|          | Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284   | -4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 1 of 8                          |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 1        |  |  |  |
| 2        |  |  |  |
| 3        |  |  |  |
| 4        |  |  |  |
| 5        |  |  |  |
| 6        |  |  |  |
| 7        |  |  |  |
| 8        |  |  |  |
| 9        | UNITED STATI   | <b>FS DISTRICT COURT</b>                               |  |
| 10       | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |  |
| 11       |  |  |  |
| 12       | DESIDERO SOTO, STEVEN STRICKLEN,<br>STEEVE FONDROSE, LORENZO   | Case No.: 3:17-cv-00251-VC                             |  |
| 13       | ORTEGA, and JOSE ANTONIO FARIAS, JR.,<br>on behalf of themselves and all others similarly                    | [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING<br>PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR    |  |
| 14       | situated,  | PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS<br>AND COLLECTIVE ACTION |  |
| 15       | Plaintiffs,  | SETTLEMENT   |  |
| 16       | VS.  | Date: March 21, 2019                                   |  |
| 17       | O.C. COMMUNICATIONS, INC., COMCAST   | Time: 10:00 a.m.<br>Courtroom: 4 (17th Floor)          |  |
| 18       | CORPORATION, and COMCAST CABLE<br>COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT, LLC;  | Judge: Honorable Vince Chhabria                        |  |
| 19<br>20 | Defendants.  | Complaint Filed: January 18, 2017                      |  |
| 20       |  |  |  |
| 21<br>22 |  |  |  |
| 22       |  |  |  |
| 24       |  |  |  |
| 25       |  |  |  |
| 26       |  |  |  |
| 27       |  |  |  |
| 28       |  |  |  |
|          | [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOT  | ON FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND               |  |
|          | COLLECTIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT<br>Soto, et al. v. O.C. Communications, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:17-cv-00251-VC |  |  |
|          |  |  |  |

#### Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284-4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 2 of 8

The Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Collective Action Settlement, filed by
 Plaintiffs Desidero Soto, Steven Stricklen, Steeve Fondrose, Lorenzo Ortega, and Jose Antonio
 Farias, Jr. ("Plaintiffs") in the above-captioned action, came on for hearing regularly in Courtroom
 4 of the above captioned court, the Honorable Vincent Chhabria presiding. Defendants O.C.
 Communications, Inc. ("OCC"), Comcast Corporation and Comcast Cable Communications
 Management, LLC (collectively, "Comcast") do not oppose the motion.

7 Plaintiffs bring a representative wage and hour action under federal and state laws on behalf 8 of themselves and other Technicians employed by OCC who install cable television, phone, security 9 and internet services. Plaintiffs Desidero Soto and Steven Stricklen filed their initial Collective and 10 Class Action Complaint in this action on January 18, 2017, which asserted FLSA and California 11 law claims. Dkt. No. 1. On August 18, 2017, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Collective and 12 Class Action Complaint, which added Plaintiff Fondrose, refined the factual allegations, and added 13 a cause of action for violation of California Labor Code Section 226.2. Dkt. No. 117. Plaintiffs filed 14 their Second Amended Collective and Class Action Complaint on March 13, 2018, which added the 15 Comcast Defendants under a joint-employer theory, along with Plaintiff Ortega and the Washington 16 state law claims that he asserts. Dkt. No. 232. On June 20, 2018, Plaintiffs filed their Third 17 Amended Collective and Class Action Complaint ("TAC"), which added Plaintiff Farias and 18 California Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") claims against Comcast. See Dkt. No. 255.

In the operative TAC (Dkt. No. 253-1), Plaintiffs allege eighteen causes of action under the
federal Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, *et seq*. ("FLSA"), the California Labor Code
and Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq*. ("UCL"), and Washington wage and
consumer protection laws. Plaintiffs assert the first cause of action under the FLSA on behalf of
themselves and the Collective for Defendants' alleged failure to compensate Technicians for all
hours worked, including legally mandated overtime premiums.

Plaintiffs Soto, Stricklen, and Farias assert eleven additional causes of action under
California law on behalf of themselves and the California class: (1) failure to authorize, permit,
and/or make available meal and rest periods; (2) failure to compensate piece-rate workers for rest
and recovery periods and other non-productive time, and related wage statement violations; (3)

### Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284-4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 3 of 8

1

2

3

4

5

failure to pay for all hours worked; (4) failure to pay minimum wage; (5) failure to pay overtime wages; (6) failure to reimburse for necessary business expenditures (including tools and supplies);
(7) waiting time penalties; (8) failure to provide itemized wage statements; (9) violation of the UCL for unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent business acts or practices; (10) penalties pursuant to § 2699(a) of the PAGA; and (11) penalties pursuant to § 2699(f) of the PAGA.

Plaintiff Ortega asserts six additional causes of action under Washington law on behalf of
 himself and the Washington class: (1) failure to pay minimum wage; (2) failure to pay overtime
 wages; (3) failure to authorize, permit, and/or make available meal and rest periods; (4) failure to
 pay all wages due upon termination; (5) willful refusal to pay wages; and (6) violation of
 Washington's Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86, *et seq*.

After extensive and voluminous discovery, including written discovery and depositions, the
 Parties entered into private mediation with respected neutral mediator Jeff Ross in an attempt to
 resolve the claims. As a result of the mediation session on October 18, 2018 and subsequent
 negotiations via the mediator, the Parties reached a settlement. The Parties then executed a Class
 Action Settlement Agreement ("Settlement") on March 1, 2019.

A hearing was held before this Court on March 21, 2019 for the purpose of determining,
 among other things, whether the proposed Settlement is within the range of possible approval, if
 notice of the Settlement to Members of the California and Washington Classes and the Collective is
 appropriate, and whether a formal fairness hearing, also known as a final approval hearing, should
 be scheduled. Appearing at the hearing was Schneider Wallace Cottrell Konecky Wotkyns LLP and
 Berger Montague PC on behalf of Plaintiffs, the Collective, and Putative Classes; Littler
 Mendelson, P.C. on behalf of OCC; and Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP on behalf of Comcast.

Having reviewed the papers and documents presented, having heard the statements of
 counsel, and having considered the matter, the Court HEREBY ORDERS as follows:

The Court hereby GRANTS preliminary approval of the terms and conditions
 contained in the Settlement, attached hereto as Exhibit 1, as to the California and Washington
 Classes. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within the range
 of possible approval, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and applicable law.

## Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284-4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 4 of 8

1 2. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the settlement amount is fair and 2 reasonable to the California and Washington Class Members when balanced against the probable 3 outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and 4 potential appeals; (2) significant discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been 5 conducted such that counsel for the Parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their 6 respective positions; (3) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that 7 would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed Settlement has 8 been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the Parties. 9 Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement was entered into in good faith.

The Court hereby GRANTS conditional certification of the provisional California
 and Washington Classes, in accordance with the Settlement, for the purposes of this Settlement
 only. The California Class is defined as "all Technicians who are or were employed by OCC in the
 State of California at any time from January 18, 2013 through December 21, 2018, and who do not
 validly exclude themselves from the Settlement." The Washington Class is defined as "all
 Technicians who are or were employed by OCC in the State of Washington from March 13, 2015
 through December 21, 2018, and who do not validly exclude themselves from the Settlement."

- The Court hereby GRANTS Approval of the terms and conditions contained in the
   Settlement as to the Collective. The Court finds that the terms of the Settlement are within the range
   of possible approval, pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act and applicable law.
- 5. The Court finds that: (1) the settlement amount is fair and reasonable to the 20 Collective Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to 21 class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2) significant discovery, 22 investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties at this 23 time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (3) settlement at this time will avoid 24 substantial costs, delay, and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the 25 litigation; and (4) the proposed Settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and 26 non-collusive negotiations between the Parties. Accordingly, the Court finds that the Settlement 27 was entered into in good faith.
- 28

6. The Court hereby confirms its August 31, 2017 Order conditionally certifying the
 Collective. *See* Dkt. No. 127. The Collective is defined as "all Opt-In Plaintiffs who are or were
 employed by OCC at any time from and including January 18, 2014 through December 21, 2018."

7. The Court hereby authorizes the retention of CPT Group, Inc. as Settlement
Administrator for the purpose of the Settlement, with reasonable administration costs estimated not
to exceed \$40,000.00.

8. The Court hereby conditionally appoints Schneider Wallace Cottrell Konecky
Wotkyns LLP and Berger Montague PC as Counsel for the Classes. The Court hereby conditionally
appoints Plaintiffs Soto, Stricklen, and Farias as Class Representatives for the California Class, and
Plaintiff Ortega as Class Representative for the Washington Class.

9. The Court hereby appoints Schneider Wallace Cottrell Konecky Wotkyns LLP and
 Berger Montague PC as Counsel for the Collective. The Court hereby appoints Plaintiffs Soto,
 Steven, Fondrose, Ortega, and Farias as Collective representatives for the Collective.

10. The Court hereby APPROVES the Notice of Settlement attached to the Settlement as 14 **Exhibit A.** The Court finds that the Notice of Settlement, along with the related notification 15 procedure contemplated by the Settlement, constitutes the best notice practicable under the 16 circumstances and is in full compliance with the applicable laws and the requirements of due 17 process. The Court further finds that the Notice of Settlement appears to fully and accurately inform 18 the Members of the California and Washington Classes and the Collective of all material elements 19 of the proposed Settlement, of their right to be excluded from the Settlement, and of their right and 20opportunity to object to the Settlement.

11. The Court hereby authorizes dissemination of the Notice of Settlement to Members
of the California and Washington Classes and the Collective. Subject to the terms of the Settlement,
the Notice of Settlement shall be mailed via first-class mail to the most recent known address of
each Member of the California and Washington Classes and the Collective within the timeframe
specified in the Settlement, and sent via email to all such persons for whom OCC has an email
address. The parties are authorized to make non-substantive changes to the proposed Notice of
Settlement that are consistent with the terms of the Settlement and this Order.

28

# Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284-4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 6 of 8

1 12. The Court hereby APPROVES the proposed procedure for exclusion from the
 Settlement, which is to submit a written statement requesting exclusion to the Settlement
 Administrator no later than 60 days following the date on which the Settlement Administrator first
 mails the Notice of Settlement to Members of the California and Washington Classes and the
 Collective. Any Members of the California and Washington Classes who submit a written exclusion
 shall not be a Member of the Settlement Class, shall be barred from participating in the Settlement,
 and shall receive no benefit from the Settlement.

8 13. The Court further PRELIMINARILY APPROVES Class Counsel's request for
9 attorneys' fees of up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, or \$2,500,000, plus their costs,
10 currently estimated at \$180,000.

14. The Court ORDERS that Class Counsel shall file a motion for approval of the fee
and cost award and of the service awards to the Class Representatives, with the appropriate
declarations and supporting evidence, at least 14 days prior to the Notice Deadline, to be heard at
the same time as the motion for final approval of the Settlement.

15. The Court ORDERS that Class Counsel shall file a motion for final approval of the
Settlement, with the appropriate declarations and supporting evidence, including a declaration
setting forth the identity of any Members of the California and Washington Classes and the
Collective who request exclusion from the Settlement, by\_\_\_\_\_.

16. The Court further ORDERS that each Member of the California and Washington 19 Classes and the Collective shall be given a full opportunity to object to the proposed Settlement and 20request for attorneys' fees, and to participate at a Final Approval Hearing, which the Court sets to 21 commence on \_\_\_\_\_ at 10:00 a.m. in Courtroom 4 of the United States 22 District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division. Any Member of the Classes 23 and/or the Collective seeking to object to the proposed Settlement may file such objection in writing 24 with the Court and shall serve such objection on Class Counsel and Defendants' Counsel. The 25 written objection requirement may be excused upon a showing of good cause.

Accordingly, GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, the Court hereby APPROVES the
 proposed Notice of Settlement and adopts the following dates and deadlines:

28

# Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284-4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 7 of 8

| 1  | Date of preliminary approval of the Settlement   |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  | as to Class and approval of the Settlement as to<br>the Collective   |  |  |
| 3  | Deadline for OCC to provide to CPT Group, Inc.   | Within 10 business days after the Court's  |  |
|    | a database containing Class Members' contact   | preliminary approval of the Settlement   |  |
| 4  | information  |  |  |
| 5  | Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to mail the Notice  | Within 10 business days after CPT Group,   |  |
| č  | of Settlement to Class Members   | Inc. receives the Class Member database  |  |
| 6  | Deadline for Class Counsel to file attorneys' fees   | At least 14 days before the opt-   |  |
| 7  | motion and motion for service awards   | out/objection deadline   |  |
| ,  | Deadline for Class Members to postmark   | 60 days after Notice of Settlement is mailed   |  |
| 8  | requests to opt-out or file objections to the Settlement   |  |  |
| 9  | Deadline for filing of Final Approval Motion   | According to Northern District of California   |  |
| 9  | Deadline for thing of t mar Approval Motion  | Local Rules  |  |
| 10 | Final Approval Hearing   | No earlier than thirty (30) days after the   |  |
| 11 |  | opt-out/objection deadline   |  |
| 11 | Effective Date   | (i) if there is an objection to the Settlement   |  |
| 12 |  | that is not subsequently withdrawn, then the   |  |
| 10 |  | date upon the expiration of time for appeal  |  |
| 13 |  | of the Court's Final Approval Order; or (ii)   |  |
| 14 |  | if there is a timely objection and appeal by<br>an objector, then after such appeal is |  |
|    |  | dismissed or the Court's Final Approval  |  |
| 15 |  | Order is affirmed on appeal; or (iii) if there   |  |
| 16 |  | are no timely objections to the Settlement,  |  |
| 10 |  | or if any objections which were filed are  |  |
| 17 |  | withdrawn before the date of final approval,   |  |
| 18 |  | then the first business day after the Court's  |  |
| 10 |  | order granting Final Approval of the   |  |
| 19 | Deadline for OCC to pay the Gross Settlement   | Settlement<br>Within 10 business days after Effective                                  |  |
| 20 | Amount into the Qualified Settlement Fund  | Date   |  |
| 20 | Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to provide Class  | At least 10 business days before the   |  |
| 21 | Counsel and Defendants' Counsel with a final   | Settlement Awards are mailed to Class  |  |
| 22 | report of all Settlement Awards  | Members  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |
| 23 | Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to transfer the 10  | As soon as practicable after funding of the  |  |
| 24 | percent holdback of the attorneys' fees award  | Gross Settlement Amount, and prior to any  |  |
| 24 | into a separate interest-bearing account   | payment of the attorneys' fees award to<br>Class Counsel                               |  |
| 25 | Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to make payments  | Within 30 days after the Effective Date or   |  |
|    | for attorneys' fees and costs, service awards,   | as soon as reasonably practicable  |  |
| 26 | Class Member Settlement Awards, and LWDA   | J J F  |  |
| 27 | Payment  |  |  |
|    | Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to send a reminder  | 90 days before check-cashing deadline  |  |
| 28 | letter to those Class Members who have not yet   |  |  |
|    |  | 6  |  |
|    | [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND                           |  |  |
|    | COLLECTIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT<br>Soto, et al. v. O.C. Communications, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:17-cv-00251-VC |  |  |
|    |  |  |  |
|    |  |  |  |

# Case 3:17-cv-00251-VC Document 284-4 Filed 03/01/19 Page 8 of 8

| 1  |   |   |  |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1  | cashed their Class Member Settlement Award  |   |  |
| 2  | checks       Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to place a  | 60 days before check-cashing deadline   |  |
| 3  | reminder phone call to those Class Members  | too days before encek-casining deadnine   |  |
| 4  | who have not yet cashed their Class Member  |   |  |
|    | Settlement Award checks   | 190 dave after issuance   |  |
| 5  |   | 180 days after issuance<br>As soon as practicable after check-cashing                 |  |
| 6  | uncashed check funds to <i>cy pres</i> recipient or   | deadline  |  |
| 7  | redistribute such funds to those Class Members  |   |  |
|    | who cashed their cashed their Class Member<br>Settlement Award checks   |   |  |
| 8  | Deadline for Plaintiffs to file the Post-   | Within 21 days after the distribution of any  |  |
| 9  | e e   | remaining monies to Settlement Class<br>Members who cashed their Settlement           |  |
| 10 |   | Award check or to the <i>cy pres</i> recipient  |  |
| 11 | Deadline for CPT Group, Inc. to release the 10  | As soon as practicable following  |  |
|    |   | completion of the distribution process and filing of the Post-Distribution Accounting |  |
| 12 |   | with the Court  |  |
| 13 |   |   |  |
| 14 | 18. The Court further ORDERS that, pendir   | ng further order of this Court, all proceedings                                       |  |
|    | in this Action, except those contemplated herein and in   |   |  |
| 10 |   | The Settlement, are stayed, and an deadnines  |  |
| 16 | are vacated.  |   |  |
| 17 | 19. If for any reason the Court does not execute and file a Final Approval Order and  |   |  |
| 18 | Judgment, the proposed Settlement subject to this Order and all evidence and proceedings had in   |   |  |
| 19 | connection with the Settlement shall be null and void.  |   |  |
|    |   | any of the deadlines set forth in this Order or                                       |  |
| 20 | adjourn or continue the final approval hearing without  |   |  |
| 21 |   |   |  |
| 22 |   |   |  |
| 23 | IT IS SO ORDERED.   |   |  |
|    |   |   |  |
| 24 | Dated:  |   |  |
| 25 |   | HON. VINCENT CHHABRIA   |  |
| 26 |   | United States District Judge,<br>Northern District of California                      |  |
| 27 |   | Tormorn District of Cumornia  |  |
|    |   |   |  |
| 28 | _   |   |  |
|    | 7<br>[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS AND<br>COLLECTIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT<br>Soto, et al. v. O.C. Communications, Inc., et al., Case No. 3:17-cv-00251-VC |   |  |