

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC
Samuel A. Wong, State Bar No. 217104
Kashif Haque, State Bar No. 218672
Jessica L. Campbell, State Bar No. 280626
Alex J. Valle, State Bar No. 334263
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 379-6250
Facsimile: (949) 379-6251
Email: avalle@aegislawfirm.com

Aaron A. Bartz (SBN 198722)
aaron@bartzlawgroup.com
BARTZ LAW GROUP, APC
5151 California Ave., Suite 100
Irvine, California 92617
Tel: (949) 504-4413
Fax: (949) 656-7760

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
ADRIANA MAGDALENA RAMOS and VINCENT TURNER

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

ADRIANA MAGDALENA RAMOS and
VINCENT TURNER, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ROADSAFE TRAFFIC SYSTEMS,
INC.; and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 34-2023-00334458-CU-OE-GDS
[Consolidated with Case No. 23CV001415]

*Assigned for all purposes to
Hon. Judge Lauri A. Damrell
Dept. 22*

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT
GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
AND REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Date: July 18, 2025
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept: 22

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

1 This matter came on for hearing on July 18, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., in Department 22 of the
2 above-captioned Court on the Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement pursuant to
3 California Rule of Court 3.769, this Court's Order Granting Preliminary Approval, and the
4 Amended Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Class Notice ("Settlement
5 Agreement"), a copy of which was filed in conjunction with the Plaintiffs' Motion for Final
6 Approval of Class Action Settlement.

7 Having received and considered the Settlement Agreement, the supporting papers filed by
8 the Parties, and the evidence and argument received by the Court in conjunction with the
9 unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and the instant Motion
10 for Final Approval, the Court grants final approval of the Settlement and HEREBY ORDERS
11 AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

12 1. Pursuant to the Order Granting Preliminary Approval, a Class Notice was sent to
13 each Class Member by first-class mail. These papers informed the Class of the terms of the
14 Settlement, their right to receive an Individual Settlement Payment, their right (a) to comment on
15 or object to the Settlement, (b) to request exclusion from the Settlement and pursue their own
16 remedies, and (c) of their right to appear in person or by counsel at the final approval hearing and
17 to be heard regarding approval of the Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided by
18 each of these procedures. No member of the Class filed written objection to the proposed
19 Settlement as part of this notice process or stated an intention to appear at the final approval
20 hearing.

21 2. The Court finds and determines that this notice procedure afforded adequate
22 protections to Class Members and provides the basis for the Court to make an informed decision
23 regarding approval of the Settlement based on the responses of the Class. The Court finds and
24 determines that the notice provided in this case was the best notice practicable, which satisfied
25 the requirements of law and due process.

26 3. With respect to the Class and for purposes of approving this Settlement only, this
27 Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Class are ascertainable and so numerous
28 that joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the

Class, and there is a well-defined community of interest among members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the Action; (c) the claims of Class Representatives are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) the Class Representatives have fairly and adequately protected the interests of the members of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representatives, i.e., Class Counsel, are qualified to serve as counsel for Plaintiffs in their individual and representative capacities for the Class.

4. The Court has certified a Class, as that term is defined in and by the terms of the Settlement Agreement as all persons currently or formerly employed by Defendant who performed work as non-exempt employees in the State of California at any time during the Class Period of August 14, 2018 through March 22, 2024, regardless of where they reside or otherwise perform work. This specifically includes those workers who travel from out-of-state to perform work in the State of California. The Court deems this definition sufficient for purposes of California Rule of Court 3.765(a).

5. The Court hereby confirms Aegis Law Firm, PC and Bartz Law Group, APC as Class Counsel.

6. The Court hereby confirms Plaintiffs Adriana Magdalena Ramos and Vincent Turner as the Class Representatives in this Action.

7. The Court finds and determines that the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement are fair, reasonable, and adequate and directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms, having found that the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations facilitated by a neutral mediator. The Court further finds that the Parties conducted extensive investigation and that their attorneys were able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also finds that the 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 provided as part of the Settlement and recognizes the significant value accorded to the Class.

1 8. The Court further finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement are fair,
2 reasonable and adequate to the Class and to each Participating Class Member and that the
3 Settlement is ordered finally approved, and that all terms and provisions of the Settlement should
4 be and hereby are ordered to be consummated.

5 9. The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$829,002.14.

6 10. The Court finds and determines that the Individual Settlement Payments to be paid
7 to Participating Class Members as provided for by the Settlement are fair and reasonable. The
8 Court hereby gives final approval to and orders the payment of those amounts be made to the
9 Participating Class Members in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

10 11. The Court finds and determines that payment to the California Labor and
11 Workforce Development Agency of \$22,500.00 as its share of the settlement of civil penalties in
12 this case is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders
13 that the payment of that amount be paid in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

14 12. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administering the
15 Settlement incurred by Phoenix Settlement Administrators in the amount of \$7,900.00, are fair
16 and reasonable. The Court hereby gives final approval to and orders that the payment of that
17 amount in accordance with the Settlement.

18 13. The Court finds and determines the Class Representatives Service Payments of
19 \$10,000.00 each (totaling \$20,000.00) for Plaintiffs is fair and reasonable. The Court hereby
20 orders the Administrator to make this payment to the Plaintiffs/Class Representatives in
21 accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

22 14. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, and the authorities, evidence and argument
23 submitted by Class Counsel, the Court hereby awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees in the sum of
24 \$276,334.05 and litigation costs of \$20,909.71. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and
25 reasonable. The Court hereby orders the Settlement Administrator to make these payments in
26 accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

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

4 16. This Judgment is intended to be a final disposition in its entirety of the above
5 captioned action. Without affecting the finality of this judgment in any way, the Court retains
6 jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation,
7 effectuation, and enforcement of the Settlement pursuant to C.C.P. § 664.6 and the California
8 Rules of Court.

9 17. The Parties will bear their own costs and attorneys' fees except as otherwise
10 provided by this Court's Order awarding Class Counsels' Award for attorneys' fees and litigation
11 costs.

12 18. The Court sets a Hearing Re: Distribution of Settlement Funds for February 20,
13 2026, at 10:30 a.m. Class Counsel are ordered to file a Final Report Re: Distribution of the
14 Settlement Funds by the Administrator five court days prior.

15
16 DATED: 07/31/2025



A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Lauri A. Damrell".

Honorable Lauri A. Damrell
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT