

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](mailto:nick@ferrarovega.com) / [lauren@ferrarovega.com](mailto:lauren@ferrarovega.com)  
[ricardo@ferrarovega.com](mailto:ricardo@ferrarovega.com)

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

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Luis Cruz*

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

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

QUANTIX SCS, LLC, and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24CU021959C

*Hon. Blaine K. Bowman  
Dept. 74*

**CLASS ACTION**

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

Action Filed: November 12, 2024

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

3 1. On July 17, 2026, at 8:30 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  
13 Dated: July 24, 2026

***Ferraro Vega Employment Lawyers, Inc.***

14 

15 Nicholas J. Ferraro

16 Attorney for Plaintiff Luis Cruz  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# EXHIBIT 1

**F I L E D**  
San Diego Superior Court

JUL 17 2026

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

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

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

Plaintiffs,

vs.

QUANTIX SCS, LLC and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 24CU021959C

*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: July 17, 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 Veronica Olivares, and Declaration of  
Plaintiff Luis Cruz]

Action Filed: November 12, 2024

1 This matter came on for hearing on July 17, 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 Having received and considered the motions and supporting papers, including the Joint  
5 Stipulation of Class and PAGA Representative Action Settlement and Release ("Settlement"), the  
6 evidence and documents received by the Court in connection with the Motions for Final Approval and  
7 Attorneys' Fees and Costs, and the previously decided Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Court  
8 GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL of the Settlement and ORDERS AND MAKES THE FOLLOWING  
9 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. No class members requested exclusion  
19 from the 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 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 Cruz 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).

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 \$94,323.90 and litigation costs  
4 of \$20,413.61. 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: 7-17-26

  
The Honorable Blaine K. Bowman  
Judge of the Superior Court

## EXHIBIT 2

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
CENTRAL COURTHOUSE  
TENTATIVE RULING**

HEARING DATE: 7/17/2026

JUDICIAL OFFICER: BLAINE K. BOWMAN

CASE NO.: 24CU021959C

CASE TITLE: Cruz vs Quantix SCS LLC

---

Plaintiff's motion for final approval of class action settlement and 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." The court also addresses the merits of Plaintiff's motions.

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 Luis Criz. *Cellphone Termination Fee Cases* (2010) 186 Cal.App.4th 1380, 1393. The court finds an award of attorneys' fees of \$94,323.90 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 \$20,413.61 reasonable. See, *Serrano v. Priest* (1977) 20 Cal.3d 25. The court awards Plaintiff attorneys' fees of \$94,323.90 and costs of \$20,413.61. The court finds administrative costs of \$8,500.00 reasonable and approves claims administration costs in this amount. The court approves the PAGA settlement amount of \$20,000.00.00 for Plaintiffs' PAGA claims (\$13,000.00 to be paid to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency and \$7,000.00 to be distributed to the Aggrieved Employees).

The court sets a compliance hearing for February 26, 2027, 2027 at 8:30am. The settlement administrator shall file a final report on or before February 19, 2027. The court signs the order and judgment submitted by Plaintiff.

**Unless the ruling above indicates that an appearance is necessary, parties who wish to submit, who are satisfied with the above tentative ruling, and/or who do not otherwise wish to argue the motion, are encouraged to give notice to the Court and each other of their intention not to appear.**