

2021 MAR -9 PM 2: 29

LAW AND MOTION DEPT.53/64 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175) Kristen M. Agnew (State Bar No. 247656) Nicholas Rosenthal (State Bar No. 268297)

DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C. 515 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1250

Los Angeles, CA 90071

(213) 488-6555

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(213) 488-6554 facsimile

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

CINDY LABRASCA, as an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

LIRON, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2019-00256445-CU-OE-GDS

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT

Date:

March 9, 2021

Time:

1:30 P.M.

Dept.:

53

Reservation No.:

2543737

Complaint Filed:

May 14, 2019

iled by fax

1

Plaintiff's application for an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement was filed with the Court on February 11, 2021, and a hearing was held before this Court on March 9, 2021. Appearing at the hearing were Nicholas Rosenthal of Diversity Law Group, P.C. for Plaintiff and the Class and Kimberly Brooks of Ervin Cohen & Jessup LLP for Defendant.

The Court has considered the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement ("Settlement Agreement") and all other papers filed in this action.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. This Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and Defendant filed herewith. The Settlement Agreement appears to be fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class;
- 2. The Class Representative and Defendant (hereafter, "Settling Parties"), through their counsel of record in the Litigation, have reached an agreement to settle all claims in the Litigation on behalf of the Class (as defined below and in the Settlement Agreement) as a whole;
- 3. The Court hereby conditionally certifies the following Class for settlement purposes only:

all natural persons who were employed as medical examiners by the Defendant in the State of California during the period commencing May 14, 2015, and running through October 8, 2020.

- 4. Should for whatever reason the Settlement Agreement not become Final, the fact that the Parties were willing to stipulate to certification of a class as part of the Settlement Agreement shall have no bearing on, or be admissible in connection with, the Litigation or the issue of whether a class should be certified in a non-settlement context.
- 5. The Court appoints and designates: (a) Plaintiff Cindy Labrasca as the Class Representative and (b) Larry W. Lee, Kristen M. Agnew, and Nicholas Rosenthal of Diversity Law Group, P.C. as Class Counsel for the Class. Class Counsel is authorized to act on behalf of the Class with respect to all acts or consents required by, or which may be given, pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, and such other acts reasonably necessary to finalize the Settlement Agreement and its terms. Any Class Member may enter an appearance through his or her own

counsel at such Class Member's own expense. Any Class Member who does not enter an appearance or appear on his or her own behalf will be represented by Class Counsel.

- 6. The Court hereby approves the terms and conditions provided for in the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that on a preliminary basis the Settlement Agreement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement, and appears to be presumptively valid, subject only to any objections that may be raised at the final fairness hearing and final approval by the Court. It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to liability and damages issues. It also appears that investigation, research, and court proceedings have been conducted so that counsel for the Settling Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It appears to the Court that settlement at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all Settling Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the Litigation. It also appears that settlement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations.
- 7. A final fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement Agreement, the allocation of payments to Settlement Class Members, attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, settlement administration costs, and the Plaintiff's Incentive Award should be finally approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to the members of the Class is hereby set for at 130 Pin this Court.
- 8. The Court hereby approves, as to form and content, the Notice of Proposed Class Action ("Class Notice") to be sent to Class Members, which is attached as **Exhibit 1** to the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that distribution of the Class Notice to Class Members substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Settlement Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all parties entitled thereto.
- 9. The Court appoints and designates Phoenix Settlement Administrators as the Settlement Administrator. The Court hereby directs the Settlement Administrator to provide the

1

2

approved Class Notice, to Class Members using the procedures set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

- Any Class Member may choose to opt out of and be excluded from the settlement 10. as provided in the Settlement Agreement and Class Notice and by following the instructions to request exclusion. Any person who timely and properly opts out of the settlement will not be bound by the Settlement Agreement or have any right to object, appeal, or comment thereon. Any opt out request must be in writing and signed by each such Class Member opting out and must otherwise comply with the requirements delineated in the Class Notice. Class Members who have not requested exclusion by submitting a valid and timely opt out request, by the opt out deadline, shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Settlement Agreement, and Judgment.
- 11. Any Class Member may object to the Settlement Agreement or express his or her views regarding the Settlement Agreement, and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Class Notice.
- 12. The Motion for Final Approval shall be filed by the Class Representative no later than sixteen (16) court days before the Settlement Fairness Hearing.
- 13. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the Settlement Fairness Hearing and all dates provided for in the Settlement Agreement without further notice to the Class, and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the Class Settlement Agreement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

23

28

24 DATED:

9 2021 MAR -

SHAMA H. MESIWALA

HON. SHAMA H. MESIWALA SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA