

Plaintiffs Marcie Le and Karen Dao ("Plaintiffs") moved this Court for an Order under Rule 23(e)(1) regarding the Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release of Claims ("Settlement Agreement") between Plaintiffs and Defendants Walgreen Co.; Walgreen Pharmacy Services Midwest, LLC; and Walgreens Boots Alliance, Inc. ("Defendants") (together with Plaintiffs, the "Parties"), setting a hearing on the final approval of the settlement and certification of a settlement class, and directing notice to the class (the "Motion"). Upon considering the Motion, the Parties' Settlement Agreement and all exhibits thereto (collectively, the "Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement"), the materials previously submitted in this case, the arguments of counsel, and other materials relevant to this matter, it is hereby ORDERED that:

- 1. This Court has both subject matter jurisdiction and personal jurisdiction as to this action and all Parties before it.
- 2. The parties have shown that the Court will likely be able to approve the Settlement Agreement under Rule 23(e)(2). Specifically, the parties have made a showing that:
 - a. The class representatives and counsel have vigorously represented the interests of the proposed Settlement class;
 - b. The Settlement arose out of arm's-length, informed, and noncollusive negotiations between counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants, who convened multiple times to discuss settlement under the supervision of a mediator;
 - c. The relief provided for the proposed Settlement class is fair, adequate, and reasonable, considering: (i) the costs, risks and delay of appeal and further proceedings in the trial court; (ii) the effectiveness and straightforwardness of the proposed Settlement distribution process, which does not require proposed Settlement

class members to affirmatively make claims; (iii) the reasonableness of the anticipated request for an award of attorneys' fees; and (iv) the absence of any agreement required to be identified under Rule 23(e)(3).

- 3. The terms of the Settlement Agreement are sufficiently fair, reasonable, and adequate to allow dissemination of the Notice to the Class Members. This determination is not a final finding that the Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, but instead is a determination that there is good cause to submit the proposed Settlement Agreement to Class Members and to hold a hearing concerning final approval of the proposed Settlement, and ultimately approve the Settlement.
- 4. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted in connection with the Settlement, recognizes its significant value to the Class, and finds that the Settlement treats proposed Settlement class members equitably relative to each other.
- 5. The Court is likely to certify the proposed Settlement class for purposes of judgment on the proposed Settlement. Plaintiffs have made a sufficient showing, under the provisions of Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as applicable in the context of settlement classes, to establish reasonable cause, following Notice to Class Members, to hold a hearing to determine if a Class should be certified for settlement purposes only, consisting of persons who meet the following criteria: "All persons who are and/or were employed by Defendants in California at any time during the Class Period as hourly, non-exempt pharmacy interns, pharmacy intern graduates, pharmacists, staff pharmacists, multi-location pharmacists (both assigned and unassigned), and/or pharmacy managers (classified

¹ To the extent capitalized terms are not defined in this Order, they shall have the meaning set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

i			
ì			

under job code RXH; RXMHC; RXHSF; RXHCA; RXHLS; PHI5; PHIG; PHI3;
PHI6; PHI4; SPHI4; or SPHI5) and who do not submit a timely and valid Request
for Exclusion, as provided in the Settlement Agreement.

- 6. The parties have made a showing that:
 - a. The proposed Settlement class is sufficiently numerous, as there are thousands of class members, making joinder of all members impracticable.
 - b. There are questions of law and fact common to the proposed Settlement class.
 - c. The claims of Plaintiffs Dao and Le are typical of the claims of the proposed Settlement class.
 - d. Plaintiffs Dao and Le will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the proposed Settlement class, and Plaintiffs Dao and Le have no interests in conflict with those of the proposed Settlement class. Moreover, Plaintiffs Dao and Le have retained counsel experienced in employment class action litigation who have, and will continue to, vigorously represent the proposed Settlement class.
 - e. Common questions of law and fact predominate over any questions affecting only individual members.
 - f. Resolving these claims through a class settlement is superior to other available methods for a fair and efficient adjudication.
- 7. If, for any reason, the proposed Settlement is not approved, any order certifying a Class for settlement purposes shall be vacated *nunc pro tunc* and the litigation shall proceed as though the Class had never been certified.
- 8. The Court hereby designates named Plaintiffs Marcie Le and Karen Dao as the Class Representatives.
 - 9. The Court hereby appoints the following attorneys as counsel for the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Class: Elliot Siegel and Julian Burns King of King & Siegel LLP and Daniel Hutchinson and Lin Chan of Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP (collectively, "Class Counsel"). For purposes of these settlement proceedings, the Court finds that Class Counsel have extensive class action experience and are capable of serving as Class Counsel.
- 10. The Settlement Agreement is for settlement purposes only. Neither the fact of, any provision contained in, nor any action taken under the Settlement Agreement shall be construed as an admission of the validity of any claim or any factual allegation that was or could have been made by Plaintiffs and Class Members in the Action, or of any wrongdoing, fault, violation of law, or liability of any kind on the part of Defendants or the Released Persons. The Settlement Agreement shall not be offered or be admissible in evidence by or against Defendants or the Released Persons or cited or referred to in any other action or proceeding, except one: (1) brought by or against the Parties to enforce or otherwise implement the terms of the Settlement Agreement; (2) involving Plaintiffs or any Settlement Class Member to support a defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, release, or other theory of claim preclusion, issue preclusion, or similar defense; or (3) involving an attempt to enforce a stay of other litigation pursuant to the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and the Court's Order preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement.
- 11. The Notice and provisions for disseminating notice substantially as described in and attached to the Settlement Agreement are hereby approved. The Court approves the Notice attached as Exhibit 1 to the Settlement Agreement. This Notice: (a) provides the best practicable notice; (b) is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the Action, the terms of the proposed Settlement, and of their right to appear, object to, or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement; (c) are reasonable and constitute due,

adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (d) fully comply with federal law, the United States Constitution, and all other applicable laws.

- 12. CPT Group, Inc. (herein referred to as "Settlement Administrator"), selected pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, shall be responsible for providing notice of the proposed Settlement to the Class Members in accordance with the provisions of the Settlement Agreement.
- 13. Defendants shall provide the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data within twenty-five (25) business days of the entry of this Order. The Class Data, its contents, and any files containing Class Data shall remain strictly confidential for the Settlement Administrator, not to be disclosed to Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, any Class Member, or their attorneys.
- 14. The Settlement Administrator shall mail the Notice Packet to the identified Class Members per the Notice Program within fourteen (14) calendar days of its receipt of the Class Data from Defendants. On the same date, the Claims Administrator will make an informational settlement website available to the public, which website will include a copy of this Order, the Notice, the Settlement Agreement, and other important documents as set forth in the Notice.
- written request for exclusion (as described in the Notice and Settlement Agreement) by sending it to the Settlement Administrator, by First-Class U.S. mail to the address provided in the Notice or by fax. Requests for exclusion must contain all information described in the Settlement Agreement. The envelope containing the Request for Exclusion must be postmarked, or the fax must be fax stamped, on or before 60 days from date that the Settlement Administrator mails the Notice Packets. The Court shall rule on the validity of exclusions at the Final Approval Hearing.

- 16. Anyone who falls within the Class definition and does not submit a Request for Exclusion in complete accordance with the deadlines and other specifications set forth in this Order and the Settlement Agreement shall remain a Settlement Class Member and shall be bound by all proceedings, orders, and judgments of this Court pertaining to the Settlement Class.
- 17. Any Class Member who wishes to object to the proposed Settlement must serve a Notice of Objection on the Settlement Administrator in compliance with the deadlines and other specifications set forth in this Order and the Settlement Agreement. The envelope containing the Notice of Objection must be postmarked, or the fax must be fax stamped, on or before 60 days from date that the Settlement Administrator mails the Notice Packets. The Court shall rule on objections at the Final Approval Hearing.
- 18. Any Class Member who does not submit a timely Objection to the Settlement in complete accordance with this Order and the applicable provisions of the Settlement Agreement shall not be permitted to object to the Settlement.
- 19. No less than fifteen (15) days after the Response Deadline, the Claims Administrator will provide to the Parties a declaration attesting that Class Notice was disseminated in a manner consistent with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and setting forth: (a) the number of Notice Packets mailed and re-mailed to Class Members; (b) the number of undeliverable Notice Packets; (c) the number of timely Requests for Exclusion; (d) the number of timely objections received; (e) the amount of the average Individual Settlement Payment, as well as the highest and lowest Individual Settlement Payment; (f) the Settlement Administration Costs; and (g) any other information as the Parties mutually agree or the Court orders the Settlement Administrator to provide.
- 20. The Claims Administrator shall also have the obligations otherwise enumerated in the Settlement Agreement.

- 21. At least twenty-eight (28) days prior to the date set for the Final Approval Hearing, Plaintiffs shall file a motion for judgment and final approval of the Settlement and a motion for payment of attorneys' fees, reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, and class representative enhancements. The briefing shall include the Parties' responses to any Objections. Such briefing shall be served on any other attorneys who have entered an appearance in this proceeding, and on any member of the Settlement Class to whose Objection to the Settlement the briefing responds.
- 22. The Court finds that Defendants have provided notice to the appropriate state and federal officials pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act (28 U.S.C. § 1715).
- Approval Hearing, which shall be held either via telephone or videoconference pursuant to the Order of the Chief Judge 21-002 and the United States District Court for the Central District of California's Continuity of Operations Plan ("COOP"), if still in effect, or in the United States District Court for the Central District of California, 411 West Fourth Street, Courtroom 9 D, Santa Ana, CA, 92701-4516. The Final Approval Hearing may be continued or rescheduled by the Court with notice to Class Counsel and counsel for Defendants and to any objecting Settlement Class Member. At the Final Approval Hearing, or as soon thereafter as practicable, the Court will determine whether the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and should be approved by the Court. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will also consider the amount of attorneys' fees and expenses that should be awarded to Class Counsel and the amount to be awarded to Plaintiffs as Class Representative Enhancements.
- 24. Pending further orders by this Court, all proceedings in this case shall be stayed, except for proceedings pursuant to this Order. A stay is warranted

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- because it will conserve the parties' and various courts' resources, minimize interference with this Court's ability to rule on the proposed Settlement, and preserve the Settlement for a short period of time while Class Members receive notice and evaluate their options. A standstill of litigation will be efficient, promotes the public policy favoring settlement, and aids resolution of claims on a statewide basis, which is in the public interest.
 - 25. All members of the Class under the jurisdiction of this Court are enjoined from commencing and thereafter prosecuting any action, suit, proceeding, claim, or cause of action, in any jurisdiction or court against Defendants or the Released Parties relating to or arising out of the subject matter of this Action until a further Order of this Court following the Final Approval Hearing.
 - Approval Hearing or any further adjournment thereof, and to approve the Settlement Agreement, including any modifications thereto which are acceptable to the Parties, without further notice to Class Members. Any new date shall be posted on the settlement website. The Parties shall be permitted to make any non-substantive corrections or changes to the Notice to the Class and other Settlement documents without seeking further approval of the Court.
 - 27. Class Counsel and Counsel for Defendants are authorized to establish other means necessary to effectuate the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>April 1</u>, 2021

THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

Algorid O. Carter