

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ALBERT SIMIC, Plaintiff, on behalf of
himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

KASAMBA, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:24-cv-08887-SK

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND
PRIVATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL
ACT (PAGA) REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION SETTLEMENT**

1 Plaintiff and Defendant Kasamba, Inc. have entered into an agreement to settle
2 the above captioned class action, subject to the Court's approval. Plaintiff filed an
3 unopposed motion for final settlement approval. One Class Member filed an objection,
4 to which Plaintiff has responded. (ECF 60, 62, 62-1). Plaintiff's motion came before
5 the Court for hearing on January 7, 2026, in the District Court for the Central District
6 of California, the Honorable Steve Kim presiding. The Court has reviewed the materials
7 submitted by the parties and the one objector (who did not appear for hearing), and has
8 heard arguments presented by counsel at the hearing.

9 Based upon the pleadings, the submissions of all parties and the objector,
10 declaration of counsel, and the information presented at hearing, the Court finds as
11 follows:

12 Rule 23(a) is satisfied because: (1) the class is so numerous that joinder would be
13 impracticable; (2) there are questions of law and fact common to the class; (3) the named
14 Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class; and (4) Plaintiff and his counsel
15 adequately and fairly represent the interests of the class.

16 Rule 23(b)(3) is satisfied because: (1) questions of law or fact common to Class
17 Members predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and (2) a
18 class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating
19 the controversy.

20 The settlement was entered into in good faith, was the product of serious,
21 informed, non-collusive negotiations, has no obvious deficiencies, and does not
22 improperly grant preferential treatment to any individuals.

23 In making the foregoing findings, the Court has carefully considered the
24 arguments of the lone objector and overrules the objections for the reasons stated on the
25 record at the hearing because none of those arguments undermines the fairness,
26 reasonableness, and adequacy of the Settlement.

27 Accordingly, the Court hereby **approves** the Settlement in full. Specifically:

28 1. For the reasons set forth in the Preliminary Approval Order, which are adopted

1 and incorporated here by reference, this Court finds that the applicable
2 requirements of Rule 23 have been satisfied with respect to the Settlement Class
3 defined in the Settlement Agreement.

- 4 2. The Notice distributed to the Class Members fully and accurately informed the
5 Class Members of all material elements of the proposed settlement and of their
6 opportunity to object, opt out, or comment; was the best notice practicable under
7 the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members;
8 and complied fully with all applicable law and due process under the United
9 States Constitution. The Notice fairly and adequately described the settlement
10 and provided Class Members adequate instructions and a variety of means to
11 obtain additional information. All settlement Class Members who did not timely
12 and properly opt out are bound by this Judgment.
- 13 3. The Court finds that the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and worthy
14 of approval both as to the Class and PAGA, and directs the parties to effectuate
15 the Settlement Agreement.
- 16 4. Without affecting the finality of this matter, this Court shall retain exclusive and
17 continuing jurisdiction over this action and the parties, including all settlement
18 Class Members, for purposes of supervising, administering, implementing,
19 enforcing, and interpreting the settlement and the claims process.

20 * * *

21 The parties are ordered to submit a proposed final judgment consistent with
22 this order and the related order granting the unopposed motion by Class Counsel for
23 attorney's fees and costs.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
26 DATED: January 7, 2026



HON. STEVE KIM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE