

Electronically Received 01/24/2023 10:44 AM

LIDMAN LAW, APC
Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)
slidman@lidmanlaw.com
Elizabeth Nguyen (SBN 238571)
enguyen@lidmanlaw.com
Milan Moore (SBN 308095)
mmoore@lidmanlaw.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 322-4772
Fax: (424) 322-4775

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARTURO RODRIGUEZ

HAINES LAW GROUP, APC
Paul K. Haines (SBN 248226)
phaines@haineslawgroup.com
2155 Campus Drive, Suite 180
El Segundo, California 90245
Tel: (424) 292-2350
Fax: (424) 292-2355

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ARTURO RODRIGUEZ

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

ARTURO RODRIGUEZ, as an individual
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

GREEN SET, INC., a California limited
liability company; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 21STCV30141

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Carolyn
B. Kuhl, SSC-12]*

**[PROPOSED] AMENDED ORDER
GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT, CLASS
REPRESENTATIVE'S SERVICE AWARD,
AND ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS**

Date: January 18, 2023
Time: 10:30 a.m.
Dept.: SSC-12

Action filed: August 16, 2021
Trial Date: None set

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

01/31/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: L. McGreené Deputy

1 This matter came on regularly for hearing before this Court on January 18, 2023, pursuant to
2 California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's August 23, 2022 Order Granting Preliminary Approval
3 of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Stipulation
4 of Settlement (herein "Settlement")¹ and the documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and
5 recognizing the disputed factual and legal issues involved in this case, the risks of further prosecution
6 and the substantial benefits to be received by the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement, the Court
7 hereby makes a final ruling that the proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is the
8 product of good faith, arm's-length negotiations between the parties. Good cause appearing therefor,
9 the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and
10 ORDERS as follows. This Amended Order supersedes the Order Granting Final Approval of Class
11 Action Settlement, Class Representative's Service Award and Attorneys' Fees and Costs entered on
12 January 18, 2023.

13 1. The conditional class certification contained in the Preliminary Approval Order is hereby
14 made final, and the Court thus certifies, for purposes of the Settlement only, a Settlement Class defined
15 as:

16 All current and former non-exempt, hourly employees of Defendant Green Set, Inc.
17 who worked in California at any time between August 16, 2017 and August 23,
18 2022.

19 2. Plaintiff Arturo Rodriguez is hereby confirmed as Class Representative, and Scott M.
20 Lidman, Elizabeth Nguyen, and Milan Moore of Lidman Law, APC and Paul K. Haines of Haines Law
21 Group, APC are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.

22 3. Notice was provided to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement. The form and
23 manner of notice were approved by the Court on August 23, 2022, and the notice process has been
24 completed in conformity with the Court's Order. The Court finds that said notice was the best notice
25 practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Packet (which consists of the Notice of Pendency of
26 Class Action and Proposed Settlement and Notice of Individual Settlement Award) provided due and
27 adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed Settlement Class members of

28 ¹ Unless otherwise indicated, all terms used in this Order shall have the same meaning as that assigned to them in the Settlement.

1 their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1781(e),
2 California Rule of Court 3.769, and due process.

3 4. The Court finds that no Settlement Class member objected to the Settlement, that zero
4 (0) class members have opted out of the Settlement, and that the 100% participation rate in the
5 Settlement supports final approval.

6 5. The Court hereby approves the settlement as set forth in the Settlement Agreement as
7 fair, reasonable, and adequate, and directs the parties to effectuate the Settlement Agreement according
8 to its terms.

9 6. For purposes of settlement only, the Court finds that (a) the members of the Settlement
10 Class are ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are
11 questions of law or fact common to the Settlement Class, and there is a well-defined community of
12 interest among members of the Settlement Class with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c)
13 the claims of the Class Representative are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class;
14 (d) the Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the interests of the Settlement Class
15 members; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this
16 controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to serve as counsel for the Class Representative and the
17 Settlement Class.

18 7. The Court finds that given the absence of objections to the Settlement, and objections
19 being a prerequisite to appeal, that this Order shall be considered final as of the date of notice of entry.

20 8. The Court orders that Defendant Green Set, Inc. deposit the Gross Settlement Amount of
21 Four Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$450,000.00) with Simpluris, Inc., the Settlement
22 Administrator, as provided for in the Settlement.

23 9. Any Settlement funds that remain uncashed after 180 calendar days after they are mailed
24 shall be delivered to the California State Controller's Office – Unclaimed Property Fund in the name of
25 the Settlement Class member.

1 10. The Court finds that the settlement payments, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair,
2 reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute the individual payments
3 in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

4 11. The Court finds that an incentive payment in the amount of \$5,000.00 for Plaintiff Arturo
5 Rodriguez is appropriate for his risks undertaken and service to the Settlement Class. The Court finds
6 that this award is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make this
7 payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

8 12. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$150,000.00 and litigation costs of
9 \$14,443.63 for Class Counsel, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement
10 Administrator distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
11 The fee award is appropriate in light of the benefit provided to the class.

12 13. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$4,900.00 from the
13 Gross Settlement Amount for all of its work done and to be done until the completion of this matter, and
14 finds that sum appropriate.

15 14. The Court finds that the payment to the California Labor & Workforce Development
16 Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$15,000.00 for its share of the settlement of Plaintiff's
17 representative action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA") is fair,
18 reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute this payment to the
19 LWDA in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

20 15. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, the employer's share of payroll taxes for the
21 portion of the Net Settlement Amount allocated to wages shall be paid by Defendant separately from,
22 and in addition to, the Gross Settlement Amount.

23 16. The Court finds and determines that upon satisfaction of all obligations under the
24 Settlement and this Order, all Settlement Class Members will be bound by the Settlement, will have
25 released the Released Claims as set forth in the Settlement, and will be permanently barred from
26 prosecuting against Defendants any of the Released Claims pursuant to the Settlement.

1 17. The Settlement is not an admission by Defendant nor is this Order a finding of the validity
2 of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither this Order, the Settlement, nor any
3 document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the Settlement, shall be construed or
4 deemed an admission of liability, culpability, or wrongdoing on the part of Defendant.

5 18. The Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the Settlement, this Final Approval Order,
6 and the Judgment entered in connection with the Settlement.

7 19. The Settlement Administrator shall file a declaration regarding the disbursement of
8 Settlement funds on or before November 30, 2023.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10
11 Dated: 01/31/2023, 2023



A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Carolyn B. Kuhl".

Carolyn B. Kuhl / Judge

Honorable Carolyn B. Kuhl
Judge of the Superior Court