

12/11/2025 11:44:47 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)
Xavier L. Woodford (State Bar No. 355326)
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
xavier@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Marie Macias

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

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

PATTERSON DENTAL SUPPLY, INC. and
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00016055-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Marcella O McLaughlin
Dept. 72

CLASS ACTION

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

Action Filed: April 5, 2024

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

3 1. On December 5, 2025, at 9:30 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the Order and
4 Judgment 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 copy of this Notice has been 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 Dated: December 11, 2025

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

14 

15 Nicholas J. Ferraro

16 Xavier L. Woodford

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff Marie Macias
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

FILED **B.D.**
Clerk of the Superior Court

DEC 05 2025

By: B. Delgado, Deputy

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

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

PATTERSON DENTAL SUPPLY, INC.,
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00016055-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Marcella O McLaughlin
Dept. 72

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: December 5, 2025

Time: 9:30 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 Marie Macias]

Action Filed: April 5, 2024

1 This matter came on for hearing on December 5, 2025 at 9:30 a.m. in Department 72 of the
2 above-captioned Court, the Honorable Marcella O McLaughlin presiding, on (1) Plaintiff's Motion for
3 Final 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: Donald Caskey. 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 \$8,500 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 Macias 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 \$224,977.50 and litigation costs
4 of \$13,474.27. 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: _____

12/5/2020

21 
The Honorable Marcella O McLaughlin
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - December 04, 2025

HEARING DATE: 12/05/2025 HEARING TIME: 9:30 AM DEPT.: C-72

JUDICIAL OFFICER: Marcella O. McLaughlin

CASE NO.: 37-2024-00016055-CU-OE-CTL

CASE TITLE: Macias vs Patterson Dental Supply Inc [E-FILE]

CASE TYPE: (U) Other Employment

HEARING TYPE:

Plaintiff's unopposed motion for final approval of class action settlement is GRANTED.

A. The court finds that the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable, and adequate to all concerned. *See Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801; *see also Moniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77, disapproved on another ground in *Turrieta v. Lyft, Inc.* (2024) 16 Cal.5th 664. Accordingly, the court approves the parties' proposed settlement.

B. The litigation costs of \$13,474.27, payable to class counsel, and the claims administration costs of \$8,500, payable to CPT Group are reasonable for a case of this type. Moreover, the costs have been substantiated and both are less than the amounts originally estimated in the preliminary approval papers (\$25,000 and \$15,000, respectively). (See Ferraro Decl., ¶ 15; *see also* Soto-Najera Decl., ¶ 16.) Thus, the costs are approved.

C. The proposed service award of \$10,000 to plaintiff is reasonable under the circumstances and not disproportionate to the average amount that the participating settlement class members will receive. The service award is therefore approved.

D. Finally, with respect to attorneys' fees, "[t]he court has a duty, independent of any objection, to assure that the amount and mode of payment of attorneys' fees are fair and proper, and may not simply act as a rubber stamp for the parties' agreement." *Consumer Privacy Cases* (2009) 175 Cal.App.4th 545, 555. In common fund cases like this one, trial courts have discretion to begin with a percentage-of-recovery approach and then to use the "lodestar" approach to cross-check the reasonableness of the percentage. *Laffitte v. Robert Half Internat. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503-06.

Here, the attorney's fees proposal of \$224,977.50 represents one-third of the gross settlement amount of \$675,000. This is not out of line with class action fee awards calculated using the percentage-of-the-benefit method. *See Chavez v. Netflix, Inc.* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 43, 66 fn. 11.

Performing the "lodestar" cross-check further confirms the reasonableness of the fees request. The evidence shows that counsel billed a total of 361 hours on this matter. (See Ferraro Decl., ¶ 9.) This results in a blended hourly rate of approximately \$623.21 (\$224,977.50 in requested fees divided by 361 hours), which is reasonable for similar work in San Diego County during the relevant time period. The requested fee award is also in line with counsel's theoretical lodestar of \$216,600. (See *id.* at ¶¶

9-10.) In sum, based on the evidence submitted, the court finds that the requested fee award of \$224,977.50 is reasonable under the circumstances and hereby approved. See *Nemecek & Cole v. Horn* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 641, 651 ("The amount to be awarded as attorney fees is left to the sound discretion of the trial court, which is in the best position to evaluate the services rendered by an attorney in his courtroom.").

E. The court will sign the proposed order and judgment submitted with the moving papers. See ROA 35. Plaintiff must submit the signed order to the LWDA within 10 days. See Lab Code § 2699(s)(3).