

**BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK
DE BLOUW LLP**

Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687)
Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975)
Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)
Piya Mukherjee (State Bar #274217)
Victoria B. Rivapalacio (State Bar #275115)
2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, CA 92037
Telephone: (858)551-1223
Facsimile: (858) 551-1232
Firmsite: www.bamlawca.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

Coordination Proceeding Special Title
(Rule 3.550)

SOLARCITY WAGE AND HOUR CASES

Coordinated actions:

Irving v. SolarCity Corp.,
San Mateo County Superior Court,
Case No. CIV 525975

Thomas v. SolarCity Corp.,
San Diego County Superior Court,
Case No. 37-2017-00018317

CASE No. **JCCP 4945**

(Included actions: Case No. CIV 525975
and Case No. 37-2017-00018317)

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINAL
APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

Hearing Date: February 1, 2019
Hearing Time: 2:00 p.m.
[Hearing Scheduled by Oder dated
September 13, 2018]

Judge: Hon. Marie S. Weiner
Dept: 2

Action Filed: December 24, 2013


1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT on February 1, 2019, the Court entered the
3 Final Approval Order and Judgment in the above entitled action. A true and correct copy of the
4 Final Approval Order and Judgment is attached hereto as Exhibit #1.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6
7 Dated: February 4, 2019

8 BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMIK
DE BLOUW LLP

9
10 By: 

11 Norman B. Blumenthal
12 Kyle R. Nordrehaug
Attorneys for Plaintiff

13 SODERSTROM LAW PC
Jamin Soderstrom (State Bar No. 261054)
14 Three Park Plaza, Suite 100
Irvine, CA 92614
15 Tel: (949) 667-4700
Fax: (949) 424-8091
jamin@soderstromlawfirm.com

16 SETAREH LAW GROUP
17 Shaun Setareh (State Bar No. 204514)
shaun@setarehlaw.com
18 9454 Wilshire Boulevard, Ste. 907
Beverly Hills, California 90212
19 Tel: (310) 888-7771, Fax: (310) 888-0109

20 Attorney for Plaintiffs
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

3 I, Kyle Nordrehaug, am employed in the County of San Diego, State of California. I am
4 over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 2255 Calle Clara,
5 La Jolla, California 92037.

6 On February 4, 2019, I served the document(s) described as:

7 **1. NOTICE OF ENTRY OF FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

8 XX (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE): I caused the above entitled documents to be served on
9 the following parties to this action via electronic service through OneLegal:

10 Andrew R. Livingston
11 Zachary Scott
12 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
405 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669

13 X (ONLINE TO THE LWDA): I caused the above-described document to be delivered to the
14 Labor Workforce Development Agency via online process at the PAGA Filing website in
accordance with the procedure imposed by the LWDA.

15 X (State): I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
16 above is true and correct. Executed on February 4, 2019, at La Jolla, California.


17 
18 Kyle Nordrehaug
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT #1

ENDORSED FILED
SAN MATEO COUNTY

FEB - 1 2019

Clerk of the Superior Court
By ASHMIKA SEGRAN-TEO
DEPUTY CLERK

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

SOLARCITY WAGE AND HOUR CASES,

Coordination Proceeding
Special Title (CRC Rule. 3.550)

Coordinated actions:

Irving v. SolarCity Corp.,
San Mateo County Superior Court,
Case No. CIV 525975

Thomas v. SolarCity Corp.,
San Diego County Superior Court,
Case No. 37-2017-00018317

JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION
PROCEEDING CASE NO. JCCP 4945

(Included actions: Case No. CIV 525975 and
Case No. 37-2017-00018317)

~~PROPOSED~~ **FINAL APPROVAL
ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

Hearing Date: February 1, 2019
Hearing Time: 2:00 p.m.

Judge: Hon. Marie S. Weiner
Dept.: 2

Action Filed: December 24, 2013

FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

1 This matter, having come before the Honorable Marie S. Weiner of the Superior
2 Court of the State of California, in and for the County San Mateo, on September 13, 2018, for the
3 motion by for preliminary approval of the class settlement with.

4 The motion by Plaintiffs Anita Irving, Les Thomas, Breana Daugherty, Jason Wool, and
5 Felicia Kim ("Plaintiffs") for an order finally approving the Joint Stipulation of Class Action
6 Settlement and Release ("Stipulation" or "Settlement") with Defendant SolarCity Corporation
7 ("Defendant") and the motion for an award of attorneys' fees, costs and service awards duly came
8 on for hearing on February 1, 2019, before the above-entitled Court. The Court, having
9 considered the briefs, argument of counsel and all matters presented to the Court and good cause
10 appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, and
11 **HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:**

12
13 **I.**

14 **FINDINGS**

15 Based on the oral and written argument and evidence presented in
16 connection with the motion, the Court makes the following findings:

17 1. All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the
18 Agreement.

19 2. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation pending
20 in the California Superior Court for the County of San Mateo ("Court"), Case No. JCCP 4945,
21 entitled *Solarcity Wage and Hour Cases*, and over all Parties to this litigation, including the Class.

22 **Preliminary Approval of the Settlement**

23 3. On September 13, 2018, the Court granted preliminary approval of a class-
24 wide settlement. At this same time the court approved certification of a provisional settlement
25 class for settlement purposes only. The Court confirms this Order and finally approves the
26 settlement and the certification of the Class.

27 **Notice to the Class**

28 **FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

1 4. In compliance with the Preliminary Approval Order, the Notice was mailed
2 by first class mail to the Class Members at their last known addresses on October 12, 2018.
3 Mailing of the Notice to their last known addresses was the best notice practicable under the
4 circumstances and was reasonably calculated to communicate actual notice of the litigation and
5 the proposed settlement to the members of the Class. The Court finds that the Notice provided
6 fully satisfies the requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

7 5. The deadline for opting out or objecting was November 27, 2018. There
8 was an adequate interval between notice and deadline to permit Class Members to choose what to
9 do and act on their decision. No Class Members objected. One (1) Class Member requested
10 exclusion, and that exclusion was submitted by Veronica Li (Wenyan Li).

11 **Fairness Of The Settlement**

12 6. The Agreement provides for a Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,780,000.
13 The Agreement is entitled to a presumption of fairness. (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48
14 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801.)

15 a. The settlement was reached through arm's-length bargaining
16 between the parties. There is no evidence of any collusion between the parties in reaching the
17 proposed settlement.

18 b. The Parties' investigation and discovery have been sufficient to
19 allow the Court and counsel to act intelligently.

20 c. Counsel for both parties are experienced in similar employment
21 class action litigation and have previously settled similar class claims on behalf of employees
22 claiming compensation. All counsel recommended approval of the Settlement.

23 d. The percentage of objectors and requests for exclusion is small. No
24 objections were received. One (1) request for exclusion was received.

25 e. The participation rate is high. 4,551 Class Members will be
26 participating in the Settlement and will be sent settlement payments.

27
28 FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

1 7. The consideration to be given to the Class under the terms of the Agreement
2 is fair, reasonable and adequate considering the strengths and weaknesses of the claims asserted in
3 this Lawsuits and is fair, reasonable and adequate compensation for the release of the Released
4 Claims, given the uncertainties and risks of the litigation and the delays which would ensue from
5 continued prosecution of the Lawsuits.

6 8. The Agreement is finally approved as fair, adequate and reasonable and in
7 the best interests of the Class Members.

8 **Attorneys' Fees and Litigation Expenses**

9 9. The Agreement provides for an award of up to one-third of the Gross
10 Settlement Amount to Class Counsel as the Attorneys' Fees, subject to the Court's approval. The
11 Agreement also provides for an award of their actual litigation expenses incurred in an amount not
12 to exceed \$55,000 for Litigation Expenses. Class Counsel requests an award of \$50,364.48 as
13 reimbursement for litigation expenses, and \$593,333 for Attorneys' Fees.

14 10. An award of \$593,333 for the Attorneys' Fees and \$50,364.48 for Litigation
15 Expenses is reasonable in light of the contingent nature of Class Counsel's fee, the hours worked
16 by Class Counsel, and the results achieved by Class Counsel. The requested attorneys' fee award
17 represents one-third of the common fund, which is reasonable and at the low end of the range for
18 fee awards in common fund cases, and is supported by Class Counsel's lodestar which exceeds the
19 requested Attorneys' Fees.

20 **Service Enhancement Payments**

21 11. The Agreement provides for a service award of up to Twenty-Five
22 Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) to Class Representative Irving, and Ten Thousand Dollars
23 (\$10,000.00) each to Class Representatives Wool, Kim, and Daugherty as the Service
24 Enhancement Payments, subject to the Court's approval. The Court finds that the amounts of
25 \$25,000 to Class Representative Irving, and \$10,000 each to Class Representatives Wool, Kim,
26 and Daugherty are reasonable in light of the risks and burdens undertaken by the Class
27 Representatives in this class action litigation.

28 **FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

1 **Claims Administration Costs**

2 12. The Agreement provides for Claims Administration Costs to be paid in an
3 amount not to exceed \$40,000. The Declaration of the Claims Administrator provides that the
4 actual claims administration expenses were \$35,000. The amount of this payment of \$35,000 is
5 therefore reasonable in light of the work performed by the Claims Administrator.

6
7 **II.**

8 **ORDERS**

9 Based on the foregoing findings, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY
10 ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

11 1. The Class is certified for the purposes of settlement only. The Class is
12 hereby defined to include:

13 All individuals who worked for SolarCity in California as a commissioned
14 salesperson who were classified as non-exempt from December 24, 2009 to August
15 28, 2018..

16 2. Excluded from the Class is the one individual, Veronica Li (Wenyan Li),
17 who submitted a valid and timely request for exclusion. Every person in the Class who did not opt
18 out is a Settlement Class Member.

19 3. The Stipulation is hereby approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, and in the
20 best interest of the Class. The Parties are ordered to effectuate the Settlement in accordance with
21 this Order and the terms of the Agreement. The Parties selected Children's Advocacy Institute as
22 the *cy pres* beneficiary.

23 4. Class Counsel are awarded Attorneys' Fees in the amount of \$593,333 and
24 Litigation Expenses in the amount of \$ 50,364.48. Class Counsel shall not seek or obtain any
25 other compensation or reimbursement from Defendant, Plaintiffs or members of the Class.

26
27
28 **FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

1 5. The payment of service awards to the Plaintiffs in the amounts of \$25,000
2 to Class Representative Irving, and \$10,000 each to Class Representatives Wool, Kim, and
3 Daugherty are approved.

4 6. The payment of \$35,000 to the Settlement Administrator for Settlement
5 Administration Expenses is approved.

6 7. The PAGA Penalty Payment is approved, to be allocated as set forth in the
7 Stipulation.

8 8. Final Judgment is hereby entered in this action. The Final Judgment shall
9 bind each Settlement Class Member. The Final Judgment shall operate as a full release and
10 discharge of Defendant and each and all of its respective past and present parents, subsidiaries,
11 affiliated companies and corporations, and each and all of their respective past and present
12 directors, officers, managers, employees, general partners, limited partners, principals, agents,
13 insurers, reinsurers, shareholders, attorneys, advisors, representatives predecessors, successors,
14 divisions, joint venturers, assigns, or related entities, and each and all of their respective executors,
15 successors, assigns and legal representatives ("Released Parties") from any and all Released
16 Claims that occurred during the Class Period as to the Settlement Class Members. The Released
17 Claims are defined as the Alleged Claims, all claims that could have been alleged based upon the
18 factual allegations in the Lawsuits, and any premiums, penalties, interest, punitive damages, costs,
19 attorneys' fees, injunctive relief, declaratory relief, or accounting based on the Alleged Claims
20 which occurred during the Class Period for only those workweeks when the Class Member was
21 classified as non-exempt. The Released Claims expressly exclude all other claims including but
22 not limited to claims for wrongful termination, retaliation, discrimination, unemployment
23 insurance, disability, workers' compensation and claims outside the Class Period which are not
24 released.

25 9. In addition to the release given by each Settlement Class Member, each
26 Class Representative also generally releases Defendant and the Released Parties from any and all
27 of the Class Representative Released Claims as defined in the Stipulation. This general release by
28

FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

1 each Class Representative also includes a waiver of rights under California Civil Code Section
2 1542.

3 10. The Stipulation is not an admission by Defendant or any of the other
4 Released Parties, nor is this Final Approval Order and Judgment a finding, of the validity of any
5 claims in the lawsuits or of any wrongdoing by Defendant or any of the other Released Parties.
6 Neither this Final Approval Order, the Stipulation, nor any document referred to herein, nor any
7 action taken to carry out the Settlement is, may be construed as, or may be used as an admission
8 by or against Defendant or any of the other Released Parties of any fault, wrongdoing or liability
9 whatsoever. The entering into or carrying out of the Stipulation, and any negotiations or
10 proceedings related thereto, shall not in any event be construed as, or deemed to be evidence of, an
11 admission or concession with regard to the denials or defenses by Defendant or any of the other
12 Released Parties and shall not be offered in evidence in any action or proceeding against
13 Defendant or any of the Released Parties in any court, administrative agency or other tribunal for
14 any purpose as an admission whatsoever other than to enforce the provisions of this Final
15 Approval Order and Judgment, the Stipulation, or any related agreement or release.
16 Notwithstanding these restrictions, any of the Parties may file in the Lawsuits or in any other
17 proceeding this Final Approval Order and Judgment, the Stipulation, or any other papers and
18 records on file in the Lawsuits as evidence of the Settlement to support a defense of res judicata,
19 collateral estoppel, release, or other theory of claim or issue preclusion or similar defense as to the
20 claims being released by the Settlement.

21 11. Notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be given to
22 Class Counsel on behalf of Plaintiffs and all Class Members. It shall not be necessary to send
23 notice of entry of this Final Approval Order and Judgment to individual Class Members and the
24 Final Approval Order and Judgment shall be posted on Class Counsel's website as indicated in the
25 Notice.

26 12. After entry of Final Judgment, the Court shall retain jurisdiction to construe,
27 interpret, implement, and enforce the Agreement, to hear and resolve any contested challenge to a

28
FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT

1 claim for settlement benefits, and to supervise and adjudicate any dispute arising from or in
2 connection with the distribution of settlement benefits.

3 11. If the Settlement does not become final and effective in accordance with the
4 terms of the Settlement, resulting in the return and/or retention of the Gross Settlement Amount to
5 Defendant consistent with the terms of the Settlement, then this Final Approval Order and
6 Judgment, and all orders entered in connection herewith shall be rendered null and void and shall
7 be vacated.

8
9 **IT IS SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED. LET JUDGMENT BE FORTHWITH**
10 **ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.**

11
12 Dated: **FEB - 1 2019**

MARIE S. WEINER

HON. MARIE S. WEINER
JUDGE, SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
FINAL APPROVAL ORDER AND JUDGMENT