

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

AUG 28 2026

CLERK OF THE COURT
BY: Edmond J. de
Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
DEPARTMENT 304

ERIC MONTANO, DOUGLAS LUKINS,
individually, and on behalf of other members of
the general public similarly situated and on behalf
of other aggrieved employees pursuant to the
California Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

v.

PROJECTION PRESENTATION
TECHNOLOGY, INC., a Virginia corporation;
PROJECTION VIDEO SERVICES, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CGC-23-608843

ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA
SETTLEMENT

Plaintiffs' motion for final approval of class action and PAGA settlement came before this Court on August 28, 2026. Having considered the motion and accompanying memorandum, the Settlement Agreement,¹ and the file in this case, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows.

1. Unless otherwise specified, terms in this Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (the "Final Approval Order") shall have the same definition as used in the Settlement Agreement.

¹ "Settlement Agreement" or "Settlement" refers to the Amended Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release attached as Exhibit A to the Supplemental Declaration of Devin E. Rauchwerger filed January 16, 2026.

1 2. The Court granted preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement on January 22, 2026
2 (“Preliminary Approval Order”). In accordance with the Settlement Agreement and the Preliminary
3 Approval Order, Phoenix Class Action Administration Solutions (“Phoenix”) distributed notice to all
4 members of the putative class by first-class mail and email. The Class Notice informed the putative class
5 of the terms of the Settlement, of their right to receive their proportional Settlement Payment, of their
6 right to request exclusion from the Class and the Settlement, of their right to comment upon or object to
7 the Settlement, and to appear by themselves or by counsel at the Final Approval Hearing.

8 3. The Court finds that the Class Notice and notice procedure met the requirements of due
9 process and constituted the best notice practicable under the circumstances.

10 4. No Settlement Class Member filed a written objection to the proposed Settlement as part of
11 this notice process or stated an intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing. No Settlement Class
12 Member appeared and objected at the Final Approval Hearing.

13 5. Five Settlement Class Members, Sharilene Bethel, Nancy Chu, Joel Hutchinson, Gabrielle
14 Haney, and Curtis Frank, requested to be excluded from the Settlement.² The Court hereby excludes
15 Sharilene Bethel, Nancy Chu, Joel Hutchinson, Gabrielle Haney, and Curtis Frank from the Settlement
16 Class and the Settlement. This Order is binding on all remaining Settlement Class Members.

17 6. With respect to the Settlement Class and for purposes of approving this Settlement only,
18 this Court finds and concludes that: (a) the members of the Class are ascertainable and so numerous that
19 joinder of all members is impracticable; (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the Class, and
20 there is a well-defined community of interest among members of the Class with respect to the subject
21 matter of the Action; (c) the Class Representatives’ claims are typical of the claims of the members of the
22 Class; (d) the Class Representatives have fairly and adequately protected the interests of the members of
23 the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for an efficient adjudication of this
24 controversy; and (f) the counsel of record for the Class Representatives, i.e., Class Counsel, are qualified
25 to serve as counsel for Plaintiffs in their individual and representative capacities for the Class.

26
27 ² One Settlement Class Member, Daniel Markovski, submitted an untimely request for exclusion
28 postmarked on May 20, 2026. (Lee Decl. ¶ 9 & Ex. B [request for exclusion form is dated May 19,
2026].) The deadline to request exclusion from the Settlement was April 23, 2026 and the extended
deadline for re-mailed notices was May 8, 2026. (*Id.* ¶ 9.)

1 7. The Court hereby certifies the following Class for settlement purposes only: all current
2 and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who were employed by Defendants in California at any
3 time during the Class Period, September 5, 2019 to January 24, 2025.

4 8. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally appoints Plaintiffs Eric Montano and
5 Douglas Lukins as the Settlement Class Representatives.

6 9. For settlement purposes only, the Court finally appoints Zack I. Domb and Devin
7 Rauchwerger of Domb & Rauchwerger LLP as well as Joanna Ghosh and Selena Matavosian of Lawyers
8 *for Justice*, PC as Class Counsel.

9 10. The Court finds and determines that the terms of the Settlement Agreement are fair,
10 reasonable, and adequate and directs the Parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its terms. The
11 Court finds that the Settlement was reached as a result of informed and non-collusive arm's-length
12 negotiations facilitated by a neutral mediator after sufficient investigation by the Parties allowing them to
13 reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery provided
14 as part of the Settlement and recognizes the significant value accorded to the Class.

15 11. The Court hereby approves the Gross Settlement Amount of \$500,000. Defendants shall
16 fund the Gross Settlement Amount within 30 calendar days after the Effective Date. The Court hereby
17 orders the Settlement Administrator to disburse the payments from the Gross Settlement Amount as set
18 forth herein, and in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

19 12. The Court awards reasonable attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the amount of \$150,000.³

20 13. The Court awards Class Counsel \$22,344.47 for litigation costs incurred.⁴

21 14. The Court awards \$5,000 to Class Representative Eric Montano and \$2,500 to Class
22 Representative Douglas Lukins in addition to their individual settlement payments in recognition of the
23 time and effort spent litigating the case on behalf of the Class.

24 15. The Court awards \$75,000 in PAGA penalties (75% or \$56,250 allocated to the Labor and
25 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and 25% or \$18,750 allocated to the PAGA Employees.

26
27 ³ The \$150,000 attorneys' fees award is allocated as follows pursuant to Class Counsel's fee arrangement:
\$120,000 to Lawyers *for Justice*, PC (i.e., eighty percent) and \$30,000 to Domb & Rauchwerger LLP (i.e.,
twenty percent). (Rauchwerger Decl. Ex. 6.)

28 ⁴ The \$22,344.47 cost award is allocated as follows: \$21,032.24 to Lawyers *for Justice*, PC and
\$1,312.23 to Domb & Rauchwerger LLP.

1 The PAGA Employees covered by the Settlement consist of the following individuals: all current and
2 former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees who were employed by Defendants in California at any time
3 during the PAGA Period, June 29, 2022 to November 1, 2024.

4 16. The Court awards \$18,750 in settlement administration fees to Phoenix.

5 17. A status conference regarding settlement distribution is set for June 7, 2027 at 9:00 a.m. A
6 status report, accompanied by an admissible evidentiary declaration, shall be filed no later than five court
7 days prior to the status conference. The status report must state: (1) the date the Settlement
8 Administrator distributed individual settlement payments; (2) the number of checks issued; (3) the
9 number of checks cashed; (4) the number of uncashed checks; and (5) the total amount of residual funds
10 available for tender to the State Controller's Office Unclaimed Property Fund.

11 18. Class Counsel must submit a copy of this order to the LWDA within ten days of entry
12 pursuant to Labor Code section 2699(s)(3).

13 19. This Order shall be posted on the Settlement Administrator's website for 180 days.

14 20. The Court reserves exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over the Action, the Class
15 Representatives, the Class Members, and Defendants for the purposes of supervising the implementation,
16 enforcement, construction, administration, and interpretation of the Settlement Agreement, pursuant to
17 California Rules of Court, rule 3.769(h).

18
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20
21 Dated: August 28, 2026



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 August 28, 2026, 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: AUG 28 2026

Brandon E. Riley, Court Executive Officer

By: Edward J. Santos
Edward Santos, Deputy Clerk