

FILED
Clerk of the Superior Court

OCT 04 2024

By: R. Day, Deputy

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

CAITLIN RAYMOND, *et al.*

Plaintiff,

vs.

ALPHATEC SPINE, INC., *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2023-00012914-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Joel R. Wohlfeil
Dept. 73

CLASS ACTION

~~[Proposed]~~ **Order Granting Final Approval of
Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees
and Costs and Entering Judgment**

Motion for Final Approval/Attorneys' Fees:

Date: October 4, 2024

Time: 9:00 a.m.

[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion and
Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
Settlement, Memorandum of Points and
Authorities, Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferraro,
Declaration of Settlement Administrator, and
Declaration of Caitlin Raymond]

Action Filed: March 29, 2023

1 This matter came on for hearing on October 4, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 73 of the above-
2 captioned Court, the Honorable Joel R. Wohlfeil presiding, on (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval
3 of Class Action Settlement and (2) Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

4 Having received and considered the motions and supporting papers, including the Class,
5 Collective and PAGA Representative Action Settlement Agreement and Class Notice ("Settlement"),
6 the evidence and documents received by the Court in connection with the Motions for Final Approval
7 and Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and the previously decided Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Court
8 GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL of the Settlement and ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING
9 DETERMINATIONS:

10 1. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the Order Granting Preliminary Approval,
11 and the Settlement, a notice was sent to each class member by first-class U.S. mail. The notice
12 informed the class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive a settlement payment without
13 any required action, their right to comment upon or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear
14 in person or by counsel at the Final Approval Hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the
15 Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided for each of these procedures.

16 2. Zero class members returned a written objection to the proposed Settlement as part of
17 the notice process or stated an intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing and there were no
18 dissenting appearances from class members at the hearing. Nine individuals requested exclusion from
19 the Settlement: Anola Sanders, Greydon Snyder, Emelie A. Nieto, Luke Moody, Matthew Makepeace,
20 Chet Moody, William H. Nobert, Maile Faust and Katherine Nolan. These "opt outs" are affirmatively
21 excluded from the class settlement.

22 3. The Court finds and determines the notice procedure afforded adequate protections to
23 the class and provides the basis for the Court's informed decision regarding approval of the Settlement
24 based on the response. The Court finds and determines the notice provided was the best notice
25 practicable, satisfying the requirements of law and due process.

26 4. For purposes of approving this Settlement only, this Court finds and concludes: (a) the
27 proposed class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the class is
28 impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed class, and there is a well-

1 defined community of interest among members of the class with respect to the subject matter of the
2 claims; (c) the claims of the representative are typical of the claims of the class; (d) the class
3 representative has and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class; (e) a class action is
4 superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of
5 settlement; and (f) the law firm of Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc. is qualified and adequate
6 to serve as Class Counsel in this action.

7 5. The Court confirms certification, for settlement purposes only, of the class as defined in
8 the Settlement and approved at the preliminary approval stage.

9 6. The Court finds and determines the terms set forth in the Settlement are fair, reasonable,
10 and adequate and, having found the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive
11 arms'-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral and experienced mediator, directs the Parties to
12 effectuate the Settlement according to its terms. The Court further finds the Parties conducted
13 extensive investigation, research, and informal discovery, and that their attorneys were able to
14 reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that Settlement will enable the
15 Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks if the
16 Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery and
17 recognizes the significant value provided to the Class. Therefore, the Court approves the Settlement
18 and incorporates the terms of the Settlement in full into this Final Approval Order as though fully set
19 forth herein.

20 7. The Court finds and determines the fees and expenses in administering the Settlement
21 incurred by the Settlement Administrator of \$10,000 are fair and reasonable. The Court orders these
22 administration costs be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

23 8. The Court finds and determines the Service Award of \$10,000 to Plaintiff Raymond as
24 fair and reasonable. The Court orders the service awards be paid in accordance with the terms of the
25 Settlement.

26 9. The Court finds and determines payment to the California Labor and Workforce
27 Development Agency of \$15,000, as its 75% share of the civil penalties under the Private Attorneys
28 General Act is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court orders that amount be paid in accordance

1 with the terms of the Settlement and approves the settlement of claims under the Private Attorneys
2 General Act pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2).

3 10. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the statutory provisions authorizing
4 attorneys' fees under the California Labor Code and Code of Civil Procedure, as set forth in the Motion
5 for Attorneys' Fees, the Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees of \$114,988.50 and litigation costs
6 of \$18,425.26. Class Counsel has sufficiently explained the basis for the fee award based on a
7 percentage of the fund. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court orders the
8 Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Settlement.

9 11. Without affecting the finality of this Order or the entry of judgment in any way, the
10 Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation,
11 and enforcement of this Order and the Settlement.


12 12. Nothing in this Order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations under
13 the Settlement or under this Order, including the requirement that Defendant make payments to Class
14 Members in accordance with the Settlement.

15 13. The Court hereby ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT in accordance with the terms of the
16 Settlement, in accordance with this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

17 14. The Parties shall comply with Cal. Rules of Court Rule 3.771(b), by filing a Notice of
18 Entry of Judgment with the Court.

19
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
22 Date: 10-4-24

23 
24
25
26
27
28

The Honorable Joel R. Wohlfeil
Judge of the Superior Court