

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

NANCY CALIGARIS, in a Representative
capacity only, and on behalf of other
members of the public similarly situated

Plaintiff,

v.

SAN DIEGO FUNDING, a California
Corporation, and DOES 1-10, inclusive

Defendants

CASE NO. 37-2020-00045598-CU-OE-CTL

**[PROPOSED] ORDER APPROVING PAGA
SETTLEMENT & ENTRY OF JUDGMENT**

Date: April 12, 2022

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept.: 64

Judge: Hon. John S. Meyer

1 TO ALL PARTIES HEREIN AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 Plaintiff NANCY CALIGARIS's, in a Representative capacity only, and on behalf of other
3 members of the public similarly situated, *Ex Parte* Application re Enforcement of Settlement was
4 heard in Department C-64 of the above-entitled Court on April 12, 2022, at 8:30 a.m.

5 Having read and considered the application filed by Plaintiff's Counsel, any opposition thereto,
6 and the arguments of the parties, the Court finds there are sufficient grounds to grant Plaintiff's
7 Application in this matter. Accordingly, good cause appearing therefore,

8 **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

9 The Court has reviewed and approves the terms of the parties settlement pursuant to the Private
10 Attorneys General Act (PAGA);

11 1) The Court approves the parties proposed allocations set forth in the moving papers.
12 Specifically, the Court approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$70,00.00 which is
13 broken down as follows:

- 14 - \$2,000.00 Settlement Administrator Fees;
15 - \$23,333.33 Attorneys' Fees
16 - \$5,000.00 Costs of Litigation
17 - \$34,666.67 Total PAGA Penalty. 75% shall be assigned and transmitted to
18 the LWDA as penalties. The remaining 25% shall be allocated
19 to the PAGA employees.

20 2) In all other respects, Judgment is entered in accordance with the terms of the parties'
21 PAGA Settlement Agreement, which was attached to the declaration of Eric K.
22 Yaeckel that was filed with the Court on April 11, 2022

23 3) As noted in the Settlement Agreement, a judgment in this representative action brought
24 by an aggrieved employee under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004
25 is binding not only on the named plaintiff but also on government agencies and any
26 aggrieved employee not a party to this proceeding.

27
28 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

4) The Court will retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 664.6.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

HONORABLE JOHN S. MEYER
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT