1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Justian Jusuf – State Bar No. 201507 E-mail: jjusuf@jusuf-law.com LAW OFFICE OF JUSTIAN JUSUF, APC 17011 Beach Blvd., Suite 900 Huntington Beach, California 92647 Phone: (714) 274-9815 Sahag Majarian II – State Bar No. 146621 E-mail: sahagii@aol.com LAW OFFICES OF SAHAG MAJARIAN II 18250 Ventura Blvd. Tarzana, California 91356 Phone: (818) 609-0807 Fax: (818) 609-0892	Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 08/13/2024 David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court By: T. Lewis Deputy	
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff DAISY HERNANDEZ, individually and on behalf of others similarly situ	ated	
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11	FOR THE COUNTY LOS ANGELES		
12	(SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE)		
13 14	DAISY HERNANDEZ, individually and on	CASE NO.: 19STCV43133	
15	behalf of others similarly situated,	CLASS ACTION	
16	Plaintiff,	Assigned For All Purposes To:	
17	vs.	Judge: Hon. David S. Cunningham III Dept.: 11	
18 19	OXGORD INCORPORATED, LYNEER STAFFING SOLUTIONS, LLC, and DOES 1 through 50,	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENT	
20	Defendants.	Final Approval Hearing:	
21 22		Date: August 13, 2024 Time: 10:00 a.m. Dept.: 11	
23			
24	<u> </u>	Complaint Filed: December 3, 2019	
25			
26			
27			
28			
	FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT		

FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

Plaintiff Daisy Hernandez ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Lyneer Staffing Solutions, LLC

1

1

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 5. For settlement purposes, the Court hereby appoints Plaintiff Daisy Hernandez as Class Representative.
- 6. For settlement purposes, the Court hereby appoints Justian Jusuf of Law Office of Justian Jusuf APC and Sahag Majarian II of the Law Offices of Sahag Majarian II as Class Counsel.
- 7. The Court hereby approves the terms of the Settlement and the terms and conditions of same as set forth in and memorialized by the Agreement, and finds that the Settlement is, in all respects, fair, adequate and reasonable. In making this finding, the Court considered the nature of the claims and the risks inherent in such claims, the monetary benefit available to the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, Defendant's potential liability, and the fact that a settlement represents a compromise of the Parties' respective positions rather than the result of a finding of liability, if any, at trial. The Court further finds that the terms of the Agreement have no obvious deficiencies and do not improperly grant preferential treatment to Plaintiff or any individual Class Member. Therefore, the Court finds that the Settlement was entered into in good faith.
- 8. The Court finds the Parties reached the Settlement through intensive, non-collusive, and temporally extensive arms-length negotiations, which included private mediation. The Court

further finds that the Parties have conducted extensive investigation and research, and counsel for the Parties are able to and have reasonably evaluated 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 also has notes the significant benefits to the Class Members that are achieved by a settlement at this time.

- 9. Neither the acceptance nor the performance of the terms of the Settlement, including this approval of the Settlement, is or shall be claimed to be, construed as, or deemed a precedent or an admission of the truth of any allegations and claims made in the Action.

 Moreover, this Order and/or the judgment entered thereon does not amount to any findings, determinations, or conclusions of liability on Defendants' behalf, individually, collectively, or otherwise. Additionally, this Order and/or the judgment entered thereon does not amount to any findings, determinations, or conclusions as to Defendants' relationship to one another. Rather, this Order and/or the judgment entered thereon reflects approval of a compromise reached by the Parties prior to any such merits findings, determinations, or conclusions being made in this case.
- Agreement has been completed in conformity with the Order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement. The Notice of Class and PAGA Settlement provided adequate notice of the proceedings and about the case, including the proposed settlement terms as set forth in the Agreement, to the Class Members/Aggrieved Employees. Overall, the Notice of Class and PAGA Settlement fully satisfied due process requirements. The Notice of Class and PAGA Settlement was sent via U.S. Mail to all persons entitled to such notice and to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort. As executed, the Notice of Class Settlement was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. As such, all persons within the definition of "Class Members" have been adequately provided with an opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement by requesting to opt-out of the Settlement. Additionally, the Court finds that no Class Member submitted any request to opt-out of the Settlement nor did any object to the Settlement.
- 11. In granting final approval of the Settlement and, in turn, the Agreement, the Court hereby orders the Parties to implement the terms of the Agreement, and directs the Settlement

28

California Rules of Court, the Court retains jurisdiction over the Parties to enforce the terms of the

1	Agreement and this Judgment.		
2	18. A copy of this Order and the Judgment shall be posted on the Settlement		
3	Administrator's website for at least 180 days.		
4	IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUGED AND DECREED.		
5	204124224	David S. Cunningham	
6	Dated:08/13/2024	Hon. David S. Cunningham III	
7		Judge of the Superior Court	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
2122			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		5	