

LIDMAN LAW, APC
 Scott M. Lidman (SBN 199433)
 slidman@lidmanlaw.com
 Milan Moore (SBN 308095)
 mmoore@lidmanlaw.com
 Tiara Gose-Hardy (SBN 323823)
 tgose@lidmanlaw.com
 2155 Campus Drive, Suite 150
 El Segundo, California 90245
 Tel: (424) 322-4772
 Fax: (424) 322-4775

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 BIDKAR SEQUEIRA and JUAN SALAS

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 Plaintiffs
 BIDKAR SEQUEIRA and JUAN SALAS

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

BIDKAR SEQUEIRA, as an individual and
 on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MOBILE CLEAR SHIELD, LLC, a
 California limited liability company; and
 DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 22STCV31788

Related to Lead Case No.: 22STCV31784

[Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. David S. Cunningham III, Dept. SSC-11]

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

Date: January 13, 2026
 Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Dept.: SSC-11

Complaint Filed: September 28, 2022
 Trial Date: None Set

FILED
 Superior Court of California
 County of Los Angeles
 01/13/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
 By: T. Lewis Deputy

1 This matter came on regularly for hearing before this Court on January 13, 2026, pursuant to
2 California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's February 27, 2025 Order Granting Preliminary Approval
3 of Class Action Settlement ("Preliminary Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Class
4 Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice (collectively "Settlement")¹ and the
5 documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and recognizing the disputed factual and legal
6 issues involved in this case, the risks of further prosecution and the substantial benefits to be received
7 by the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement, the Court hereby makes a final ruling that the
8 proposed Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is the product of good faith, arm's-length
9 negotiations between the parties. Good cause appearing therefor, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs'
10 Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and ORDERS as follows:

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

14 All individuals whom Defendant Mobile Clear Shield, LLC classified as non-
15 exempt employees and who worked for Defendant in California at any time during
the Class Period.

16 The Class Period is the period of time starting on September 28, 2018 and ending
17 on October 12, 2023.

18 2. Plaintiff Bidkar Sequeira and Plaintiff Juan Salas are hereby confirmed as Class
Representatives, and Scott M. Lidman and Milan Moore of Lidman Law, APC and Paul K. Haines of
19 Haines Law Group, APC are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.

20 3. Notice was provided to the Settlement Class as set forth in the Settlement. The form and
21 manner of notice were approved by the Court on February 27, 2025, and the notice process has been
22 completed in conformity with the Court's Order. The Court finds that said notice was the best notice
23 practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice provided due and adequate notice of the
24 proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed Settlement Class members of their rights, and fully
25 satisfied the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1781(e), California Rule of Court
26 3.769, and due process.

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 4. 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 percent participation rate in the
3 Settlement supports final approval.

4 5. 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 6. 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 Representatives are typical of the claims of the members of the Settlement Class;
12 (d) the Class Representatives have 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 Representatives and
15 the Settlement Class.

16 7. 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 8. The Court orders Defendant Mobile Clear Shield, LLC (“Defendant”) to pay a Gross
19 Settlement Amount (“GSA”) of \$325,000.00. The Gross Settlement Amount shall be deposited by
20 Defendant with Phoenix Settlement Administrators (“Phoenix”), the Settlement Administrator as
21 provided for in the Settlement.

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

25 10. The Court finds that the settlement payments, as provided for in the Settlement, are fair,
26 reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to distribute the individual payments
27 in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.
28

1 11. The Court finds that service awards in the amount of \$7,500.00 to Plaintiff Sequeira and
2 \$7,500 to Plaintiff Salas are appropriate for their risks undertaken and service to the Settlement Class.
3 The Court finds that these awards are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement
4 Administrator make these payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

5 12. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$108,333.33 and litigation costs of
6 \$6,936.46 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 13. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$7,750.00 from the
9 Settlement Amount for all of its work done and to be done until the completion of this matter, and finds
10 that sum appropriate.

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

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

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


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

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

3 19. The Settlement Administrator shall file a declaration regarding the disbursement of
4 Settlement funds on or before November 17, 2026.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: 01/13/2026, 2026

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "David S. Cunningham". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "D" and "C".

Honorable David S. Cunningham
Judge of the Superior Court