporation 1375 55" Street FEB 0 9 2072 3 Professional Corporation 1375 55" Street EmeryVille, CA 94608 4 Telephone (510) 337-1003 Event of Superior Corput of California. Controlices@unioncounsel.net 6 countrolices@unioncounsel.net Costence@unioncounsel.net 7 Attomeys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 7 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 8 DEFINIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, 5 I 6 v 9 Matted, 9 Defendant. 9 Image: Defendant.				
2 WEINBERG, ROCER & ROSENTELD A Professional Corporation 1375 55" Street FEB 0 9 2072 3 Professional Corporation 1375 55" Street EmeryVille, CA 94608 4 Telephone (510) 337-1003 Event of Superior Corput of California. Controlices@unioncounsel.net 6 countrolices@unioncounsel.net Costence@unioncounsel.net 7 Attomeys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 7 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 8 DEFINIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated, 5 I 6 v 9 Matted, 9 Defendant. 9 Image: Defendant.	1	DAVID A. ROSENFELD, Bar No. 058163	EILED	
A Professional Comporation FEB 0'9 2022 1 375 55% Street Emeryville, CA 94608 Emeryville, CA 94608 Emeryville, CA 94608 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Fax (510) 337-1001 Fax (510) 337-1023 Emeryville, CA 94608 Telephone (510) 337-1023 Emeryville, Ca 94608 SWPER: and DENNIS SPOHR, INC, MVILLE CASE NO.: SCV258850 Assigned for all purposes to the Hongradue Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 Theoreoff of State Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 Plaintiffs, Memorandum of Points of Authorities; Notice of Motion; and Declaration of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently	2	CAREN P. SENCER, Bar No. 233488		
1 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Fax (510) 337-1002 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Telephone (510) 337-1001 5 E-Mail: countnotices@unioncounsel.net cosenfeld@unioncounsel.net 6 cosenfeld@unioncounsel.net Cosenfeld@unioncounsel.net 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; CASE NO: SCV258850 3 Superry of the the self of themselves and other similarly situated, Assigned for all purposes to the Homerable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 6 V Image: Plaintiffs, Image: Plaintiffs, 6 V Image: Plaintiffs, Image: Plaintiffs, 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., Image: Plaintiffs, Image: Plaintiffs, 9 Defendant. The: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 1 TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 1 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 1 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016		A Professional Corporation	FEB 0 9 2022	
1 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Fax (510) 337-1002 Telephone (510) 337-1001 Telephone (510) 337-1001 5 E-Mail: countnotices@unioncounsel.net cosenfeld@unioncounsel.net 6 cosenfeld@unioncounsel.net Cosenfeld@unioncounsel.net 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; CASE NO: SCV258850 3 Superry of the the self of themselves and other similarly situated, Assigned for all purposes to the Homerable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 6 V Image: Plaintiffs, Image: Plaintiffs, 6 V Image: Plaintiffs, Image: Plaintiffs, 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., Image: Plaintiffs, Image: Plaintiffs, 9 Defendant. The: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 1 TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 1 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 1 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016	3		Clark of Superior Could of California,	
5 E-Mail: courthotices@unioncounsel.net 6 csencer@unioncounsel.net 7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; 7 ROBERT MILLEMAN: ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; 3 ROBERT MILLEMAN: ORVILLE 4 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; 3 ROBERT MILLEMAN, ORVILLE 4 OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and 9 OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and 1 Plaintiffs, 6 V 9 Immorphane 6 V 9 Immorphane 1 Defendant. 9 Immorphane 1 Immorphane 10 Immorphane 10 Immorphane 10 Immorphane 10 Immorphane 10 Immorphane 11 Immorphane 12 Immorphane	4	Telephone (510) 337-1001		
6 csencer@unioncounsel.net 7 Attomeys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 12 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 13 OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, CASE NO: SCV258850 5 Plaintiffs, Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 6 V Memorandum of Points of Authorities; Notice of Motion: and Declaration of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently herewith] 0209/2022 9 Defendant, Imemorandum of Points of Authorities; Notice of Motion: and Declaration of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently herewith] 0209/2022 9 Defendant, Detentint, inclusion of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently herewith] 0209/2022 9 Defendant, TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 FAC Filed: October 18, 2021 Complaint File: May 24, 2016 Trial Date: None	5	E-Mail: courtnotices@unioncounsel.net		
ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; IEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR, INC. and the certified classes SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, Plaintiffs, V HANSEL FORD, INC., Defendant. Defendant. Defendant. Defendant. Image: Application of the set	6	drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net csencer@unioncounsel.net		
8 SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR, INC. and the certified classes 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 21 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE 3 OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, 5 Plaintiffs, 6 v 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., 8 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 1 Trime: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 7 ACFiled: September 15, 2021 Time: 3:00 pm 9 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 1 Defendant.	7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs RALPH GRAY, JR.;	DAVID JARRELL;	
0 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 11 FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA 2 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE CASE NO.: SCV258850 3 SBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, Assigned for all purposes to the Homorandum of Points of Authorities; Notice of Motion; and Declaration of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently herewith] 02/09/02/202 8 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 9 Oztober 15, 2021 Time: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 1 Cotober 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 FAC Filed: October 14, 2016 Trial Date: None	8	SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR, INC. and t	he certified classes	
FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; IEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, Plaintiffs, N HANSEL FORD, INC., Defendant. Defendant. Defendant. CASE NO: SCV258850 Assigned for all purposes to the Homorandum of Points of Authorities; Notice of Motion; and Declaration of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently herewith] 02/09/2022 Date: December 15, 2021 Time: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 FAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 FAC Filed: None 1				
 RALPH GRAY, JR.; DAVID JARRELL; ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; IEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, Plaintiffs, V HANSEL FORD, INC., Defendant. Defendant. Defendant. CASE NO.: SCV258850 Assigned for all purposes to the Hongrable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 TAC Filed: December 15, 2021 Time: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 FAC Filed: May 24, 2016 TAC Filed: May 24, 2016 Trial Date: None 	10	SUPERIOR COURT OF 1	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
3 ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 4 Plaintiffs, Image: Comparison of the similarly situated, 5 Image: Plaintiffs, 6 V: 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., 9 Image: Plaintiffs, 1 Defendant. 9 Image: Plaintiffs, 1 Image: Plaintiffs, 1 Image: Plaintiffs, 6 V: 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., 8 Image: Defendant. 9 Image: Plaintiffs, 1 Image: Plaintiffs,	11	FOR THE COU	JNTY OF SONOMA	
3 OSBORNE; JEFFREY SNYDER; and DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated, Assigned for all purposes to the Hongrable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16 5 Plaintiffs, Plaintiffs, 6 v. Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, 8 Defendant. October 14, 2016 9 Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, Defendant. 9 Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, Defendant. 9 Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, Defendant. 9 Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, 9 Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, Defendant. 9 Image: Constraint of the similarly situated, Defendant. 9 Image: Constraint site site site site site site site sit	12	ROBERT MILLEMAN; ORVILLE	CASE NO.: SCV258850	
4 and other similarly situated, 5 Plaintiffs, 6 v: 7 HANSEL FORD, INC., 8 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 1 Defendant. 1 TAC Filed: 2 October 14, 2016 3 Sac Filed: 3 October 14, 2016 4 Sac Filed: 5 October 14, 2016 5 Trial Date: 7 None	13	DENNIS SPOHR on behalf of themselves	Assigned for all purposes to the Honorable Patrick Broderick, Dept. 16	
6 V: [Memorandum of Points of Authorities; Notice of Motion; and Declaration of Tim Cunningham filed concurrently herewith] 8 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 1 2 2 Defendant. 3 Arto social concurrently herewith] 02/2022 Date: Defendant. Defendant. 9 Image: Concurrently herewith] 02/2022 Date: Determber 15, 2021 Time: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 FAC Filed: October 18, 2021 Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016 Trial Date: None 1 1	14	Į	EROPOSED FINAL APPROVAL ORDER	
7 HANSEL FORD, INC., of Motion; and Declaration of Tim Cunningham 8 Defendant. 02/09/2022 9 Defendant. Determter 15, 2021 1 Time: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 0 TAC Filed: October 14, 2016 1 Sac Filed: October 18, 2021 2 October 18, 2021 3 Trial Date: None		Plaintiffs,	AND JUDGMENT	
8 Defendant. 9 Defendant. 1 Defendant. 1 Defendant. 2 Date: December 15, 2021 Time: 3:00 pm Dept: 16 0 SAC Filed: October 14, 2016 SAC Filed: October 18, 2021 Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016 Trial Date: None Trial Date: None	16 17	y .	of Motion; and Declaration of Tim Cunningham	
9 1 Detrimation Detrimatio				
0 10 1 10 2 10 2 10 3 10 3 10 4 10 5 10 6 10 7 10 8 1	18	Defendant.	Time: 3:00 pm	
1 SAC Filed: September 21, 2016 2 SAC Filed: October 18, 2021 Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016 3 Trial Date: None		al - free	-	
2 Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016 3 Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016 5 Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016 7 None 8 1	20 21		SAC Filed: September 21, 2016	
3 4 5 6 7 8	22		Complaint Filed: May 24, 2016	
	23			
	24			
	25			
8	26			
1	27			
	28			
W IPROPOSEDI FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT - CASE NO. SCV258850			1	
		THE IPROPOSEDIFINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT - CASE NO. SCU259950		

۴

	1		
1	This matter has come before the Honorable Patrick Broderick in Department 16 of the		
2	above-entitled Court, located at 3055 Cleveland Avenue, Santa Rosa, California 95403, on		
3	Plaintiffs Ralph Gray, Jr.; David Jarrell; Robert Milleman; Orville Osborne; Jeffrey Snyder;		
4	and Dennis Spohr ("Plaintiffs") Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, and		
5			
6	Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Litigation Costs, and Enhancement Payments (collectively		
7	"Motion for Final Approval"). Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld appeared on behalf of Plaintiffs,		
	and Fisher & Phillips LLP appeared on behalf of Defendant Hansel Ford, Inc. ("Defendant").		
8	On August 4, 2021, the Court entered the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action		
9	Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"), thereby preliminarily approving the settlement of		
10	the above-entitled action ("Action") in accordance with the Joint Stipulation and Settlement		
11	Agreement of Class Action and PAGA Claims (together, "Settlement," "Agreement," or		
12	"Settlement Agreement"), which, together with the exhibits annexed thereto, set forth the terms		
13	and conditions for settlement of the Action.		
14	Having reviewed the Settlement Agreement and duly considered the parties' papers and		
15	oral argument, and good cause appearing,		
16	THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS, ADJUDGES, AND DECREES AS		
17	FOLLOWS:		
18	1: All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the Settlement		
19	Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order.		
20	2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of the Settlement Class Members		
21	asserted in this proceeding and over all parties to the Action.		
22	3. The Court finds that the applicable requirements of California Code of Civil		
23	Procedure section 382 and California Rule of Court 3.769, et seq. have been satisfied with		
24	respect to the Settlement Class Members and the Settlement. The Court hereby makes final its		
25	earlier provisional certification of the Settlement Class Members for settlement purposes, as set		
26	forth in the Preliminary Approval Order. The Settlement Class is hereby defined to include:		
27	All current and former technicians or mechanics who were employed by Hansel		
28	Ford, Inc. within the State of California during the time period from May 24, 2012 to August 4, 2021 ("Settlement Class Members").		
	2		
	[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT - CASE NO. SCV258850		

۰

Ŕ

1 Notice of Class Action Settlement ("Notice") that was provided to the 4 Settlement Class Members fully and accurately informed the Settlement Class Members of all 2 material elements of the Settlement and of their opportunity to participate in, object to or 3 4 comment thereon, or to seek exclusion from, the Settlement; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members; 5 and complied fully with the laws of the State of California, the United States Constitution, due 6 process and other applicable law. The Notice fairly and adequately described the Settlement 7 and provided the Settlement Class Members with adequate instructions and a variety of means 8 to obtain additional information. 9

16

10 5: Pursuant to California law, the Court hereby grants final approval of the Settlement and finds that it is reasonable and adequate, and in the best interests of the 11 Settlement Class Members as a whole. More specifically, the Court finds that the Settlement 12 was reached following meaningful discovery and investigation conducted by Weinberg, Roger 13 & Rosenfeld ("Class Counsel"); that the Settlement is the result of serious, informed, 14 adversarial, and arms-length negotiations between the parties; and that the terms of the 15 Settlement are in all respects fair, adequate, and reasonable. In so finding, the Court has 16 considered all of the evidence presented, including evidence regarding the strength of 17 Plaintiffs' claims; the risk, expense, and complexity of the claims presented; the likely duration 18 of further litigation; the amount offered in the Settlement; the extent of investigation and 19 discovery completed; and the experience and views of Class Counsel. The Court has further 20 considered the absence of objections to and requests for exclusion from the Settlement 21 submitted by Settlement Class Members. Accordingly, the Court hereby directs that the 22 Settlement be affected in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the following terms 23 and conditions. 24

6: A full opportunity has been afforded to the Settlement Class Members to
participate in the Final Approval Hearing, and all Settlement Class Members and other persons
wishing to be heard have been heard. The Settlement Class Members also have had a full and
fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement. Accordingly, the Court determines

[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT - CASE NO. SCV258850

3

1 that all Settlement Class Members who did not timely and validly opt out of the Settlement 2 ("Participating Class Members") are bound by this Final Approval Order and Judgment. The Court finds that payment of Administration Costs in the amount of 3 7. \$7,500.00 is appropriate for the services performed and costs incurred and to be incurred for 4 5 the notice and settlement administration process. It is hereby ordered that the Claims Administrator, CPT Group, Inc. shall issue payment to itself in the amount of \$7,500.00 in 6 7 accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in Settlement Agreement. 8 The Court finds that the Enhancement Payments sought are fair and reasonable 82 for the work performed by Plaintiffs on behalf of the Settlement Class Members. It is hereby 9 10 ordered that the Claims Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$3,000.00 each to 11 Plaintiffs Ralph Gray, Jr.; David Jarrell; Robert Milleman; Orville Osborne; Jeffrey Snyder; and Dennis Spohr as their Enhancement Payments, according to the terms and methodology set 12 13 forth in the Settlement Agreement. 91 14 The Court finds that the allocation of \$10,000.00 toward penalties under the 15 California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA penalties"), is fair, reasonable, and appropriate, and hereby approved. Defendant shall separately remit \$7,500.00 to the Claims 16 Administrator at the same time that it remits the Gross Settlement amount, upon which the 17 Claims Administrator will remit it to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency 18 ("LWDA") The remaining \$2,500.00 will be part of the Net Settlement Amount for 19 Distribution to Participating Class Members, according to the terms and methodology set forth 20 in the Settlement Agreement. 21 The Court finds that the request for attorneys' fees in the amount of \$388,253.00 22 10. to Class Counsel falls within the range of reasonableness, and the results achieved justify the 23 24 award sought. The requested attorneys' fees to Class Counsel are fair, reasonable, and appropriate, and are hereby approved. It is hereby ordered that the Claims Administrator issue 25 payment in the amount of \$388,253.00 to Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld, in accordance with 26 27 the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement. 28 4

[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT - CASE NO. SCV258850

11. 1 The Court finds that reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the 2 amount of \$55,823.43 to Class Counsel is reasonable, and hereby approved. It is hereby ordered that the Claims Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$55,823.43 to Weinberg, 3 4 Roger & Rosenfeld for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, in accordance with the 5 terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement. 12. The Court hereby enters Judgment by which Participating Class Members shall 6 7 be conclusively determined to have given a release of any and all Released Claims against the 8 Released Parties, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Notice. 9 13. It is hereby ordered that Defendant shall deposit the Gross Settlement Amount 10 into an account established by the Claims Administrator within ten (10) business days of the 11 Effective Date, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement 12 Agreement. 14. 13 It is hereby ordered that the Claims Administrator shall distribute Individual Settlement Payments to the Participating Class Members within thirty (30) calendar days of the 14 Effective Date, according to the methodology and terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement. 15 15. 16 After entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment, pursuant to California 17 Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(h), the Court shall retain jurisdiction to construe, interpret. 18 implement, and enforce the Settlement Agreement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment, to hear and resolve any contested challenge to a claim for settlement benefits, and to 19 supervise and adjudicate any dispute arising from or in connection with the distribution of 20 settlement benefits. 21 16. 22 Notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be given to the Settlement Class Members by posting a copy of the Final Approval Order and Judgment on 23 24 CPT Group, Inc.'s website for a period of at least sixty (60) calendar days after the date of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment. Individualized notice is not required. 25 26 27 7-9-7022 By: 28 HON. PATRICK BRODERICK 5 [PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT – CASE NO. SCV258850

đ,

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I certify that I am an employee of the Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma, and that my business address is 600 Administration Drive, Room 107-J, Santa Rosa, California, 95403; that I am not a party to this case; that I am over the age of 18 years; that I am readily familiar with this office's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service; and that on the date shown below I placed a true copy of the foregoing attached papers in an envelope, sealed and addressed as shown below, for collection and mailing at Santa Rosa, California, first class, postage fully prepaid, following ordinary business practices.

3/15/2022

Arlene Junior Court Executive Officer

bv Jennifer Ellis, Deputy Clerk

ADDRESSEES

CAREN P SENCER Weinberg Roger & Rosenfeld APC 1375 55th Street Emeryville CA 94608