

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3160 Camino del Rio South, Suite 308
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 fax
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Ines Abid

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
10/24/2022 at 03:01:00 PM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By Mariejo Guyot, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

INES ABID, individually and on behalf of all
others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TEEMA INC., a Delaware corporation, and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2021-00039986-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Hon. Matthew C. Braner
Department C-60

CLASS ACTION

**Notice of Order Granting Final Approval of
Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees
and Costs and Entering Judgment**

Action Filed: September 20, 2021

1 TO THE COURT, THE CALIFORNIA LABOR AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
2 AGENCY (LWDA), ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE
3 NOTICE THAT:

4 1. On September 21, 2022, Plaintiff Ines Abid, through counsel of record, filed an
5 Unopposed Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs; [Proposed] Order Granting Final Approval of Class
6 Action, Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering Judgment in this action entitled *Ines*
7 *Abid v. Teema Inc., et al.*

8 2. On October 18, 2022, the Honorable Matthew C. Braner signed the proposed order, as
9 amended by the Court, which became the Order of the Court. The Court entered final judgment
10 according to its terms.

11 3. A true and correct copy of the ~~{Proposed}~~ **Order Granting Final Approval of Class**
12 **Action, Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering Judgment** is attached hereto as
13 **Exhibit 1.**

14
15 Respectfully submitted,

16
17 Dated: October 24, 2022

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

18
19 

20 Nicholas J. Ferraro
21 Attorneys for Plaintiff Ines Abid
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 1

FILED
Clerk of the Superior Court

OCT 18 2022

By: B. Delgado, Deputy
B.D.

B.D.
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

09/21/2022 at 11:21:51 AM
Clerk of the Superior Court
By Elizabeth Reyes, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

INES ABID, as an individual and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TEEMA INC., a Delaware corporation; and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2021-00039986-CU-OE-CTL

*Assigned to the Hon. Matthew C. Braner
Dept. C-60*

CLASS ACTION

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL
APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT AND ATTORNEYS' FEES
AND COSTS AND ENTERING
JUDGMENT**

Motions for Final App. /

Attorneys' Fees & Costs

Date: October 14, 2022

Time: 9:00 A.M.

Judge: Hon. Matthew C. Braner

Courtroom: C-60

Action Filed: Sept. 20, 2022

Trial Date: Not Set

1 This matter came on for hearing on October 14, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. in Department C-60 of the
2 above-captioned Court, the Honorable Matthew C. Braner presiding, on Plaintiff's Motion for Final
3 Approval of Class Action Settlement and on Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs in
4 connection to the final approval motion.

5 Having received and considered the motions and supporting papers, including the Settlement,
6 the evidence and documents received by the Court in connection with the motions and the Motion for
7 Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, the Court grants final approval of the Settlement
8 and ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

9 1. Pursuant to the Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and
10 the Agreement, a Class Notice, Change of Address, and Request for Exclusion form, and pre-printed
11 return envelope ("Notice Packet") was sent to each Settlement Class Member by first-class U.S.
12 mail. The Class Notice informed the Class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive a
13 Settlement Payment without any required action, their right to comment upon or object to the
14 Settlement, and their right to appear in person or by counsel at the final approval hearing and to be
15 heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided for each of
16 these procedures.

17 2. No Settlement Class Member returned a written objection to the proposed Settlement
18 as part of the notice process or stated an intention to appear at the final approval hearing and none
19 appeared at hearing. The following two individuals validly requested exclusion from the Settlement:
20 Nicolle Duncan and Marcia Martinez.

21 3. The Court finds and determines this notice procedure afforded adequate protections to
22 Settlement Class Members and provides the basis for the Court's informed decision regarding
23 approval of the Settlement based on responses of the Class. The Court finds and determines the
24 notice provided was the best notice practicable, satisfying the requirements of law and due process.

25 4. For purposes of approving this Settlement only, this Court finds and concludes that:
26 (a) the proposed Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the class is
27 impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed Class, and there is a
28 well-defined community of interest among members of the proposed Class with respect to the

1 subject matter of the class action; (c) the claims of the Class Representatives are typical of the claims
2 of the members of the proposed Class; (d) the Class Representative has and will fairly and
3 adequately protect the interests of the Members of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other
4 available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of settlement; and
5 (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representative is qualified to serve as counsel for her as well
6 as her representative capacity and for the Class.

7 5. The Court confirms certification, for settlement purposes only, of the Class defined as:
8 “All California citizens who worked for Defendants as non-exempt employees in California at any
9 time during the four-year period preceding the filing of the Complaint and continuing through the
10 end of the Class Period[.]” The “Class Period” is defined as September 20, 2017 through June 20,
11 2022 (the date of preliminary approval).

12 6. The Court finds and determines the terms set forth in the Agreement are fair,
13 reasonable, and adequate and, having found the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and
14 non-collusive arms’-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral and experienced mediator, directs the
15 Parties to effectuate the Agreement according to its terms. The Court further finds the Parties
16 conducted extensive investigation, research, and informal discovery, and that their attorneys were
17 able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that Settlement will
18 enable the Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and
19 risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has reviewed the monetary
20 recovery and recognizes the significant value provided to the Class.

21 7. The Court further finds and determines the terms of the Settlement are fair, reasonable
22 and adequate to the Class and to each Class Member and that the Settlement is ordered finally
23 approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement should be and are ordered.

24 8. The Court finds and determines the Settlement Payments to be paid to Participating
25 Settlement Class Members as provided for by the Settlement are fair and reasonable. The Court
26 grants final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts be made to the Participating Class
27 Members in accordance with the Agreement.

1 9. The Court finds and determines the fees and expenses in administering the Settlement
2 incurred by Phoenix Settlement Administrators of \$10,950 are fair and reasonable. The Court grants
3 final approval to and orders the payment of that amount in accordance with the Agreement.

4 10. The Court finds and determines the Class Representative Service Award of \$10,000 to
5 Plaintiff Ines Abid is fair and reasonable. The Court orders the Administrator to make this payment
6 to the Plaintiff Ines Abid, in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.

7 11. The Court finds and determines payment to the California Labor and Workforce
8 Development Agency of \$11,250 as its share of the Settlement of civil penalties under the Private
9 Attorneys General Act is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court grants final approval to and
10 orders that amount be paid in accordance with the Agreement.

11 12. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, and the authorities, evidence and argument
12 submitted by Class Counsel, the Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees of \$216,645 and
13 litigation costs of \$17,132.80. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court
14 orders the Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Agreement.

15 13. Without affecting the finality of this Order or the entry of judgment in any way, the
16 Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation,
17 and enforcement of this Order and the Agreement.

18 14. Neither Defendant nor any related persons or entities shall have any further liability
19 for costs, expenses, interest, attorneys' fees, or any other charge, expense, or liability, except as
20 provided for by the Agreement.

21 15. Nothing in this Order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations
22 under the Agreement or under this Order, including the requirement that Defendants make payments
23 to the Participating Class Members in accordance with the Settlement.

24 16. The Court enters final judgment in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, and
25 the Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and this Order.

26 17. The Parties will comply with Cal. Rules of Court Rule 3.771(b), by providing notice of
27 entry of judgment with Court.

1 18. The Parties will bear their own costs and attorneys' fees except as otherwise provided
2 by this Court's Order awarding Class Counsels' attorneys' fees and litigation costs.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5
6 Date: 10/18/22


The Honorable Matthew C. Braner
Judge of the Superior Court

PROOF OF SERVICE

1. At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in San Diego County; my business address is Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, 3160 Camino del Rio South, Suite 308, San Diego, California 92108.

2. My email address is alma@ferrarovega.com.

3. On October 24, 2022, I served the following documents:

1. Notice of Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering Judgment

4. I served the abovementioned document(s) on the following person(s):

Amy L. Lessa – Alessa@fisherphillips.com

Boris Sorsher – BSorsher@fisherphillips.com

Lauren M. Bushman – LBushman@fisherphillips.com

Fisher Phillips, LLP
4747 Executive Drive, Suite 1000
San Diego, CA 92121

5. The documents were served through the following means:

By Email or Electronic Transmission. Based on a court order or agreement of the parties to accept service by email or electronic transmission under CRC 2.251, I electronically served the documents via email transmission to the individuals identified above.

6. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the above is true and correct.

7. This proof of service was executed in San Diego, California on October 24, 2022.

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.



Alma R. Perez
Legal Secretary