

3/13/2026 1:48:17 PM

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

Nicholas J. Ferraro (State Bar No. 306528)
Lauren N. Vega (State Bar No. 306525)
Dorota James (State Bar No. 309933)
Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.
3333 Camino del Rio South, Suite 300
San Diego, California 92108
(619) 693-7727 main / (619) 350-6855 fax
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com /
dorota@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Eloina Vigil

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

ELOINA VIGIL, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated and the State
of California under the Private Attorneys
General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SLH ESCONDIDO MANAGER, LLC and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00013517-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Loren G. Freestone
Dept. 64

CLASS ACTION

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF AMENDED
ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL
OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND
ENTERING JUDGMENT**

Action Filed: March 22, 2024

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

- 3 1. On March 6, 2026, at 10:30 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the *Amended* Order
4 Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Attorneys' Fees and Costs and
5 Entering Judgment 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 electronic portal
8 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: March 13, 2026

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

14
15 
16 _____
17 Nicholas J. Ferraro
18 Lauren N. Vega
19 Dorota A. James
20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Eloina Vigil*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

3/5/2026 2:30:44 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By G. Lopez ,Deputy Clerk

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

ELOINA VIGIL, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated and the State
of California under the Private Attorneys
General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SLH ESCONDIDO MANAGER, LLC and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00013517-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Loren G. Freestone
Dept. 64

CLASS ACTION

**AMENDED [PROPOSED] ORDER
GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF
CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT AND
ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS AND
ENTERING JUDGMENT**

Motion for Final Approval/Attorneys' Fees:

Date: March 6, 2026

Time: 10:30 a.m.

Action Filed: March 22, 2024

1 This matter came on for hearing on March 6, 2026, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 64 of the above-
2 captioned Court, the Honorable Loren G. Freestone 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. One class member requested exclusion
18 from the Settlement: Brenda Janet Reyes. This "opt out" is affirmatively excluded from the class
19 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 \$7,750 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 Vigil as fair
22 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 \$141,652.50 and litigation costs
4 of \$15,893.65. 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: 3/5/2026



The Honorable Loren G. Freestone
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - March 05, 2026

HEARING DATE: 03/06/26 HEARING TIME: 10:30AM DEPT.: C-64

JUDICIAL OFFICER: FREESTONE, LOREN

CASE NO.:37-2024-00013517-CU-OE-CTL

CASE TITLE: Vigil vs SLH Escondido Manager LLC [IMAGED]

CASE TYPE: (U)Other Employment

HEARING TYPE: Motion Hearing

Plaintiff ELOINA VIGIL'S unopposed motion (ROA # 30) for an order granting final approval of class action and PAGA settlement is GRANTED.

Plaintiff ELOINA VIGIL'S unopposed motion (ROA # 35) for an award of attorneys' fees and costs is GRANTED.

The settlement is "fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA's purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws." Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc. (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.

The court approves the following final approval breakdown:

- Gross Settlement (Non-Revisionary) - \$425,000.00
- Attorney Fees - \$141,652.50 (33.33% of Gross Settlement)
- Litigation Costs - \$15,893.65
- Service Award to Class Representative - \$10,000.00
- Settlement Administration Costs - \$7,750.00
- LWDA Payment – \$15,000 (75% of \$20,000 PAGA payment)

To date, there are 267 eligible class members (0 objections, 1 request for exclusion, 4 undeliverable). Among these class members, 144 are also PAGA group members. The highest individual class settlement payment will be approximately \$3,632.19, and the average class settlement payment will be approximately \$863.50. The highest individual PAGA payment will be approximately \$76.02, and the average individual PAGA payments will be approximately \$34.72. These are significant individual recoveries and justify the settlement. Therefore, the settlement is approved in full, and the settlement proceeds will be disbursed to participating class and PAGA members.

The Court will execute the proposed order and judgment (ROA # 38) at the hearing.