

Howard L. Magee (State Bar No. 185199)
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 South Figueroa Street, Suite 1250
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 488-6555
Facsimile: (213) 488-6554

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CENTRAL CIVIL WEST

RAMON SINGLEY, as an individual and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BLS LIMOUSINE SERVICE OF LOS
ANGELES, INC., a California corporation;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: BC619822

(Assigned to the Honorable Kenneth R. Freeman,
Department 310)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION
FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT AND JUDGEMENT**

Date: February 27, 2018
Time: 3:00 P.M.
Dept.: 310

1 Plaintiff and Class Representative Ramon Singley (“Plaintiff” or “Class Representative”),
2 and the settling Defendant BLS Limousine Service of Los Angeles, Inc. (together the “Settling
3 Parties”) have entered into the Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement (hereafter
4 “Stipulation” or “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 the Class
7 Action Settlement, including approval of an Enhancement Award for the Class Representative
8 and Class Counsel’s Application for a Fee and Expense Award. The Court has read, heard, and
9 considered all the pleadings and documents submitted, and the presentations made in connection
10 with the Motion which came on for hearing on February 27, 2018.

11 **I. BACKGROUND**

12 **A. Class Members**

13 The “Class” or “Class Members” are defined as “all current and former employees who
14 were employed by Defendant in the State of California at any time from May 9, 2015, through
15 February 17, 2017.”

16 **B. Operation of the Settlement.**

17 Pursuant to the Preliminary Approval Order dated October 23, 2017, this Court
18 conditionally certified the Class and granted preliminary approval to the Settlement. The
19 Preliminary Approval Order also approved of the proposed form of class notice. The Court
20 entered the Preliminary Approval Order after review and consideration of all of the pleadings
21 filed in connection herewith, and the oral presentations made by counsel at the hearing.

22 In compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order, the Class Notice was sent to all
23 Class Members via first class mail. Furthermore, follow-up mailings were performed for
24 returned mail. The notice process was timely completed.

25 This Court finds that the Settlement appears to be the product of serious, informed, non-
26 collusive negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, and does not improperly grant preferential
27 treatment to any individuals. The Court finds that the Settlement was entered into in good faith
28 pursuant to California *Code of Civil Procedure* section 877.6. The Court further finds that the

1 Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate and that Plaintiff has satisfied the standards for final
2 approval of a class action settlement under California law. Under the provisions of California
3 *Code of Civil Procedure* section 382 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, as approved for use
4 by the California state court in *Vasquez v. Superior Court*, 4 Cal.3d 800, 821 (1971), the trial
5 court has discretion to certify a class where:

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

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

11 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED AS
12 FOLLOWS:

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

15 2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Litigation, the Class
16 Representatives, the Class, and Defendant.

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

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

25 5. With respect to the Class and for purposes of approving the Settlement only and
26 for no other purpose, this Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Class are
27 ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are
28 questions of law or fact common to the Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest

1 among Class Members with respect to the subject matter of the claims in the litigation; (c) the
2 claims of the Class Representative is typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) the
3 Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the interests of the members of the
4 Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this
5 controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representative, i.e., Class Counsel, are
6 qualified to serve as counsel for the Plaintiff in their individual and representative capacities and
7 for the Class.

8 6. The Court approves the individual payment amounts to Class Members, which
9 shall be distributed pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

10 7. Defendant shall pay (a) to Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the amount of
11 \$150,000 and reimbursement of costs in the amount of \$4,714.78; (b) enhancement award to the
12 Class Representative in the amount \$15,000; (c) the sum of \$7,500.00 to be paid to the LWDA
13 for PAGA Penalties (which represents the LWDA's 75% share of the PAGA Penalties paid); and
14 (d) \$6,500.00 as class administration fees will be paid to Phoenix Settlement Administrators. The
15 Court finds that these amounts are fair and reasonable.

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

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 DATED: _____

Honorable Kenneth R. Freeman
Judge of the Superior Court

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

STATE OF CALIFORNIA]
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES]ss.

On January 26, 2018, I served the following document(s) described as: **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND JUDGEMENT** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

Attorney for Defendant BLS Limousine Service of Los Angeles, Inc.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on January 26, 2018, at Los Angeles, California.

26, 2018, at Los Angeles, California.



Olympia Peña