## ACKERMANN & TILAJEF, P.C. Received 4/2/2021 Craig J. Ackermann (SBN 229832) 2 cja@ackermanntilajef.com Sam Vahedi (SBN 282650) sv@ackermanntilajef.com 1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 610 4 Los Angeles, California 90035 APR 13 2021 5 Telephone: (310) 277-0614 S. Salazar Facsimile: (310) 277-0635 6 MELMED LAW GROUP P.C. 7 Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218) 8 im@melmedlaw.com 1801 Century Park East, Suite 850 9 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 824-3828 10 Facsimile: (310) 862-6851 11 Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Class, and Aggrieved Employees 12 13 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 14 FOR THE COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE 15 16 RODERICK MURRAY, an individual, on behalf Case No. RIC2002545 of the State of California, as a private attorney 17 general, and on behalf of all others similarly TRAVISAD PROPOSERI situated, ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL 18 OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT Plaintiff, 19 V. 20 SCELZI ENTERPRISES, INC., a California 21 corporation, and DOES 1 to 50 inclusive, Dept.: 6 Judge: Hon. Sunshine Sykes 22 Defendants. Complaint Filed: July 6, 2020 23 Trial Date: None Set 24 25 26 27 28

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT

On March 25, 2021, the Court held a hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. In conformity with California Rules of Court, Rule 3.769, with due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members, and the Court having considered the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release ("Settlement Agreement") attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Craig J. Ackermann in Support of Plaintiff's Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement filed on September 15, 2020, all of the legal authorities and documents submitted in support thereof, all papers filed and proceedings has herein, all oral and written comments received regarding the proposed settlement, and having reviewed the record in this litigation, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT AND ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS AND ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. All terms used in this Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Final Judgment (the "Final Judgment") shall have the same meanings given as those terms are used and/or defined in the parties' Settlement Agreement. A copy of the Agreement is attached as **Exhibit A** to the Declaration of Craig J. Ackermann in Support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement and is made a part of this Final Judgment.
- 2. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties to this litigation and subject matter jurisdiction to approve this Settlement and all exhibits thereto.
- 3. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally certifies the Class, as defined in the Agreement and as follows:

Plaintiff and all non-exempt hourly individuals who are or were employed by Scelzi or its predecessor or merged entities in California who were classified as non-exempt and who worked at least one shift longer than 3.5 hours at any time from October 26, 2014 through November 3, 2020.

- 4. The Court deems this definition sufficient for the purpose of California Rule of Court 3.765(a), and solely for the purpose of effectuating the Settlement.
- 5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of 838 class members exists and a well-defined community of interest exists on the questions of law and fact involved because in the context of the Settlement: (i) all related matters, predominate over any individual questions; (ii) the claims of the Plaintiff are typical of claims of the Class Members; and (iii) in negotiating, entering into and implementing the

Settlement, Plaintiff and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interest of the Class Members.

- 6. The Court is satisfied that CPT Group, Inc., which functioned as the Settlement Administrator, completed the distribution of Class Notice and Share Form to the Class in a manner that comports with California Rule of Court 3.766. The Class Notice informed 842 Class Members, of the Settlement terms, their rights to do nothing and receive their settlement share, their rights to submit a request for exclusion, their rights to comment on or object to the Settlement, and their rights to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time to respond and to act were provided by each of these procedures.
- 7. No Class Members filed written objections to the Settlement as part of this notice process, and no Class Members filed a written statement of intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.
- 8. Four (4) individuals have submitted timely requests for exclusion, and will not participate in the Settlement or be subject to the Settlement or Release of Claims. Those individuals are identified as follows: (1) Carlton Pullen, (2) Juan Paulino, (3) Michael A. Zemansky, and (4) Faustino Jimenez.
- 9. The Court requires that the envelope transmitting the settlement checks to the Class Members shall bear the notation "YOUR CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT CHECK IS ENCLOSED."
- 10. The Court hereby approves the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and finds that the Settlement Agreement is, in all respects, fair, adequate, and reasonable, consistent and compliant with all applicable requirements of the California Code of Civil Procedure, the California and United States Constitutions, including the Due Process clauses, the California Rules of Court, and any other applicable law, and in the best interests of each of the Parties and Class Members.
- 11. The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms and declares the Settlement Agreement to be binding on all Class Members.
- 12. The Court finds that the Settlement Agreement has been reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations. The Court further finds that the Parties have conducted extensive investigation and research, and their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions.
  - 13. The Court also finds that the Settlement now will avoid additional and potentially

substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks of the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. Additionally, after considering the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement in light of the challenges posed by continued litigation, and Court concludes that Class Counsel secured significant relief for Class Members.

- 14. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Final Judgment a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither this Final Judgment, the Settlement Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement Agreement, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant.
- 15. The Court appoints Plaintiff Roderick Murray as Class Representative and finds him to be adequate.
- 16. The Court appoints Jonathan Melmed of Melmed Law Group P.C., and Craig J. Ackerman and Sam Vahedi of Ackermann & Tilajef, P.C., as Class Counsel, and finds each of them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in class action litigation.
- 17. The terms of the Agreement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$392,410.12 and the individual Settlement Shares, are fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and to each Class Member, and the Courts grants final approval of the Settlement set forth in the Agreement, subject to this Final Judgment. The Court approves the following allocations, which fall within the ranges stipulated by and through the Settlement Agreement:
  - a. The \$13,750.00 designated for payment to CPT Group, Inc., the Settlement Administrator, is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Parties to make the payment to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the Agreement.
  - b. The \$116,666.66 amount requested by Plaintiff and Class Counsel for the Class Counsel's attorneys' fees is fair and reasonable in light of the benefit obtained for the Class. The Court grants final approval of, awards, and orders the Class Counsel Fees Payment to be made in accordance with the Agreement.
  - c. The Court awards \$10,795.90 in litigation costs, an amount which the Court finds to be reflective of the reasonable costs incurred. The Court grants final approval of, and order the

- Class Counsel Litigation Expenses Payment in this amount to be made in accordance with the Agreement.
- d. The Court awards a Class Representative Payment in the reduced amount of \$5,000.00 to Plaintiff. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Class Representative Payment to be made in accordance with the Agreement.
- e. The Court approves of the \$35,000.00 allocation assigned for claims under the Private Attorney General Act (PAGA), and orders 75% thereof (i.e., \$26,250.00) to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.
- 18. The Court orders the Parties to comply with and carry out all terms and provisions of the Settlement, to the extent that the terms thereunder do not contradict with this Final Judgment, in which case the provisions of this Final Judgment shall take precedence and supersede the Settlement.
- 19. Nothing in the Settlement or this Final Judgment purports to extinguish or waive Defendant's rights to continue to oppose the merits of the claims in this Action or class treatment of these claims in this case if the Settlement fails to become Final or effective, or in any other case without limitation.
- 20. All Participating Class Members (i.e., all Class Members except for those identified in Paragraph 8 herein who requested to be excluded) shall be bound by the Settlement and this Final Judgment, including the release of claims as set forth in the Agreement.
- 21. The Parties shall bear their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in the Settlement Agreement.
- 22. The Attorneys Fees awarded herein shall be split equally between Melmed Law Group, P.C. and Ackermann & Tilajef, P.C. Of the \$10,795.90 awarded in litigation costs, \$5,032.12 shall be paid to Melmed Law Group, P.C. and \$5,763.78 shall be paid to Ackermann & Tilajef, P.C.
- 23. All checks mail to the Class Members must be cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) days after mailing. The Settlement Administrator shall mail a reminder postcard to any class member whose settlement check has not been cashed within 60 days of mailing.
  - 24. If (i) any of the Class Members are current employees of Defendant, (ii) the settlement

check mailed to those employees is returned to the Settlement Administrator as undeliverable, and (iii) the Settlement Administrator is unable to locate a valid mailing address, the Settlement Administrator shall arrange with Defendant to have those distributions deliver to the employee at the place of employment.

- 25. The Court approved the *cy pres* beneficiary (the Justice Gap Fund established by the California State Bar located at 180 Howard St., San Francisco, CA 94105), for any uncashed checks, and finds that the *cy pres* beneficiary meets the requirements of CCP § 384.
- Administrator will give notice of entry of judgment to Settlement Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) by posting a Notice and copy of said Final Judgment on its website at the following web address: <a href="http://www.cptgroupcaseinfo.com/ScelziEnterprisesSettlement/">http://www.cptgroupcaseinfo.com/ScelziEnterprisesSettlement/</a> (along with the Settlement Agreement, Class Notice, and other pertinent documents). The Notice shall state as follows:

To all Class members in the case of *Murray v. Scelzi Enterprises, Inc.*, Riverside Superior Court Case No. RIC2002545, PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Court has entered the following ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND FINAL JUDGMENT, which you can view by clicking on the link below. There is now a 60 day appellate period from entry of the Final Judgment. Assuming there are no appeals, the Final Judgment will become final and unappealable on after the 60<sup>th</sup> day, and settlement checks will be sent out within 21 days thereafter.

If you would like more information about the final approval order or the Final Judgment, please contact Class Counsel:

## ACKERMANN & TILAJEF, P.C.

Craig J. Ackermann (SBN 229832)
cja@ackermanntilajef.com
Sam Vahedi (SBN 282650)
sv@ackermanntilajef.com
1180 South Beverly Drive, Suite 610
Los Angeles, California 90035
Telephone: (310) 277-0614

Facsimile: (310) 277-0635

MELMED LAW GROUP P.C.

Jonathan Melmed (SBN 290218) jm@melmedlaw.com 1801 Century Park East, Suite 850 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 824-3828

Facsimile: (310) 862-6851

25

26

27

28

27. The Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the Action and the Settlement, including jurisdiction pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h), solely for purposes of (a) enforcing the Settlement Agreement, (b) addressing settlement administration matters, and (c) addressing such post-

Judgment matters as may be appropriate under court rules or applicable law.

- 28. The Court hereby sets a <u>non-appearance</u> hearing on the final accounting and distribution of the settlement funds on **February 10, 2022 at 8:30 a.m.** Plaintiff shall file with the Court a report and/or declaration from the Settlement Administrator regarding the status of distribution at least fourteen (14) calendar days prior to the hearing.
- 29. This Final Judgment is intended to be a final disposition of the above captioned action in its entirety and is intended to be immediately appealable. This Judgment resolves and extinguishes all claims released by the Settlement Agreement, against Defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:

DATED: 413 2021

HON. SYNSHINE SYKES

Judge of the California Superior Court, County of Riverside