| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672 khaque@aegislawfirm.com SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104 swong@aegislawfirm.com JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 2806 jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com KRISTY R. CONNOLLY, State Bar No. 3286 kconnolly@aegislawfirm.com 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100 Irvine, California 92618 Telephone: (949) 379-6250 Facsimile: (949) 379-6251 Attorneys for Plaintiff Ynesita Ramirez, individually and on behalf of all others similar | 477 | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| 10 11 | | | | |
| 12 | SUPERIOR COURT OF | THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 13 | FOR THE COU | JNTY OF RIVERSIDE | | |
| 14 | | | | |
| 15 | YNESITA RAMIREZ, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated | Case No. RIC1809690 | | |
| 16 | Plaintiff, | Assigned for All Purposes to: Hon. Sunshine Sykes | | |
| 17 | VS. | Department 6 | | |
| 18 | ACT FULFILLMENT, INC., a California | NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT | | |
| 19 | corporation; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive, | | | |
| 20 | Defendants. | | | |
| 21 | 2010110011001 | | | |
| 22 | | | | |
| 23 | | | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| 26 | | | | |
| 27 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | |
| | | -1- | | |
| NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT | | | | |

| 1 | TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD HEREIN: |
|---------------------------------|--|
| 2 | PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on July 21, 2021, the Honorable Sunshine Sykes in Department 6 |
| 3 | of the Riverside County Superior Court granted final approval of the class action settlement in this |
| 4 | action and issued Judgment. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the |
| 5 | Judgment. |
| 6 | |
| 7 8 | |
| 9 | Dated: August 6, 2021 AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC |
| 10 | Bu Lin Om 111 |
| 11 | By: Confly Attorney for Plaintiff |
| 12 | Attorney for Plaintiff |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 2627 | |
| 28 | |
| 20 | -2- |

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

AUG 0 2 2021

S. Salazar



SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

YNESITA RAMIREZ, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

Plaintiff,

VS.

ACT FULFILLMENT, INC., a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. RIC1809690

Assigned for All Purposes to: Hon. Sunshine Sykes

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT

Date:

July 21, 2021

Time:

8:30 a.m.

Dept:

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

This matter came on for hearing on July 21, 2021 at 8:30 a.m., in Department 6 of the above-captioned Court on the unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769, this Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval filed March 26, 2021, and the First Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement ("Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement"), a copy of which was filed on March 4, 2021 as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Kristy R. Connolly in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

Having received and considered the Settlement Agreement, the supporting papers filed by the Parties, and the evidence and argument received by the Court in conjunction with the unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement heard March 10, 2021 and the instant Motion for Final Approval, the Court grants final approval of the Settlement and HEREBY ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

- 1. Pursuant to the Order Granting Preliminary Approval, a Notice of Class Action Settlement, Exclusion Form, and Objection Cover Sheet ("Class Notice Packet") was sent to each Settlement Class Member by first-class mail. These papers informed the Settlement Class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive an Individual Settlement Payment, their right (a) to comment on or object to the Settlement, (b) to request exclusion from the Settlement and pursue their own remedies, and (c) of their right to appear in person or by counsel at the final approval hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided by each of these procedures. One Class Member submitted an Objection Form to the Settlement Administrator, but confirmed to the Settlement Administrator that it was done in error. The following three Class Members who submitted Exclusion Forms are excluded from the Settlement: Genoveva Garcia, Milagro Garcia, and Somphon Inkhamny.
- The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate protections to Settlement Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed decision regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of the Settlement Class. The

Court finds and determines that the notice provided in this case was the best notice practicable, which satisfied the requirements of law and due process.

- 3. With respect to the Settlement Class and for purposes of approving this Settlement only, this Court finds and concludes 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 Action; (c) the claims of Class Representative Ynesita Ramirez are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class; (d) the Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the interests of the members of the Settlement Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representative, i.e., Class Counsel, are qualified to serve as counsel for Plaintiff in their individual and representative capacities for the Class.
- 4. The Court has certified a Settlement Class, as that term is defined in and by the terms of the Settlement Agreement as all current and former non-exempt employees employed by ACT Fulfillment, Inc. at any time during the Class Period of May 23, 2014 through March 1, 2020 and the Court deems this definition sufficient for purposes of California Rule of Court 3.765(a).
 - 5. The Court hereby confirms Aegis Law Firm, PC as Class Counsel.
- The Court hereby confirms Plaintiff Ynesita Ramirez as the Class Representative in this Action.
- 7. The Court finds and determines that the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms, having found that the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral mediator. The Court further finds that the Parties conducted extensive investigation, research, and discovery and that their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that the Settlement will enable the Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks

if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement and recognizes the significant value accorded to the Class.

- 8. The Court further finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement are fair, reasonable and adequate to the Settlement Class and to each Settlement Class Member and that the Settlement is ordered finally approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement should be and hereby are ordered to be consummated.
- 9. The Court finds and determines that the Individual Settlement Payments to be paid to participating Settlement Class Members as provided for by the Settlement are fair and reasonable. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts be made to the participating Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
- 10. The Court finds and determines that payment to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency of \$15,000.00 as its share of the settlement of civil penalties in this case is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders that the payment of that amount be paid in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
- 11. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administrating the Settlement incurred by Phoenix Settlement Administrators in the amount of \$12,000.00, are fair and reasonable. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders that the payment of that amount in accordance with the Settlement.
- 12. The Court finds and determines the Class Representative Enhancement Payment of up to \$10,000 for Plaintiff is fair and reasonable. The Court hereby orders the Administrator to make this payment to the Plaintiff/Class Representative in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 13. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, and the authorities, evidence and argument submitted by Class Counsel, the Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the sum of \$163,333.33 and litigation costs of \$9,000. The Court finds such amounts to be fair

and reasonable. The Court hereby orders the Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

- 14. Without affecting the finality of this order or the entry of judgment in any way, the Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation, effectuation, and enforcement of this order and the Settlement.
- 15. Neither Defendant nor any related persons or entities shall have any further liability for costs, expenses, interest, attorneys' fees, or for any other charge, expense, or liability, except as provided for by the Settlement Agreement.
- Agreement constitutes an admission by Defendant, nor is this order a finding of the validity of any claims in this case or of any other wrongdoing. Further, the Settlement Agreement is not a concession, and shall not be used as an admission of any wrongdoing, fault, or omission of any entity or persons; nor may any action taken to carry out the terms of the Settlement Agreement be construed as an admission or concession by or against Defendants or any related person or entity.
- 17. Nothing in this order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations under the Settlement or under this order, including the requirement that Defendants make payment to the participating Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Settlement.
- 18. The Settlement Administrator shall mail the Individual Settlement Payments to participating Settlement Class Members as provided in the Settlement Agreement with an envelope bearing the notation, "YOUR CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CHECK IS ENCLOSED." The settlement distribution checks shall be negotiable for at least 90 days but not more than 180 days from the date of mailing.
- 19. The Settlement Administrator shall mail a reminder postcard to any class members whose settlement distribution check has not been negotiated within 60 days after the date of mailing.
- 20. If any of the participating Settlement Class Members are current employees of Defendant, the distribution mailed to those employees is returned to the Settlement Administrator

as being undeliverable, and the Settlement Administrator is unable to locate a valid mailing address, the Settlement Administrator shall arrange with Defendant to have those distributions delivered to the employees at their place of employment.

- 21. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Settlement Administrator shall prepare a Final Report in the form of a declaration which shall describe (i) the date the checks were mailed, (ii) the total number of checks mailed to class members, (iii) the average amount of those checks, (iv) the number of checks that remain uncashed, (v) the total value of those uncashed checks, (vi) the average amount of the uncashed checks, and (vii) the nature and date of the disposition of those unclaimed funds. The Final Report shall be filed with the Court five (5) court days before the Final Report (Nonappearance) Hearing set for March 28, 2022 at 8:30 a.m. in Dept. 6.
- 22. The Court hereby enters final judgment in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement filed on March 26, 2021, and this Order.
- 23. Class Counsel shall file a Notice of Entry of Judgment, and provide the same to the Settlement Administrator, who shall post the Order and Judgment on the Settlement Administrator's website (www.phoenixclassaction.com) for sixty calendar days.
 - 24. The Notice of Entry of Judgment shall state the following:

- //

5 //

| | 25 The Position will be set their new coasts and attermosts' food assent as otherwise |
|----|--|
| 1 | 25. The Parties will bear their own costs and attorneys' fees except as otherwise |
| 2 | provided by this Court's Order awarding Class Counsels' Award for attorneys' fees and litigation |
| 3 | costs. |
| 4 | 16 |
| 5 | DATED: 727, 2021 |
| 6 | Honorable Sunshine Sykes JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | -7- |