

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

THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

SHARON ROZEBOOM, ANTHONY
LAVALLEY, BROOKE ALCANTAR,
MARY BILSKI, MATTHEW BRESLIN,
MICHAEL BRODSKY, KATHY BUCKLEY,
GLENN COHEN, TERESA DOAN, JOAN
DURANTE, CHRISTIAN GAVILANES,
MICHAEL LAGOY, LAURA LAKOWSKI,
THOMAS LOBELLO, KAYODE LOTT,
THOMAS MAIER, JULIUS MALEK, TINA
NESBITT, NELSON ORTEGA, MARK
ROHAN, RODNEY ROSS, TRENT
RUSSELL, SABINA SCHOEN, STEPHEN
SHRADER, KATHLEEN SUCHAN,
ROBERTA SUCHAN, ROBERT TOWNSEL,
DOMINICK VITALE, AND RUTH
WARREN INDIVIDUALLY AND/OR ON
BEHALF OF ALL OTHER similarly situated
individuals,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DIETZ & WATSON, INC.

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:17-cv-01266-RAJ

**~~PROPOSED~~ FINAL ORDER AND
JUDGMENT APPROVING FLSA AND
RULE 23 SETTLEMENT**

The above-titled matter came before this Court upon the Parties' Joint Motion for Final Approval of FLSA and Rule 23 Settlement. Dkt. # 90. The proposed settlement in this case was preliminarily approved by this Court on January 31, 2019. Dkt. # 89. Pursuant to the Court's

1 Preliminary Approval of Settlement Order, the Court conducted a final fairness hearing on May
2 17, 2019. Having considered the arguments of counsel, all applicable law, and any objections
3 properly made to the proposed settlement, and based upon the memoranda, exhibits, and all the
4 files and proceedings herein, the Court makes the following:

5 **ORDER**

6 1. The Court finds that it has personal jurisdiction over all members of the Settlement
7 Class and that it has subject matter jurisdiction over all claims being settled and to approve the
8 Settlement Agreement and all exhibits hereto. This Final Order and Judgment adopts and
9 incorporates the Settlement Agreement, the terms defined therein, and all exhibits thereto.

10 2. The parties' Joint Motion for Final Approval of FLSA and Rule 23 Settlement is
11 **GRANTED.**

12 3. The parties' Settlement Agreement is approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate as
13 to the members of the FLSA Collective and Rule 23 California State Law Settlement Class,
14 consistent and in compliance with all requirements of the law, and in the best interest of each of
15 the parties and the members of the Settlement Class. The relief with respect to the Settlement
16 Class is appropriate, as to the individual members of the Settlement Class and as a whole.

17 4. The Notices of Settlement approved by the Court were disseminated by U.S. Mail
18 and e-mail to the last known address and e-mail address of each of the Plaintiffs and Rule 23
19 settlement class members. The Notices adequately described all of the relevant and necessary
20 aspects of the proposed Settlement, the request for service payments to the Named Plaintiffs, and
21 Class Counsel's motion for an award of attorneys' fees and costs.

22 5. The Court finds that the Notices given to the Settlement Class Members fully
23 complied with Rule 23, were the best notices practicable, were reasonably calculated under the
24 circumstances to apprise members of the Settlement Class of the pendency of the litigation and
25 their rights with respect to the settlement, and satisfied all applicable requirements of constitutional
26 due process and any other applicable requirements under the law.

27 6. The Court directs the parties and their counsel to implement and consummate the
28 Settlement Agreement in accordance with its terms and provisions.

