

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

Alejandra Garcia et al
Plaintiff/Petitioner(s)
VS.
Genetic Foresight, Inc.
Defendant/Respondent
(s)

No. 22CV010309

Date: 03/04/2025

Time: 2:30 PM

Dept: 21

Judge: Somnath Raj Chatterjee

ORDER re: Hearing on Motion to
Confirm Settlement filed
by Alejandra Garcia
(Plaintiff) + filed by
Alejandra Garcia
(Plaintiff); Prabhmeet
Randhawa (Plaintiff) on
02/04/2025

The Motion for Final Approval of Settlement filed by Alejandra Garcia, Prabhmeet Randhawa on 02/04/2025 is Granted.

The motion of plaintiffs for final approval of class action settlement is GRANTED.

APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT

The complaint alleges various Labor Code claims.

The case preliminarily settled for a total of \$395,000.

The settlement agreement states there will be attorneys' fees of up to \$131,666.66 (33%), costs of up to \$25,000, service award of \$7,500 to plaintiffs, settlement administration costs of up to \$8,250, and a PAGA payment of \$20,000 (\$15,000 to the LWDA). After these expenses of \$194,917, the amount available to be distributed to the Class would be \$200,083. Assuming that there are an estimated 236 Class Members, the average payment per Class Member would be \$826.

The motion makes an adequate analysis as required by Kullar v. Foot Locker Retail, Inc. (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 116.

ORDER re: Hearing on Motion to Confirm Settlement filed by Alejandra
Garcia (Plaintiff) + filed by Alejandra Garcia (Plaintiff);
Prabhmeet Randhawa (Plaintiff) on 02/04/2025

Page 1 of 5

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

The proposed class notice form and procedure are adequate. None of the 236 Class Members opted out, and none objected.

The proposed class is appropriate for class certification.

The scope of the named plaintiff release is appropriate. The agreement for the named plaintiff may include a Civil Code 1542 waiver.

The scope of the LWDA's release for claims asserted under the PAGA is appropriate. The scope of the LWDA's release is limited to the scope of the PAGA notice letter. (*LaCour v. Marshalls of California, LLC* (2023) 94 Cal.App.5th 1172, 1192-1196.)

The scope of the class release is appropriate. The scope of the class release must be limited to the claims arising out of the claims in the complaint where the named plaintiffs are typical and can adequately represent the class. (*Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Management, LLC* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521, 537-538.) The release of claims by the class is limited by the "factual predicate rule." (*Hesse v. Sprint Corp.* (9th Cir. 2010) 598 F.3d 581, 590.) (See also *Hendricks v. Starkist Co* (N.D. Cal. 2016) 2016 WL 692739 at * 2-4 [Denying motion for final approval of class settlement because scope of release overbroad].) The scope of the class release does not include a release of the LWDA's claims.

The Court notes and approves of the plan to distribute the settlement funds with no claims process.

The unclaimed funds will be distributed to Capital Pro Bono. (Agt para 4.4.3.) This is consistent with CCP 384. Counsel has provided a declaration in support of the motion that provides the information required by CCP 382.4.

APPROVAL OF FEES, COSTS, AND SERVICE AWARD

"Because absent class members are not directly involved in the proceedings, oversight to ensure settlements are fair and untainted by conflict is the responsibility of both the class representative and the court." (*Mark v. Spencer* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 219, 227.)

"[T]horough judicial review of fee applications is required in all class action settlements and the fairness of the fees must be assessed independently of determining the fairness of the substantive settlement terms. (*Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 555-556.)

The court starts with its benchmark, then cross-checks with the lodestar, and makes adjustments if the benchmark is significantly different from the lodestar. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 505 ["If the multiplier calculated by means of a lodestar cross-check is extraordinarily high or low, the trial court should consider whether the percentage used should be adjusted"].)

The Ninth Circuit's benchmark is 25%. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 495.)

When using the percentage of recovery approach, this court's benchmark for fees is 30% of a total fund. Courts have benchmarks ranging from 25% to 33%. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat.*

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

Inc. (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 495; Schulz v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc. (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 1167, 1175; Consumer Privacy Cases (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 557 fn 13; Chavez v. Netflix, Inc. (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 fn 11; Schulz v. Jeppesen Sanderson, Inc. (2018) 27 Cal.App.5th 1167, 1175.)

The court recently reviewed and reaffirmed its use of a benchmark of 30%. (Hurtubise v. Sutter East Bay Hosp. (2021) 2021 WL 11134912.)

The benchmark of 30% of \$395,000 suggests fees of \$118,500.

When cross-checking with the lodestar/multiplier, the court will evaluate the lodestar based on reasonable fees that would have been charged at hourly rates and then apply a multiplier. The multiplier includes contingent fee risk and other factors.

Counsel assert they spent 237.1 hours on the case. The court finds that this is reasonable.

The court finds that a blended rate of \$600 is appropriate for the case. (Meridian Financial Services, Inc. v. Phan (2021) 67 Cal.App.5th 657, 708-709 [blended rate of \$550]; Espejo v. Copley Press, Inc. (2017) 13 Cal.App.5th 329, 337 [blended rate of \$500/hour]; 569 East County Boulevard LLC v. Backcountry Against the Dump, Inc. (2016) 6 Cal.App.5th 426, 438-440 fn 14, fn 16 [blended rate of \$275].) Regarding the amount of the blended rate, the court considers the evidence and its own knowledge and familiarity with the legal market. (Meridian Financial Services, Inc. v. Phan (2021) 67 Cal.App.5th 657, 709.) The court takes judicial notice of the rates for counsel in the USAO Fitzpatrick Matrix on “Hourly Rates (\$) for Legal Fees for Complex Federal Litigation in the District of Columbia.” The court takes judicial notice of the Laffey matrix. (<http://www.laffeymatrix.com/>) The court gives little weight to the anecdotal fee awards of other trial judges. Counsel can selectively present fee awards that indicate the highest hourly billing rates.

The court recently reviewed and reaffirmed its use of a blended rate of \$550. (Harris v. Southern New Hampshire University (2023) 2023 WL 3605289.)

The court will use a blended rate of \$600 per hour.

This results in a lodestar of \$142,260.

The court applies a 1.2 multiplier for risk. When considering risk, the court considers there is less risk in a case with fee shifting statutes because counsel's potential fees are not limited by and coupled to the monetary recovery. With a fee shifting statute, counsel has the risk of proving liability but if counsel proves liability, then the fees shift to the defendant with little to no consideration of the amount of the client's monetary recovery. (Weeks v. Baker & McKenzie (1998) 63 Cal.App.4th 1128, 1174.) For example, a nominal damage recovery will result in counsel recovering “reasonable attorneys’ fees” that could far exceed the award of damages. (Harman v. City and County of San Francisco (2007) 158 Cal.App.4th 407, 419 [jury awarded plaintiff \$30,300, counsel recovered \$1,113,905.40 in fee-shifted fees]; Heritage Pacific

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

Financial, LLC v. Monroy (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 972, 1006-1007 [client recovered \$1, counsel recovered \$87,525 in fee-shifted fees.] There was a fee shifting provision. (E.g. Labor Code 2802) This results in a multiplier adjusted lodestar of \$170,712.

Considering the percentage analysis fees of \$118,500 and the multiplier adjusted lodestar fees of \$170,712, the court will award fees of \$118,500. Thus is the court's benchmark. The lodestar amount is not extraordinarily high or low when compared with the percentage amount. The award of fees is appropriate to compensate counsel in this case, to incentivize the prosecution of meritorious cases, and does not result in an unreasonable windfall to counsel at the expense of their clients.

The court approves costs of \$ 19,581.35.

The court approves actual settlement administration costs of \$8,250.

The court approves a service award of \$7,500 for Ms. Randhawa and \$7,500 for Ms. Garcia. Plaintiffs were not deposed. Plaintiff provided evidence regarding the nature of participation in the action, including a description of specific actions and the amount of time committed to the prosecution of the case. (Clark v. American Residential Services LLC (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 785, 804-807.)

The Court ORDERS that funds not be distributed to the cy pres beneficiary until after Court approval of a final accounting. If there are significant uncashed checks after the initial distribution, then class counsel may propose a second distribution. Based on information provided by the claims administrator, the court might order a second distribution.

The Court ORDERS that 10% of any fee award to be kept in the administrator's trust fund until the completion of the distribution process and Court approval of a final accounting.

The Court will set a compliance hearing after the completion of the distribution process and the expiration of the time to cash checks for counsel for plaintiff and the Administrator to comply with CCP 384(b) and to submit a summary accounting how the funds have been distributed to the class members and the status of any unresolved issues. If the distribution is completed, the Court will at that time release funds to the cy pres beneficiary and any hold-back of attorney fees.

The court ORDERS that at the time of the final accounting that counsel for plaintiff transmit a copy of this order and the final judgment and the final accounting to the Judicial Council. (CCP 384.5; Govt Code 68520.)

Plaintiff may submit a proposed order if necessary. The court will sign any proposed order, which is modified by this order.


SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

Rene C. Davidson Courthouse

Compliance Hearing Re: Final Distribution is scheduled for 09/16/2025 at 02:30 PM in Department 21 at Rene C. Davidson Courthouse.

Clerk is directed to serve copies of this order, with proof of service, to counsel and to self-represented parties of record.

Dated : 03/04/2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Somnath Raj Chatterjee". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the last name "Chatterjee" being more prominent.

Somnath Raj Chatterjee / Judge

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp
COURTHOUSE ADDRESS: Rene C. Davidson Courthouse 1225 Fallon Street, Oakland, CA 94612	FILED Superior Court of California County of Alameda 03/05/2025
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Alejandra Garcia et al	Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court By: <u>Nicole Hall</u> Deputy N. Hall
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Genetic Foresight, Inc.	
CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 1010.6	CASE NUMBER: 22CV010309

I, the below named Executive Officer/Clerk of Court of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that on this date I served one copy of the Order re: Hearing on Motion to Confirm Settlement filed by Alejandra Garcia (Plaintiff) + filed by Alejandra Garcia (Plaintiff); Prabhmeet Randhawa (Plaintiff) on 02/04/2025 entered herein upon each party or counsel of record in the above entitled action, by electronically serving the document(s) from my place of business, in accordance with standard court practices.

Bruce M. Timm
Boutin Jones
btimm@boutinjoness.com

Jessica Campbell
jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com

Dated: 03/05/2025

Chad Finke, Executive Officer / Clerk of the Court

By:

Nicole Hall

N. Hall, Deputy Clerk