King & Siegel

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT QUINTERO, individually and on behalf of all similarly situated individuals,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MILLER MILLING COMPANY, LLC, a corporation, and Does 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:19-CV-07459-DMG-JC

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACITON SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Robert Quintero's ("Plaintiff") motion for final approval of the proposed class action settlement and entry of final judgment. Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the proposed settlement class, and Defendant Miller Milling Company, LLC ("Miller" or "Defendant") have entered into a stipulated Settlement Agreement and Release ("Settlement Agreement") that fully and finally resolves this action. Having considered the motion for final approval, the motion for attorneys' fees, costs, and a class representative incentive payment, the Court's May 15, 2020 order on the motion for preliminary approval, the pleadings and papers on file in this matter, the Settlement Agreement, and the briefs and oral arguments in this matter, it is hereby ORDERED as follows:

- 1. <u>Incorporation of Other Documents.</u> Unless otherwise specified, the terms used in this Order shall have the same meaning as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement is expressly incorporated herein.
- 2. **Jurisdiction.** Because adequate notice has been disseminated to all Class Members and they have been afforded the opportunity to opt out of this action, the Court has personal jurisdiction over the claims of all Class Members. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action because there is diversity of citizenship under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. Accordingly, the Court has jurisdiction to approve the proposed Settlement, grant final certification to the Class, and enter judgment in this action.
- 3. <u>Adequacy of Representation.</u> King & Siegel LLP and Plaintiff Robert Quintero have fully and adequately represented the Class for purposes of entering into and implementing the Settlement.
- 4. <u>Adequacy of Notice.</u> The Court finds that the Class Notice and its distribution to Class Members, along with the follow-up measures set forth in the settlement, have been implemented pursuant to the Settlement and this Court's May 15, 2020 order granting preliminary approval to the Settlement:

- (a) constitute the best practicable notice to Class Members under the circumstances of the action;
- (b) constitute notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of (i) the pendency of the Action, (ii) the terms and conditions of the settlement, their rights under the Settlement, and instructions on how to submit, and the timetable for submission of, a dispute regarding workweek calculations and individual settlement shares, (iii) their right to exclude themselves from the Class and the proposed Settlement; (iv) their right to object to any aspect of the proposed Settlement (including the fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of the proposed Settlement, the award of attorneys' fees and costs, and the Enhancement Payments to the Class Representatives), (v) their right to appear at the Final Approval and Fairness Hearing, either on their own behalf or through counsel hired at their own expense, if they did not exclude themselves from the Class, and (vi) the binding effect of the Orders and Judgment in the Action, whether favorable or unfavorable, on all persons who do not request exclusion from the Class;
- (c) constitute notice that was reasonable, adequate and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to be provided with notice;
- (d) constitute notice that fully satisfied the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e) and due process; and
- (e) this settlement will have no binding effect upon, and provide no *res judicata* preclusion to, any individuals who timely requested exclusion from the Class.¹
- 5. **Final Settlement Approval.** Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(2) requires the Court to determine whether the Settlement Agreement is "fair, adequate, and reasonable." The Court may consider the following factors in evaluating the Settlement Agreement under this standard: "the strength of plaintiffs' case; the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation; the risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial; the amount offered in settlement; the extent of discovery completed and the stage of

¹ No Class Members timely requested exclusion from the Class or the Settlement.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

proceedings; the experience and views of counsel; the presence of a governmental participant; and the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement." Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982); accord Torrisi v. Tuscon Elec. Power Co., 8 F.3d 1370, 1375 (9th Cir. 1993).

- The Court finds that the Settlement Agreement is fair, adequate, and reasonable in light of these factors. First, the Settlement reflects the strength of Plaintiffs' case as well as the Defendants' position. This Court has been "'exposed to the litigants and their strategies, positions and proof," Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011, 1026 (9th Cir. 1988) (quoting Officers for Justice, 688 F.2d at 626), and finds that the judicial policy favoring the compromise and settlement of class action suits is applicable here. See Class Plaintiffs v. City of Seattle, 955 F.2d 1268, 1276 (9th Cir. 1992). The Court further finds the Settlement Agreement was reached after arm's length negotiations by capable counsel, aided by an experienced mediator, and that it was not the product of fraud, overreaching, or collusion among the parties.
- 7. Second, the risks, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation also support approval of the Settlement. Even if the Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for class certification of the selected claims, Plaintiffs still would have faced Defendants' motion for summary judgment, trial, and appeals. Trial of any case, let alone a large class action, is inherently risky.
- 8. Third, the extent of discovery completed also supports approval. Class Counsel reviewed all materials that would have been necessary to evaluate the value of the claims for the Class Members, including all policies and summary payroll data for all Class Members. Accordingly, the Parties have ample information with which to weigh the relative merits of settlement and continued litigation.
- Fourth, the consideration provided, a Settlement Fund of \$500,000, is substan-9. tial, and the parties have structured the benefits to maximize the benefits to the Settlement Class.

- 10. Fifth, the views of Class Counsel, who are experienced in litigating and settling employment cases and class actions, weigh in favor of final approval. *See Linney v. Cellular Alaska P'Ship*, No. 96-3008-DJL, 1997 WL 450064, at *5 (N.D. Cal. July 18, 1997), *aff'd* 151 14 F.3d 1234 (9th Cir. 1998). Class Counsel endorse the Settlement as fair, adequate, and reasonable.
- 11. Finally, the reaction of the Settlement Class Members supports final approval of the Settlement. Of the approximately 133 class members, *no* Class Members objected to the Settlement or requested exclusion. This clearly weighs in favor of final approval. *See Rodriguez v. West Publishing Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 967 (9th Cir. 2009) (low number of objections supports fairness of settlement).
- 12. The Court, therefore, finds that the Settlement Agreement is in the best interests of Settlement Class Members, is fair, reasonable, and adequate within the meaning of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, and GRANTS final approval of the Settlement Agreement and all of the terms and conditions contained therein.
- Judgment are binding on Plaintiff and the Class members, as well as their heirs, executors and administrators, successors and assigns, and those terms shall have *res judicata* and other preclusive effect in all pending and future claims, lawsuits or other proceedings maintained by or on behalf of any such persons, to the extent those claims, lawsuits or other proceedings involve matters that were or could have been raised in the Action and are encompassed by the release of Released Claims set forth in the settlement.
- 14. **Released Claims.** Upon full and final payment by Defendant of the Gross Settlement Amount, the Plaintiff and each Class Member shall be deemed to have fully, finally, and forever released the Releasees from all Released Claims.
- 15. The Court expressly adopts all defined terms in the Settlement and the release of Released Claims, including but not limited to the following definition of Released Claims (which is set forth at paragraph 29 of the Settlement):

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Released Claims means any and all of Participating Class Members' claims or causes of action, including for damages, wages, benefits, expenses, penalties, debts, rights, demands, liabilities, obligations, attorneys' fees, costs, and any other form of relief or remedy in law, equity, or whatever kind or nature, whether known or unknown, suspected or unsuspected, based on the following and which accrued during the Class Period:

- (a) All claims for failure to provide meal period premiums or failure to provide meal periods under the Labor Code or the applicable wage order(s) that accrued during the Claims Period;
- All claims for failure to pay rest period premiums or failure to authorize and (b) permit rest periods under the Labor Code or the applicable wage order(s) that accrued during the Claims Period;
- All claims for unpaid wages, failure to pay minimum wage, failure to pay over-(c) time, and any other claim for failure to pay wages under the Labor Code or the applicable wage order(s), any claim for failure to pay wages at the agreed upon rate under Labor Code 221 to 223 during the Claims Period;
- (d) All claims for failure to timely pay wages and/or waiting time penalties pursuant to Labor Code §201 to 204 that accrued during the Claims Period;
- (e) All claims for failure to maintain records under the Labor Code or the applicable wage order(s), including under Labor Code 1174, which accrued during the Claims Period;
- (f) All claims for failure to issue adequate wage statements, whether for any penalty or wage, pursuant to Labor Code §226 that accrued during the Claims Period;
- All claims for penalties under the California Private Attorney General Act based (g) on the aforementioned alleged Labor Code violations;
- (h) All claims for unfair business practices under Business and Professions Code §17200 based on the aforementioned alleged Labor Code violations; and
- Any other claims arising, or which could have arisen, from the operative facts alleged in Plaintiff's Complaint filed on July 26, 2019.

- 16. **Enforcement.** Nothing in this Order and Entry of Judgment shall preclude any action to enforce the terms of the Settlement.
- 17. <u>Modification of Settlement.</u> The Parties are hereby authorized, upon approval of the Court, to agree to and adopt such amendments to, and modifications and expansions of, the Settlement, as are in writing and signed by the Parties' counsel and are consistent with this Final Order and do not limit the rights of Class Members under the Settlement.
- 18. Retention of Jurisdiction. The Court has jurisdiction to enter this Final Order and the accompanying Final Judgment. This Court expressly retains jurisdiction as to all matters relating to the administration, consummation, enforcement and interpretation of the settlement and of this Final Order and the accompanying Final Judgment, and for any other necessary purpose, including, without limitation: (a) enforcing the terms and conditions of the settlement and resolving any disputes, claims or causes of action in the Action that, in whole or in part, are related to or arise out of the settlement, this Final Order or the Final Judgment; (b) entering such additional orders as may be necessary or appropriate to protect or effectuate the Court's Final Order and the Final Judgment approving the settlement, and permanently enjoining Settling Plaintiff from initiating or pursuing related proceedings, or to ensure the fair and orderly administration of this settlement; and (c) entering any other necessary or appropriate orders to protect and effectuate this Court's retention of continuing jurisdiction.
- 19. **No Admissions.** Neither this Final Order and the accompanying Final Judgment nor the settlement (nor any other document referred to here, nor any action taken to carry out this Final Order and the Final Judgment) is, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission or concession by or against Defendant of the validity of any claim or any actual or potential fault, wrongdoing or liability. Entering into or carrying out the settlement, and any negotiations or proceedings related to it, shall not be construed as, or deemed to be evidence of, an admission or concession as to Defendant's denials or defenses and shall not be offered or received in evidence in any action or proceeding against any party hereto in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal for any purpose whatsoever, except as evidence

of the settlement or to enforce the provisions of this Final Order and Final Judgment and the Settlement; provided, however, that this Final Order, the accompanying Final Judgment, and the settlement may be filed in any action against or by Defendant to support a defense of *res judicata*, collateral estoppel, release, waiver, good-faith settlement, judgment bar or reduction, full faith and credit, or any other theory of claim preclusion, issue preclusion or similar defense or counterclaim.

20. <u>Final Certification of Settlement Class.</u> The Court preliminarily found class certification appropriate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23. Dkt. 24. For the reasons set forth below, the Court finds final certification of the Settlement Class defined as follows:

"Class Members" means all non-exempt employees who were employed by Defendant in California and performed work in either the mill, maintenance, or sanitation departments at any time during the Class Period who do not opt out of this Settlement.

The Court has conducted a rigorous Rule 23 analysis and finds that the Settlement Class satisfies the requirements of Rule 23(a). There are common questions that predominate over individual questions, and class litigation is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

21. Attorneys' fees and expenses. The Court approves Class Counsel's attorneys' fees in the amount of \$165,000.00. The Court finds that the fees sought are fair and reasonable in light of the results obtained for the Class; the strengths of Plaintiff's case and the risk, expense, complexity, and duration of further litigation; the contingent nature of the risk and risk incurred; the skill and experience of counsel; and awards in similar cases. The Court approves Class Counsel's request for reimbursement of litigation expenses and costs of suit in the amount of \$9,900.99. Such fees and expenses are to be paid pursuant to the conditions set forth in the settlement. Defendant shall not be required to pay for any other attorneys' fees and expenses, costs or disbursements incurred by Class Counsel or any other counsel representing the Plaintiff, Class Members, or incurred by the Class Representative,

or Class Members, or any of them, in connection with or related in any manner to the action, the Settlement, the administration of the Settlement, and/or the Released Claims.

- 22. <u>Class Representative Enhancement Payment.</u> The Court approves an incentive payment to the named plaintiff and class representative in this action, Robert Quintero, in the amount of \$7,500.00. This award is reasonable and appropriate in light of the risks incurred, the time spent, and the service provided to the Class.
- 23. <u>Settlement Administration Costs.</u> The Court finds that Settlement Administration Costs in the amount of \$10,000.00 to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount to the Settlement Administrator is reasonable and appropriate. Settlement Administration costs are to be paid pursuant to the conditions set forth in the Agreement.
 - 24. Payment to LWDA. Pursuant to the Settlement,
- Dismissal and Release. Upon the Effective Date, this action is dismissed with prejudice, with each Party to bear its own costs and attorneys' fees except as specified in the Settlement. Every Settlement Class Member who did not timely and validly opt-out and exclude himself or herself from the Settlement Class fully, finally, and forever releases any and all Released Claims in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement. All Class Members shall be bound by the terms of the Settlement Agreement upon entry of this final approval order.
- 26. Termination. In the event that the Settlement is terminated pursuant to its terms, the Agreement shall become void, have no further force and effect, and shall not be used in this action or any other for any purpose other than to enforce the terms of the Settlement Agreement that survive termination. This matter shall have the status that existed before the execution of the Settlement Agreement and no term of no term or draft of the Settlement Agreement or any part of the Parties' settlement discussions, negotiations or documentation (including any briefs filed in support of preliminary or final approval of the Settlement) shall (i) be admissible into evidence for any purpose in any Action or other proceeding other than as may be necessary to enforce the terms of the Settlement Agreement that survive

termination, (ii) be deemed an admission or concession by any Party regarding the validity of any Released Claim or the propriety of certifying any class against Defendant, or (iii) be deemed an admission or concession by any Party regarding the truth or falsity of any facts alleged in the Actions or the availability or lack of availability of any defense to the Released Claims.

27. Entry of Final Judgment. The Court finds that there is no just reason for delay and directs the Clerk to enter judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: ______, 2020

The Honorable Dolly M. Gee United States District Judge