1	ACKERMANN & TILAJEF, P.C.	FILED KERN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
2	Craig J. Ackermann, CA Bar No. 229832 cja@ackermanntilajef.com	09/08/2021
3	1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 610 Los Angeles, CA 90035	BY <u>Villalon, Maribel</u> DEPUTY
4	Telephone: (310) 277-0614 Facsimile: (310) 277-0635	
5	, ,	
6	EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS LAW GROUP, AI Amir H. Seyedfarshi, CA Bar No. 301656	PC.
7	amir@employmentrightslawgroup.com 1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 610	
8	Los Angeles, California 90035 Telephone: (424) 777-0964	
9		
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Aggrieved Employees, and the Settlement Class	
11	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
12	FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN	
13	KHALID ABU-DAYYEH and AMINAH	CASE NO.: BCV-20-102367
14	UWAIS, individually and on behalf of all	
15	others similarly situated,	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL
16	Plaintiffs,	APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL
17	v.	JUDGMENT
18	GUIDANCE RESIDENTIAL, LLC, a	Date: August 20, 2021
19	Delaware Limited Liability Company, and DOES 1 to 100, inclusive,	Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: 17
20	Defendants.	Judge: Hon. Thomas S. Clark
21	Berendants.	Complaint Filed: October 9, 2020
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

On August 20, 2021, the Court held a hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

Due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members, and the Court having considered the Stipulation and Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement" or "Agreement"), all of the legal authorities and documents submitted in support thereof, all papers filed and proceedings held herein, all oral and written comments received regarding the proposed settlement, and having reviewed the record in this litigation, and good cause appearing, the Court **GRANTS** final approval of the settlement and orders and makes the following findings and determinations **HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:**

- 1. All terms used in this Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs (the "Order") shall have the same meanings given as those terms are used and/or defined in the parties' Settlement Agreement. A copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached as **Exhibit A** to the Declaration of Craig J. Ackermann in Support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement and is made a part of this Order.
- 2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties to this litigation and subject matter jurisdiction to approve this Settlement and all exhibits thereto.
- 3. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally certifies the Class, as defined in the Agreement as follows:

"All current and former employees of Defendant who were employed in California as nonsupervisory outside sales account executives at any time from July 16, 2016, through January 13, 2021, (the date of this Court's Preliminary Approval Order."

- 4. The Court deems this definition sufficient for the purpose of California Rule of Court 3.765(a), and certifies the Class solely for the purpose of effectuating the Settlement.
- 5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of 25 Class Members exists and a well-defined community of interest exists on the questions of law and fact involved because in the context of the Settlement: (i) all related matters, predominate over any individual questions; (ii) the claims of Plaintiffs are typical of claims of the Class Members; (iii) in negotiating, entering into and implementing the Settlement, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately

represented and protected the interest of the Class Members; (iv) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (v) Class Counsel are qualified to serve as counsel for the Class Representatives and the Class.

- 6. The Court is satisfied that Phoenix Settlement Administration, which functioned as the Settlement Administrator, completed the distribution of the Class Notice to the Class in a manner that comports with California Rule of Court 3.766 and due process. The Court finds that said notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein and informed 25 Class Members of the Settlement terms, their right to do nothing and receive their settlement share, their right to submit a request for exclusion, their right to comment on or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time to respond and to act were provided by each of these procedures. No Class Members filed a written objection to the Settlement as part of this notice process, no Class Members filed a written statement of intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and no Class Members requested exclusion from the Settlement.
- 7. The Court hereby approves the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and finds that the Settlement Agreement is, in all respects, fair, adequate, and reasonable, consistent and compliant with all applicable requirements of the California Code of Civil Procedure, the California and United States Constitutions, including the Due Process clauses, the California Rule of Court, and any other applicable law, and in the best interest of each of the Parties and Class Members.
- 8. The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms and declares the Settlement Agreement to be binding on all Class Members.
- 9. The Court finds that the Settlement Agreement has been reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations. The Court further finds that the Parties have conducted extensive investigation and research, and their attorneys were able to reasonably

¹ Notice was sent to all 25 Class Members, and the administrator reports that after re-mailing one (1) returned notice packet, zero (0) notice packets remained undeliverable.

4

56

7 8

9

1112

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

2223

24

25

26

27

28

evaluate their respective positions.

- 10. The Court also finds that the Settlement now will avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. Additionally, after considering the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement in light of the challenges posed by continued litigation, and Court concludes that Class Counsel secured significant relief for Class Members.
- 11. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendants, nor is this Order a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendants. Neither this Order, the Settlement Agreement, any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement Agreement, shall be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant.
- 12. The Court appoints Plaintiff's Khalid Abu-Dayyeh and Aminah Uwais as Class Representatives and finds them both adequate.
- 13. The Court appoints Craig J. Ackermann of Ackermann & Tilajef, P.C. and Amir Seyedfarshi of Employment Rights Law Group, APC as Class Counsel, and finds each of them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in similar class action litigation.
- 14. The Court finds that the terms of the Settlement Agreement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$150,000.00 and the individual Settlement Shares, are fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and to each Class Member, and the Courts grants final approval of the Settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, subject to this Order. The Court approves the following allocations, which fall within the ranges stipulated by and through the Settlement Agreement:
 - a) The maximum amount of \$2,500.00 designated for payment to Phoenix Settlement Administration, the Settlement Administrator, is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders payment of said amount to the Settlement Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
- b) The \$50,000.00 amount requested by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel for the Class [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL ACKERMANN & TILAJEF, P.C.

Counsel's attorneys' fees is fair and reasonable in light of the benefit obtained for the Class. The Court grants final approval of, awards, and orders the Class Counsel Fees Payment to be made from the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

- c) The \$3,000.00 in litigation costs requested by Plaintiffs and Class Counsel for reimbursement of expenses is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment to be made from the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.²
- d) The \$7,500.00 requested by each of the two Plaintiffs for their Class Representative Payments is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Class Representative Payments to be made from the Gross Settlement Amount in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
- e) The Court approves of the \$10,000.00 allocation assigned for claims under the Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) is fair and reasonable, and orders 75% thereof (i.e., \$7,500.00) to be paid from the Gross Settlement Amount to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA), with the remainder distributed to the Class, in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 15. The Court orders the Parties to comply with and carry out all terms and provisions of the Settlement, to the extent that the terms thereunder do not contradict with this Order, in which case the provisions of this Order shall take precedence and supersede the Settlement.
- 16. Nothing in the Settlement or this Order purports to extinguish or waive Defendant's rights to continue to oppose the merits of the claims in this Action or class treatment of these claims in this case if the Settlement fails to become Final or effective, or in any other case without limitation. Neither the Settlement, this Order, nor the subsequent Court Judgment is a finding that

² Class Counsel actually incurred litigation costs greater than the amount contemplated in the Settlement Agreement, but Class Counsel is only requesting reimbursement of litigation costs in the amount of \$3,000. The amount preliminarily approved by this Court and noticed to the Class.

certification of the Class is proper for any purpose or proceeding other than for settlement purposes.

- 17. All Participating Class Members shall be bound by the Settlement and this Order, including the release of claims in favor of Defendant and the other Released Parties as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. Class Members are permanently barred from prosecuting against Defendant and the other Released Parties any and all of Class Members' Released Claims as defined in the Settlement Agreement.
- 18. Class Representatives Khalid Abu-Dayyeh and Aminah Uwais are both bound to the general release of claims against Defendant and the other Released Parties as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and are permanently barred from prosecuting against Defendant and the other Released Parties any and all of their released Claims as defined in the Settlement Agreement.
- 19. The Parties shall bear their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in the Settlement Agreement and approved by the Court in this Order.
- 20. The Court approves the one hundred and twenty (120) day period for cashing of checks provided in the Settlement Agreement. Any funds associated with stale checks that have not been cashed within one hundred and twenty (120) days will be deemed void and shall be distributed by the Settlement Administrator pursuant to CCP Section 384 to the *cy pres* beneficiary "State Bar of California, Justice Gap Fund".
- 21. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h), the Court retains jurisdiction solely for purposes of enforcing the Settlement Agreement, addressing settlement administration matters, and addressing such post-Judgment matters as may be appropriate under court rules or applicable law.
- 22. Plaintiff or the Settlement Administrator shall file with the Court a report regarding the status of distribution within one-hundred eighty (180) days after the Effective Date.
- 23. Final judgment is hereby entered in conformity with the Settlement Agreement and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order dated January 13, 2021.
- 24. The Settlement Administrator, within five (5) days of the date of this Order, shall give notice to the Settlement Class pursuant to Rule 3.771(b) of the California Rules of Court, by