

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL**

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 07/17/2026 TIME: 9:00 AM DEPT: C-75

JUDICIAL OFFICER: EUKETA OLIVER
CLERK: Natalie Calantoc
REPORTER/ERM: Not Reported
BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: J. Lemke

CASE NO: **24CU020914C** CASE INIT.DATE: 10/31/2024
CASE TITLE: **Segovia vs Artemis Headlands LLC**
CASE CATEGORY: Civil CASE TYPE: (U)Other Employment

HEARING TYPE: Motion Hearing
MOVING PARTY:

APPEARANCES

Brooke Baquial Nevels, Attorney for Plaintiff(s), present via remote audio appearance.
Lauren M Guggisberg, Attorney for Defendant(s), present via remote video appearance.

The Court confirms and modifies its tentative ruling as follows:

Plaintiffs Ruth Joy Segovia, Faranak Kianfar, Diemvy Pham, Lisa Matthews Fitzgibbons, Cynthia Guerrero, and Rene Amel Peralta's unopposed Motions for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees are **GRANTED**.

This motion seeks final approval of the parties' proposed \$485,000.00 wage and hour class action and PAGA settlement. Of this amount, \$30,000 is the PAGA portion of the settlement.

The Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement on February 6, 2026. (ROA 50.)

The settlement class is certified for purposes of settlement. The class action settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$485,000.00.

Plaintiffs Ruth Joy Segovia Faranak Kianfar, Diemvy Pham, Lisa Matthews Fitzgibbons, Cynthia Guerrero, and Rene Amel Peralta service awards of \$5,000.00 each are approved. Plaintiff Ruth Joy Segovia is also to receive an additional \$20,000.00 for her retaliation claim, which is approved.

The requested settlement administration fee of \$5,450.00 is also approved. The Court finds the costs reasonable and supported by the Declaration of Cassandra Polites. (ROA 65.)

The class consists of 204 class members. Of the notices sent, 5 remain undeliverable. There were zero objections, no work week disputes, and only one request for exclusion. The Court finds the settlement to be fair, adequate and

reasonable. (See, e.g., *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800-01; Cal. Rules of Ct. rule 3.769(g).) The reasonableness of the settlement is further demonstrated by the fact that there is no opposition or objections.

Plaintiff requests \$161,650.50 in attorney fees and \$17,881.43 in costs, which is approved. A percentage method may be used to calculate a reasonable fee in a common fund case such as this. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.) This is more than the lodestar and results in a 1.335 multiplier, which is reasonable under these circumstances based on the work set forth in the attorneys' declarations. (See ROA 55, 62.) Class counsel obtained a good result on behalf of a class where 99% approved the settlement. Counsel bore the entire risk and cost of litigation on a contingency basis.

Incentive payments to class representatives "must not be disproportionate to the amount of time and energy expended in pursuit of the lawsuit." (*Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1395.) The court must also consider the "risk to the class representative in commencing suit" and any "notoriety and personal difficulties" he or she encounters as a result of the litigation. (*Id.*, at p. 1394.)

Plaintiffs Ruth Joy Segovia, Faranak Kianfar, Diemvy Pham, Lisa Matthews Fitzgibbons, Cynthia Guerrero, and Rene Amel Peralta provided declarations reflecting the effort assisting with the prosecution of the action. (See ROA 56-60, 66.) The incentive payment is reasonable and appropriate to compensate Plaintiffs for their efforts.

The Court assessed *Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Management, LLC* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521, 538 and finds the released claims appear to be appropriately tethered to the operative complaint's factual allegations and do not extend beyond the scope of its allegations. (*Amaro, supra.*)

The PAGA portion of the settlement in the amount of \$30,000 also appears fair, reasonable and adequate in terms of PAGA's purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws. (*Muniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.) Plaintiff has also served notice of the settlement on the LWDA and the preliminary approval motion on the LWDA. (ROA 62 at ¶ 24.)

For these reasons, the motion is **GRANTED**.

Concluding Orders

The Court sets a status conference on November 13, 2026, at 9:45 a.m. in Department 75 to confirm the completion of the settlement process.

The Court will review and sign the proposed order (ROA 52) and proposed judgment (ROA 63).

Plaintiff is ordered to provide notice of the Court's ruling to all parties by July 21, 2026.

Euketa Oliver

Judge Euketa Oliver