HAINES LAW GROUP, APC 1 Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226) phaines@haineslawgroup.com DEC 8 2023 2 Fletcher W. Schmidt (SBN 286462) fschmidt@haineslawgroup.com By: J. Virissimo, Deputy

ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVED

Superior Court of California,

County of San Diego 3 Matthew K. Moen (SBN 305956) mmoen@haineslawgroup.com 4 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180 11/14/2023 at 04:36:04 PM El Segundo, California 90245 Clerk of the Superior Court By Andrea Naranjo, Deputy Clerk 5 Tel: (424) 292-2350 Fax: (424) 292-2355 6 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 7 8 9 10 11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 14 Case No. 37-2021-00048823-CU-OE-CTL ROBERTO ARCOS, and MARTIN ARCOS as 15 individuals and on behalf of all others similarly [Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Loren situated, G. Freestone, Dept. C-64] 16 Plaintiffs, PROPOSED JUDGMENT AND 17 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF VS. 18 CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, PANORAMIC DOORS, LLC, a Delaware ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS, AND 19 CLASS REPRESENTATIVE SERVICE limited liability company; and DOES 1 through **PAYMENTS** 20 100. Date: December 8, 2023 Defendants. 21 Time: 10:30 a.m. Dept.: C-64 22 Action Filed: November 17, 2021 23 Trial Date: None Set 24 25 26 27 28

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT AND ORDER GRANTING FINAL SETTLEMENT APPROVAL

12

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT AND ORDER

The Motion of Plaintiffs Roberto Arcos and Martin Arcos ("Plaintiffs") for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Class Representative Service Payments came on regularly for hearing before this Court on December 8, 2023, at 10:30 a.m., pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's Amended Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release ("Settlement Agreement"), attached as Exhibit 2 to the June 2, 2023 Supplemental Declaration of Matthew K. Moen in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion For Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, and all other documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and recognizing the sharply disputed factual and legal issues involved in this case, the risks of further prosecution, and the benefits to be received by the Settlement Class members 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, arms'length negotiations between the parties. Good cause appearing therefor, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

- Final judgment is hereby entered in conformity with the Settlement and this Court's Preliminary Approval Order.
- 2. The conditional class certification contained in the Preliminary Approval Order is hereby made final, and the Court thus certifies, for purposes of the Settlement, the Settlement Class defined as:

All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant Panoramic Doors, LLC ("Defendant"), within the State of California at any time from November 17, 2017 through February 9, 2023 (the "Class Period").

3. Plaintiffs Roberto Arcos and Martin Arcos are hereby confirmed as the Class Representatives, and Paul K. Haines, Fletcher W. Schmidt, and Matthew K. Moen of Haines Law Group, APC are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.

28 ||

///

- Agreement, which was approved by the Court on June 15, 2023, and the notice process has been completed in conformity with the Court's Orders. The Court finds that said notice constituted reasonable notice under the circumstances, and constituted valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Settlement Class members. The Notice of Class Action Settlement provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed Settlement Class members of their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769, the California and United States Constitutions, and other applicable law.
- 5. The Court finds that no Class Member objected to the Settlement and zero individuals requested to be excluded from the Settlement, resulting in a 100% participation rate. The Court determines that this response 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 Settlement Class members 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 members, and there is a well-defined community of interest among Settlement Class members with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the claims of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class members; (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 is qualified to serve as counsel for the Class Representatives and the Settlement Class members.
- 8. The Court finds that given the absence of objections, and objections being a prerequisite to appeal, this Order shall be considered final as of the Effective Date (as defined in the Settlement Agreement).

As of the date that this Judgment becomes final, all Settlement Class members 9. release and discharge Defendant and each of its parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, current and former management companies, shareholders, members, agents (including any investment bankers, accountants, insurers, reinsurers, attorneys and any past, present or future officers, directors and employees) predecessors, successors, and assigns (collectively, the "Released Parties") from all claims, demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action of every nature and description whatsoever including without limitation statutory, constitutional, contractual or common law claims, against the Released Parties, and any of them, for relief and penalties, that accrued during the Class Period, and as a result of Settlement Class members employment by Defendant in California, that arise under any state or local law or state administrative order that was or could have been pled based on the facts alleged in the operative complaint, including claims of failure to pay minimum wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide compliant meal periods and/or associated premiums, failure to provide compliant rest periods and/or associated premiums, failure to pay wages timely at termination, violations of the California WARN Act, and violations of California Labor Code §§ 201, 202, 203, 204, 226.7, 510, 516, 558, 1182.12, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1198, 1400, the applicable Wage Order of the Industrial Wage Commission, and California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 to 17208, including without limitation all related claims for restitution and other equitable relief arising from California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200, et seq., and interest on unpaid wages, unpaid wages, attorneys fees or litigation costs (collectively, the "Released Claims"). The release does not extend to any claims not alleged in the operative class action complaint and specifically excludes claims for workers compensation, personal injuries, unemployment insurance, state disability compensation, claims under the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, previously vested benefits under any employer sponsored benefits plan, wrongful termination, discrimination, retaliation, and harassment including but not limited to those arising under the Age Discrimination In Employment Act, the California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Title VII of the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964, and/or Federal Civil Rights Act of 1991, or any similar state or federal laws, the California Family Rights Act, the Federal Family Medical Leave

Act, the California Pregnancy Leave Law, or similar state or federal laws, the Federal Equal Pay Act of 1963, violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 or violations of any other state or federal law, rule or regulation concerning discrimination, retaliation and/or harassment. The release period for the Released Claims will be from November 17, 2017, through February 9, 2023.

- 10. The Court orders Defendant to deposit the entire Maximum Settlement Amount of \$299,000.00 with ILYM Group, Inc. (the "Settlement Administrator") within 30 calendar days of the Effective Date.
- 11. The Court finds that the Class Representative Service Payments in the amount of \$5,000.00 to each named Plaintiff (\$10,000.00 total) is appropriate in recognition of the risks Plaintiffs undertook; for the amount of time and effort spent by Plaintiffs as the Class Representatives; and the service Plaintiffs provided to the Settlement Class members. The Court finds that this amount is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 12. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the total amount of \$99,666.67 and litigation costs of \$10,802.09 for Class Counsel are fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 13. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$7,000.00 from the Maximum Settlement Amount for all of its work done and to be done until the completion of this matter and finds that sum appropriate.
- 14. The Court finds that the Individual Class Settlement Payments, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute these payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
- 15. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.771(b) and the Parties' Settlement Agreement, the Court orders that notice of this Judgment and Order be posted on a website hosted by the Settlement Administrator for a period of sixty (60) calendar days.

16. Any funds from Individual Class Settlement Payments checks remaining uncashed after the 180-day check-cashing deadline shall be transferred to the California State Controller's Office to be held pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, California Civil Code § 1500 et seq., in the name of the Settlement Class member to whom the check was issued, until such time that they claim their property.

This document shall constitute a final judgment pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h) which provides, "If the court approves the settlement agreement after the final approval hearing, the court must make and enter judgment. The judgment must include a provision for the retention of the court's jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the terms of the judgment. The court may not enter an order dismissing the action at the same time as, or after, entry of judgment." The Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the Settlement, the Final Approval Order, and this Judgment, pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769(h) and California Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 12/8/23 ,2023

Honorable Loren G. Freestone Judge of the Superior Court