FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

		01/12/2024
1	Joseph Lavi, Esq. (State Bar No. 209776) jlavi@lelawfirm.com	David W. Stayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Cou By: R. Aspiras Deputy
2	Jordan D. Bello, Esq. (State Bar No. 243190)	_,
3	jbello@lelawfirm.com LAVI & EBRAHIMIAN, LLP 8889 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 200	
4	Beverly Hills, California 90211 Telephone: (310) 432-0000	
5	Facsimile: (310) 432-0001	
6	Sahag Majarian II, Esq. (State Bar No. 146621) sahagii@aol.com	
7	Law Offices of Sahag Majarian II 18250 Ventura Boulevard	
8	Tarzana, California 91356 Telephone: (818) 609-0807 Facsimile: (818) 609-0892	
9	Attorneys for PLAINTIFF	
10	JUAN NAVARRO on behalf of himself and others	3
11	similarly situated.	
12		
	SUPERIOR COURT OF THI	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13	FOR THE COUNTY	OF LOS ANGELES
14		
15	JUAN NAVARRO on behalf of himself and others similarly situated.	Case No.: BC683876
16 17	PLAINTIFF,	Assigned for all purposes to Hon. William F Highberger, Dept. 10
	VS.	JUDGMENT AND ORDER GRANTING
18 19	L.A. SOUTHPARK HIGH-RISE, LP, a limited partnership; and DOES 1 to 100, Inclusive.	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
20	DEFENDANTS.	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
20		

The above captioned action is a putative class action lawsuit brought by Plaintiff Juan Navarro ("Plaintiff") against Defendant L.A. Southpark High-Rise, LP ("Defendant") In the lawsuit, Plaintiff alleged that Defendant failed to provide legally compliant itemized statements and improperly withheld security deposits for tenants who moved out and had any portion of their security deposits withheld for cleaning, repair, or late charges for rent ("Class Members") during the Class Period (November 17, 2013 to December 16, 2019).

Defendant denies all alleged wrongdoing, denies any liability to the Plaintiff, to members of the putative class, and denies that Plaintiff's claims are appropriate for class treatment.

On September 11, 2023, this Court entered an order granting preliminary approval of the class action settlement, resulting in preliminary certification of the following class for settlement purposes only: all persons who leased residential units from L.A. Southpark High-Rise, LP in California except those who were evicted, at any time during the period of November 17, 2013, to December 16, 2019 who paid a security deposit to L.A. Southpark High-Rise, LP for a rental agreement for residential property in California and had any portion of their security deposit withheld by L.A. Southpark High-Rise, LP for cleaning, repair work, and/or late charges for rent.

The Court further directed the Plaintiff to provide notice to the class, which informed absent class members about information about the settlement, including: (a) the proposed settlement, and the settlement's key terms; (b) the date, time and location of the Final Approval Hearing; (c) the right of any Class Member to object to the proposed settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; (d) the right of any class member to exclude themselves from the proposed settlement, and an explanation of the procedures to exercise that right; and (e) an explanation of the procedures for class members to participate in the proposed settlement.

The Court, upon notice having been given as required in the preliminary approval order, and having considered the proposed settlement agreement as well as all papers filed, hereby ORDERS AND ENTERS JUDGMENT AS FOLLOWS:

1. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and over the Parties, including all members of the settlement class.

- 2. The Court finds that the class is properly certified as a class for settlement purposes only.
- 3. The notice provided to the class members conforms with the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Civil Code section 1781, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, the Court's order granting preliminary approval, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all class members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the other class members. The notice was adequate, fully satisfied the requirements of due process, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances.
- 4. The Court finds the settlement was entered into in good faith, that the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and that the settlement satisfies the standards and applicable requirements for final approval of this class action settlement under California law, including the provisions of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769.
- 5. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, or by any other released party, nor is this Order and Judgment a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant or any other released party. Neither this Order and Judgment, the Settlement Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement Agreement, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant or any of the other released parties.
 - 6. No class members have objected to the settlement or requested exclusion.
- 7. On the first non-holiday within 15 calendar dates following the entry of this Judgment,
 Defendant is directed to pay the Gross Settlement Amount as that term is defined in the Settlement
 Agreement and pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 8. In addition to any recovery that Plaintiff may receive under the Settlement, and in recognition of the Plaintiff's efforts on behalf of the settlement class, the Court hereby approves the

payment of an incentive award to the Plaintiff in the amount of \$7,500 payable from the Gross Settlement Amount pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

- 9. The Court approves the payment of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the sum of \$176,550, and the reimbursement of litigation expenses in the sum of \$27,000, both payable from the Gross Settlement Amount and pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement. Both are reasonable amounts. The reasonableness of the fee award is determined based on a reasonable percentage of a common fund obtained for the class. The court also has considered the lodestar amount. Awarding fees on a percentage basis encourages efficient litigation practices and reflects the actual benefit obtained for the class.
- 10. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of \$12,500 to CPT Group, Inc. for performance of settlement administration services pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement. This amount will be payable from the Gross Settlement Amount and pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 11. The Court approves and orders funding of the settlement in compliance with the terms of the settlement agreement, including the payment and disbursement schedule.
- 12. Following 180 days after the settlement administrator mails the individual settlement payments to the Class Members; any monies and interest remaining from uncashed checks shall be sent to the Controller of the State of California to be held in the class member's name until claimed pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, Code Civ. Proc. §§1500.
- 13. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(g), the Court grants final approval of the Settlement Agreement and declares, that the Settlement Agreement binding on Plaintiff, all Class Members who have not opted out, all of whom will release the Released Parties from the released claims as set forth by the approved settlement agreement.
- 14. This Court shall retain jurisdiction over all matters related to the administration and consummation of the terms of this Settlement, over the enforcement, construction and interpretation of this Agreement, over the enforcement, construction, and interpretation of the Final Judgment, including, but not limited to, the provisions therein enjoining any further litigation of Released

1	Claims, and over the Plaintiff and all Class Members (and their attorneys and law firms) in connection		
2	therewith.		
3	15. The Plaintiff shall file a report for the settlement administrator by		
4	, confirming the distribution of funds, indicating the total amount paid		
5	to the class members, confirming the distribution of funds, indicating the total amount paid to the		
6	class members and confirming that all funds, including uncashed funds, have been disbursed.		
7	16. A non-appearance case review re Compliance with the Distribution is set for		
8	at a.m./ p.m. in this department.		
9	17. The Court hereby enters Judgment in the case, which will be res judicata as to the		
10	released claims of Plaintiff and Class Members.		
11			
12	IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.		
13	01/12/2024 Ar F. Nyhloga		
14	Dated.		
15	Hon. William F. Highberger Judge of the Superior Court		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			