

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
JOSE SALCIDO

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
JOSE SALCIDO

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

JOSE SALCIDO, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ELECTRO ADAPTER, INC., a California
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 21STCV32600

*[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. Stuart M.
Rice, Dept. SSC-1]*

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

Date: November 15, 2023

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Dept.: SSC-1

Action filed: September 2, 2021

Trial Date: None set

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

11/16/2023

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: _____ A. He _____ Deputy

1 This matter came on regularly for hearing before this Court on November 15, 2023, pursuant to
2 California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's April 26, 2023 Order Granting Preliminary Approval of
3 Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Stipulation of
4 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. The conditional class certification contained in the Preliminary Approval Order
11 is hereby made final, and the Court thus certifies, for purposes of the Settlement only, a Settlement Class
12 defined as:

13 All current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt employees who worked for
14 Defendant Electro Adapter, Inc. in California at any time from September 2, 2017
through November 15, 2022.

15 1. Plaintiff Jose Salcido is hereby confirmed as Class Representative, and Scott M. Lidman,
16 Elizabeth Nguyen, and Milan Moore of Lidman Law, APC and Paul K. Haines of Haines Law Group,
17 APC are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.

18 2. Notice was provided to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement. The form and
19 manner of notice were approved by the Court on April 26, 2023, and the notice process has been
20 completed in conformity with the Court's Order. The Court finds that said notice was the best notice
21 practicable under the circumstances. The Notice Packet (which consists of the Notice of Pendency of
22 Class Action and Proposed Settlement and Notice of Individual Settlement Award) provided due and
23 adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed Settlement Class members of
24 their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1781(e),
25 California Rule of Court 3.769, and due process.

26
27
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 3. The Court finds that no Settlement Class member objected to the Settlement, that zero
2 (0) class members have opted out of the Settlement, and that the 100% participation rate in the
3 Settlement supports final approval.

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

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

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

18 7. The Court orders that Defendant Electro Adapter, Inc. deposit the Gross Settlement
19 Amount of Two Hundred Ninety Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$290,000.00) with Phoenix, Inc.,
20 the Settlement Administrator, as provided for in the Settlement.

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

24 9. The Court finds that the settlement payments, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair,
25 reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute the individual payments
26 in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

1 10. The Court finds that an incentive payment in the amount of \$5,000.00 for Plaintiff Jose
2 Salcido is appropriate for his risks undertaken and service to the Settlement Class. The Court finds that
3 this award is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement Administrator make this
4 payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

5 11. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$96,666.66 and litigation costs of
6 \$20,639.09 for Class Counsel, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement
7 Administrator distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
8 The fee award is appropriate in light of the benefit provided to the class.

9 12. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$7,250.00 from the
10 Gross Settlement Amount for all of its work done and to be done until the completion of this matter, and
11 finds that sum appropriate.

12 13. The Court finds that the payment to the California Labor & Workforce Development
13 Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$11,250.00 for its 75% share of the \$15,000.00 settlement of
14 Plaintiff's representative action under the California Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act
15 ("PAGA") is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute this
16 payment to the LWDA in conformity with the terms of the Settlement. The remaining 25% or \$3,750
17 of the PAGA Amount is to be distributed to the 82 Aggrieved Employees in conformity with the terms
18 of the Settlement. The highest Individual PAGA Payment to an Aggrieved Employee is \$76.05, and the
19 average Individual PAGA Payment to be paid is \$45.73.

20 14. After the above deductions, attorneys' fees (\$96,666.66), attorneys' litigation costs
21 (\$20,639.09), incentive payment to Plaintiff (\$5,000.00), Settlement Administrator costs (\$7,250.00),
22 and the PAGA Amount to the LWDA (\$11,250.00), the Net Settlement Amount of \$149,194.25 is to be
23 distributed to 138 Settlement Class members, that worked a total of 16,015 workweeks during the Class
24 Period, in conformity with the terms of the Settlement. The lowest Individual Settlement Share to be
25 paid to a Settlement Class member is \$9.08, the highest Individual Settlement Share is \$2,415.75, and
26 the average Individual Settlement Share to be paid is \$1,053.94.

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

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

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

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

14 19. The Settlement Administrator shall file a declaration regarding the disbursement of
15 Settlement funds on or before July 31, 2024. A NACR re: filing of distribution declaration is set for
16 August 7, 2024.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18
19 Dated: November 16, 2023



Stuart M. Rice / Judge

Honorable Stuart M. Rice
Judge of the Superior Court