

5/6/2026 4:35:32 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)
Ricardo De Leon (State Bar No. 365493)
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 /
ricardo@ferrarovega.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Carmina Torres

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

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

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FIRST MERIDIAN HOME CARE
SERVICES, INC. DBA MERIDIAN HOME
CARE LLC and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24CU016862C

*Hon. Carolyn M. Caietti
Dept. 70*

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: October 11, 2024

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

- 3 1. On March 27, 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: May 6, 2026

Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.

14
15 

16 Nicholas J. Ferraro
17 Lauren N. Vega
18 Ricardo De Leon
19 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Carmina Torres*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EXHIBIT 1

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego
4/29/2026 9:03:28 AM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By A. Villasenor ,Deputy Clerk

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

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

Plaintiffs,

vs.

FIRST MERIDIAN HOME CARE
SERVICES, INC. DBA MERIDIAN HOME
CARE LLC and DOES 1 through 50,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24CU016862C

Hon. Carolyn M. Caietti
Dept. 70

CLASS ACTION

***Amended [~~Proposed~~] Order Granting Final
Approval of Class Action Settlement and
Attorneys' Fees and Costs and Entering
Judgment***

Cont. Motion for Final Approval/Attorneys'
Fees Hearing:

Date: March 27, 2026
Time: 10:30 a.m.

Action Filed: October 11, 2024

1 This matter came on for hearing on March 27, 2026, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 70 of the
2 above-captioned Court, the Honorable ^{Robert C. Gonsky} Carolyn M. Caietti 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. ^{Fourteen notices} The notice ^{seem}
11 informed the class of the terms of the Settlement, their right to receive a settlement payment without ^{clude here.}
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. Six class members requested exclusion
18 from the Settlement, the names of which are maintained by the Settlement Administrator, CPT Group.
19 The six "opt outs" are affirmatively excluded from the class settlement.

20 3. The Court finds and determines the notice procedure afforded adequate protection to the
21 class and provides the basis for the Court's informed decision regarding approval of the Settlement
22 based 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 \$15,000 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 Torres 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 \$13,000, as its 65% 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).~~

10. Pursuant to the terms of the Settlement and the statutory provisions authorizing attorneys' fees under the California Labor Code and Code of Civil Procedure, as set forth in the Motion for Attorneys' Fees, the Court awards Class Counsel attorneys' fees of \$149,850 and litigation costs of \$14,994.72. Class Counsel has sufficiently explained the basis for the fee award based on a percentage of the fund. The Court finds such amounts to be fair and reasonable. The Court orders the Settlement Administrator to make these payments in accordance with the Settlement.

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

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

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

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

15. The Court sets a status conference on August 21, 2026, at 9:00 a.m., in Department 70 to confirm the completion of the settlement process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 4/29/26

The Honorable Carolyn M. Caietti
Judge of the Superior Court

EXHIBIT 2

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE

TENTATIVE RULINGS - March 26, 2026

HEARING DATE: 03/27/2026 HEARING TIME: 10:30 AM DEPT.: C-70

JUDICIAL OFFICER: LONGSTRETH, ROBERT

CASE NO.:24CU016862C

CASE TITLE: Torres vs First Meridian Home Care Services Inc

CASE TYPE: (U)Other Employment

HEARING TYPE: Motion Hearing

Plaintiff Carmina Torres's unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement is **GRANTED**.

Plaintiff Carmina Torres's unopposed Motion for Attorneys' Fees is **GRANTED**.

This motion seeks final approval of the parties' proposed \$450,000.00 wage and hour class action and PAGA settlement.

The Court granted preliminary approval of the settlement. (ROA – Order After Hearing filed on October 17, 2025; ROA 24.)

The settlement class is certified for purposes of settlement. The class action settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$450,000.00.

Class counsel is awarded \$149,850.00 in attorney fees and \$14,994.72 in litigation costs. Plaintiff's service award of \$10,000.00 is approved. The requested settlement administration fee of \$15,000.00 is also approved.

The class consists of 1,364 class members. Of the notices sent, fourteen remain undeliverable. There were zero objections, no work week disputes, and six requests for exclusion. The Court finds the settlement to be fair, adequate and reasonable. (See, e.g., *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1800-01; Cal. Rules of Ct. rule 3.769(g).) The reasonableness of the settlement is further demonstrated by the fact that there is no opposition or objections and only seven requests to be excluded. The escalation clause was not triggered.

Plaintiff requests \$149,850.00 in attorney fees, which is 33.33% of the gross settlement amount. A percentage method may be used to calculate a reasonable fee in a common fund case such as this. (*Laffitte v. Robert Half Intern. Inc.* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 480, 503.) This is more than the lodestar and results in a 2.44 multiplier, which is reasonable under the circumstances. (ROA 30 – Declaration of Nicholas Ferraro, at ¶ 7.) Class counsel obtained a good result on behalf of a class who 99.56% of which approved the settlement. Counsel bore the entire risk and cost of litigation on a contingency basis. Plaintiff's request for attorney fees is approved.

Plaintiff's request for litigation costs of \$14,994.72 is less than was what agreed to and anticipated and is approved.

The motion asks for \$15,000.00 in settlement administration costs, which is reasonable and supported by the Declaration of Christian Labow (ROA 41.)

Incentive payments to class representatives "must not be disproportionate to the amount of time and energy expended in pursuit of the lawsuit." (*Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1395.) The court must also consider the "risk to the class representative in commencing suit" and any "notoriety and personal difficulties" he or she encounters as a result of the litigation. (*Id.*, at p. 1394.)

Plaintiff invested many hours into this case. Plaintiff's declaration reflects effort assisting with the prosecution of the action. (ROA 31 – Declaration of Carmina Torres.) The incentive payment of \$10,000.00 is reasonable and appropriate to compensate Plaintiff for her efforts.

The Court assessed *Amaro v. Anaheim Arena Management, LLC* (2021) 69 Cal.App.5th 521, 538 and finds the released claims appear to be appropriately tethered to the operative complaint's factual allegations and do not extend beyond the scope of its allegations. (*Amaro*, *supra*.)

The PAGA portion of the settlement in the amount of \$20,000.00 also appears fair, reasonable and adequate in terms of PAGA's purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws. (*Muniz v. Adecco USA, Inc.* (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 56, 77.) Plaintiff previously served notice of the settlement on the LWDA and the preliminary approval motion on the LWDA as well. (Ferraro Decl., at ¶ 5.)

For these reasons, the motion is **GRANTED**.

Concluding Orders

The Court orders Plaintiff to provide a courtesy copy at the motion hearing of the proposed Order granting final approval reflecting the gross settlement amount; descriptions of the settlement class and the PAGA members; and the future status conference.

Plaintiff is ordered submit a proposed judgment.

The Court sets a status conference on August 21, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. in Department 70 to confirm the completion of the settlement process.