1	Kane Moon (SBN 249834)	
2	Allen Feghali (SBN 301080) MOON & YANG, APC	
3	1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880 Los Angeles, California 90017	
4	Telephone: (213) 232-3128 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125	
5	E-mail: kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com E-mail: allen.feghali@moonyanglaw.com	
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff Malu Vaesau	
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
10	MANAGARI II I	G N GGG 10 572500
11	MALU VAESAU, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	
12	Plaintiff,	[Hon. Andrew Y.S. Cheng, Dept. 613]
13		<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
14	VS.	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
15	DOUBLE AA CORPORATION, a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
16	Defendants	
17	Detendants	
18		DDELIMINADY ADDDONAL HEADING
19		PRELIMINARY APPROVAL HEARING Date: TBD Time: TBD
20		Dept. 613
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

The Court has before it Plaintiff Malu Vaesau ("Plaintiff") Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. Having reviewing the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, the Declaration of Kane Moon, the Joint Stipulation re: Class Action Settlement (which is referred to here as the "Settlement Agreement"), and good cause appearing, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows:

- 1. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement appears to be fair, adequate, and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements for preliminary approval. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Settlement Class based upon the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement attached to the Declaration of Kane Moon in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Moon Declaration") as Exhibit 1. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within the range of possible approval, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and applicable law.
- 2. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which could ultimately be given final approval by this Court, and appears to be presumptively valid, subject only to any objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing and final approval by this Court. The Court notes that Defendant has agreed to create a common fund of \$175,000.00 to cover (a) settlement payments to class members who do not validly opt out; (b) Class Representative service payment of up to \$5,000.00 for Plaintiff; (d) Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, not to exceed 33-1/3% of the Gross Settlement Amount (\$58,333.33), and up to \$12,000.00 in costs for actual litigation expenses incurred by Class Counsel; and (e) Settlement Administration Costs of up to \$10,000.00
- 3. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the settlement amount is fair and reasonable to the class members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2) significant informal discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (3) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that would

be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the Parties. Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement Agreement was entered into in good faith.

- 4. A final fairness hearing on the question of whether the proposed settlement, attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, and the class representatives' service payment should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the members of the class is hereby set in accordance with the Implementation Schedule set forth below.
- 5. The Court provisionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class (the "Class" or "Class Members"): "All current and former non-exempt, hourly employees of Defendant employed in California at any time during the who worked in California for Defendant at any time from beginning January 7, 2015 through January 31, 2020, or the date upon which the Court grants preliminary approval, whichever is sooner. Excluded from the Class are all persons who properly and timely elect to opt out.
- 6. The Released Claims are all claims, rights, demands, damages, liabilities and causes of action, whether known or unknown, contingent or vested, in law or in equity, arising at any time during the Settlement Period for unpaid wages, and/or related penalties, interest, costs, attorneys' fees, and/or injunctive or other equitable remedies, allegedly owed or available, against Defendant and its respective former, current and future parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, shareholders, members, agents (including, without limitation, any investment bankers, accountants, insurers, reinsurers, attorneys and any past, present or future officers, directors and employees) predecessors, successors, and assigns, allegedly owed or available, arising out of allegations and operative facts asserted in the operative complaint, or which could have been asserted in the Action based on the alleged facts in the operative complaint, including: (1) failure to provide meal periods; (2) failure to authorize and permit rest breaks; (3) failure to pay minimum and straight time wages; (4) failure to pay overtime compensation; (5) failure to timely pay final wages at termination; (6) all related claims for Unfair Competition or Business Practices under California's Business and Professions Code or

similar laws related to the alleged claims; and (7) failure to provide accurate, itemized wage statements under Labor Code section 226; The release shall include release of California Labor Code, §§ 201-204, 210, 216, 218.6, 510, 512, 516, 558, 1174, 1194, 1198, and derivative claims for unfair business practices under California Business & Professions Code Sections 17200 el seq. and all claims under the Wage Order and Fair Labor Standards Act, the relevant Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission, any and all claims for attorneys' fees and costs, and/or California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.

- 7. The Court finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Class meets the requirements for certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 in that: (1) the Class are so numerous that joinder is impractical; (2) there are questions of law and fact that are common, or of general interest, to all individuals in the Class, which predominate over individual issues; (3) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class; (4) Plaintiff and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class; and (5) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.
- 8. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, Malu Vaesau as Class Representative.
- 9. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, Moon & Yang, APC, as Class Counsel. The Court further preliminary approves Class Counsel's ability to request attorneys' fees of up to one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount (\$58,333.33), and costs not to exceed \$12,000.00.
- 10. The Court appoints ILYM Group, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator with reasonable administration costs estimated not to exceed \$7,355.55.
- 11. The Court approves, as to form and content the Notice Packet, attached as Exhibit A and B to the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that plan for distribution of the Notice to Class Members satisfies due process, provides the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

- 12. The Parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the Agreement.
- 13. Any class member who does not request exclusion from the settlement may object to the Settlement Agreement.
 - 14. The Court orders the following Implementation Schedule:

Defendant to provide Class List to the	Within 15 days after the Court grants
Claims Administrator	preliminary approval
Claims Administrator to mail the Notice	Within 15 days of receipt of Class List
Packets	
Response Deadline	60 days from mailing of Notice Packets
Deadline to file Motion for Final	, 2020
Approval	
Final Approval Hearing	, 2020 atm.
	in Department 613.

- 15. The Court further ORDERS that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in this lawsuit, except those contemplated herein and in the settlement, are stayed.
- 16. The Agreement and the Settlement are preliminarily approved but are not an admission by Defendant of the validity of any claims in this class action, or of any wrongdoing by Defendant or of any violation of law. Neither the Agreement nor any related document shall be offered or received in evidence in any civil, criminal or administrative action or proceeding other than such proceedings as may be necessary to consummate or enforce the Agreement and Settlement. The obligations set forth in the Agreement are deemed part of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE:	
	Andrew Y.S. Cheng,
	Judge of the San Francisco County Superior Court

1	PROOF OF SERVICE	
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss	
4	I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is 1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880, Los	
5	Angeles, CA 90017. On April 28, 2020 , I served the foregoing document described as:	
6	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT	
7		
8	$\frac{X}{\text{as follows:}}$ by placing the original $\frac{X}{\text{as true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelope(s)}}$ addressed	
9	Richard A. Lezanby, Esq. Jeffrey H. Lowenthal, Esq.	
10	Rlazenby@victorrane.com Jlowenthal@steyerlaw.com	
	Geneva A. Collins, Esq. Cody T. Stroman, Esq. Gcollins@ victorrane.com Cstroman@steyerlaw.com	
11	VICTOR RANE STEYER LOWENTHAL BOODROOKAS	
12	101 Montgomery St., suite 2300 ALVAREZ & SMITH LLP San Francisco, CA 90414 235 Pine Street, 15 th Floor	
13	Telephone: 415-365-1810 San Francisco, CA 94104 Fasimile: 415-376-5136	
14	Attorneys for Defendant Double AA Corporation	
15	[] BY U.S. MAIL: I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The	
16	envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that	
17	practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I	
18	am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for	
19	mailing in affidavit.	
20	[] BY PERSONAL DELIVERY: I delivered said document(s) to the office of the addressee shown above under whom it says delivered by personal delivery.	
21	[X] BY Via Court Approved Efiling & Eservice Vendor: FILE & SERVE EXPRESS:	
22	by transmitting via electric service the document(s) listed above to the parties and or email address(es) set forth below.	
23	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the	
24	foregoing is true and correct.	
25	Executed this April 28, 2020 at Los Angeles, California.	
26		
27	Type or Print Name Signature	
28		
	5	

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT