

9211581h

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

SEP 03 2025

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

BY M. NEVAREZ, DEPUTY

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

GREGORY MEADE, as an individual and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

PUMPKIN CITY'S PUMPKIN FARM INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through
100,

Defendants.

Case No. 30-2024-01382083-CU-OE-CXC

*[Case assigned for all purposes to the Hon.
David A. Hoffer, Dept. CX103]*

**SECOND AMENDED ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION AND PAGA ACTION
SETTLEMENT, ATTORNEYS' FEES
AND COSTS, AND CLASS
REPRESENTATIVE ENHANCEMENT
AWARD, AND FINAL JUDGMENT**

Action Filed: February 27, 2024
Trial Date: None Set

1 **[PROPOSED] ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

2 The Motion of Plaintiff Gregory Meade ("Plaintiff") for Final Approval of Class Action
3 and PAGA Action Settlement, Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and Class Representative Enhancement
4 Award ("Final Approval Motion") came regularly for hearing before this Court on August 29,
5 2025, at 10:00 a.m., pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.769 and this Court's earlier Order
6 Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Action Settlement ("Preliminary
7 Approval Order"). Having considered the parties' Stipulation of Settlement (the "Settlement
8 Agreement" or "Settlement"), attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Matthew K. Moen in
9 Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Final Approval of Class Action and PAGA Action Settlement
10 (ROA #74), and the documents and evidence presented in support thereof, and recognizing the
11 sharply disputed factual and legal issues involved in this case, the risks of further prosecution,
12 and the substantial benefits to be received by the Settlement Class pursuant to the Settlement, the
13 Court hereby makes a final ruling that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is the
14 product of good faith, arm's-length negotiations between the parties. Good cause appearing
15 therefor, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Final Approval Motion and hereby ORDERS the
16 following:
17

18 1. Final judgment is hereby entered in conformity with the Settlement Agreement
19 and this Final Approval Order.

20 2. The conditional class certification is hereby made final, and the Court thus
21 certifies, for purposes of the Settlement, the following Settlement Class:

22 All current and former non-exempt employees who worked for Defendant
23 Pumpkin City's Pumpkin Farm Inc. ("Defendant") in California at any time
24 between February 27, 2020 and September 23, 2024 (the "Class Period").

25 3. Plaintiff Gregory Meade is hereby confirmed as the Class Representative. Paul K.
26 Haines, Fletcher W. Schmidt, Matthew K. Moen, and Aden M. Khachadorian of Haines Law
27 Group, APC, and Joeph Tojarieh of Stonebrook Law are hereby confirmed as Class Counsel.

28 4. Notice was provided to Settlement Class members as set forth in the Settlement,
which was approved by the Court on January 24, 2025, and the notice process has been completed

1 in conformity with the Settlement and the Court's Preliminary Approval Order. The Court finds
2 that said notice was the best notice practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice
3 provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and matters set forth therein, informed
4 Settlement Class members of their rights, and fully satisfied the requirements of California Code
5 of Civil Procedure § 1781(e), California Rule of Court 3.769, and due process.

6 5. The Court finds that no Settlement Class member objected to the Settlement, that
7 only one Settlement Class member, Serinami Magallanes, has opted out of the Settlement, and
8 that the 99.86% participation rate supports final approval.

9 6. The Court hereby approves the settlement as set forth in the Settlement as fair,
10 reasonable, and adequate, and directs the parties to effectuate the Settlement according to its
11 terms.

12 7. For purposes of settlement only, the Court finds that: (a) the members of the
13 Settlement Class are ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable;
14 (b) there are questions of law or fact common to the Settlement Class, and there is a well-defined
15 community of interest among members of the Settlement Class with respect to the subject matter
16 of the litigation; (c) the claims of the Class Representative are typical of the claims of the
17 Settlement Class members; (d) the Class Representative has fairly and adequately protected the
18 interests of the Settlement Class members; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods
19 for an efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to serve as
20 counsel for the Class Representative and the Settlement Class.

21 8. The Court finds that given the absence of objections to the Settlement, this Order
22 shall be considered final as of the date of entry.

23 9. The Court finds that the Individual Settlement Payments, as provided for in the
24 Settlement, are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to
25 distribute the Individual Settlement Payments in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

26 10. The Court orders that Defendant shall deposit the Maximum Settlement Amount
27 of Two Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$225,000.00) with the
28 Settlement Administrator in two equal installment payments, with the first installment payment

1 due thirty (30) calendar days after the Effective Date, as that term is defined in the Settlement
2 Agreement, and the second installment payment due on or by November 14, 2025, as provided
3 for in the Settlement.

4 11. The Court finds that an Enhancement Award in the amount of \$3,500.00 to
5 Plaintiff is appropriate for Plaintiff's risks undertaken and his substantial service to the Settlement
6 Class. The Court finds that this payment is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the
7 Settlement Administrator make this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

8 12. The Court finds that attorneys' fees in the amount of \$67,500.00 for Class Counsel
9 are fair, reasonable, and adequate in light of the common fund created by the Settlement, and
10 orders that the Settlement Administrator distribute these payments to Class Counsel in conformity
11 with the terms of the Settlement, divided as follows: \$45,562.50 (equivalent to 67.5% of the total
12 fee award) to Haines Law Group, APC) and \$21,937.50 (equivalent to 32.5% of the total fee
13 award) to Stonebrook Law. The Court finds that reimbursement of actual litigation costs of
14 \$7,673.76 for Class Counsel are fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders that the Settlement
15 Administrator distribute this payment in conformity with the terms of the Settlement, with the full
16 award of litigation costs (\$7,673.67 total) awarded to Haines Law Group, APC.

17 13. The Court orders that the Settlement Administrator shall be paid \$13,490.00 from
18 the Maximum Settlement Amount in conformity with the terms of the Settlement, for all of its
19 work done and to be done until the completion of this matter and finds that sum appropriate.

20 14. The Court finds that the payment to the California Labor & Workforce
21 Development Agency ("LWDA") in the amount of \$7,500.00 for its share of the settlement of
22 Plaintiff's representative claim under the Private Attorney Generals Act, Labor Code § 2698, *et*
23 *seq.* ("PAGA"), is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and orders the Settlement Administrator to
24 distribute this payment to the LWDA in conformity with the terms of the Settlement.

25 15. This Court orders that any settlement checks shall be negotiable for 180 calendar
26 days from the date of issuance of the check, and that any settlement checks that remain uncashed
27 after 180 days after they are mailed shall be distributed to the Controller of the State of California
28

1 to be held pursuant to the Unclaimed Property Law, California Civil Code § 1500 *et seq.*, in the
2 name of the Settlement Class member to whom the check was issued.

3 16. As of the Effective Date and upon Defendant's full funding of the Maximum
4 Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and each Settlement Class member (excluding Serinami
5 Magallanes, who validly and timely requested exclusion from the Settlement), shall fully and
6 finally release and discharge Defendant and any and all of its present and former parent
7 companies, subsidiaries, divisions, related or affiliated companies, shareholders, investors,
8 owners, partners, officers, directors, employees, agents, attorneys, insurers, consultants,
9 successors and assigns (collectively, the "Released Parties") from liability for all claims,
10 demands, rights, liabilities and causes of action based on the factual allegations set forth in the
11 operative First Amended Complaint in the Action or Plaintiff's PAGA Notice to the LWDA, or
12 which could have been pled in the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action based on the
13 factual allegations therein, that arose during the Class Period including, but not limited to: (i)
14 failure to pay all overtime wages; (ii) failed to pay all minimum wages; (iii) failure to provide all
15 lawful meal periods; (iv) failure to authorize and permit all lawful rest periods; (v) failed to issue
16 accurate itemized wage statements; (vi) failure to timely pay all final wages due upon separation
17 from employment; and (vii) failure to comply with California's Unfair Competition laws
18 ("Released Claims"). This release shall run from February 27, 2020 through September 23, 2024.

19 17. In addition, As of the Effective Date and upon Defendant's full funding of the
20 Maximum Settlement Amount, Plaintiff and all Settlement Class members who worked for
21 Defendant in California at any time between February 27, 2023 through September 23, 2024 (the
22 "PAGA Period"), regardless of whether they submitted a timely Request for Exclusion Form from
23 the Settlement, shall be deemed to have released and discharged the Released Parties from all
24 claims for civil penalties under PAGA that are based on the Labor Code violations pled in the
25 operative First Amended Complaint in the Action or Plaintiff's letter to the California Labor and
26 Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") dated February 27, 2024, or which could have been
27 pled in the operative First Amended Complaint in the Action based on the factual allegations
28

1 therein, that arose during the PAGA Period ("PAGA Released Claims"). This release shall run
2 from February 27, 2023 through September 23, 2024.


3 18. This document shall constitute a Final Judgment pursuant to California Rule of
4 Court 3.769(h), which provides, "If the court approves the settlement agreement after the final
5 approval hearing, the court must make and enter judgment. The judgment must include a provision
6 for the retention of the court's jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the terms of the judgment.
7 The court may not enter an order dismissing the action at the same time as, or after, entry of
8 judgment." The Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the Settlement, the Final Approval Order,
9 and this Judgment pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Section 664.6 and California
10 Rule of Court 3.769(h).

11 19. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.771(b), the Court orders that notice of this
12 Final Approval Order and Final Judgment be posted on the Settlement Administrator's website
13 for at least 30 days from the date of Final Judgment for the Settlement Class members, in
14 accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

15 20. Plaintiff shall file a Final Accounting Report on or before January 15, 2027. The
16 Final Accounting Report must include all information necessary for the Court to determine the
17 total amount actually paid to participating Settlement Class members and any amounts tendered
18 to the State Controller's Office under the unclaimed property law. A Final Accounting Hearing is
19 set for February 1, 2027 at 1:30 p.m. in Department CX-103 of this Court, located at 751 West
20 Santa Ana Boulevard, Santa Ana, California 92701.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22
23 Dated: 9/3/25

24 
Honorable David A. Hoffer
Judge of the Superior Court