

SEP 2 6 2024

CLERK OF THE COURT

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA **COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

DEPARTMENT 304

CHARLES HICKS, on behalf of himself and all | CASE NO.: CGC-22-599591 others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DECKER ELECTRIC CO., a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, inclusive,

Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION **SETTLEMENT**

25 26

27 28 Plaintiff Charles Hicks' ("Plaintiff") Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement came on regularly for hearing on September 25, 2024, regarding the terms set forth in the Amended Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement" or the "Settlement Agreement") attached as Exhibit C to the Supplemental Declaration of Mehrdad Bokhour filed June 4, 2024. In conformity with California Rules of Court, rule 3.769, with due and adequate notice having been given to Class Members (as defined in the Settlement), and having considered the Settlement, all of the legal authorities and documents submitted in support thereof, having reviewed the record in this litigation, and good cause appearing, the Court hereby GRANTS final approval of the Settlement and makes the following findings and determinations as follows:

- 1. All terms used in this order shall have the same meaning as those terms used and/or defined in the parties' Settlement Agreement and Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement.
- 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 Settlement Class, as defined in the Settlement as follows: all of Defendant's current and former hourly paid or non-exempt employees within the State of California at any time from May 11, 2018, to March 23, 2024. The PAGA Members include all current and former hourly paid or non-exempt employees who have worked for Defendant within California at any time from May 10, 2021, through March 23, 2024.
- 4. The Court deems the Settlement Class definition sufficient for the purpose of rule 3.765(a) of the California Rules of Court and solely for the purpose of effectuating the Settlement.
- 5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class 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 ILYM Group, Inc., appointed as the Settlement

Administrator, completed the distribution of the Class Notice to the Class in a manner that complies with California Rules of Court, rule 3.766. The Class Notice informed 1,969 prospective Class Members of the Settlement terms, their rights under the settlement and their settlement share, their rights to submit a request for exclusion, their right to comment on or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear at the Final Approval and Fairness Hearing and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Each of these procedures provided a sufficient period of time to respond and to act.

- 7. No Class Members filed a written objection to the Settlement as part of the notice process and no Class Members appeared at the Final Approval and Fairness Hearing to orally object to the Settlement.
 - 8. One Class Member, Mike Reynolds, requested exclusion from the settlement.
- 9. The Court appoints Plaintiff Charles Hicks as Class Representative and finds him to be adequate.
- 10. The Court appoints Joshua Falakassa of Falakassa Law, P.C. and Mehrdad Bokhour of Bokhour Law Group, P.C. as Class Counsel and finds each of them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in class action litigation.
- 11. 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 evaluate their respective positions reasonably.
- 12. The Court hereby approves the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and finds that the Settlement Agreement is, in all respects, fair, adequate, 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.
- 13. The Court directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according to its terms and declares the Settlement Agreement to be binding on all 1,968 Participating Class Members.
- 14. The terms of the Settlement Agreement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$3,400,000 and the individual settlement shares, are fair, adequate, and reasonable to the Class and

The Court approves the following allocations from the Gross Settlement

each Class Member.

1

21

22

23

24

26

27

Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement a finding of the validity of any claims in the Action. Neither this Order, Judgment, the Settlement Agreement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement is, may be construed as, or may be used as an admission by or against Defendant of any fault, wrongdoing or liability, or that this Action is appropriate for class or representative treatment (other than for settlement purposes). The entering into or carrying out of the Settlement Agreement, and any negotiations or proceedings related thereto, shall not in any event be construed as, or deemed to be evidence of, an admission or concession with regard to the denials or defenses by Defendant. Notwithstanding these restrictions, Defendant may file in the Action or in any other proceeding this Order, Judgment, the Settlement Agreement, or any other papers and records on file in the Action as evidence of the Settlement to support a defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, release, or other theory of claim or issue preclusion or similar defense as to the released claims. 17. The Settlement shall bind all 1,968 Participating Class Members, including the release of claims (including Released Class Claims, Released PAGA Claims, and General Release by

18.

19.

provided in this Order.

Plaintiff) as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

The Parties shall bear their respective attorneys' fees and costs, except as otherwise

Final Settlement Class Members shall have 180 calendar days after mailing by the

Settlement Administrator to cash their settlement checks. If any Final Settlement Class Member's

check is not cashed within that period, and if the aggregate funds represented by the uncashed checks

total \$15,000 or more, they will be distributed to each remaining Class Member, who is participating

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

(CCP 1010.6(6) & CRC 2.260(g))

I, Edward Santos, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On September 26, 2024, I electronically served ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT via File & ServeXpress on the recipients designated on the Transaction Receipt located on the File & ServeXpress website.

Dated:

SEP 2 6 2024

Brandon E. Riley, Court Executive Officer

By:

Edward Santos, Deputy Clerk