24

25

26

27

28

20, inclusive,

JAY SMITH (CA Bar No. 166105) js@gslaw.org JOSHUA F. YOUNG (CA Bar No. 232995) jyoung@gslaw.org MICHAEL D. WEINER (Bar No. 240155) mweiner@gslaw.org GILBERT & SACKMAN, A LAW CORPORATION 3699 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1200 Los Angeles, California 90010 Telephone: (323) 938-3000 Fax: (323) 937-9139 PARKER WRIGHT, ALYSSA GRANT, KEVIN DOHERTY, and JUSTIN ATKINS, Plaintiffs, ENTERTAINMENT CENTRAL AGENCY, INC dba Entertainment Central Productions; JEREMY JAMES; SHALISA JAMES; and DOES 1 through

Defendants.

CONFORMED COPY ORIGINAL FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles

MAR 26 2021

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk By: Stephanie Chung, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

. 37

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

Case No. 18STCV01046

Assigned for All Purposes To: Honorable Daniel J. Buckley Spring Street Courthouse - Dept. 1

CLASS ACTION

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION, APPROVAL OF CLASS NOTICE, AND SETTING OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING

By Fax

Date: October 30, 2020

Time: 4:00 pm Dept: 1

Judge: Daniel J. Buckley

Action Filed: October 16, 2018

-[PROP] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR PRELIM APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL CERTIF, APPROVAL OF CLASS NOTICE; & SETTING OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING On October 16, 2018, Plaintiffs filed this class-action lawsuit against Defendants in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, alleging, *inter alia*, misclassification, unpaid overtime, minimum wage violations, and meal and rest period violations. The case was removed by Defendants to the Central District of California on November 29, 2018. On March 27, 2019, following settlement, the case was remanded to the Los Angeles Superior Court. Plaintiffs contend in this action that Defendants misclassified performers as independent contractors instead of employees at its productions in California, including the "Frog Choir" and "Grinchmas" at Universal Studios Hollywood. Defendants deny any liability and contend they complied with all laws.

Plaintiff has moved this Court for an order: (1) preliminarily and conditionally certifying the class for purposes of settlement; (2) preliminarily approving the class action settlement; (3) preliminarily

Plaintiff has moved this Court for an order: (1) preliminarily and conditionally certifying the class for purposes of settlement; (2) preliminarily approving the class action settlement; (3) preliminarily appointing Plaintiffs Parker Wright, Alyssa Grant, Kevin Doherty, and Justin Atkins as the Class Representatives for purposes of settlement; (4) preliminarily appointing Gilbert & Sackman, a Law Corporation as class counsel for purposes of settlement; (5) preliminarily approving the application for payment to class counsel of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; (6) preliminarily approving the payment of an "enhancement award" to each of the four class representatives; (7) preliminarily approving settlement administration services to be provided by KCC (8) approving the form and content the proposed class notice; (9) directing that the notice of settlement be mailed by first class mail to the Settlement Class members; and (10) scheduling a final fairness approval hearing.

No opposition has been filed to plaintiff's motion, which came for hearing before the Court on October 30, 2020 at 4:00 p.m. Counsel for all parties were present at the hearing.

This Court, having considered Plaintiffs' notice of motion, supporting memorandum of points and authorities and the declarations of counsel, the Settlement Agreement, the proposed Class Notice, and the oral argument presented to the Court, and in recognition of the Court's duty to make a preliminary determination as to the reasonableness of any proposed class action settlement, and to conduct a fairness hearing as to good faith, fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of any proposed settlement, HEREBY ORDERS and MAKES DETERMINATIONS as follows:

| | ///

28 | ///

16.

///

///

ORDER CONDITIONALLY CERTIFYING SETTLEMENT CLASS, AND APPOINTING CLASS REPRESENTATIVES AND CLASS COUNSEL

The Court finds that provisional certification of the following class for settlement purposes only is appropriate under Code of Civil Procedure § 382: "All persons in California who worked as performers and were classified as independent contractors by Defendants during the four years preceding the filing of the Complaint" (since October 16, 2014).

The Court finds that the Settlement Class meets the ascertainability and numerosity requirements because at least 52 class members have been identified through Defendants' records. The commonality requirement is also met. In the absence of class certification and settlement, each individual Settlement Class member would be forced to litigate core common issues of law and fact.

Because the Plaintiffs' and Settlement Class members' claims all arise from the same events and course of conduct, and are based on the same legal theories, the typicality requirement is also satisfied. The adequacy of representation requirement is also met here because the representative plaintiffs have the same interests as all members of the Settlement Class and there is no conflict of interest. Moreover, counsel at Gilbert & Sackman, ALC, is adequate and competent Class Counsel.

The Court further finds that common issues predominate over individual issues in the litigation and that class treatment is superior to other means of resolving this dispute. Employing the class device here will not only achieve economies of scale for Settlement Class members with relatively small individual claims but will also conserve the resources of the judicial system by avoiding the waste and delay of repetitive proceedings and prevent the inconsistent adjudications of similar issues and claims.

For all of these reasons, the Court ORDERS that the class be conditionally certified for purposes of settlement only.

The Court finds that Parker Wright, Alyssa Grant, Kevin Doherty, and Justin Atkins are adequate class representatives and appoints them such. Gilbert & Sackman, ALC, shall be appointed as Class Counsel and shall be responsible for communicating with Class Members where necessary and providing input on substantive and procedural issues during the litigation.

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The Court has reviewed the Settlement Agreement and the proposed Class Notice documents, which are attached as exhibits to the supporting declaration of Joshua F. Young. The Court finds, on a preliminary basis, that the Settlement Agreement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by the Court. The Court also finds, on a preliminary basis, that the Settlement Agreement appears to be the product of intensive, non-collusive, arm's length negotiations between well-informed counsel, and is thus presumptively valid.

It appears to the Court that on a preliminary basis, the settlement amount of \$120,000 is fair and reasonable to all Settlement Class members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to liability and damages issues. It further appears that extensive investigation, research and mediation have been conducted such that the parties' counsel at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears that the settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, in addition to those which have already been incurred by both sides, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of this litigation.

The Court, therefore, preliminarily and conditionally approves the Settlement, including: (1) the proposed incentive fee to each named plaintiff in the amount of \$1,000 in addition to their pro rata share of the settlement amount; (2) the proposed attorney's fees and costs (\$30,000 in reasonable attorney's fees and \$1,000 in estimated costs) from the settlement amount; and (3) payment of reasonable settlement administration costs (estimated at less than \$5,000) from the Settlement.

APPROVAL OF DISTRIBUTION OF CLASS NOTICE

The Court finds that the proposed Class Notice form, which is attached as an exhibit to the supporting declaration of Joshua F. Young, fairly and adequately advises potential class members of the terms of the proposed settlement, the process for the class members to opt out of the class, the process for class members to compute and challenge their pro rata share of the settlement, the process to file objections to the proposed settlement, and their right to appear at the Fairness Hearing to be conducted on the date set forth below.

The Court finds the proposed distribution of the Class Notice, including distribution of such notice by first class mail to each identified Settlement Class member at his or her last known address; database

search done prior to mailing; and skip tracing and re-mailing as to any notices that are returned by the post office of such returned notice, to comport with all constitutional requirements, including those of due process, and is the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

The Court confirms the selection of Simpluris, Inc., as the Administrator of the settlement claims process, the reasonable costs of which will be paid from the settlement amount.

Accordingly, good cause appearing, the Court hereby approves the proposed Class Notice and adopts the following dates and deadlines:

Within ten (10) calendar days after entry of the Court's Order of Preliminary Approval:	Defendants will produce the Class List and Data to Class Counsel and to the Administrator in a readable Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet which shall include for each Class Member: (1) full name; (2) most recently known mailing address; (3) telephone and cell numbers; (4) email address (to the extent available); (5) Social Security Number; (6) dates of employment; (7) work site(s) where employed during the Class Period; (8) total number of Qualifying Shifts worked during the Class Period.
Within fourteen (14) calendar days after receiving the information from Defendants:	Administrator shall mail the Notice Packet to all Class Members, via first class United States mail, using the most current mailing address. Any Notice Packet returned to the Administrator with a forwarding address shall be immediately re-mailed by the Administrator. The Administrator shall conduct a skip-trace address search for any Class Member's Notice Packet that is returned without a forwarding address and shall, upon obtaining a new or different address, immediately remail the Class Member's Notice Packet. It shall be presumed that each and every Class Member whose Notice Packet is not returned to the Administrator as undeliverable within thirty (30) calendar days after mailing has actually received the Notice Packet.
At least thirty-five (35) calendar days before objection deadline:	Claims Administrator to post Motion for Attorneys' Fees and any related filings on the website.
Within thirty-five (35) calendar days after Class Notice is mailed:	Last day for Class Members to file written objections with the Court or submit a written request for exclusion from the settlement.
75 calendar days after Order of Preliminary Approval:	Plaintiffs file Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Motion for Attorney's Fees and Costs.
At least 110 calendar days after Order of Preliminary Approval:	Final Approval Hearing.
Within seven (7) calendar days after Effective Date:	Initial checks sent to Class Members.

1	1 30 carendar days after	istrator to send reminder postcard to Class Members who have		
2	2 checks sent to Class not cast Members:	hed checks.		
3	3 30 calendar days after checks sent to Class	istrator Report to be filed with Court.		
4	4 Members:			
5	5 180 calendar days after Checks checks issued:	valid for 180 days after issuance.		
6	FINAL APPROVAL FAIRNESS HEARING			
7	The Court hereby grants Plaintiffs' motion to set a hearing for final approval of the Settlement			
8	Agreement on 7/11/2011, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 1 of this Court. Members of the			
9	Settlement Class who object to the proposed settlement may appear and present such objections at the			
10	Final Approval Fairness Hearing in person or by counsel, provided that any objecting Settlement Class			
11	members submit a written statement containing the name and address of the objecting Settlement Class			
12	member and the basis of that person's objections, together with a notice of the intention to appear, which			
13	must be postmarked no later than 35 days from the date on which the Notice is sent out by the			
14	Administrator. No person shall be heard, and no briefs or papers shall be received or considered, unless			
15	the foregoing documents have been filed and served as provided in this Order and she or he appears at the			
16.	6. Final Fairness hearing, except as this Co	Final Fairness hearing, except as this Court may permit for good cause shown.		
17	Class Counsel shall file a memorandum of points and authorities in support of the final approval			
18	of the Settlement Agreement and their request for approval of the attorney's fees and costs no later than			
19	16 court days prior to the hearing.			

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if for any reason the Court does not grant final approval of the Settlement Agreement, all evidence and proceedings held in connection therewith shall be without prejudice to the status quo and the rights of the parties to the litigation as more specifically set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DATED: Mark 26,

DANIEL J. BUCKLEY

The Honorable Daniel J. Buckley Los Angeles Superior Court Judge

[PROP] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR PRELIM APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CONDITIONAL CERTIF, APPROVAL OF CLASS NOTICE, & SETTING OF FINAL APPROVAL HEARING



3699 Wilshire Blud Suck 1200 has Angeles, CA 90010

Stoc 2522801006

