21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

RECEIVED September 18, 2024

OCT 11 2024

By: R. Day, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

MICHAEL DEL TORO, et al.

Plaintiffs,

V.

ABZENA (SAN DIEGO) INC., et al.

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2023-00017443-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Joel R. Wohlfeil Dept. 73

CLASS ACTION

[Proposed] Order Granting Preliminary **Approval of Class Action Settlement**

Motion for Prelim. App. Hearing

Date:

October 11, 2024

Time:

9:00 a.m.

[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion and Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferrarol

Action Filed: April 25, 2023

This matter came on for hearing on October 11, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 73 of the above-captioned Court on Plaintiffs' Motion Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Motion").

Having fully reviewed the Motion, the supporting Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferraro (and its exhibits), including the settlement agreement ("Settlement"), and the notice attached as an exhibit to the Settlement, and in recognition of the Court's duties (to make a preliminary determination as to the reasonableness of any proposed class action settlement; to ensure proper notice is provided to all class members in accordance with due process requirements; and to set a final approval hearing to consider the good faith, fairness, adequacy and reasonableness of the proposed Settlement), the Court makes the following determinations and orders:

- 1. The Court conditionally finds, for the purposes of approving this settlement only, the proposed class meets the requirements for certification under § 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure: (a) the proposed class is ascertainable and so numerous joinder of all class members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed class, and a well-defined community of interest among members of the proposed class with respect to the subject matter of the class action; (c) the claims of the class representative are typical of the claims of the members of the proposed class; (d) the class representative appears to be adequate to serve in that role; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of settlement; and (f) counsel of record for the Plaintiff are qualified to serve as class counsel.
- 2. The class is hereby defined and certified as: all individuals currently or formerly employed by Abzena in California as hourly, non-exempt employees during the Class Period of April 25, 2019, through June 26, 2024."
- 3. The Court finds, on a preliminary basis, the Settlement, incorporated by this reference in full, and made a part of this Order, appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which could ultimately be given final approval by this Court.
- 4. The Court further finds, on a preliminary basis, (a) the non-reversionary Gross Settlement Amount is fair and reasonable to the class when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals;

(b) sufficient investigation, research, and informal discovery, have been conducted such that counsel for the parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (c) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks presented by further prosecution of the litigation; and (d) the proposed Settlement was reached through prudent and non-collusive negotiations.

- 5. The Court finds the allocation from the common fund to PAGA penalties, including the LWDA's 75% share, as fair, adequate, and reasonable in light of the overall gross settlement and that the proposed settlement of PAGA penalties has been adequately submitted to the LWDA in advance of the preliminary approval hearing. Therefore, the Court **APPROVES** the PAGA payment pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2).
- 6. Accordingly, good cause appearing, the Motion for Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement is **GRANTED**.
 - 7. Class members are therefore defined pursuant to the terms set forth in the Settlement.
- 8. The Court further finds the proposed notice fairly and adequately advises class members of (a) pendency of the Settlement; (b) conditional class certification for settlement purposes only; (c) preliminary Court approval of the proposed Settlement; (d) the date, time and place of the Final Approval Hearing; (e) the terms of the proposed Settlement and the benefits available to the class under the Settlement; (f) their right to receive a proportionate share of the Net Settlement Amount without the need to return a claim form; (g) their right to request exclusion, and the procedures and deadline for doing so; (h) their right to object to the Settlement, and the procedure and deadline for doing so; and (i) their right to appear at the final approval hearing.
- 9. The Court further finds the proposed notice provides the best practicable notice to the Class and comports with the constitutional requirements, including those of due process. The Court further finds that mailing of the notice to the last known address of all class members with measures taken for verification of an address and skip tracing of bad addresses, as specifically described within the Settlement, constitutes an effective method of notifying class members of their rights with respect to the class action and the Settlement.
- 10. Therefore, for good cause, the Court **APPROVES** the notice for distribution to the class pursuant to the notice procedures set forth in full in the Settlement.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that:

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

13. The Court reserves the right to continue the Final Approval Hearing without further notice to the class. However, if written objections are submitted, class counsel is ordered to serve notice on any such objecting class member of the new date and time of the Final Approval Hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date:

The Honorable Joel R. Wohlfeil Judge of the Superior Court