

Larry W. Lee (State Bar No. 228175)  
Kristen M. Agnew (State Bar No. 247656)  
Nicholas Rosenthal (State Bar No. 268297)  
**DIVERSITY LAW GROUP, P.C.**  
515 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1250  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 488-6555  
(213) 488-6554 facsimile

Kelsey A. Webber (State Bar No. 303721)  
Kelsey.Webber@WebberLawGroup.com  
Shaelyn A. Stewart (State Bar No. 335149)  
Shaelyn.Stewart@webberlawgroup.com  
**WEBBER LAW GROUP**  
333 University Ave, Suite 200  
Sacramento, California 95825  
Telephone: (916) 588-0683

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

JAMIE ELLSWORTH, as an individual and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LECLAIR FITNESS II, LLC, a California  
limited liability company; LECLAIR  
FITNESS III, LLC, a California limited  
liability company; LECLAIR FITNESS IV,  
LLC, a California limited liability company;  
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2021-00295114-CU-OE-GDS

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL  
APPROVAL OF CLASS AND  
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION  
SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENT**

Date: September 20, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 54

**Reservation #: 2658341**

Complaint Filed: February 23, 2021

FAC Filed: May 6, 2022

Trial Date: None

1 Plaintiff Jamie Ellsworth (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants LeClair Fitness II, LLC, LeClair  
2 Fitness III, LLC, and LeClair Fitness IV, LLC (together, “Defendants”) (collectively, the  
3 “Parties”) have entered into the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and  
4 Release (“Settlement Agreement”) to settle the above-captioned class action subject to the  
5 Court’s approval (the “Settlement”).

6 This matter is now before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval of Class and  
7 Representative Action Settlement, including approval of an Enhancement Payment for the  
8 Named Plaintiff and Class Counsel’s Application for a Fee and Expense Award. The Court has  
9 read, heard, and considered all the pleadings and documents submitted, and the presentations  
10 made in connection with the Motion which came on for hearing on September 20, 2022.

11 **I. BACKGROUND**

12 On February 23, 2021, Plaintiff commenced a putative class and representative action  
13 against Defendants in the Superior Court of California for the County of Sacramento. On May 6,  
14 2022, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. The first amended complaint is the operative  
15 complaint (“Complaint”). As alleged in the Complaint, Plaintiff asserts class-wide claims for:  
16 failure to pay minimum and overtime wages; failure to pay overtime at the correct regular rate of  
17 pay; failure to provide paid rest periods; failure to pay wages at termination; failure to reimburse  
18 employees; failure to provide accurate wage statements); and unfair business practices. The  
19 Complaint also asserts a representative Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, California Labor  
20 Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) claim predicated on Defendants’ alleged violations of the  
21 Labor Code.

22 **A. The Class**

23 The “Class” is defined as “all current and former non-exempt or hourly employees of  
24 Defendants that worked in California at any time from February 23, 2017, through November 28,  
25 2021.”

26 **B. Operation of the Settlement**

27 Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order dated April 29, 2022, this Court  
28 conditionally certified the Class and granted preliminary approval to the Settlement. The

1 Preliminary Approval Order also approved of the proposed form of notice and notice plan. The  
2 Court entered the Preliminary Approval Order after review and consideration of all of the  
3 pleadings filed in connection herewith, and the oral presentations made by counsel at the hearing.

4 In compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order, the Notice of Class Action  
5 Settlement (“Class Notice”) was sent to all Class Members via first class mail. Class Notices  
6 were sent to 155 individuals with updated addresses. No Class Notice remained undeliverable.  
7 The notice process was timely completed.

8 This Court finds that the Settlement appears to be the product of serious, informed, non-  
9 collusive negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, and does not improperly grant preferential  
10 treatment to any individuals. The Court finds that the Settlement was entered into in good faith  
11 pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 877.6. The Court further finds that the  
12 Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and that Plaintiff has satisfied the standards for final  
13 approval of a class action settlement under California law. Under the provisions of California  
14 Code of Civil Procedure section 382 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, as approved for use  
15 by the California state court in *Vasquez v. Superior Court*, 4 Cal.3d 800, 821 (1971), the trial  
16 court has discretion to certify a class where:

17 [Q]uestions of law or fact common to the members of the class  
18 predominate over any questions affecting only individual members,  
19 and that a class action is superior to the available methods for the  
20 fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy ... Fed. R. Civ.  
Proc. 23.

21 Certification of a settlement class is the appropriate judicial device under these circumstances.

22 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED AS  
23 FOLLOWS:

24 1. The Court, for purposes of this Order, adopts all defined terms as set forth in the  
25 Settlement Agreement filed in this case.

26 2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the litigation, the Class  
27 Representative, the other members of the Settlement Class, PAGA Aggrieved Employees and  
28 Defendants.

1           3.       The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice as disseminated to the  
2 Class Members, constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances to all persons  
3 within the definition of the Class, and fully met the requirements of California law and due  
4 process under the United States Constitution.

5           4.       The Court approves the settlement of the above-captioned action, as set forth in  
6 the Settlement Agreement, as fair, just, reasonable, and adequate as to the Parties. The Parties are  
7 directed to perform in accordance with the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

8           5.       Except as otherwise provided in the Settlement Agreement, the Parties are to bear  
9 their own costs and attorneys' fees.

10          6.       The Court hereby certifies the following Class for settlement purposes only:

11               All current and former non-exempt or hourly employees of  
12               Defendants that worked in California at any time from February 23,  
13               2017, through November 28, 2021.

14 Dana Peel and Joe Delmonaco submitted timely and valid Requests for Exclusion and are not  
15 members of the Settlement Class.

16          7.       With respect to the Class and for purposes of approving the settlement only and  
17 for no other purpose, this Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Class are  
18 ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are  
19 questions of law or fact common to the Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest  
20 among members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the claims in the Litigation; (c)  
21 the claims of Class Representative are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) the  
22 Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the interests of the members of the  
23 Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this  
24 controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representative, *i.e.*, Class Counsel, are  
25 qualified to serve as counsel for the Plaintiff in her individual and representative capacity and for  
26 the Class.

27          8.       Within thirty (30) days after the grant of Final Approval of the Settlement,  
28 Defendants shall remit to the Qualified Settlement Fund established by the Settlement

1 Administrator the Gross Settlement Amount of One Hundred Seventy-Eight Thousand Seven  
2 Hundred Twenty-One Dollars and One Cents (\$178,721.01), pursuant to the terms of the  
3 Settlement Agreement.

4 9. From the Gross Settlement Amount, the Settlement Administrator shall pay:

5 (a) To Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of Sixty-Two Thousand  
6 Five Hundred Fifty-Two Dollars and Thirty-Five Cents (\$62,552.35) and reimbursement of  
7 actual litigation costs in the amount of Eleven Thousand Five Hundred Thirty-Five Dollars and  
8 Fifty-Five Cents (\$11,535.55);

9 (b) Enhancement Payment to Class Representative Jamie Ellsworth to  
10 reimburse her for her unique services, and as consideration for the execution of a general release,  
11 in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000.00);

12 (c) The sum of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$7,500.00) to the  
13 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency for its seventy-five percent (75%) share  
14 of PAGA penalties;

15 (d) The sum of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$2,500) to PAGA  
16 Aggrieved Employees for their twenty-five percent (25%) share of PAGA penalties; and

17 (e) the sum of Six Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$6,250.00) to the  
18 Settlement Administrator, Phoenix Settlement Administrators, for its fees and costs relating to  
19 the settlement administration process.

20 10. The Court finds that these amounts are fair and reasonable. The Settlement  
21 Administrator is directed to make such payments in accordance with the terms of the Settlement  
22 Agreement.

23 11. The Court approves of the Individual Settlement Payment and Individual PAGA  
24 Payment amounts, which will be distributed pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

25 12. The Court hereby orders the parties to implement the terms of the Settlement  
26 Agreement, including distributing any uncashed settlement payment checks to the California  
27 State Controller's Office – Office of Unclaimed Property in the name of the Settlement Class  
28 Members and PAGA Aggrieved Employees.

1           13. All Class Members who did not opt out of the Settlement shall be bound by the  
2 releases provided in the Settlement Agreement. The Class Representative shall be bound by the  
3 general releases provided in the Settlement Agreement.

4           14. The Court hereby enters final judgment in this case in accordance with the terms  
5 of the Settlement, Preliminary Approval Order, and this Order. Without affecting the finality of  
6 the Settlement or Judgment entered, this Court shall retain exclusive and continuing jurisdiction  
7 over the action and the Parties, including all Settlement Class Members, for purposes of  
8 enforcing and interpreting this Order and the Settlement.

9           **IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED.**

10  
11 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
12 HON. CHRISTOPHER E. KRUEGER  
13 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28