Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles ILED

MAY 26 2021

,,,,cer/Clerk LALFREDO MORALES

Edwin Aiwazian (SBN 232943) Arby Aiwazian (SBN 269827) Joanna Ghosh (SBN 272479) LAWYERS for JUSTICE, PC 410 West Arden Avenue, Suite 203 Glendale, California 91203 Tel: (818) 265-1020 / Fax: (818) 265-1021 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Class

STEPHANIE COLLAZO-TEJEDA.

of the general public similarly situated;

Plaintiff.

a California corporation; and DOES 1

Defendants.

KAREN STURGEON, individually, and on

similarly situated and on behalf of other

aggrieved employees pursuant to the California Private Attorneys General Act;

Plaintiff.

STATE BANK OF INDIA-CALIFORNIA, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1

Defendants.

behalf of other members of the general public

VS.

through 100, inclusive,

VS.

through 100, inclusive,

individually, and on behalf of other members

STATE BANK OF INDIA (CALIFORNIA),

6

1

2

3

4

5

1

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Case No.: BC717304 (lead) Case No.: 18STCV02768

Honorable Amy D. Hogue Department SSC7

CLASS ACTION

[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Date: Time:

Department:

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES—SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE

May 26, 2021 11:00 a.m. SSC7

Date Collazo-Tejeda filed: August 9, 2018 Date Sturgeon filed:

Trial Date:

October 29, 2018

None Set

[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

This matter has come before the Honorable Amy D. Hogue in Department SSC7 of the above-entitled Court, located at 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, on Plaintiffs Stephanie Collazo-Tejeda and Karen Sturgeon's ("Plaintiffs") Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Enhancement Awards ("Motion for Final Approval"). Lawyers *for* Justice, PC appeared on behalf of Plaintiffs, and Morrison & Foerster LLP appeared on behalf of Defendant State Bank of India (California) ("Defendant").

On November 17, 2020, the Court entered the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"), thereby preliminarily approving the settlement of the above-entitled actions ("Actions") in accordance with the Amended Agreement and Release Re: PAGA and Class Action Settlement ("Settlement," "Agreement," or "Settlement Agreement"), which, together with the exhibits annexed thereto, set forth the terms and conditions for settlement of the Actions.

Having reviewed the Settlement Agreement and duly considered the parties' papers and oral argument, and good cause appearing,

THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS, ADJUDGES, AND DECREES AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary Approval Order.
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the claims of the Class Members asserted in this proceeding and over all parties to the Actions.
- 3. The Court finds that the applicable requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and California Rule of Court 3.769, et seq. have been satisfied with respect to the Class and the Settlement. The Court hereby makes final its earlier provisional certification of the Class for settlement purposes, as set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order. The Class is hereby defined to include:

All individuals who are or were employed by Defendant State Bank of India (California) in California as hourly-paid or non-exempt employees at any time during the period from August 9, 2014 to and including November 17, 2020. ("Class" or "Class Members").

4. The Notice of Class Action Settlement ("Class Notice") that was provided to the

Class Members, fully and accurately informed the Class Members of all material elements of the Settlement and of their opportunity to participate in, object to or comment thereon, or to seek exclusion from, the Settlement; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of California, the United States Constitution, due process and other applicable law. The Class Notice fairly and adequately described the Settlement and provided the Class Members with adequate instructions and a variety of means to obtain additional information.

- 5. Pursuant to California law, the Court hereby grants final approval of the Settlement and finds that it is reasonable and adequate, and in the best interests of the Class as a whole. More specifically, the Court finds that the Settlement was reached following meaningful discovery and investigation conducted by Lawyers for Justice, PC ("Class Counsel"); that the Settlement is the result of serious, informed, adversarial, and arms-length negotiations between the parties; and that the terms of the Settlement are in all respects fair, adequate, and reasonable. In so finding, the Court has considered all of the evidence presented, including evidence regarding the strength of Plaintiffs' claims; the risk, expense, and complexity of the claims presented; the likely duration of further litigation; the amount offered in the Settlement; the extent of investigation and discovery completed; and the experience and views of Class Counsel. The Court has further considered the absence of objections to and requests for exclusion from the Settlement submitted by Class Members. Accordingly, the Court hereby directs that the Settlement be affected in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the following terms and conditions.
- 6. A full opportunity has been afforded to the Class Members to participate in the Final Approval Hearing, and all Class Members and other persons wishing to be heard have been heard. The Class Members also have had a full and fair opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement. Accordingly, the Court determines that all Class Members who did not timely and validly opt out of the Settlement ("Settlement Class Members") are bound by this Final Approval Order and Judgment.
- 7. The Court finds that payment of Settlement Administration Costs in the amount of \$5,000 is appropriate for the services performed and costs incurred and to be incurred for the notice

 and settlement administration process. It is hereby ordered that the Settlement Administrator, Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions, shall issue payment to itself in the amount of \$5,000, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

- 8. The Court finds that the Enhancement Awards sought are fair and reasonable for the work performed by Plaintiffs on behalf of the Class. It is hereby ordered that the Settlement Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$7,500 each to Plaintiffs Stephanie Collazo-Tejeda and Karen Sturgeon for their Enhancement Awards, according to the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 9. The Court finds that the allocation of \$40,000 toward penalties under the California Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA Payment"), is fair, reasonable, and appropriate, and hereby approved. The Settlement Administrator shall distribute the PAGA Payment as follows: the amount of \$30,000 to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and the amount of \$10,000 to be included in the Class Member Allocation for distribution to Settlement Class Members, according to the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 10. The Court finds that the request for attorneys' fees in the amount of \$298,350 to Class Counsel falls within the range of reasonableness, and the results achieved justify the award sought. The requested attorneys' fees to Class Counsel are fair, reasonable, and appropriate, and are hereby approved. It is hereby ordered that the Settlement Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$298,350 to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 11. The Court finds that reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses in the amount of \$28,000 to Class Counsel is reasonable, and hereby approved. It is hereby ordered that the Settlement Administrator issue payment in the amount of \$17,659.72 to Class Counsel for reimbursement of litigation costs and expenses, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 12. The Court hereby enters Judgment by which Settlement Class Members shall be conclusively determined to have given a release of any and all Released Claims against the Released Parties, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Class Notice.

- 13. It is hereby ordered that Defendant shall deposit the Maximum Settlement Amount into a Qualified Settlement Fund established by the Settlement Administrator within ten (10) business days after the Effective Date, in accordance with the terms and methodology set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 14. It is hereby ordered that the Settlement Administrator shall distribute Individual Payment Amounts to the Settlement Class Members within fifteen (15) business days after the Effective Date, according to the methodology and terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 15. After entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment, pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769(h), the Court shall retain jurisdiction to construe, interpret, implement, and enforce the Settlement Agreement and this Final Approval Order and Judgment, to hear and resolve any contested challenge to a claim for settlement benefits, and to supervise and adjudicate any dispute arising from or in connection with the distribution of settlement benefits.
- 16. Notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be given to the Class Members by posting a copy of the Final Approval Order and Judgment on the Settlement Administrator's website for a period of at least sixty (60) calendar days after the date of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment. Individualized notice is not required.

17. The Hoministrator must file a Declara or by 12/15/21. The Court sets non-afficience can revise of 1/6/2022 at 10:a.m.

Dated:

| The Hoministrator must file a Declara or or of 12/21. The Court sets and non-afficience can be supported by the superior court.

| Honorable and Defocute judge of the superior court.