[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

Plaintiff FRANCISCO LOMELI ("Plaintiff") and Defendant PHARMAVITE, LLC ("Defendant") have reached terms of settlement for a putative class action.

Plaintiff has filed a motion for final approval of a class action settlement of the claims asserted against Defendant in this action, memorialized in the JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT (*see* Declaration of H. Scott Leviant In Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement ["Leviant Decl."], at Exh. 1). The JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT is referred to herein as the "Agreement" or "Settlement."

After reviewing the Agreement, the Notice process, and other related documents, and having heard the argument of Counsel for respective parties, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the proposed class action Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. In granting final approval of the class action settlement the Court has considered the factors identified in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*,48 Cal. App. 4th 1794 (1996), as approved in *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224 (2001) and *In re Mircrosoft IV Cases*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 706 (2006).
- 2. The Court finds that the Settlement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious and non-collusive arms-length negotiations. The Court further finds that the parties have conducted thorough investigation and research, and the attorneys for the parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that settlement at this time will avoid additional substantial costs, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the action. The Court finds that the risks of further prosecution are substantial.
- 3. The parties' Settlement is granted final approval as it meets the criteria for final settlement approval. The settlement falls within the range of possible approval as fair, adequate and reasonable, and appears to be the product of arm's-length and informed negotiations and to treat all Settlement Class Members fairly. The Settlement Class meets the requirements for conditional certification for settlement purposes only under Code of Civil Procedure § 382.
- 4. The Class Notice provided to the Settlement Class conforms with the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure § 382, Civil Code § 1781, Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and

United States Constitutions, and any other applicable law, and constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances, by providing individual notice to all Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and by providing due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein to the other Settlement Class Members. The Class Notice fully satisfied the requirements of due process.

5. The following persons are certified as Class Members solely for the purpose of entering a settlement in this matter:

All individuals employed by Defendants in California and classified as "non-exempt" at any time during the Class Period (the "Class Period" is January 16, 2016 through June 1, 2021). (Settlement, ¶¶ 3-4.)

6. The Court also defines the following "PAGA Employees" impacted by the proposed settlement of PAGA claims:

All Class Members that worked at any time during the PAGA Period (the "PAGA Period" means the period between March 11, 2019 through November 9, 2021). (Settlement, ¶¶ 10-11.)

- 7. Plaintiff FRANCISCO LOMELI is appointed the Class Representative. The Court finds Plaintiff's counsel are adequate, as they are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation and have no conflicts of interest with absent Settlement Class Members, and that they adequately represented the interests of absent class members in the Litigation. Kane Moon, H. Scott Leviant, and Lilit Tunyan of Moon & Yang, APC, are appointed Class Counsel.
- 8. The Court appoints Phoenix Settlement Administrators to act as the Settlement Administrator, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.
- 9. No Settlement Class Members timely requested exclusion from the Class. All Class Members are Settlement Class Members, bound by the Final Approval Order and Judgment in the Action.
- 10. Upon entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment, funding of the Settlement and compensation to the Settlement Class Members shall be implemented pursuant to the terms of the Settlement.
- 11. In addition to any recovery that Plaintiff may receive under the Settlement as a Settlement Class Member, and in recognition of the Plaintiff's efforts on behalf of the Settlement Class,

the Court hereby approves the payment of an enhancement award to Plaintiff FRANCISCO LOMELI in the amount of \$5,000.

- 12. The Court approves the payment of attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the amount of \$308,333.33. Litigation expenses are approved by the Court in the following amount: \$12,542.52 is awarded to Moon & Yang, APC.
- 13. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of \$9,000.00 to Phoenix Settlement Administrators for performance of its services as the Settlement Administrator, as set forth in the Notice to the Class.
- 14. Upon completion of administration of the Settlement, the Parties shall file a declaration stating that all amounts payable under the Settlement have been paid and that the terms of the Settlement have been completed.
- 15. The Court sets a non-appearance case review regarding compliance with all fund distribution requirements under the Settlement for ② À Î ★ Î , 2023, at 1 ► E È, in Dept. SSC-14 of the above-entitled Court. A Final Report, including any declaration from the Settlement Administrator regarding compliance, shall be filed with the Court no later than ② À Î ♣ Â , 2023.
- 16. The Court approves and orders payment in the amount of \$60,000.00 to the Labor and Workforce Development Agency in compromise of claims under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 (Labor Code § 2698 *et seq.*).
- 17. Once Defendant fully funds the Settlement by paying the Final Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members, shall have, by operation of this Final Approval Order and the separate Judgment, fully, finally and forever released, relinquished, and discharged Defendant from the Released Claims described in the Settlement.
- 18. In accordance with California Rule of Court 3.771(b), the Parties are ordered to give notice of this final Order and Judgment to all Settlement Class Members by posting the Order and Judgment for 90 days on the Settlement Administrator's website and to the LWDA, pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(l)(3).

| 1 | 19. The Court retains ju | risdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or in |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 2 | connection with the settlement. | |
| 3 | | Jujuoku and a same a s |
| 4 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 5 | | (M) . A |
| 6 | Dated:05/12/2022 | Kenneth R. Freeman / Judge Hon Kenneth R Freeman |
| 7 | | Hon. Kenneth R. Freeman LOS ANGELES COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 20 | | |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{bmatrix}$ | | |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 21 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$ | | |
| 23 | | |
| $\begin{bmatrix} 23 \\ 24 \end{bmatrix}$ | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | | |

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within suit; my business address is 1055 W. 7th Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT on the interested parties in this action by sending [] the original [or] [\(\sqrt{} \)] a true copy thereof [\(\sqrt{} \)] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the attached service list:

ERIKA L. SHAO
eshao@grsm.com
LINH T. HUA
lhua@grsm.com
GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI,
LLP
633 West Fifth Street, 52nd floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 270-7851
Facsimile: (213) 680-4470

Attorneys for Defendant PHARMAVITE, LLC

[✓] BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept electronic service, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses listed above via third-party cloud service CASEANYWHERE. I did not receive an error message.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **March 30, 2022** at Los Angeles, California.

H. Scott Leviant
Type or Print Name
Signatu

Case No.: 20STCV09861 Page 1 Lomeli v. Pharmavite, LLC