ACTION SETTLEMENT

1	ERIC B. KINGSLEY, Bar No. 185123 eric@kingsleykingsley.com LIANE KATZENSTEIN LY, Bar No. 259230		
2	liane@kingsleykingsley.com KINGSLEY & KINGSLEY, APC	259230	
3	16133 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 1200		
5	Encino, CA 91436 Telephone: (818) 990-8300 Facsimile: (818) 990-2903		
6 7	JOSHUA M. DAVID (<i>Admitted Pro H</i> jdavid@davidkampfrank.com NICHOLAS A. NUNES (<i>Admitted Pro</i> nanunes@davidkampfrank.com	itted Pro Hac Vice)	
9	DAVID, KAMP & FRANK, L.L.C. 739 Thimble Shoals Boulevard, Suite Newport News, VA 23606 Telephone: (757) 595-4500	105	
10	Facsimile: (757) 595-6723		
11	NICHOLAS SELBE, DANIEL GHYCZY, MAKAELA O'CONNELL, and ANNIYA LOUIS, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly		
12			
13			
14	Counsel Continued on Next Page		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17	NICHOLAS SELBE, DANIEL Case No. 3:14-cv-3238-MMC		
18	GHYCZY, MAKAELA O'CONNELL, and ANNIYA	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING:	
19	LOUIS on behalf of themselves and others similarly situated,	(1) MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND COLLECTIVE	
20	Plaintiffs,	ACTION SETTLEMENT; AND (2) PLAINTIFFS' AND CLASS	
21	V.	COUNSEL'S MOTION FOR AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES, LITIGATION	
2223	PEAK CAMPUS MANAGEMENT, LLC,	COSTS, AND ENHANCEMENT AWARDS	
24	Defendant.		
25			
26			
27			
28			
20	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND COLLECTIVE	Case No. 3:14-cv-3238-MMC	

1		
2	Continued From Previous Page:	
3	ELIZABETH STAGGS WILSON, Bar No. 183160 estaggs-wilson@littler.com	
4	LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C. 633 West 5th Street, 63rd Floor	
5	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: (213) 443-4300 Facsimile: (213) 443-4299	
6	Facsimile: (213) 443-4299	
7	SHANNON R. BOYCE, Bar No. 229041 sboyce@littler.com FATEMEH MASHOUF, Bar No. 288667	
8	tmashouf@littler.com LITTLER MENDELSON, P.C.	
10	2049 Century Park East, 5th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90067	
11	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (310) 712-7304 Facsimile: (310) 553-5583	
12	Attorneys for Defendant PEAK CAMPUS MANAGEMENT, LLC	
13	TEAR CAMITOS MANAGEMENT, LLC	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND COLLECTIVE Case No. 3:14-cv-3238-MMC	

ACTION SETTLEMENT

ORDER

Plaintiff's unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class and Collective Action Settlement and Plaintiffs' and Class Counsel's Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Litigation Costs, and Enhancement Awards (the "Motions") came on regularly for hearing on April 29, 2016, at 9:00 a.m., in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, the Honorable Maxine M. Chesney presiding. All parties were represented by counsel.

Having considered the memoranda and declarations, oral arguments of counsel, and the relevant statutory and case law, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's and Class Counsels' Motions and orders and finds as follows:

- 1. The Court FINDS that no member of the Rule 23 class or the FLSA collective action has objected to the settlement.
- 2. The Court FINDS that the settlement is fair and reasonable, and, therefore, the Motion for Final Approval of Class and Collective Action Settlement is GRANTED.
- 2. The Parties' proposed Stipulated Settlement Agreement of Class Action Claims (the "Settlement"), which the Court preliminarily approved with certain modifications as set forth in the Order Regarding Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Collective Action Settlement (ECF No. 108), is APPROVED as so modified.
- 3. The following Class and Collective Action is finally certified for settlement purposes only pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23 and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b):

All persons who have submitted a "Consent to Join Collective Action" in the instant Lawsuit prior to June 1, 2015 ("Opt-In Class Members") and all individuals employed in the State of California between January 1, 2011 and August 1, 2014 who were employed in any of the following "Covered Positions": All Star; Community Advisor;

Community Assistant; Leasing All-Star; Work for Rent Leasing All-Star; or any combination thereof ("California Class Members") (collectively, "Class Members").

- 4. The appointment of Plaintiffs' attorneys, Joshua M. David of David, Kamp & Frank, L.L.C. and Eric B. Kingsley of Kingsley & Kingsley, APC as Class Counsel is confirmed.
- 5. The appointment of Nicholas Selbe, Daniel Ghyczy, Makaela O'Connell, and Anniya Louis as Class Representatives is confirmed.
- 6. The appointment of Simpluris as the Settlement Administrator is confirmed.
- 7. Under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(h) and 54(d) and Section 216 of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have moved for an award of attorneys' fees, enhancement awards, and litigation costs.
- 8. This class action and collective action settlement resolves a wage-and-hour dispute on a class-wide basis.
- 9. The Court's December 30, 2015 Order granted preliminary approval of the Settlement, pursuant to which Plaintiffs and Class Counsel requested payment from the Settlement Amount of attorneys' fees of thirty percent (30%) of the Settlement Amount, equating to \$240,000.00, litigation costs of \$24,473.43, and enhancement awards for the Class Representatives totaling \$24,000.00 to be allocated \$8,000.00, \$8,000.00, \$4,000.00, and \$4,000.00, respectively.
- 10. Rule 23(h) provides that, "[i]n a certified class action, the court may award reasonable attorney's fees and nontaxable costs that are authorized by . . . the parties' agreement." The Rule further provides that "[a] claim for an award must be made by motion under Rule 54(d)(2)," notice of which must be "directed to class members in a reasonable manner" and that the Court "must find the facts and state its

and content, including, in relevant part, "the grounds entitling the movant to the award" and "the amount sought." Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2)(B).

11. All Class Members were advised of Class Counsel's request for an award

Rule 54(d)(2) requires a claim for fees to be made by motion, and specifies its timing

- 11. All Class Members were advised of Class Counsel's request for an award of fees and costs in the Court-approved Class Settlement Notices. As directed by the Court, on February 9, 2016, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel filed a separate Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Litigation Costs, and Enhancement Awards (ECF No. 110). In the Class Settlement Notices, all Class Members were advised how to obtain a copy of the Motion either from PACER or the Settlement Administrator's website where the Motion is readily available.
- 12. When "the settlement produces a common fund for the benefit of the entire class, courts have discretion to employ either the lodestar method or the percentage-of-recovery method" of calculating attorneys' fees awards. *In Re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 654 F.3d 935, 942 (9th Cir. 2011).
- 13. Under the percentage-of-the-fund method, it is appropriate to base the percentage calculation on the gross settlement amount. *See generally Boeing v. Gemert*, 444 U.S. 472, 479 (1980); *Williams v. MGM-Pathe Commc'ns Co.*, 129 F.3d 1026, 1027 (9th Cir. 1997).
- 14. The Court adopts the percentage-of-the-fund approach here and finds that the attorneys' fees and litigation costs requested are reasonable. The fee award of thirty percent (30%) of the fund is within the range of reasonable percentage fee awards in this Circuit. *Six* (6) *Mexican Workers v. Arizona Citrus Growers*, 904 F.2d 1301, 1311 (9th Cir. 1990) (stating that the Ninth Circuit has historically considered twenty-five percent of the common fund a "benchmark" figure for attorneys' fee awards); *Knight v. Red Door Salons, Inc.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11149, at *17, 2009 WL 248367 (N.D. Cal. 2009) (stating the exact percentage varies depending on the

benchmark."); *Paul, Johnson, Alston & Hunt v. Graulty*, 886 F.2d 268, 272 (9th Cir. 1989) ("Ordinarily, however, such fee awards range from 20 percent to 30 percent of the fund created.").

- 15. A lodestar cross-check reveals that the attorneys' fees requested, 30% of the common fund amount, equating to \$240,000.00, is substantially less than the lodestar amount of \$449,195.00. The Court finds that Class Counsel's hours and hourly rates are reasonable, thus, the requested fee award results in a "negative multiplier" and the lodestar cross-check supports a finding that the requested percentage of the fund, 30%, is both fair and reasonable.
- 16. Litigation costs are routinely awarded in addition to attorneys' fees. *See Harris v. Marhoefer*, 24 F.3d 16, 19 (9th Cir. 1994); *Odrick v. UnionBanCal Corp.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 171413, at *17, 2012 WL 6019495 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2012); *Knight v. Red Door Salons, Inc.*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11149, at *20 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 2, 2009). Class Counsel have advanced all costs incurred in this case and request reimbursement from the common settlement fund in the total amount of \$24,473.43, including \$23,223.43 in costs incurred and \$1,250 in anticipated costs. Class Counsel has provided a detailed itemization of these costs, and the Court FINDS that these costs are reasonable.
- 17. The Court has the discretion to award enhancement awards, or incentive fees, to named class representatives in a class action suit. *Van Vranken v. Atl. Richfield Co.*, 901 F.Supp. 294, 299 (N.D. Cal. 1995). The Court FINDS that enhancement awards to the Class Representatives in this case are justified.
- 18. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' and Class Counsel's Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Litigation Costs, and Enhancement Awards is GRANTED. Class Counsel is awarded a fee of thirty percent (30%) of the Settlement Amount, equating to \$240,000.00, and litigation costs of \$24,473.43. The Class Representatives are awarded total Enhancement Awards of \$24,000.00, to be allocated \$8,000.00 each to ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

 Case No. 3:14-cv-3238-MMC SETTLEMENT