

5/20/2025 9:21:24 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By T. Automation , Deputy Clerk

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Mariela R. Romo (State Bar No. 341657)
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 /
mariela@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Yvonne Gonzalez

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

YVONNE GONZALEZ *et al.*

Plaintiff,

v.

WEST MARINE PRODUCTS, INC. *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2023-00017462-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Blaine K. Bowman
Dept. 74

CLASS ACTION

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

Action Filed: April 25, 2023

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

3 1. On May 9, 2025, at 8:30 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the Order Granting
4 Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering Judgment
5 attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

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

7 3. A conformed copy of this Notice will be submitted to the LWDA via its online
8 electronic portal in accordance with Labor Code § 2699(s)(3).

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

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12
13 Dated: May 20, 2025

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

14 
15 _____
16 Nicholas J. Ferraro
17 Lauren N. Vega
18 Mariela R. Romo
19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Yvonne Gonzalez*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Exhibit 1

FILED
San Diego Superior Court

MAY 09 2025

Clerk of the Superior Court
By: K. Mulligan, Deputy

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

YVONNE GONZALEZ, *et al.*

Plaintiff,

vs.

WEST MARINE PRODUCTS, INC., *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2023-00017462-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Blaine K. Bowman
Dept. 74

CLASS ACTION

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

Motion for Final Approval/Attorneys' Fees:

Date: May 9, 2025

Time: 8:30 a.m.

[Filed concurrently with Notice of Motion and
Motion for Final Approval of Class Action
Settlement, Memorandum of Points and
Authorities, Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferraro,
Declaration of Settlement Administrator, and
Declaration of Yvonne Gonzalez]

Action Filed: April 25, 2023

1 This matter came on for hearing on May 9, 2025 at 8:30 a.m. in Department 74 of the above-
2 captioned Court, the Honorable Blaine K. Bowman presiding, on (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Final
3 Approval of Class Action Settlement and (2) Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs.

4 Having received and considered the motions and supporting papers, including the Class Action
5 and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement"), the evidence and documents received by the Court
6 in connection with the Motions for Final Approval and Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and the previously
7 decided Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Court GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL of the Settlement
8 and ORDERS 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 were no
17 dissenting appearances from class members at the hearing. Five class members requested exclusion
18 from the Settlement: Valerie A. Orrantia, Alicia Swithenbank, Maurice Perez, Chase V. Edwards, and
19 Edward I. Rivera. These "opt outs" are affirmatively excluded from the class settlement.

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

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

1 representative has and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class; (e) a class action is
2 superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this controversy in the context of
3 settlement; and (f) the law firm of Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc. is qualified and adequate
4 to serve as Class Counsel in this action.

5 5. The Court confirms certification, for settlement purposes only, of the class as defined in
6 the Settlement and approved at the preliminary approval stage.

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

18 7. The Court finds and determines the fees and expenses in administering the Settlement
19 incurred by the Settlement Administrator of \$15,000 are fair and reasonable. The Court orders these
20 administration costs be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

21 8. The Court finds and determines the Service Award of \$10,000 to Plaintiff Gonzalez as
22 fair and reasonable. The Court orders the service awards be paid in accordance with the terms of the
23 Settlement.

24 9. The Court finds and determines payment to the California Labor and Workforce
25 Development Agency of \$15,000, as its 75% share of the civil penalties under the Private Attorneys
26 General Act is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court orders that amount be paid in accordance
27 with the terms of the Settlement and approves the settlement of claims under the Private Attorneys
28 General Act pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(s)(2).

1 10. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the statutory provisions authorizing
2 attorneys' fees under the California Labor Code and Code of Civil Procedure, as set forth in the Motion
3 for Attorneys' Fees, the Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees of \$233,310 and litigation costs
4 of \$20,365.42. Class Counsel has sufficiently explained the basis for the fee award based on a
5 percentage of the fund. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court orders the
6 Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Settlement.

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

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

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

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

17
18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 Date: 5925



The Honorable Blaine K. Bowman
Judge of the Superior Court

Exhibit 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - May 08, 2025

HEARING DATE: 05/09/25

HEARING TIME: 8:30AM

DEPT.: C-74

JUDICIAL OFFICER: BOWMAN, BLAINE K.

CASE NO.:37-2023-00017462-CU-OE-CTL

CASE TITLE: Gonzalez vs West Marine Products Inc [E-FILE]

CASE TYPE: (U)Other Employment

HEARING TYPE: Motion Hearing

Plaintiff's unopposed motion for final approval of class action settlement and unopposed motion for final approval of attorneys' fees and costs are GRANTED. Applying the factors set forth in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1796, the court finds Plaintiff meets Plaintiff's burden of showing that the settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable. See also, *Wershba v. Apple Computer, Inc.* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 224. The court finds the service award requested reasonable and approves Plaintiff's request for a class representative service award in the amount of \$10,000.00. *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1393. The court finds an award of attorney's fees of \$233,310.00 proper under the percentage of common fund and lodestar cross-check analysis of *Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480 and the authorities cited therein. The court finds costs of \$20,365.42 reasonable. See, *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25. The court awards Plaintiff attorney's fees of \$233,310.00 and costs of \$20,365.42. The court finds administrative costs of \$15,000.00 reasonable and approves claims administration costs in this amount. The court approves the Private Attorney General Act (PAGA) settlement amount of \$20,000.00 for Plaintiff's PAGA claims (\$15,000.00 to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and \$5,000.00 to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees).

The court signs Plaintiff's proposed order and judgment.

Unless the ruling(s) above indicate that an appearance is necessary, parties who wish to submit, who are satisfied with the above tentative ruling(s), and/or who do not otherwise wish to argue the motion(s) are encouraged to give notice to the Court and each other of their intention not to appear.