1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	HAINES LAW GROUP, APC Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226) phaines@haineslawgroup.com Fletcher W. Schmidt (SBN 286462) fschmidt@haineslawgroup.com Andrew J. Rowbotham (SBN 301367) arowbotham@haineslawgroup.com Matthew K. Moen (SBN 305956) mmoen@haineslawgroup.com 222 N. Sepulveda Blvd., Ste 1550 El Segundo, California 90245 Tel: (424) 292-2350 Fax: (424) 292-2355  James R. Hawkins, Esq. SBN 192925 Isandra Fernandez, Esq. SBN 220482 JAMES HAWKINS APLC 9880 Research Drive, Suite 200 Irvine, CA 92618 TEL: (949) 387-7200 FAX: (949) 387-6676  Attorneys for Plaintiffs	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER  JUL 2 6 2019  DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court  BY:, DEPUTY
13		
14	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
15	FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE	
16 17 18 19	JERONIMO LUCANO, ROXANA M. CUELLAR, and MARISOL E. ARGUETA, as individuals on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,  Plaintiffs,	CASE NO. 30-2016-00885837-CU-OE-CXC  [Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Peter Wilson, Dept. CX102]  REVISED-[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	vs.  UMPCO, INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,  Defendants.	FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS, AND CLASS REPRESENTATIVES ENHANCEMENT PAYMENTS  Date: June 27, 2019 Time: 2:00 p.m. Dept.: CX102  Action Filed: November 8, 2016 Trial Date: None Set

4

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

27

26

28

## PROPOSED JUDGMENT AND ORDER

The Motion of Plaintiffs Jeronimo Lucano, Roxana M. Cuellar and Marisol E. Argueta ("Plaintiffs") for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Class Representatives Enhancement Payments came on regularly for hearing before this Court on June 27, 2019 at 2:00 p.m., pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's Amended Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Stipulation of Settlement ("Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"), and all other documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and recognizing the sharply disputed factual and legal issues involved in this case, the risks of further prosecution, and the benefits to be received by the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement, the Court hereby makes a final ruling that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is the product of good faith, arms'-length negotiations between the parties. Good cause appearing therefor, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Class Representatives Enhancement Payments, and HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

The conditional class certification contained in the Preliminary Approval Order is 1. hereby made final, and the Court thus certifies, for purposes of the Settlement, a Settlement Class consisting of:

All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant UMPCO, Inc. ("Defendant") from November 8, 2012 until January 23, 2019 (the "Class Period").

- Plaintiffs Jeronimo Lucano, Roxana M. Cuellar and Marisol E. Argueta are hereby confirmed as Class Representatives, and Paul K. Haines, Fletcher W. Schmidt, Andrew J. Rowbotham, and Matthew K. Moen of Haines Law Group, APC, and James R. Hawkins and Isandra Fernandez of James Hawkins APLC, are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.
- 3. Notice was provided to Settlement Class Members as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, which was approved by the Court on January 23, 2019, and the notice process has been completed in conformity with the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds that

said notice constituted reasonable notice under the circumstances, and constituted valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class Members. The Class Notice provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed Settlement Class Members of their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and other applicable law.

- 4. The Court finds that no Settlement Class Members objected to or requested exclusion from the Settlement, and the 100% participation rate supports final approval.
- 5. The Court hereby approves the Settlement as set forth in the Settlement Agreement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and directs the parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms.
- 6. For purposes of settlement only, the Court finds that: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the Settlement Class and there is a well-defined community of interest among members of the Settlement Class with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the claims of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class; (d) the Class Representatives have fairly and adequately protected the interests of the Settlement Class Members; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to serve as counsel for the Class Representatives and the Settlement Class.
- 7. The Court finds that given the absence of objections, and objections being a prerequisite to appeal, this Order shall be considered final as of the date of entry.
- 8. The Court orders that within fourteen (14) calendar days of this Order, Defendant shall deposit the Maximum Settlement Amount (\$525,000.00) with Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Settlement Administrator"), as provided for in the Settlement.
- 9. The Court finds that the Individual Settlement Payments, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute these payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

- 10. The Court finds that the payment to the State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$7,500.00 for its 75% share of the civil penalties allocated under the Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 11. The Court finds that the Class Representatives Enhancement Payments in the amount of \$4,000.00 each are appropriate in recognition of the risks Plaintiffs undertook; for the amount of time and effort spent by Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives; for the general release provided by Plaintiffs as part of the Settlement Agreement; and the service they provided to the Settlement Class. The Court finds that these amounts are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make these payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 12. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$175,000.00 and litigation costs of \$19,917.61 for Class Counsel are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 13. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$9,500.00 from the Maximum Settlement Amount for all of its work done and to be done until the completion of this matter, and finds that sum appropriate.
- 14. The Court orders that this Final Order and the Court's Final Judgment shall be posted to the Settlement Administrator's static website. The Court finds that this method of notice to the Settlement Class Members satisfies California Rule of Court 3.771(b).
- p.m. in Department CX102 of the above-entitled Court. Plaintiffs shall prepare and submit a final report regarding the status of the settlement administration, including all information necessary for the Court to determine the total amount actually paid to the Class Members, by no later than ten (10) days prior to the date of the Final Accounting Status Conference. Plaintiffs shall also submit a [Proposed] Amended Judgment by no later than ten (10) days prior to the date of the

Final Accounting Status Conference, directing Defendant (or the settlement administrator on Defendant's behalf) to pay the sum of the unpaid residue or unclaimed or abandoned Class Member funds plus any interest that has accrued thereon as follows: 25% to the State Treasury for deposit in the Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, and 75% to the State Treasury fund for deposit into the Equal Access Fund of the Judicial Branch.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June\_\_\_\_\_, 2019

Honorable Peter Wilson Judge of the Superior Court