1 2 3	BLUMENTHAL NORDREHAUG BHOWMI DE BLOUW LLP Norman B. Blumenthal (State Bar #068687) Kyle R. Nordrehaug (State Bar #205975) Aparajit Bhowmik (State Bar #248066)	FILED Superior Court of California County of Sacramento 06/27/2024 T. Shaddix, Deputy	
4	2255 Calle Clara La Jolla, CA 92037		
5	Telephone: (858)551-1223 Facsimile: (858) 551-1232		
6	Website: www.bamlawca.com		
7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
8			
9			
10			
11	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO		
12			
13			
14 15	JESSICA LOPEZ and CHARONE DESHAZIER, individuals, on behalf of	CASE NO.: <u>34-2022-00327993-CU-OE-GDS</u>	
16	themselves and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,		
17	Plaintiffs,	[PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER	
18	VS.		
19		Hearing Date: _June 14, 2024 Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.	
20	ETHOS-CALIFORNIA VETERINARY GROUP, INC., a California corporation;	Reservation # A-327993-001	
21	ETHOS VETERINARY HEALTH LLC; a Delaware limited liability company; and	Judge: Hon. Jill H. Talley Dept: 23	
22	DOES 1-50, Inclusive,	Date Filed: October 6, 2022	
23	Defendants.	Trial Date: Not set	
24			
25	This matter came before the Honorable Jill H. Talley of the Superior Court of the State of		
26	California, in and for the County Sacramento, on June 14, 2024, for hearing on the unopposed		
27	motion by Plaintiffs Jessica Lopez and Charone DeShazier ("Plaintiffs") for preliminary approval		
28			
	PRELIMINARY A	PPROVAL ORDER	

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

1. The Court preliminarily approves the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement ("Agreement") attached as Exhibit #1 to the Declaration of Kyle Nordrehaug in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement. This is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement set forth in the Agreement is within the range of possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.

of the Settlement with Defendants Ethos-California Veterinary Group, Inc., and Ethos Veterinary

Health LLC ("Defendants"). The Court, having considered the briefs, argument of counsel and all

matters presented to the Court and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' Motion for

- 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.
- 3. The Gross Settlement Amount that Defendants shall pay is One Million Two Hundred Seventy Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$1,270,000.00). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate, and reasonable as to all potential Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that the Settlement will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the Action. It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of serious and non-collusive, arm's-length negotiations.
- 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted as part of the Settlement and

preliminarily finds that the monetary settlement made available to the Class is fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation and the significant risks relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.

- 5. The Agreement specifies for an attorneys' fees award not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount, an award of litigation expenses incurred, not to exceed \$25,000, and proposed Class Representative Service Payments to the Plaintiffs in an amount not more than \$7,500 for Plaintiff DeShazier and \$10,000 for Plaintiff Lopez. The Court will not approve the amounts of attorneys' fees and costs, nor the amount of any service award, until the Final Approval Hearing. Plaintiffs will be required to present evidence supporting these requests, including lodestar, prior to final approval.
- 6. The Court recognizes that Plaintiffs and Defendants stipulate and agree to representative treatment and certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the Class which consists of "all individuals who were employed by any Defendants in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the Class Period." The "Class Period" is October 6, 2018 through February 15, 2024.
- 7. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the Class meets the requirements for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that:

 (a) the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class is impracticable; (b) common questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined community of interest amongst the members of the Class with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the claims of the Plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the members of the Class; (d) the Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class; (e) a class action is superior to other available methods for the efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) counsel for the Class is qualified to act as counsel for the Class and the Plaintiffs are adequate representatives of the Class.

28 ||

- 8. The Court provisionally appoints Plaintiffs as the representatives of the Class. The Court provisionally appoints Norman B. Blumenthal, Kyle R. Nordrehaug, Aparajit Bhowmik, Nicholas J. De Blouw, Jeffrey S. Herman, Sergio J. Puche, and Trevor G. Moran of Blumenthal Nordrehaug Bhowmik De Blouw LLP, Shani O. Zakay of Zakay Law Group, APC, and Jean-Claude Lapuyade of JCL Law Firm, APC as Class Counsel.
- 9. The Agreement provides for a PAGA Penalty out of the Gross Settlement Amount of \$26,000, which shall be allocated \$19,500 to the Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") as the LWDA's 75% share of the settlement of civil penalties paid under this Agreement pursuant to the PAGA and \$6,500 to the Aggrieved Employees. "Aggrieved Employees" are all individuals who were employed by any Defendants in California and classified as a non-exempt employee at any time during the PAGA Period (May 24, 2021 through February 15, 2024). Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (1)(2), the LWDA will be provided notice of the Agreement and these settlement terms. The Court finds these PAGA Penalties to be reasonable.
- Agreement as Exhibit A. The Court finds that the Class Notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, of the Class Members' right to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written opt-out request, and of each member's right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the Class Notice substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the best notice practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of the Class Notice by first class mail pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement. If a Class Notice Packet is returned because of an incorrect address, the Administrator will promptly search for a more current address for the Class Member and re-mail the Class Notice Packet to any new address for the Class Member no later than seven (7) days after the receipt of the undelivered Class Notice.

- 11. The Court hereby appoints Apex Class Action as the Administrator. No later than thirty (30) days after this Order, Defendants will provide the Class Data to the Administrator. The Administrator will perform address updates and verifications as necessary prior to the first mailing. Using best efforts to mail it as soon as possible, and in no event later than fourteen (14) days after receiving the Class Data, the Administrator will mail the Class Notice Packet to all Class Members via first-class regular U.S. Mail to their last known address.
- 12. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded from the Class as provided in the Class Notice by following the instructions for requesting exclusion from the Class that are set forth in the Class Notice. All requests for exclusion must be postmarked or received no later than sixty (60) calendar days after the date of the mailing of the Class Notice ("Response Deadline"). If a Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response Deadline for requests for exclusion will be extended an additional fourteen (14) days. A Request for Exclusion may also be faxed or emailed to the Administrator as indicated in the Class Notice. Any such person who chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Class will not be entitled to any recovery under the Class Settlement and will not be bound by the Class Settlement or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Class Members who have not requested exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement and the Judgment. A request for exclusion may only opt out that particular individual, and any attempt to effect an opt-out of a group, class, or subclass of individuals is not permitted and will be deemed invalid.
- 13. Any Class Member who has not opted out may appear at the final approval hearing and may object or express the Member's views regarding the Settlement and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Class Notice. Class Members will have until the Response Deadline to submit their written objections to the Administrator. Written objections may also be faxed or emailed to the Administrator as indicated in the Class Notice. If a Class Notice Packet is re-mailed, the Response Deadline for written objections will be extended an

additional fourteen (14) days. Alternatively, Class Members may appear at the Final Approval Hearing to make an oral objection.

- 14. A final approval hearing shall be held before this Court on November 1, 2024 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 23 at the Gorden D. Schaber Courthouse of the Sacramento County Superior Court to hear the motion for final approval and the motion for attorneys' fees and costs, and to determine all necessary matters concerning the Settlement, including: whether the proposed settlement of the Action on the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable and should be finally approved by the Court; whether the Final Approval Order and Judgment should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained in the Agreement should be approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class Members; and to finally approve attorneys' fees and costs, service awards, and the fees and expenses of the Administrator. All papers in support of the motion for final approval and for attorneys' fees, costs and service awards shall be filed with the Court and served on all counsel no later than sixteen (16) court days before the hearing and the motion shall be heard at this final approval hearing.
- thereunder shall be construed as a concession or admission by Defendants in any way that the claims asserted have any merit or that this Action was properly brought as a class or representative action, and shall not be used as evidence of, or used against Defendants as, an admission or indication in any way, including with respect to any claim of any liability, wrongdoing, fault or omission by Defendants or with respect to the truth of any allegation asserted by any person. Whether or not the Settlement is finally approved, neither the Settlement, nor any exhibit, document, statement, proceeding or conduct related to the Settlement, nor any reports or accounts thereof, shall in any event be construed as, offered or admitted in evidence as, received as or deemed to be evidence for any purpose adverse to the Defendants, including, but not limited to, evidence of a presumption, concession, indication or admission by Defendants of any liability, fault, wrongdoing, omission, concession or damage.

	ı	l
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		

16. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled or fails to become effective for any reason, this Order shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated, and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement, and expressly reserve their respective rights regarding the prosecution and defense of this Action, including all available defenses and affirmative defenses, and arguments that any claim in the Action could not be certified as a class action and/or managed as a representative action. In such an event, the Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Order, shall not be used or referred to in litigation for any purpose. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to alter the terms of the Agreement with respect to the effect of the Agreement if it is not approved.

17. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final approval hearing and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 06/27/2024

HON. JILL H. TALLEY

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA