1	LIDMAN LAW, APC	FILED Superior Court of California
2	Scott M. Lidman (State Bar #199433) Elizabeth Nguyen (State Bar # 238571)	County of Los Angeles 08/01/2023
3	Milan Moore (State Bar # 308095)	David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Co
4	2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150 El Segundo, California 90245	By: L. M'Greené Deputy
	Telephone: (424) 322-4772	
5	Facsimile: (424) 322-4775	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs KATARINA HAINES	, et al.
7	[Additional counsel listed on next page]	
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF	F THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE COU	NTY OF LOS ANGELES
10		
11	JOSALYN O'QUINN, ANGELITA BONDS, and KATARINA HAINES, individually and	Case No.:19STCV28155
12	on behalf of themselves and those similarly situated and in their representative capacity on	[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Carolyn B. Kuhl, SSC-12]
13	behalf of the State of California and fellow Aggrieved Employees;	
14		[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
15	Plaintiff,	SETTLEMENT, CLASS
	v.	REPRESENTATIVES' SERVICE PAYMENTS, AND ATTORNEYS' FEES
16	LAUGH FACTORY, INC., a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,	AND COSTS
17		Date: August 1, 2023
<u>≅</u> 18	Defendants.	Time: 10:30 a.m.
		Dept.: 12
55 20		Action Filed: August 16, 2019
23		Trial Date: None Set
Electronically Received 07/10/2023 12:12 20 23 22:12 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 2		
₹ 22		
를 23		
8 25		
± 26		
딅 27		
<u>ш</u> 28		

1	ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC		
2	Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924) 3990 Old Town Avenue, Ste. C204		
3	San Diego, CA 92110 Telephone: (619) 255-9047		
	Facsimile: (858) 404-9203		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiffs JOSALYN O'QUINN, et al.		
6	JCL LAW FIRM, APC		
	Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676) 3990 Old Town Avenue, Suite C204		
7	San Diego, California 92110		
8	Telephone: (619) 599-8292 Facsimile: (619) 599-8291		
9			
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs JOSALYN O'QUINN, et al.		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	2		
	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, CLASS		
	REPRESENTATIVES' SERVICE PAYMENTS, AND ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS		

25

26

27

28

This matter came on regularly for hearing before this Court on August 1, 2023, pursuant to 1.

California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's February 28, 2023 Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice (herein "Settlement")¹ and the documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and recognizing the 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:

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 defined as:

> All persons employed by Defendants Laugh Factory, Inc. and Laugh Factory Long Beach ("Defendants"), or either of them in California and classified as non-exempt who worked for Defendants, or either of them, during the Class Period.

- 2. Class Period is defined as the period from January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2021.
- 3. Plaintiffs Josalyn O'Quinn, Angelita Bonds, and Katarina Haines are hereby confirmed as Class/PAGA Representatives, and Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq. of JCL Law Firm, APC, Shani Zakay of Zakay Law Group, and Scott Lidman of Lidman Law, APC are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.
- 4. Notice was provided to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement. The form and manner of notice were approved by the Court on February 28, 2023, and the notice process has been completed in conformity with the Court's Order. The Court finds that said notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice (meaning the Court Approved Notice of Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date of Final Court Approval) provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed Settlement Class members of their rights, and fully

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all terms used in this Order shall have the same meaning as that assigned to them in the Settlement.

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, that zero (0) class members have opted 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 Settlement Agreement 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 Representatives are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class; (d) the Class Representatives have 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 finds that given the absence of objections to the Settlement, and objections being a prerequisite to appeal, that this Order shall be considered final as of the date of notice of entry.
- 9. The Court orders that Defendants Laugh Factory, Inc. and Laugh Factory Long Beach deposit the Gross Settlement Amount of One Hundred Forty-Four Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$144,000.00) with ILYM Group, Inc., the Settlement Administrator, as provided for in the Settlement. Specifically, Defendants shall transfer to the Administrator the first installment totaling \$50,000.04 within ten (10) calendar days after the date of this Order. Thirty (30) calendar days after Defendants transfer the first installment, Defendants shall transfer subsequent installments of \$7,833.33 per installment to the Administrator every thirty (30) days until the full Gross Settlement Amount has been paid, which shall total thirteen (13) total payments.

- 10. Any Settlement funds that remain uncashed after 180 calendar days after they are mailed shall be delivered to the California State Controller's Office Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the Settlement Class member.
- 11. The Court finds that the settlement payments, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute the individual payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 12. The Court finds that a service payment in the amount of \$7,500.00 for Plaintiff Josalyn O'Quinn is appropriate for her risks undertaken and service to the Settlement Class. The Court finds that this award is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 13. The Court finds that a service payment in the amount of \$7,500.00 for Plaintiff Angelita Bonds is appropriate for her risks undertaken and service to the Settlement Class. The Court finds that this award 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 finds that a service payment in the amount of \$7,500.00 for Plaintiff Katarina Haines is appropriate for her risks undertaken and service to the Settlement Class. The Court finds that this award is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 15. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$48,000.00 (\$12,000 to JCL Law Firm, APC; \$12,000 to Zakay Law Group, APLC; and \$24,000 to Lidman Law, APC) and litigation costs of \$16,274.64 (\$6,339.50 to JCL Law Firm, APC; \$3,601.09 to Zakay Law Group, APLC; and \$6,334.05 to Lidman Law, APC) for Class Counsel, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the terms of the Settlement. V@Á^^Áæ &åÁ*Á^æ[} æå/Á*Á*Æ[} æå/Á*Á*Æ[} æå/Á*Á*Æ] æð/Á*Á*Æ[} æð/Á*Á*Æ] æð/Á*Á*Æ[} æð/Á*Á*Æ] æð/Á*Æ[} æð/Á*Á*Æ]
- 16. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$5,500.00 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.

- 17. The Court finds that the payment to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$7,500.00 for its share of the settlement of Plaintiff's representative action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute this payment to the LWDA in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 18. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, the employer's share of payroll taxes for the portion of the Net Settlement Amount allocated to wages shall be paid by Defendants separately from, and in addition to, the Gross Settlement Amount.
- 19. The Court finds and determines that upon satisfaction of all obligations under the Settlement and this Order, all Settlement Class Members will be bound by the Settlement, will have released the Released Claims as set forth in the Settlement, and will be permanently barred from prosecuting against Defendants any of the Released Claims pursuant to the Settlement.
- 20. The Settlement is not an admission by Defendants nor is this Order a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendants. Neither this Order, 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 Defendants.
- 18. The Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the Settlement, this Final Approval Order, and the Judgment entered in connection with the Settlement.
- 19. The Settlement Administrator shall file a declaration regarding the disbursement of Settlement funds on or before April 30, 2025, which accounts for the 13 installment payments and 180 day void deadline for check cashing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 08/01/2023 , 2023

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

seo yn B Kuhl

Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl Judge of the Superior Court