1 2 3 4	Damion D. D. Robinson, State Bar No. 262573 DIAMOND McCARTHY LLP 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2450 Los Angeles, California 90071 Tel. (424) 278-2335 Fax (424) 278-2339 damion.robinson@diamondmccarthy.com	FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles 06/14/2024 David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court By: M. Fregoso Deputy
5 6	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Xin Chen and Brian Chia and the Class and Subclasses	Dy Dupary
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
8 9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
10		
11	XIN CHEN, an individual; and BRIAN CHIANG, an individual; individually and on	Case No.: BC 713402
12	behalf of all others similarly situated;	(Consolidated Case No. 19 STCV 03883)
13	Plaintiffs,	Assigned for All Purposes to: The Hon. Elihu M. Berle, Dept. 6
14	VS.	[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER
15	GHP MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, a California corporation, <i>et al</i> .	Date: May 29, 2024
16	Defendants.	Time: 9:00 a.m. Dept.: 6 (Spring Street)
17		Action Filed: July 13, 2018 Trial Date: None Set
18		
19	Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement came before the Court for	
20	hearing on May 29, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 6. The Court granted Preliminary Approval of	
21	the Class Action Settlement Agreement (the "Agreement") on September 1, 2023.	
22	Having considered Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval, finding no objections to the	
23	Agreement, the evidence submitted, and the arguments of all counsel and parties at the hearing, the	
24	Court finds good cause and enters the following Final Approval Order.	
25	I. FINDINGS	
26	1. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement.	
27	2. After consideration of the terms of the Agreement and the evidence submitted, the	
28	proposed settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and consistent with the requirements of	

- 3. The Class Notice provided to members of the Settlement Class was the best practicable notice under the circumstances, and meets the requirements of California law, including California Rules of Court, rule 3.769. The Court finds that the Class Notice constituted due, adequate, and sufficient notice, consistent with due process of law.
- 4. The attorney's fees requested by counsel for Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class ("Class Counsel") are fair and reasonable. The Court has considered Class Counsel's fee request under a common fund method with a lodestar cross-check and is fully familiar with the history of this litigation, the extensive work performed, and the risks and complexity of the case. The Court is also familiar with the market for legal services in the Los Angeles area and the rates charged by counsel in similar cases. The Court finds that a total fee of \$3,300,000, reflecting 33% of the common fund recovery is reasonable and appropriate in this case in light of the length and complexity of the litigation and the excellent results obtained for the class. Using a lodestar cross-check, the Court finds that counsel's hourly rates and hours are reasonable, and that a multiplier of 1.975 is warranted in this case due to the risk involved and results obtained, as well as the contingent nature of the representation.
- 5. The costs incurred by counsel in the amount of \$123,487.75 are reasonable and appropriate in light of the nature and scope of this litigation.
- 6. The Court finds that the service awards of \$7,500 to each named Plaintiff are fair, reasonable, and appropriate. The named Plaintiffs responded to multiple rounds of significant written discovery, assisted counsel in strategy and settlement discussions, attended mediation, and sat for depositions.

II. ORDER

In light of the foregoing, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**:

13. The Court hereby sets an Order to Show Cause re: Settlement Administration for January 13, 2025 at 8:30 AM in Department 6. Parties are directed to file a Joint Report setting forth evidence of distribution with declaration from the Class Administrator no later than January 6, 2025.

26

27

28

IT IS SO ORDERED. Elihu M. Berle Dated: Î 🖺 🗓 The Honorable Elihu M. Berle JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT Elihu M. Berle / Judge

1	PROOF OF SERVICE		
2	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 355 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2450, Los Angeles, CA 90071.		
4	On June 10, 2024, I served the following documents:		
5	[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER		
6	on interested parties in this action by electronic service as described below.		
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Counsel for Defendants GHP Management Corporation, et al. Robert M. Waxman Jason L. Haas Ervin Cohen & Jessup LLP 9401 Wilshire Blvd., Ninth Floor Beverly Hills, CA 90212-2974 Tel. (310) 273-6333 rwaxman@ecjlaw.com; jhaas@ecjlaw.com; Counsel for Plaintiff Kierney Waldron Jimmie Davis Parker, SBN 252023 Law Office of Jimmie Davis Parker 4241 Arden Way San Diego, CA 92103 Tel. (619) 887-3300 JDParker@gmail.com BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Pursual Court's Order directing service via CaseAnywh at the notification addresses listed above using the	Counsel for Defendants GHP Management Corporation, et al. Robert A. Latham III Frances O'Meara Wood, Smith, Henning & Berman LLP 10960 Wilshire Blvd., 18th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90024 rlatham@wshblaw.com; fomeara@wshblaw.com Richard Scott Lysle Law Office of Richard Scott Lysle 475 Washington Blvd., Suite 200 Marina del Rey, CA 90292 Tel. (310) 822-6023 Lyslelaw@yahoo.com Int to Code of Civil Procedure § 1010.6 and the ere, I caused the documents to be sent to the person the CaseAnywhere electronic service platform. The laws of the State of California that the	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	- 5 -		

[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER