ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVED - 10/18/2024 5:15 PM - By: Becky Perez, DEPUTY COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO MELMED LAW GROUP, P.C. 1 SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT Jonathan Melmed, (SBN 290218) 2 im@melmedlaw.com NOV 1 5 2024 Laura M. Supanich, (SBN 314805) 3 lms@melmedlaw.com 1801 Century Park East, Suite 850 4 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 824-3828 5 Facsimile: (310) 862-6851 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff, the Putative Class, and the Aggrieved Employees 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO 9 Case Number: CIVSB2200817 AARON VANDERPOOL, an individual, 10 on behalf of himself, the State of California, 11 as a private attorney general, and on behalf [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION of all others similarly situated, 12 **SETTLEMENT** 13 Plaintiff, Date: November 14, 2024 Time: 8:30 a.m. 14 Dept.: Dept. S26 Christian Towns v. 15 Judge: Hon. Jessica L. Morgan-SEARLES VALLEY MINERALS, a 16 Complaint Filed: March 1, 2022 Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 TO 50, 17 Defendants. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

This matter having come for hearing on November 14, 2024, at 8:30 a.m., regarding Plaintiff Aaron Vanderpool's ("Plaintiff") unopposed *Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement* (the "Motion") on the terms set forth in the *Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release* (the "Settlement Agreement"). 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 Agreement and the Motion), and having considered the Settlement Agreement, all of the legal authorities and documents submitted in support thereof, all papers filed and proceedings had herein, all oral and written comments received regarding the Settlement Agreement, and having reviewed the record in this litigation, and good cause appearing, the Court GRANTS final approval of the Settlement Agreement and orders and makes the following findings and determinations and enters final judgment as follows:

- 1. The Court grants Plaintiff leave file the overlength brief attached to the Motion.
- 2. All terms used in this order shall have the same meanings given as those terms are used and/or defined in the parties' Settlement Agreement and the Motion. A copy of the Settlement Agreement is attached to the *Declaration of Jonathan Melmed in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement* as **Exhibit A** and is made a part of this order.
- 3. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Plaintiff and Defendant Searles Valley Minerals ("Defendant") (collectively, the "Parties") to this litigation and subject matter jurisdiction to approve this Settlement Agreement and all exhibits thereto.
- 4. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally certifies the Class, as defined in the Motion and the Settlement Agreement and as follows: "All current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees employed by Defendant in California at any time from January 12, 2018, to December 31, 2023." The Court deems this 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 Agreement.
- 5. The Court finds that an ascertainable class of 778 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 Agreement: (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 Agreement, Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel have fairly and adequately represented and protected the interest of the Class Members.

- 6. The Court is satisfied that ILYM Group, Inc., which was appointed as the Settlement Administrator, completed the distribution of Class Notice to the Class in a manner that comports with California Rule of Court 3.766. The Class Notice informed 779 prospective Class Members of the Settlement Agreement's terms, their rights under the Settlement Agreement to receive their settlement share, their rights to submit a request for exclusion, their rights to comment on or object to the Settlement Agreement, and their rights to appear at the Final Approval and Fairness Hearing, and be heard regarding approval of the Settlement Agreement. Sufficient periods of time to respond and to act were provided by each of these procedures.
- 7. 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.
- 8. 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.
- 9. 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.
- 10. The Court also finds that the Settlement Agreement 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 Agreement in light of the challenges posed by continued litigation, and Court concludes that Class Counsel secured significant relief for Class Members.
- 11. The Settlement Agreement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this order a finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant.

- 12. The Court appoints Plaintiff Aaron Vanderpool as Class Representative and finds him to be adequate for purposes of settlement.
- 13. The Court appoints Jonathan Melmed and Laura Supanich of Melmed Law Group P.C. as Class Counsel and finds each of them to be adequate, experienced, and well-versed in class action litigation.
- 14. The terms of the Settlement Agreement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$100,000,000.00 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 Settlement Agreement, subject to this order.
- 15. The Court approves the following allocations, which fall within the ranges stipulated by and through the Settlement Agreement:
 - A. The Court awards \$10,450.00 to ILYM Group, Inc., the Settlement Administrator, and finds this amount to be fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of it and orders the Parties to make the payment to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
 - B. The Court awards \$333,333.33 to Plaintiff's counsel as attorneys' fees and finds this amount to be fair and reasonable in light of the benefit obtained for the Class. The Court grants final approval of, awards, and orders the payment to Plaintiff's counsel to be made in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
 - C. The Court awards \$11,226.55 in litigation costs, an amount which the Court finds to be reflective of the reasonable costs incurred. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the litigation expenses payment in this amount to be made to Plaintiff's counsel in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.
 - D. The Court awards \$7,500.00 to the class representative as payment requested by Plaintiff and finds this amount to be fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the class representative payment to be made in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

- E. The Court approves the \$100,000.00 allocation for penalties under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, and orders 75% thereof (i.e., \$75,000.00) to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement and the remainder to the Aggrieved Employees.
- 16. 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 order, in which case the provisions of this order shall take precedence and supersede the Settlement Agreement.
- 17. Nothing in the Settlement Agreement or this order 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 Agreement fails to become final or effective, or in any other case without limitation.
- 18. All Class Members who did not request exclusion from the Settlement shall be bound by the Settlement and this order, including the release of claims as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. One person requested exclusion from the settlement, Eric Epperly, and he will not be bound by the Settlement and this order.
- 19. The Parties shall bear their own respective attorneys' fees and costs except as otherwise provided in this order and the Settlement Agreement.
- 20. All checks mailed to the Class Members must be cashed within one hundred and eighty (180) days after mailing. If a Class Member fails to cash his/her check by the deadline, then the Settlement Administrator shall submit such funds to the California State Controller for deposit in the Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of the individual whose check was uncashed. The Court finds that this meets the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 384.
- 21. Within seven days of this order, the Settlement Administrator shall give notice of judgment to Settlement Class Members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) by posting a copy of this order and final judgment on its website.
- 22. The Court retains continuing jurisdiction over the Action and the Settlement, including jurisdiction pursuant to rule 3.769(h) of the California Rules of Court, solely for purposes of (a) enforcing the Settlement Agreement, (b) addressing settlement administration matters, and