



FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

DEC 23 2025

CLERK OF THE COURT

BY: Edmund J. [Signature]
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

DEPARTMENT 304

RAYMOND REED, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE SAN FRANCISCO BAR PILOTS;
and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-22-601736

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

1 Plaintiff's motion for final approval of class action and PAGA settlement came on
2 regularly for hearing on December 19, 2025. Having reviewed and considered the papers and
3 pleadings on file in the action, including the Settlement Agreement and Plaintiff's motion, and
4 having considered the arguments of counsel, the Court hereby grants Plaintiff's motion.¹ The
5 Court hereby orders as follows.

6 1. Pursuant to the Court's Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary
7 Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement dated August 19, 2025, a Class Notice was sent
8 to each Settlement Class Member by first-class mail. The Class Notice informed the Settlement
9 Class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive an Individual Settlement Payment, their
10 right (a) to comment on or object to the Settlement, (b) to request exclusion from the Settlement
11 and pursue their own remedies, and (c) of their right to appear in person or by counsel at the final
12 approval hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time
13 were provided by each of these procedures.

14 2. In response to the Class Notice, no member of the Settlement Class filed a written
15 objection to the Settlement and zero Settlement Class Members requested to be excluded from
16 the Settlement.

17 3. The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate
18 protections to Settlement Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed
19 decision regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of the Settlement Class
20 Members. The Court finds and determines that the notice provided in this case was the best notice
21 practicable under the circumstances, which satisfies the requirements of law and due process.

22 4. With respect to the Settlement Class and for purposes of approving this Settlement
23 only, the Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Settlement Class are ascertainable
24 and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or
25 fact common to the Settlement Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest among
26

27 ¹ "Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement" refers to the Amended Class Action and PAGA
28 Settlement Agreement attached as Exhibit 5 to the Supplemental Declaration of Carolyn Bell
filed August 14, 2025.

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

7 4. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 382, the Court hereby finally certifies
8 the Settlement Class for settlement purposes only: all non-exempt, hourly employees employed
9 by The San Francisco Bar Pilots in the State of California at any time from September 12, 2018
10 to May 13, 2024 and held one of the following positions: dock bosun, station boat captain, station
11 boat mate, steward/cook, run boat captain, river boat captain, swing captain, river relief captain,
12 mate 1 A/B deckhand, and mate 2 A/B deckhand.

13 5. The Court hereby confirms Aegis Law Firm, PC as Class Counsel.

14 6. The Court hereby confirms Plaintiff Raymond Reed as the Class Representative.

15 7. The Court finds and determines that the Settlement was reached as a result of
16 informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral mediator. The
17 Court also finds that the Parties conducted sufficient investigation, research, and discovery such
18 that their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court has
19 reviewed the monetary recovery provided as part of the Settlement and recognizes the significant
20 value accorded to the Class.

21 8. The Court further finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement are fair,
22 reasonable, and adequate to the Class and to each Settlement Class Member and that the
23 Settlement is ordered finally approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement should
24 be and hereby are ordered to be consummated.

25 9. The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$420,000, plus
26 Defendant's employer share of payroll taxes.

27 10. The Court finds and determines that the Individual Settlement Payments to be paid
28 to Settlement Class Members as provided for by the Settlement are fair and reasonable. The Court

1 hereby gives final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts be made to the Settlement
2 Class Members in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

3 11. The Court finds and determines that Private Attorneys General Act ("PAGA")
4 Penalties of \$20,000 are fair, reasonable, and appropriate. In accordance with the Settlement
5 Agreement, the Court hereby orders: (1) payment to the California Labor and Workforce
6 Development Agency ("LWDA") of \$15,000 (i.e., seventy-five percent of the PAGA Penalties);
7 and (2) payment of \$5,000 (i.e., twenty-five percent of the PAGA Penalties) to Aggrieved
8 Employees in the manner set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

9 12. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administrating the
10 Settlement incurred by Phoenix Settlement Administrators in the amount of \$6,295, are fair and
11 reasonable.² The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders the payment of that amount in
12 accordance with the Settlement.

13 13. The Court finds and determines the Class Representative Service Payment of
14 \$6,500 to Plaintiff Raymond Reed is fair and reasonable. The Court hereby orders the
15 Settlement Administrator to make this payment to the Plaintiff/Class Representative in
16 accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

17 14. The Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the sum of \$140,000
18 and litigation costs of \$16,264.57. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The
19 Court hereby orders the Settlement Administrator to make these payments to Class Counsel in
20 accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

21 15. Without affecting the finality of this order in any way, the Court retains
22 jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation,
23 effectuation, and enforcement of this order and the Settlement.

24
25
26
27 ² The amount awarded to Phoenix for settlement administration costs reflects a reduction of
28 \$35.00 for the cost of email notice. At the hearing, Defendant's counsel represented that email
notice was not provided to the Settlement Class because Defendant does not collect email
addresses from employees.

1 18. Nothing in this order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations
2 under the Settlement Agreement or under this order, including the requirement that Defendant
3 make payment to the Settlement Class Members in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

4 19. A status conference regarding settlement distribution is set for December 1, 2026
5 at 10:00 a.m. A status report, accompanied by an admissible evidentiary declaration, shall be
6 filed no later than five court days prior to the status conference. The status report must state:
7 (1) the date upon which Individual Settlement Payments were issued; (2) the number of checks
8 issued; (3) the number of uncashed checks; and (4) the total amount of residual funds to be
9 tendered to the State Controller's Office Unclaimed Property Fund.

10 20. Plaintiff shall submit a copy of this order to the LWDA within ten days of entry
11 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(s)(3).

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: December 23, 2025


Ethan P. Schulman
Judge of the Superior Court

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

(CCP 1010.6, and CRC 2.251)

I, Edward Santos, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On December 23, 2025, I electronically served:

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION

AND PAGA SETTLEMENT

via File & ServeXpress on the recipients designated on the Transaction Receipt located on the File & ServeXpress website.

Date: DEC 23 2025

Brandon E. Riley, Court Executive Officer

By: Edward J. Santos
Edward Santos, Deputy Clerk