FILED Superior Court of California BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C. 1 County of Los Angeles David D. Bibiyan, Esq. (SBN 287811) 8484 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 500 12/06/2022 2 Beverly Hills, California 90211 Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court 3 Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705 B. Guerrero Deputy J. GILL LAW GROUP, P.C. 4 Jasmin K. Gill, Esq. (SBN 315090) 515 South Flower Street, Suite 1800 Los Angeles, California 90071 Tel: (310) 728-2137; Fax: (310) 728-2137 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff, SIMON DETHRASAVONG, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated /or aggrieved, 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE 9 10 SIMON DETHRASAVONG, on behalf of CASE NO.: 20STCV32312 himself and all others similarly situated or 11 [Assigned to the Hon. Kenneth R. Freeman in aggrieved, Dept. SS-14] 12 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL Plaintiffs, 13 APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION v. 14 SETTLEMENT, APPLICATION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS, AND ASI COMPUTER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., a 15 **ENHANCEMENT AWARD** California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, 16 Defendants. 17 **HEARING INFORMATION:** DATE: November 8, 2022 18 10:00 a.m. TIME: DEPT: SS-14

ORDER FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION SETTLEMENT

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

10 AND DECREED THAT:

1. The Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and Representative Action Settlement; Enhancement Award; and Reasonable Attorneys' Fees and Costs is hereby granted in its entirety.

being fully informed and good cause appearing therefor, it is hereby **ORDERED**, **ADJUDGED**

This matter having come before the Court on November 8, 2022 for a final fairness hearing

- 2. The definitions set out in the Settlement Agreement are incorporated by reference into this Order; all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as defined in the Settlement Agreement.
- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation and over all Parties to this litigation, including all Class Members.
- 4. Distribution of the Notice of Settlement of Class Action Lawsuit ("Class Notice") directed to the Class Members as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and the other matters set forth herein have been completed in conformity with the Preliminary Approval Order, including individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, and was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. This Class Notice provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and of the matters set forth therein, including the proposed class settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, to all persons entitled to such Class Notice, and the Class Notice fully satisfied the requirement of due process.

27

28

///

3

7

10

9

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27 28 5. Zero Class Members opted out and zero Class Members objected to the settlement.

- 6. The Court further finds that the settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate and that plaintiff Simon Dethrasavong ("Plaintiff") has satisfied the standards and applicable requirements for final approval of class action settlement under California law, including the provisions of Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, rule 23, approved for use by the California state courts in Vasquez v. Superior Court (1971) 4 Cal.3d 800, 821.
- 7. This Court hereby approves the class settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement and finds that the settlement is, in all respects, fair, adequate and reasonable and directs the parties to effectuate the settlement according to its terms. The Court finds that the settlement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious and non-collusive arm's length The Court further finds that the parties have conducted extensive and costly negotiations. investigation and research and counsel 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 this action. The Court has noted the significant benefits to the Class Members under the settlement. The Court also finds that the class is properly certified as a class for settlement purposes only.
- 8. For settlement purposes only, the Court certifies the following class: all current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who worked at any time for defendant ASI Computer Technologies, Inc. ("Defendant") during the Class Period in California, including thirty-two (32) employees who were allegedly misclassified by Defendant as "exempt" employees ("Class Members"). "Class Period" means the period from August 21, 2016 through January 1, 2022.
- 9. Nothing contained in this Settlement Agreement shall be construed or deemed in admission of liability, culpability, negligence, or wrongdoing on the part of Defendant.
- 10. Effective only upon the entry of an Order granting Final Approval of the Settlement, entry of Judgment, and payment by Defendant to the Settlement Administrator Phoenix of the full Gross Settlement Amount and Employers' Taxes necessary to effectuate the Settlement, Plaintiff and Participating Class Members release the Released Parties as defined in

the parties' Settlement Agreement of all claims against the Released Parties asserted in the
Complaint filed in this Action, or any and all claims that may be asserted against the Released
Parties based on the factual allegations in the Complaint filed on August 21, 2020 in the Action, as
follows: For Participating Class Members, the release includes, for the duration of the Class
Period: (a) all claims for failure to pay overtime wages; (b) all claims for failure to pay minimum
wages; (c) all claims for failure to provide compliant meal and rest periods and associated
premium pay; (d) all claims for the failure to timely pay all wages due upon termination or
resignation; (e) all claims for non-compliant wage statements; (f) all claims for failure to
reimburse costs as required under Labor Code section 2802; (g) all claims for failure to pay wages
timely in violation of Labor Code section 204; and (h) all claims asserted through California
Business & Professions Code § 17200 et seq. arising out of the Labor Code violations referenced
in the Complaint filed in this Action ("Class Released Claims"). For Aggrieved Employees, the
release includes, for the duration of the PAGA Period (i.e., June 9, 2019 through January 1, 2022).
all claims released during the Class Period, as well as all claims for civil penalties under PAGA
arising out of Labor Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1 and 2699 based on the factual
allegations and Labor Code sections alleged to have been violated in the Complaint filed on
August 21, 2020 in this Action, which includes, without limitation, Labor Code sections 204, 246,
432, 1174, 1198.5, and 2810.5 ("PAGA Released Claims").

- 11. Each of the Parties has entered into this Settlement Agreement with the intention to avoid further disputes and litigation, and the attendant inconvenience and expense.
- 12. The Settlement Agreement provides for a "Gross Settlement Amount" of \$1,036,950.00. From the Gross Settlement Amount individual settlement payments to Class Members, Court approved attorneys' fees of \$362,932.50 and costs of \$15,145.93, Settlement Administrator costs of \$7,750.00, a Service Award to Simon Dethrasavong of \$7,500.00, and PAGA penalties in the amount of \$50,000.00, of which \$37,500.00 (75%) will be paid to the LWDA and \$12,500.00 (25%) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees. The payment of the settlement funds by Defendants, as well as the payment of individual settlement checks to Class Members and Employers' Taxes, will be made as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

1	
2	\$3
3	de
4	\$1
5	pa
6	Se
7	Se
8	pr
9	Co
10	rea
11	an
12	co
13	en
14	Pl
15	rat
16	Da
17	Ni
18	the
19	Pr
20	21
	1

13. The Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the total amount of 62,932.50, which is thirty-five percent (35%) of the Gross Settlement Amount and to be ducted therefrom. In addition, the Court awards Class Counsel reimbursement of their costs of 5,145.93 to be deducted from the Gross Settlement Amount. Attorneys' fees and costs will be id by the Settlement Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount as set forth in the ettlement Agreement. In approving the payment of attorneys' fees, the Court finds that the ettlement conferred a significant benefit on the Class and the necessity and financial burden of ivate enforcement of California labor laws makes an attorney fee award to Plaintiff's Class ounsel appropriate. The amount of this award is based on the lodestar analysis, subject to a asonable multiplier, for awarding reasonable attorney's fees and costs and is reasonable, fair d eminently justified. In setting an award of attorneys' fees, costs and expenses, this Court has onsidered the following factors: (a) the time and labor required; (b) preclusion of other nployment; (c) the contingent nature of the cases; (d) the experience, reputation and ability of aintiff's Class Counsel and the skill they displayed in the litigation; (e) the reasonable hourly te of attorneys' fees assessed by Class Counsel associated with prosecution of this Class Action: avid D. Bibiyan, Esq.: \$750, Jasmin K. Gill, Esq.: \$550, Diego Aviles, Esq.: \$550, Sara Ehsania, Esq.: \$450, and Vedang Patel, Esq.: \$400; (f) the results achieved and benefits conferred on e Class; and (g) the reaction of Plaintiff and the Settlement Class Members. (See, e.g. Serrano v. riest (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25, 49; Dunk v. Ford Motor Co. (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1810 fn.

.)

14. The Court hereby approves a service award to Plaintiff Simon Dethrasavong in the amount of \$7,500.00 in consideration for his time, effort and risk incurred on behalf of the Settlement Class. The Service Award will be paid to Plaintiff by the Settlement Administrator from the Gross Settlement Amount as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

15. The Court hereby approves the Settlement Administrator's cost in the amount of \$7,750.00. The Settlement Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators ("Phoenix"), shall be paid the cost of administration of the settlement from the Gross Settlement Amount.

28

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 3
- 4
- 5 6
- 7
- 8
- 9 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- 16. Except as expressly provided herein and in the Settlement Agreement, the parties each shall bear all of their own fees and costs in connection with this matter.
- 17. The Court approves Simon Dethrasavong as both the Class and Private Attorneys General Act representative.
- 18. The Court approves David D. Bibiyan of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C. and Jasmin K. Gill of J. Gill Law Group, P.C. as class counsel.
 - 19. The Court approves Phoenix as the Settlement Administrator.
- 20. Individual Settlement Payment checks and Individual PAGA Payment checks shall remain valid and negotiable for one-hundred and eighty (180) calendar days after the date of their issuance. If any checks are not redeemed or deposited within ninety (90) calendar days after mailing, the Settlement Administrator will send a reminder postcard indicating that unless the check is redeemed or deposited in the next ninety (90) calendar days, it will expire and become non-negotiable, and offer to replace the check if it was lost or misplaced. If any checks remain uncashed or not deposited by the expiration of the 90-day period after mailing the reminder notice, the Settlement Administrator will, within one hundred eighty (180) calendar days after the checks are mailed, pay the amount of the Individual Settlement Share to the California State Controller's Office in accordance with California Unclaimed Property Law so that the Participating Class Member will have his or her Individual Settlement Share available to him or her per the applicable claim procedure to request that money from the State of California. Therefore, there will be no unpaid residue or unclaimed or abandoned class member funds and the California Code of Civil Procedure section 384 shall not apply.
- 21. The Court finds that class settlement on the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement was made in good faith, and constitutes a fair, reasonable and adequate compromise of the released claims against Defendant.
- 22. Within ten (10) calendar days after the Final Approval Date, the Settlement Administrator shall distribute all payments due under the Settlement, including the Individual Settlement Payments to Participating Class Members and Individual PAGA Payments to Aggrieved Employees, as well as the Court-approved payments for the Service Award to Plaintiff,

1	attorneys' fe	ees and litigation co	osts and expenses t	to Class Counsel, Administration Costs to the		
2	Settlement Administrator, and the portion of the LWDA payment payable to the LWDA.					
3	23.	The Settlement	Administrator is ord	dered to provide notice of the Final Judgment		
4	entered in th	is Action by posting	g the same on its we	ebsite for a period of no less than one (1) year.		
5	24.	A Non-Appeara	ance Case Review	Re: Distribution is hereby scheduled for		
6	August 11, 2023, 4:00 p.m., in Department SS-14 of the Los Angeles County Superior Court,					
7	7 Spring Street Courthouse. No later than 12:00 p.m. on August 9, 2023, the parties shall file a					
8	declaration of	confirming that the	claims have been pa	aid and that administration of all of the terms		
9	and condition	ons of the class acti	ion settlement have	been completed. If said Declaration is not		
10	filed by 12:0	00 p.m. on August 9	, 2023, an Order to	Show Cause hearing will be set by the Court.		
11	25.	Without affecting	ng the finality of t	he Judgment in any way, this Court hereby		
12	retains cont	inuing jurisdiction	over the interpreta	tion, implementation and enforcement of the		
13	settlement a	nd all orders and jud	dgments entered in o	connection therewith.		
14			(
15	IT IS SO O			Service Servic		
15 16	IT IS SO O Dated:	10/00/0000	, 2022	Kenneth R. Freeman/Judge Judge of the Superior Court		
		10/00/0000	, 2022	Kenneth R. Freeman/Judge Judge of the Superior Court		
16		10/00/0000	, 2022			
16 17		10/00/0000	, 2022			
16 17 18		10/00/0000	, 2022			
16 17 18 19		10/00/0000	, 2022			
16 17 18 19 20		10/00/0000	<u>, 2022</u>			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		10/00/0000	<u>, 2022</u>			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		10/00/0000				
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		10/00/0000	<u>, 2022</u>			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26		10/00/0000	<u>, 2022</u>			
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25		10/00/0000	, 2022			