Electronically Received 11/21/2022 03:43 PM	HAINES LAW GROUP, APC Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226) phaines@haineslawgroup.com Sean M. Blakely (SBN 264384) sblakely@haineslawgroup.com Neil M. Larsen (SBN 276490) nlarsen@haineslawgroup.com 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180 El Segundo, California 90245 Tel: (424) 292-2350 Fax: (424) 292-2355 Attorneys for Plaintiff Edgar Macabulit [Additional counsel listed on following page] SUPERIOR COURT OF TI	FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 12/19/2022 David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court By: R. Aspiras Deputy HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
12	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF LOS ANGELES
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	EDGAR MACABULIT, as an individual and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff, vs. DMC POWER, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, Defendants	Lead Case No. 20STCV32034 (Related to 20STCV05459) [Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. William F. Highberger, Dept. SSC-10] [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT Date: December 19, 2022 Time: 11:00 a.m. Dept: SSC-10 Complaint Filed: August 20, 2020 Trial Date: None set.
232425262728		OVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT

1	Raymond P. Boucher, State Bar No. 115364
1	ray@boucher.la
2	Shehnaz M. Bhujwala, State Bar No. 223484
3	bhujwala@boucher.la Maria L. Weitz, State Bar. No. 268100
	weitz@boucher.la
4	Alexander Gamez, State Bar. No. 309708
5	gamez@boucher.la
	BOUCHER LLP
6	21600 Oxnard Street, Suite 600
7	Woodland Hills, California 91367-4903
8	Tel: (818) 340-5400 Fax: (818) 340-5401
0	1 ax. (616) 540-5401
9	Sahag Majarian II, State Bar No. 146621
10	sahagii@aol.com
	LAW OFFICES OF SAHAG MAJARIAN II
11	18250 Ventura Boulevard
12	Tarzana, California 91356 Tel: (818) 609-0807
13	Fax: (818) 609-0892
14	Attorneys for Plaintiff San Antonio Brock
15	Theorie ys for Figure 7 meomo Brock
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	1

_[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT

This matter came on regularly for hearing before this Court on December 19, 2022 at 11:00 a.m., pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's earlier Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Stipulation of Settlement ("Settlement Agreement")¹ and the documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and recognizing the sharply disputed factual and legal issues involved in this case, the risks of further prosecution and the substantial benefits to be received by the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement, the Court hereby makes a final ruling that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is the product of good faith, arm's-length negotiations between the parties. Good cause appearing therefor, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and ORDERS as follows:

- 1. Final judgment is hereby entered in conformity with the Settlement Agreement and this Final Approval Order.
- 2. The conditional class certification contained in the Preliminary Approval Order is hereby made final, and the Court thus certifies, for purposes of the Settlement only, a Settlement Class consisting of:

All current and former non-exempt employees employed by Defendant DMC Power, Inc. in California from February 10, 2016 until August 1, 2022 (the "Class Period").

- 3. Plaintiffs Edgar Macabulit and San Antonio Brock are hereby confirmed as the Class Representatives, and Paul K. Haines, Sean M. Blakely, and Neil M. Larsen of Haines Law Group, APC, Raymond P. Boucher and Alexander Gamez of Boucher LLP, and Sahag Majarian II of the Law Offices of Sahag Majarian II are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.
- 4. Notice was provided to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement, which was preliminarily approved by the Court on August 1, 2022, and the notice process has been

¹ All terms used in this Order and Final Judgment shall have the same meaning as that assigned to them in the Settlement Agreement.

completed in conformity with the Court's Orders. 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, informed Settlement Class members of their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1781(e), California Rule of Court 3.769, and due process.

- 5. The Court finds that no Settlement Class member objected to the Settlement, no Settlement Class member has elected to opt-out of the Settlement, and that the 100% participation rate in the Settlement supports final approval.
- 6. The Court hereby approves the Settlement as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate, and directs the parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms.
- 7. For purposes of settlement only, the Court finds 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 litigation; (c) the claims of the Class Representative 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 Settlement Class members; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to serve as counsel for the Class Representative and the Settlement Class.
- 8. The Court orders that Defendant DMC Power, Inc. shall deposit the Gross Settlement Amount in the amount of \$1,100,000.00 with the Settlement Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of this Order and Judgment.
- 9. The Court orders that any Individual Settlement Awards that remain uncashed after 180 days after they are mailed shall be distributed to the Controller of the State of California to be held pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, California Civil Code § 1500 *et seq.*, in the name of the Settlement Class member to whom the check was issued.

- 10. The Court finds that the Individual Settlement Awards, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute the Individual Settlement Awards in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 11. The Court finds that Class Representative Service Awards in the amount of \$7,500.00 to each Plaintiff, for a total of \$15,000.00, are appropriate for the risks undertaken and their service to the Settlement Class. The Court finds that the service awards are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make these payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 12. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$366,666.66 and actual litigation costs of \$38,946.93 for Class Counsel, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 13. The Court finds that a payment to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$37,500.00 for the LWDA's share of civil penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 14. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$9,500.00 from the Gross Settlement Amount for all of its work done and to be done until the completion of this matter, and finds that sum appropriate.
- 15. The Settlement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Order and Final Judgment a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither this Order and Final Judgment, the Settlement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement, shall be construed or deemed an admission of liability, culpability, or wrongdoing on the part of Defendant.
- 16. As of the date of this Order and Final Judgment, Plaintiffs and every member of the Settlement Class will fully release and discharge Defendant, and all of its past and present officers, directors, shareholders, employees, agents, principals, heirs, representatives, accountants, auditors, consultants, and their respective successors and predecessors in interest,

24

25

26

27

28

1

subsidiaries, affiliates, parents and attorneys, (collectively the "Released Parties"), from all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action that were pled in the operative Second Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint, or which could have been pled in the Second Amended Class and Representative Action Complaint, that arose during the Class Period, including: the failure to pay minimum wage, the failure to pay all overtime wages, failure to authorize and permit rest periods, or premium pay for non-compliant rest periods, failure to provide proper meal periods, or premium pay for non-compliant meal periods, failure to furnish complete and accurate wage statements, waiting time penalties and civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act (Lab. Code section 2698, et seq.), all related statutory claims including, but not limited to, alleged violations of California Labor Code sections 201-204, 210, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 256, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1199, and California Business and Professions Code section 17200, et. seq., the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Welfare Commission, and all claims for unfair business practices that could have been premised on the facts, claims, causes of action or legal theories described above (the "Released Claims"). In addition, all Settlement Class members (regardless of whether they opt out) who worked for Defendant at any time from November 25, 2018 through August 1, 2022 (the "PAGA Period") are "Aggrieved Employees" and shall release the Released Parties from all claims for civil penalties that could have been premised on the facts alleged within the exhaustion letters filed with the Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") by Plaintiff Brock and Plaintiff Macabulit ("the PAGA Released Claims").

17. This document shall constitute a final judgment pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h) which provides, "If the court approves the settlement agreement after the final approval hearing, the court must make and enter judgment. The judgment must include a provision for the retention of the court's jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the terms of the judgment. The court may not enter an order dismissing the action at the same time as, or after, entry of judgment." The Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the Settlement, and this Final Approval Order and Judgment. The Settlement Administrator shall give notice of this Judgment by posting this Final Judgment on its website.

1	18. The Settlement Administrator shall file a final report regarding distribution and
2	uncashed checks by October 2, 2023.
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	1. Ellisaberas
5	Dated:, 2022, Honorable William F (Highberger
6	Judge of the Superior Court
7	 FJÁÁÞ ŒÔÜÁ^Á*}åāj*ÁsejåÁse{^}å^åÁŏå*{^}oÁq^oÁ[¦Áú&dĚáJÉÉG€GHÁsecÁJÁseÈ;È
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	