

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 A. 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 facsimile
nick@ferrarovega.com / lauren@ferrarovega.com /
dorota@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Charles Madrid

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

CHARLES MADRID, on behalf of others
similarly situated and the State of California
under the Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GRAND AMERICA HOTELS & RESORTS,
INC.; WESTGATE HOTEL COMPANY;
REH SERVICES COMPANY; SINCLAIR
SERVICES; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00023471-CU-OE-CTL

Hon. Blaine K. Bowman
Dept. 74

CLASS ACTION

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

Action Filed: May 21, 2024

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

- 3 1. On March 27, 2026, at 8:30 a.m. in this Department, the Court entered the Order Granting Final
4 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 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: April 9, 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 Charles Madrid*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

FILED
San Diego Superior Court

MAR 27 2026

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

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

CHARLES MADRID, on behalf of others
similarly situated and the State of California
under the Private Attorneys General Act,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GRAND AMERICA HOTELS & RESORTS,
INC.; WESTGATE HOTEL COMPANY;
REH SERVICES COMPANY; SINCLAIR
SERVICES; and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 37-2024-00023471-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: March 27, 2026

Time: 8:30 a.m.

[Filed concurrently with Plaintiff's Notice of
Unopposed Motion and Motion for Final
Approval of Class Action Settlement, Plaintiff's
Memorandum of Points and Authorities,
Declaration of Nicholas J. Ferraro, Declaration
of Settlement Administrator, and Declaration of
Charles Madrid]

Action Filed: May 21, 2024

1 This matter came on for hearing on March 27, 2026, 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 ("Motions").

5 Having received and considered the Motions and supporting papers, including the Class Action
6 and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Settlement"), the evidence and documents received by the Court
7 in connection with the Motions for Final Approval and Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and the previously
8 decided Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Court GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL of the Settlement
9 and ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS:

10 1. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the Order Granting Preliminary Approval,
11 and the Settlement, a notice was sent to each class member by first-class U.S. mail. The notice
12 informed the class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive a settlement payment without
13 any required action, their right to comment upon or object to the Settlement, and their right to appear
14 in person or by counsel at the Final Approval Hearing and to be heard regarding approval of the
15 Settlement. Adequate periods of time were provided for each of these procedures.

16 2. Zero class members returned a written objection to the proposed Settlement as part of
17 the notice process or stated an intention to appear at the Final Approval Hearing, and there were no
18 dissenting appearances from class members at the hearing. One class member requested exclusion
19 from the Settlement: Adriano Damasceno. This "opt out" is affirmatively excluded from the class
20 settlement.

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

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

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

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

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

7. The Court finds and determines that the fees and expenses in administering the Settlement incurred by the Settlement Administrator of \$8,750 are fair and reasonable. The Court orders that these administration costs be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.

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

9. The Court finds and determines payment to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency of \$15,000, as its 75% share of the civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act is fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The Court orders that the amount be paid in

1 accordance with the terms of the Settlement and approves the settlement of claims under the Private
2 Attorneys General Act pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(s)(2).

3 10. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the statutory provisions authorizing
4 attorneys' fees under the California Labor Code and Code of Civil Procedure, as set forth in the Motion
5 for Attorneys' Fees, the Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees of \$115,706.66 and litigation costs
6 of \$13,914.41. Class Counsel has sufficiently explained the basis for the fee award based on a
7 percentage of the fund. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court orders the
8 Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Settlement.

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

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

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

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

19
20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21
22 Date: 3-27-26

23 
The Honorable Blaine K. Bowman
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - March 26, 2026

HEARING DATE: 03/27/26

HEARING TIME: 8:30AM

DEPT.: C-74

JUDICIAL OFFICER: BOWMAN, BLAINE K.

CASE NO.:37-2024-00023471-CU-OE-CTL

CASE TITLE: Madrid vs Grand America Hotels & Resorts 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 attorneys' fees and costs are GRANTED.

These motions have been properly noticed, with proof of service on file. These motions are unopposed and, pursuant to Superior Court of California, County of San Diego, Local Rules, Rule 2.1.19.B., "[t]he court may deem a lack of opposition to be a concession that a motion is meritorious." In addition to deeming the lack of opposition to be a concession that the motion is meritorious, the court also addresses the merits of Plaintiff's motion.

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 to Plaintiff Charles Madrid. *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1393. The court finds an award of attorneys' fees of \$115,706.66 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 \$13,194.41 reasonable. See, *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25. The court awards Plaintiff attorneys' fees of \$115,706.66 and costs of \$13,914.41. The court finds administrative costs of \$8,750.00 reasonable and approves claims administration costs in this amount. The court approves the Private Attorneys 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.

The court sets a compliance hearing for October 29, 2027, at 8:30am.

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.