Miguel Chavez v.	Shamrock Foods Company et al			Doc. 48
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10			10.0	
11			JS-6	
12				
13	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES			
14	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
15		ī		
16	MIGUEL CHAVEZ, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	Case No	. 5:17-cv-00731-SVW-AFM	
17	Plaintiff,		AND FINAL JUDGMENT	
18	V.		TING FINAL APPROVAL OF ACTION SETTLEMENT	7
19				
20	SHAMROCK FOODS COMPANY, an Arizona Corporation, and DOES 1 to	Date:	April 9, 2018	
21	10,	Time:	1:30 p.m.	
22	Defendant.	Judge: Dept.:	Hon. Stephen V. Wilson 10A	
23		Z op en		
24		J		
25				
26	///			
27	///			
28	///			
	ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPRO	· 1 - VAL OF CLAS	S ACTION SETTLEMENT	
		,		
			Dockets.Ju	ıstıq.com

The Court, having considered Plaintiff Miguel Chavez's ("Plaintiff") unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement between Plaintiff and Defendant Shamrock Foods Company ("Defendant"), ¹ and Plaintiff's Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs [Dkt. No. 41], and good cause appearing therefore, hereby **GRANTS** final approval of the parties' Class Action Settlement Agreement (the "Settlement")² as set forth below and **ORDERS AND MAKES THE**

FOLLOWING FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS:

- 1. The Court has personal jurisdiction over all Class Members and Defendant, and the Court has subject matter jurisdiction to approve the Settlement (including all Exhibits thereto).
- 2. The Settlement, including the definitions applicable to the Settlement, is incorporated by reference into this Order. All terms used in this Order, unless otherwise defined, shall have the same meanings given those terms in the Settlement.
- 3. The Court finds that the Settlement was reached after arm's-length negotiations between the Parties, including an all-day mediation session; the proposed Settlement was concluded only after counsel for the Parties had conducted adequate discovery and investigation; and the Settlement of this action, as embodied in the terms of the Settlement, is finally approved as fair, reasonable, adequate and consistent and in compliance with all applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and any other applicable law, and in the best interests of the Parties and the Class Members.
- 4. For the purpose of settlement, the Court finally certifies the following "Class":

All persons who have been employed by Defendant in California as Account Executives, Outside Sales Representatives and/or in similar sales job capacity and who received a flat rate reimbursement for

¹ Plaintiff and Defendant are collectively referred to as the "Parties."

The Settlement is in the Court's record as Exhibit 1 to Dkt. No. 29-1.

automobile-related business expenses, in an amount less than \$800 per month, at any time between March 13, 2013 through December 31, 2018 (the "Class Period").

- 5. The above Class, consisting of 111 Class Members, is certified for settlement purposes only, and the certification should not be construed as an admission by Defendant with respect to any of the allegations made against it by or on behalf of the members of the Class.
 - 6. The Court appoints Plaintiff Miguel Chavez as the Class Representative.
- 7. The Court appoints Craig J. Ackermann and Avi Kreitenberg of Ackermann & Tilajef, P.C., and Jonathan Melmed of Melmed Law Group P.C. as counsel for the Class (collectively, "Class Counsel").
- 8. The Court previously appointed CPT Group, Inc. as the Settlement Administrator.
 - 9. The Court finds that:
- a. the above-described Class contains members so numerous that the joinder of all of them is impracticable;
 - b. there are questions of law or fact common to the Class;
- c. the claims of the Plaintiff are typical of the claims of the Class that Plaintiff seeks to represent; and
- d. the Plaintiff and Class Counsel have fairly and adequately protected the interests of the Class.
- 10. The Parties and their counsel are ordered to implement and to consummate the Settlement according to its terms and provisions.
- 11. The Notice and the notice methodology implemented pursuant to the Settlement (i) constituted the best practicable notice; (ii) constituted notice that was reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of this action, their right to object to or exclude themselves from the proposed Settlement and their right to appear at the Final Settlement Hearing; (iii) was

- 12. The terms of the Settlement and this Order and Final Judgment are binding on Plaintiff and all other Class Members, as well as their heirs, executors and administrators, successors and assigns, and those terms shall have *res judicata*, collateral estoppel and all other preclusive effect in all pending and future claims, lawsuits or other proceedings (governmental, administrative, regulatory or otherwise), including all forms of alternative dispute resolution, maintained by or on behalf of any such persons, to the extent those claims, lawsuits or other proceedings involve matters that have been raised in this Action as provided by the Settlement. No Class Members timely excluded themselves from the Class, so all are bound by the Release of Defendant and the other released parties set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
- 13. In accordance with the Settlement, as of the Effective Date (as defined in the Settlement), Plaintiff and all Settlement Class Members are deemed to have conclusively released Defendant and all affiliated and related parties and entities (including all former and present parents, subsidiaries, brother/sister corporations, and affiliates, predecessors, owners, members, successors, shareholders, divisions, and each of these parties' and entities' respective past and present officers, directors, employees, partners, members, shareholders, insurers, agents, attorneys, and any other successors, assigns, or legal representatives, from all federal, state and local law claims, rights, demands, liabilities, and causes of action, whether known or unknown, arising from, or related to, the allegations that were made or reasonably could have

7

11

9

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

23

24 25

26

27

28

been made based on the facts alleged in the operative Complaint in this Action, for the period from March 13, 2013 through December 31, 2017.

- 14. The Parties are authorized, without further approval from the Court, to agree to and to adopt such amendments, modifications and expansions of the Settlement and all exhibits attached thereto which (i) are consistent with this Final Judgment, and (ii) do not limit the rights of Class Members under the Settlement.
- 15. The Court grants a Class Representative Service award of \$7,500 to the Plaintiff. This request is justified in light of the fact that, among other things, Plaintiff spent numerous hours conferring with Class Counsel, reviewing documents, gathering evidence, responded to discovery, sat for a deposition, attended an all-day mediation, entered into a general release, Plaintiff's efforts resulted in a favorable result for the Class, and Defendant did not oppose the request. The Class Representative Service award will be paid to Plaintiff in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.
- 16. The Court grants Plaintiff's and Class Counsel's request for an award of Attorneys' Fees in the amount of \$87,500.00 and costs in the amount of \$20,000.00. The request attorneys' fees are justified in light of, among other things, the following facts: (1) Class Counsel vigorously prosecuted this case and achieved a favorable result for the Class; (2) the legal issues were somewhat complex; (3) Defendant did not oppose the request; and (4) the request is reasonable and consistent with the Ninth Circuit's 25% benchmark and to Class Counsel's actual lodestar time expended. The award is granted, and the attorneys' fees and costs shall be paid by Defendant to Class Counsel in accordance with the terms of the Settlement.
- 17. The \$8,750 designated for payment to CPT Group, Inc., the Settlement Administrator, is fair and reasonable. The Court grants final approval of, and orders the Parties to make the payment to the Settlement Administrator in accordance with the Settlement.
- 18. The Court approves the allocation of \$5,000 of the Settlement as payment for penalties under the California Labor Code Private Attorney Generals Act