

04/30/2024

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: R. Arraiga Deputy

FINAL RULING RE: MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT
Department SSC-9
Hon. Elaine Lu

Ana Hernandez de Bahena vs Le Pafe, Inc.

Case No.: 20STCV44298

Hearing: April 9, 2024

The Court hereby **GRANTS** final approval and awards/approves the following:

The Parties' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement is **GRANTED** as the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

The Court hereby **GRANTS** final approval and awards/approves the following essential terms:

A. The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is **\$449,705.14**, non-reversionary **[updated to reflect increases from the triggered escalator]** (§37.c.)

B. The Net Settlement Amount is the GSA minus the following:

\$149,886.72 for attorney fees to Class Counsel, Moon Law Group, PC **[increased by escalator]** (§37.n.);

\$12,957.86 **[\$13,707.86 minus \$750]** for attorney costs to Class Counsel (Ibid.);

\$7,500 enhancement payment/Service Payment to the Named Plaintiff (§37.n.);

\$37,500 (75% of \$50,000 PAGA penalty) to the LWDA (§37.g); and

\$8,265 for settlement administration costs to ILYM Group (§37.p).

C. Employer's share of the payroll taxes on the taxable portion of the settlement payments shall be paid separately from the GSA by Defendant. (§37.h.)

D. Plaintiffs' release of Defendants from claims described herein.

By **July 1, 2024**, Class Counsel must give notice to the class members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) and to the LWDA, if applicable, pursuant to Labor Code §2699(1)(3).

Plaintiff's counsel shall file a [Proposed] Order and Judgment, consistent with this ruling containing all requisite terms, including the class definition, release language, and a statement that no class members requested exclusion.

By **April 30, 2025**, Class Counsel must file a Final Report Re: Distribution of the Settlement Funds.

The Court hereby sets a **Non-Appearance Case Review for May 7, 2025, 8:30 a.m., Department 9.**

BACKGROUND

This is a wage and hour class and PAGA representative action. Plaintiff Ana Hernandez de Bahena (“Plaintiff”) brings this action, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, for various violations of the California Labor Code. Defendant is a bakery specializing in high-end, European-style baked goods and has locations throughout California. Plaintiff worked as a packer for Defendant for approximately fifteen years.

On November 17, 2020, Plaintiff filed this action alleging that Defendant systematically: (1) failed to pay minimum wages, (2) failed to pay overtime compensation, (3) failed to provide meal periods, (4) failed to authorize and permit rest breaks, (5) failed to indemnify necessary business expenses, (6) failed to timely pay wages at termination, (7) failed to provide accurate itemized wage statements, and (8) engaged in unfair business practices. On April 1, 2021, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint to add a cause of action alleging that Defendant (9) violated civil penalty provisions recoverable as PAGA penalties pursuant to Labor Code section 2698 et seq.

Counsel represents that prior to the mediation, Defendant produced thousands of pages of sample of time and pay records for class members, as well as policy manuals in effect during the statutory period, and additional documents. Defendant also provided information regarding the total number of current and former employees in its informal discovery responses. Class Counsel further represents that they retained an expert to analyze the records produced.

On April 27, 2022, the Parties participated in private mediation with professional neutral mediator Hon. Carl West (Ret.), where a settlement was reached by the parties, the material terms of which are encompassed within the Joint Stipulation re: Class Action Settlement (“Settlement”), a fully-executed copy of which is attached to the Declaration of Kane Moon (“Moon Decl.”) ISO Prelim as Exhibit 1.

On February 1, 2023, the Court issued a checklist of items for counsel to address. In response, on May 25, 2023, counsel filed a fully executed Amended Settlement Agreement (“Amended Settlement”) a fully executed copy of which is attached to the Further Declaration of Brett Gunther (“Gunther Decl.”) ISO Prelim as Exhibit 2.

Preliminary approval was granted on June 15, 2023. Notice was given to the Class Members as ordered (see Declaration of Cassandra Polites (“Polites Decl.”).) On April 8, 2024, the Court continued Final Approval for Counsel to provide supplemental briefing, which Counsel filed on April 12, 2024. Now before the Court is the Motion for Final Approval of the proposed class action settlement

SETTLEMENT CLASS DEFINITION

- "Class" or "Class Members" consist of: All persons who worked for Defendant Le Pafe, Inc. dba "Le Chef Bakery", both in their individual and representative capacities at any

location of Defendant in California as an hourly, non-exempt employee, from November 17, 2016 to April 1, 2022, who has not signed an arbitration agreement and/or class action waiver. Excluded from the definition of Class Member are any temporary, contracted, staffing employee and/or other personnel employed by a third-party other than Defendant Le Pafe, Inc. "Settlement Class Members" are Plaintiff and those Class Members who do not submit timely exclusion requests to the Settlement Administrator. (Settlement Agreement, ¶8.)

- The "Class Period" is November 17, 2016 through April 1, 2022. (¶3.)
- "PAGA Employee" means any person employed by Defendant Le Pafe, Inc. dba "Le Chef Bakery" in California and classified as a non-exempt employee who worked for Le Pafe, Inc. dba "Le Chef Bakery" during the PAGA Period (November 15, 2019 through April 1, 2022). (¶14.)
 - "PAGA Period" means the period from November 15, 2019 through April 1, 2022. (¶13.)
- Defendant's best estimate is that the Class Members worked approximately 20,000 workweeks. (¶7.) There are 187 Class Members and 293 PAGA Aggrieved Employees. (Gunther Decl. ISO Prelim, ¶4.)
 - The Class List contained 173 individuals who worked 28,106.57 work weeks. (Polites Decl., ¶5.) There are 95 Aggrieved Employees who worked 5,164 pay periods during the PAGA period. (*Id.* at ¶19.) The reason for the 200 PAGA member discrepancy between the estimate and the final number is because counsel inadvertently estimated the number of Aggrieved Employees based on the Class Period (November 17, 2016 through April 1, 2022). (Moon Supp. Decl. ISO Final, ¶5.a) Following preliminary approval, Defense Counsel provided to the administrator an accurate list of Aggrieved Employees based on the PAGA Period (November 15, 2019 through April 1, 2022), which is three years shorter than the Class Period. (*Ibid.*)
- Escalator Clause: If it is later determined that the number of Covered Workweeks is more than 25% greater than the original estimates of 20,000 workweeks (i.e. 25,000 or more Covered Workweeks), the Gross Settlement Amount may be increased by the percentage that the actual number of class members or workweeks exceeds the original estimates beyond 25% (the "Escalator Clause"). However, should the number of Covered Workweeks exceed 25,000, Defendant shall have the right to amend and shorten the class period as of the date the number of workweeks exceeds 25,000. The Gross Settlement Amount will not be reduced for any reason. (Settlement, ¶37.d.)
 - ILYM Group informed both parties that the total number of Workweeks through that date was more than the allowable threshold (28,106.57). The Defendant elected to increase the Gross Settlement Amount. Therefore, the Gross Settlement Amount increased proportionally by the Workweeks in excess of 25,000.00.
Defendant will pay an additional payment of \$49,705.14 and, the increased Gross Settlement Amount is \$449,705.14. (Polites Decl., ¶6.)

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

The essential terms are as follows:

- The Gross Settlement Amount ("GSA") is **\$449,705.14**, non-reversionary. (¶37.c.)
[numbers updated to reflect increases from triggered escalator]

- The Net Settlement Amount (“Net”) (**\$219,818.42**) is the GSA minus the following:
 - Up to **\$149,886.72** (33.33%) for attorney fees (§37.n.); **[increased by escalator]**
 - Up to **\$20,000** for litigation costs (*Ibid.*);
 - Up to **\$7,500** for a Service Payment to the Named Plaintiff (§37.n.);
 - Up to **\$15,000** for settlement administration costs (§37.p.); and
 - Payment of **\$37,500** (75% of \$50,000 PAGA penalty) to the LWDA. (§37.g.)
- Defendants will pay their share of taxes separate from the GSA. (§37.h.)
- There is no claim form requirement. (§37.f.)
- Individual Settlement Payment Calculation: Each Settlement Class Member will be paid a pro-rata share of the Net Settlement Amount (less the PAGA Settlement Payments), as calculated by the Settlement Administrator. The pro-rata share will be determined by comparing the individual Settlement Class Member's Covered Workweeks worked during the Class Period in California to the total Covered Workweeks of all the Settlement Class Members during the Class Period as follows: [Workweeks worked by a Settlement Class Member] ÷ [Sum of all Covered Workweeks worked by all Settlement Class Members] x [Net Settlement Amount - all PAGA Settlement Payments] = Individual Settlement Payment for a Settlement Class Member. (§37.i.)
 - Tax Allocation: 33.3% as wages; 33.3% as penalties; 33.3% as interest. (§37.k.)
- PAGA Payments: PAGA Settlement Payments will be paid out of the Net Settlement Amount. Each PAGA Employee will be paid a pro-rata share of the PAGA Employees' PAGA Settlement Payment, as calculated by the Settlement Administrator. Class Members will not be permitted to exclude themselves from this portion of the Settlement. The pro-rata share will be determined by comparing the individual PAGA Employees' PAGA Pay Periods during the PAGA Period to the total PAGA Pay Periods of all the PAGA Employees during the PAGA Period as follows: [PAGA Pay Periods worked by a PAGA Employee] ÷ [Sum of all PAGA Pay Periods worked by all PAGA Employees] x [PAGA Settlement Payment] = individual PAGA Employee's portion of the PAGA Settlement Payment. (§37.j.)
 - Tax Allocation: 100% penalties. (§37.k.)
- "Response Deadline" means the date forty-five (45) days after the Settlement Administrator initially mails the Notice to Settlement Class Members and the last date on which Settlement Class Members may submit a request for exclusion or written objection to the Settlement. In the case of a re-mailed Notice, the Response Deadline will be the later of 45 calendar days after initial mailing or 14 calendar days from re-mailing. The Response Deadline may be extended only as expressly described herein. (§8.) This deadline also applies to the submission of workweek disputes. (§37.v.)
 - If ten-percent (10%) or more of the Class members opt-out of the settlement, Defendant may, at its sole discretion, within thirty (30) days of the expiration of the opt-out period, elect to revoke the settlement and their stipulation to Class Certification. If Defendant exercises this option, it will be relieved of any obligation to pay the Settlement Amount or any other obligations from the Settlement, with the exception that Defendant will be responsible for one-half of the costs of administration of the Settlement incurred prior to the election to nullify the Settlement, by giving notice to Plaintiff's Counsel and the Settlement Administrator. (§50.)

- **Funding of Settlement:** Defendant agrees to make payments required under this settlement within ninety (90) calendar days of the Effective Date. (§37.q.)
 - **Distribution:** The Settlement Administrator shall cause the Settlement Payments to be mailed to the Class Members within 14 calendar days after the final funds are deposited with the administrator. (§37.r.)
- **Uncashed Settlement Checks:** Funds from un-cashed or abandoned Settlement Payment checks, based on a 180-day void date shall be transmitted to the California State Controller's Office for Unclaimed Property in the name of each Class Member who failed to cash their Settlement Payment check prior to the void date. (§46.)
- The settlement administrator will be ILYM Group. (§38.)
- The Settlement Administrator will mail the final judgment approving the Settlement along with the settlement payments. (§41.)
- There will not be a settlement website. According to the Class Notice attached as Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement, putative Class Members are provided with the following contact information: ILYM Group, Inc., Class Counsel's firm, and the court's website, in the event Class Members need additional information about the settlement. (Gunther Decl. ISO Prelim, ¶7.)
- The parties stipulate to class certification for settlement purposes only. (Settlement, ¶30.)
- Plaintiff's LWDA notice letter was submitted on November 15, 2020. (Moon Decl. ISO Prelim, Exhibit 5.)
- The proposed settlement was submitted to the LWDA on September 13, 2022. (Moon Decl. ISO Prelim, Exhibit 2.) The amended Settlement Agreement was submitted to the LWDA, on May 25, 2023. (Gunther Decl. ISO Prelim, Exhibit 3.)
- **Scope of the release:** Upon the final approval by the Court of this Settlement and payment of all funds due under this Settlement, and except as to such rights or claims as may be created by this Settlement, the Class Representative, the Class and each Class Member who has not submitted a valid and timely request for exclusion as to claims other than the PAGA claim, will release claims as follows: (§47.)
 - **Identity of Released Parties:** The released parties are Defendant, and each of its former, present and future direct and/or indirect owners, dba's, parents, subsidiaries, affiliated and related companies, divisions, successors, predecessors, or assigns, and past, current and future employees, attorneys, officers, directors, shareholders, owners, agents, trustees, heirs, executors, administrators, predecessors, successors or assigns of any of the foregoing (collectively "Releasees"). (§47.a.)
 - **Claims Released by Settlement Class Members.** Each and every Class Member, on behalf of himself or herself and his or her heirs and assigns, unless he or she has submitted a timely and valid Request for Exclusion (which will not effectuate an opt-out from the release of Released PAGA Claims), hereby releases Releasees from the following claims for the entire Class Period: (§47.c.)
 - 1) any and all claims, charges, rights, complaints, liens, demands, obligations, damages, wages, penalties, interest, debts, liabilities, costs, compensation, damages, attorneys' fees, actions, and/or causes of action that were asserted or could have been asserted based upon the facts and circumstances alleged in the operative First Amended Complaint and arising at any time during the Class Period in this Action, including but

not limited to all state wage and hour claims (including all claims under the California Labor Code) for unpaid wages, unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime wages, off-the-clock work violations, failure to provide meal periods, failure to provide rest periods, failure to maintain accurate employment records, unreimbursed business expenses, wage statement violations, interest, penalties, and attorneys' fees, waiting time penalties, withholding from wages and the related provisions of the Labor Code including but limited to Labor Code §§ 201-204, 210, 216, 218.6, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 510, 512, 512.5, 558, 1174, 1194, 1194.2, 1197, 1197.1, 1198, 2802, derivative claims under California Business & Professions Code §§ 17200 et seq., and all claims under the governing Wage Order, and Fair Labor Standards Act ("Released Claims"); and all other potential civil and statutory penalties based on or arising from the Released Claims, including but not limited to statutory, constitutional, contractual damages, costs, penalties, punitive damages, interest, attorneys' fees, litigation costs, restitution, and equitable relief; (§47.c.1.)

- 2) as to any Class Member who cashes their Settlement Payment, the Settlement Administrator shall include language on the Settlement Payments that informs the Class Members that the signing and negotiation of that check shall serve as the Class Member's consent to join the Action for purposes of releasing all claims arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act that are alleged in the Action or related to the claims stated or that could have been stated in the Action, implicitly or explicitly; (§47.c.2.)
- 3) in addition, as to all Class Members employed during the Released PAGA Claims Period, whether requesting exclusion from the Settlement or not, claims arising under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Labor Code § 2698 et seq., to the extent asserted in Plaintiffs administrative exhaustion letter submitted to the LWDA and any complaint in this matter, including the operative First Amended Complaint (i.e., the Released PAGA Claims). (§47.c.3.)
- Named Plaintiff will also provide a general release and CC § 1542 waiver. (§37.n.))

ANALYSIS OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

A. Does a presumption of fairness exist?

The Court preliminarily found in its Order of June 15, 2023 that the presumption of fairness should be applied. No facts have come to the Court's attention that would alter that preliminary conclusion. Accordingly, the settlement is entitled to a presumption of fairness as set forth in the preliminary approval order.

B. Is the settlement fair, adequate, and reasonable?

The settlement was preliminarily found to be fair, adequate and reasonable. Notice has now been given to the Class and the LWDA.

Reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement.

Number of class members: 173 (Polites Decl. ¶5.)
 Number of notice packets mailed: 173 (*Id.* at ¶8.)
 Number of undeliverable notices: 6 (*Id.* at ¶11.)
 Number of opt-outs: 0 (*Id.* at ¶12.)
 Number of objections: 0 (*Id.* at ¶14.)
 Number of participating class members: 173 (*Id.* at ¶17.)
 Average individual payment: \$1,237.30 (*Id.* at ¶18.)
 Highest individual payment: \$2,134.59 (*Ibid.*)
 Number of Aggrieved Employees: 95 (*Id.* at ¶19.)
 Average PAGA payment: \$131.58 (*Id.* at ¶20.)
 Highest PAGA payment: \$152.50 (*Ibid.*)

The Court finds that the notice was given as directed and conforms to due process requirements. Given the reactions of the Class Members and the LWDA to the proposed settlement and for the reasons set for in the Preliminary Approval order, the settlement is found to be fair, adequate, and reasonable.

C. Attorney Fees and Costs

Class Counsel requests an award of **\$149,886.72** in fees and **\$13,707.86** in costs. (MFA at 19:11-12, 22:1-2.) The Settlement Agreement provides for up to 33 1/3% of the settlement amount in fees and **\$20,000** in costs (¶37.n).

“Courts recognize two methods for calculating attorney fees in civil class actions: the lodestar/multiplier method and the percentage of recovery method.” (*Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224, 254.) Here, class counsel request attorney fees using the percentage method, as crosschecked by lodestar. (MFA at pp. 17-21.)

In common fund cases, the Court may employ a percentage of the benefit method, as cross-checked against the lodestar. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Int’l, Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.) The fee request represents approximately one-third of the gross settlement amount, which is the average generally awarded in class actions. (See *In re Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 558, fn. 13 [“Empirical studies show that, regardless whether the percentage method or the lodestar method is used, fee awards in class actions average around one-third of the recovery.”].)

Class Counsel has provided information, summarized below, from which the lodestar may be calculated:

Attorney	Rate	Hours	Totals
Kane Moon	\$725.00	56.1	\$40,672.50
Allen Feghali	\$675.00	70.1	\$47,317.50
Brett Gunther	\$425.00	42.4	\$18,020.00
Lannie Pham	\$325.00	28.5	\$9,262.50
Totals		197.1	\$115,272.50

(Decl. of Kane Moon ISO Final ¶¶55-61.)

Counsel’s percentage-based fee request is higher than the unadjusted lodestar, and would represent application of a multiplier of approximately 1.30.

Here, the **\$149,886.72** fee request represents a reasonable percentage of the total funds paid by Defendant. Notice of the fee request was provided to class members in the Notice, and no one objected. (Polites Decl. ¶14, Exhibit A thereto.)

As for costs, Class Counsel is requesting a cost amount of **\$13,707.86**. This is less than the \$20,000 cap estimated at preliminary approval, which was disclosed to Class Members and not objected to. (Polites Decl. ¶14, Exhibit A thereto.) Costs include, but are not limited to: Mediation (\$7,950), Case Anywhere (\$1,244.40), Filing Fees (\$1,435), **Admin Fee (\$750)**, and Expert Consulting Fees [Berger Consulting] (\$1,850). (Moon Decl. ISO Final ¶14, Exhibit 4 thereto.)

Regarding the \$750 “Admin fee”, Counsel’s description is that the fee will “cover costs of legal paralegal, assistant and/or law clerk services, photocopying and printing (e.g., ink and paper), postage and mailing, office internet and telephone service, and an administrative case database initiation fee.” Counsel will already receive reimbursement for some of these costs to the extent that Counsel has itemized the costs that have been specifically incurred for the instant action, for example, photocopying and printing, postage, and mailing. Similarly, any time billed by paralegals and/or law clerks should either be covered by the award of fees or be characterized as overhead costs which would typically be factored into counsel’s hourly rate, and not payable by the class. Absent further evidence (such as a client fee agreement permitting such cost as a billed cost rather than one included in the hourly rate), the Court will subtract the \$750 from the attorney’s cost award. (See *Carr v. Tadin, Inc.*, 51 F. Supp. 3d 970, 986 (S.D. Cal. 2014) (“out-of-pocket costs may be recoverable as *attorneys’ fees* if ‘the charges are not already accounted for in the attorneys’ hourly rates.’ ” (emphasis original)); *Bussey v. Affleck* (1990) 225 Cal.App.3d 1162, 1165 *abrogated on other grounds by Robert L. Cloud & Associates, Inc. v. Mikesell* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1141 *abrogated on other grounds by Hsu v. Semiconductor Systems, Inc.* (2005) 126 Cal.App.4th 1330 (“where a contract provides for payment of costs and attorney’s fees, the court may allow disbursements of counsel as attorney fees under section 1033.5, subdivision (a)(10), if they represent expenses ordinarily billed to a client and are not included in the overhead component of counsel’s hourly rate.”).)

The costs otherwise appear to be reasonable in amount and reasonably necessary to this litigation.

Based on the above, the Court hereby awards **\$149,886.72** in fees and **\$12,957.86** **[\$13,707.86 minus \$750]** for attorney costs to Class Counsel (¶37.n.).

D. Incentive Award

The class representative, Ana Hernandez De Bahena, seeks an enhancement payment of **\$7,500** for her contributions to the action. (MFA at 1:16-2:1.)

In connection with the final fairness hearing, named Plaintiffs must submit declarations attesting to why they should be entitled to an enhancement award in the proposed amount. The named Plaintiffs must explain why they “should be compensated for the expense or risk he has

incurred in conferring a benefit on other members of the class.” (*Clark v. American Residential Services LLC* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 806.) Trial courts should not sanction enhancement awards of thousands of dollars with “nothing more than *pro forma* claims as to ‘countless’ hours expended, ‘potential stigma’ and ‘potential risk.’ Significantly more specificity, in the form of quantification of time and effort expended on the litigation, and in the form of reasoned explanation of financial or other risks incurred by the named plaintiffs, is required in order for the trial court to conclude that an enhancement was ‘necessary to induce [the named plaintiff] to participate in the suit’” (*Id.* at 806-807, italics and ellipsis in original.)

Plaintiff De Bahena represents that her contributions to this litigation include: engaging in phone calls, texts and emails with her attorneys, providing witnesses to her attorneys to interview, and remaining available for the mediation. She estimates spending 40 hours on the case. (Declaration of Ana Hernandez De Bahena, ¶¶11-25.)

Based on the above, as well as the benefits obtained on behalf of the class, the Court hereby grants the enhancement payment in the amount of **\$7,500** to Plaintiff.

E. Settlement Administration Costs

The settlement administrator, ILYM Group, is requesting **\$8,265** for the costs of settlement administration. (Polites Decl. ¶21.) This is less than the cost of \$15,000 provided for in the Settlement Agreement (¶37.p) and disclosed to class members in the Notice, to which there were no objections. (Polites Decl. ¶14, Exhibit A thereto.) Based on the above, the Court hereby awards costs in the requested amount of **\$8,265**.

CONCLUSION

The Court hereby **GRANTS** final approval and awards/approves the following:

The Parties’ Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement is **GRANTED** as the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable.

The Court hereby **GRANTS** final approval and awards/approves the following essential terms:

B. The Gross Settlement Amount (“GSA”) is **\$449,705.14**, non-reversionary **[updated to reflect increases from the triggered escalator]** (¶37.c.)

B. The Net Settlement Amount is the GSA minus the following:

\$149,886.72 for attorney fees to Class Counsel, Moon Law Group, PC **[increased by escalator]** (¶37.n.);

\$12,957.86 **[\$13,707.86 minus \$750]** for attorney costs to Class Counsel (Ibid.);

\$7,500 enhancement payment/Service Payment to the Named Plaintiff (¶37.n.);

\$37,500 (75% of \$50,000 PAGA penalty) to the LWDA (¶37.g); and

\$8,265 for settlement administration costs to ILYM Group (§37.p).

C. Employer's share of the payroll taxes on the taxable portion of the settlement payments shall be paid separately from the GSA by Defendant. (§37.h.)

D. Plaintiffs' release of Defendants from claims described herein.

By **July 1, 2024**, Class Counsel must give notice to the class members pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.771(b) and to the LWDA, if applicable, pursuant to Labor Code §2699 (1)(3).

Plaintiff's counsel shall file a [Proposed] Order and Judgment, consistent with this ruling containing all requisite terms, including the class definition, release language, and a statement that no class members requested exclusion.

By **April 30, 2025**, Class Counsel must file a Final Report Re: Distribution of the Settlement Funds.

The Court hereby sets a **Non-Appeal Case Review for May 7, 2025, 8:30 a.m., Department 9.**

Plaintiff to give notice.

DATED: April 30, 2024



A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Elaine Lu".

Elaine Lu / Judge

Elaine Lu
Judge of the Superior Court