

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 facsimile
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Elizabeth Tijero and Yanira Tijero

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

04/18/2024 at 09:24:00 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By E- Filing, Deputy Clerk

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

ELIZABETH TIJERO *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

vs.

IMPERIAL BEACH COMMUNITY CLINIC *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2022-00042973-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Loren G. Freestone
Dept. 64

CLASS ACTION

**Notice of Entry of Order Granting Final
Approval and Entering Judgment**

Action Filed: October 25, 2022

1 TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE
2 TAKE NOTICE THAT:

3 1. On April 5, 2024, at 10:30 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the Order and
4 Judgment Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and
5 Entering Judgment attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

6 2. The Judge confirmed the Court's Tentative Ruling attached hereto as Exhibit 2.

7 3. A copy of this Notice has been submitted to the LWDA via its online electronic portal
8 in accordance with Labor Code § 2699(1)(3).

9 4. Notice of the Court's final ruling and entry of judgment is hereby provided.

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12
13 Dated: April 18, 2024

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

14 
15 _____
16 Nicholas J. Ferraro
17 Lauren N. Vega
18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

ELIZABETH TIJERO, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

vs.

IMPERIAL BEACH COMMUNITY
CLINIC, *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2022-00042973-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Loren G. Freestone
Dept. 64

CLASS ACTION

**Amended ~~Proposed~~ Order Granting Final
Approval of Class Action Settlement and
Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering
Judgment**

Motion for Final Approval/Attorneys' Fees:

Date: April 5, 2024

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Action Filed: October 25, 2022

Amended ~~Proposed~~ Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement
and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering Judgment

1 This matter came on for hearing on April 5, 2024 at 10:30 a.m. in Department 64 of the above-
2 captioned Court, the Honorable Loren G. Freestone presiding, on (1) Plaintiffs' Motion for Final
3 Approval of Class Action Settlement and (2) Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

4 Having received and considered the motions and supporting papers, including the Class Action
5 Settlement Agreement ("Settlement"), the evidence and documents received by the Court in connection
6 with the Motions for Final Approval and Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and the previously decided Motion
7 for Preliminary Approval, the Court GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL of the Settlement and ORDERS
8 AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

9 1. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the Order Granting Preliminary Approval,
10 and the Settlement, a notice was sent to each class member by first-class U.S. mail. The notice
11 informed the class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive a settlement payment without
12 any required action, their right to comment upon or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear
13 in person or by counsel at the Final Approval Hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the
14 Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided for each of these procedures.

15 2. Zero class members returned a written objection to the proposed Settlement as part of
16 the notice process or stated an intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing and there we no
17 dissenting appearances from class members at the hearing. No class members requested exclusion
18 from the Settlement.

19 3. The Court finds and determines the notice procedure afforded adequate protections to
20 the class and provides the basis for the Court's informed decision regarding approval of the Settlement
21 based the response. The Court finds and determines the notice provided was the best notice
22 practicable, satisfying the requirements of law and due process.

23 4. For purposes of approving this Settlement only, this Court finds and concludes: (a) the
24 proposed class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the class is
25 impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the proposed class, and there is a well-
26 defined community of interest among members of the class with respect to the subject matter of the
27 claims; (c) the claims of the representative are typical of the claims of the class; (d) the class
28 representative has and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class; (e) a class action is

superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of settlement; and (f) the law firm of Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc. is qualified and adequate to serve as Class Counsel in this action.

5. The Court confirms certification, for settlement purposes only, of the class as defined in the Settlement and approved at the preliminary approval stage, as follows: “all individuals currently or formerly employed by Imperial Beach Community Clinic in California as hourly, non-exempt employees during the Class Period of October 25, 2018, through October 30, 2023.”

6. The Court finds and determines the terms set forth in the Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and, having found the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arms'-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral and experienced mediator, directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms. The Court further finds the Parties conducted extensive investigation, research, and informal discovery, and that their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that Settlement will enable the Parties to avoid additional and potentially substantial litigation costs, as well as delay and risks if the Parties were to continue to litigate the case. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery and recognizes the significant value provided to the Class. Therefore, the Court approves the Settlement and incorporates the terms of the Settlement in full into this Final Approval Order as though fully set forth herein.

7. The Court finds and determines the fees and expenses in administering the Settlement incurred by the Settlement Administrator of \$8,250 are fair and reasonable. The Court orders these administration costs be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

8. The Court finds and determines the Service Award of \$7,500 to Plaintiffs Elizabeth Tijero and Yanira Tijero as fair and reasonable. The Court orders the service awards be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

9. The Court finds and determines payment to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency of \$7,500, as its 75% share of the civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court orders that amount be paid in accordance

1 with the terms of the Settlement and approves the settlement of claims under the Private Attorneys
2 General Act pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2).

3 10. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the statutory provisions authorizing
4 attorneys' fees under the California Labor Code and Code of Civil Procedure, as set forth in the Motion
5 for Attorneys' Fees, the Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees of \$149,985.000 and litigation
6 costs of \$14,066.55. Class Counsel has sufficiently explained the basis for the fee award based on a
7 percentage of the fund. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court orders the
8 Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Settlement.

9 11. Without affecting the finality of this Order or the entry of judgment in any way, the
10 Court retains jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation,
11 and enforcement of this Order and the Settlement.

12 12. Nothing in this Order shall preclude any action to enforce the Parties' obligations under
13 the Settlement or under this Order, including the requirement that Defendant make payments to Class
14 Members in accordance with the Settlement.

15 13. The Court hereby ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT in accordance with the terms of the
16 Settlement, in accordance with this Final Approval Order and Judgment.

17 14. The Parties shall comply with Cal. Rules of Court Rule 3.771(b), by filing a Notice of
18 Entry of Judgment with the Court.

19
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
22 Date: **April 10, 2024**

23 

The Honorable Loren G. Freestone
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

HALL OF JUSTICE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - April 04, 2024

EVENT DATE: 04/05/2024

EVENT TIME: 10:30:00 AM

DEPT.: C-64

JUDICIAL OFFICER: Loren G. Freestone

CASE NO.: 37-2022-00042973-CU-OE-CTL

CASE TITLE: TIJERO VS IMPERIAL BEACH COMMUNITY CLINIC [IMAGED]

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited

CASE TYPE: Other employment

EVENT TYPE: Motion Hearing (Civil)

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED:

TENTATIVE RULING

Plaintiffs Elizabeth Tijero and Yanira Tijero's unopposed motion for final approval of class action and PAGA settlement is **GRANTED** as set forth below.

The class settlement is generally "fair, adequate, and reasonable." (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801.) The PAGA portion of the settlement is also generally "fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA's purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws." (*Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.)

However, Plaintiffs' request for a \$20,000 service award-\$10,000 each-is unreasonable. Plaintiffs have not explained how the class benefitted by having two named plaintiffs. Under the circumstances, Plaintiffs should split a \$10,000 service award-\$5,000 each.

Accordingly, final approval is given to the following breakdown:

- Gross Settlement - \$450,000
- Attorney Fees - \$149,985
- Costs - \$14,066.55
- Service Award - \$10,000 (\$5,000 to each named plaintiff)
- Administration - \$8,250
- LWDA Payment - \$7,500
- Employee Payment - \$260,198.45 (inclusive of both class payment and PAGA payment)

Payments to class members/aggrieved employees shall be made in accordance with the terms of the settlement agreement.

Plaintiffs are directed to revise the proposed order to reflect the reduced service award.

Once signed, Plaintiffs shall submit the signed order to the LWDA within 10 days. (Lab. Code, § 2699, subd. (l)(3).)