1	000 00 min 01 min 11 (11100) 0 min 2 10 0		
2			
3	Los Angeles, California 90071 Tel. (424) 278-2335		
4	Fax (424) 278-2339 damion.robinson@diamondmccarthy.com		
5	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Xin Chen and Brian Chiang and the Class and Subclasses		
6	and the Class and Subclasses		
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
8	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES		
9	7		
10	XIN CHEN, an individual; and BRIAN	Case No.: BC 713402	
11	CHIANG, an individual; individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated;	(Related Case No. 19STCV03833)	
12	Plaintiffs,	Assigned for All Purposes to:	
13	VS.	The Hon. Elihu M. Berle, Dept. 6	
14	GHP MANAGEMENT CORPORATION, a	[PROPOSED] FINAL APPROVAL ORDER	
15	California corporation, et al.	Date: December 13, 2023 Time: 9:00 a.m.	
16	Defendants.	Dept.: 6 (Spring Street)	
17		Action Filed: July 13, 2018 Trial Date: None Set	
18		That Date: None Set	
19	Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement came before the Court for		
20	hearing on December 13, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. in Department 6. The Court granted Preliminary		
21	Approval of the Class Action Settlement Agreement (the "Agreement") on September 1, 2023.		
22	Having considered Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval, all objections to the Agreement, the		
23	evidence submitted, and the arguments of all counsel and parties at the hearing, the Court finds good		
24	cause and enters the following Final Approval Order.		
25	I. FINDINGS		
26	This Order incorporates by referen	nce the definitions in the Agreement.	
27	2. After consideration of the terms of	f the Agreement and the evidence submitted, the	
28	proposed settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, and consistent with the requirements of		

4

6 7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

California law, including, without limitation, California Rules of Court, rule 3.769. The settlement was reached after extensive, arms-length and non-collusive negotiations among counsel with the

- 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 stellar results obtained for the class. Using a lodestar crosscheck, the Court finds that counsel's hourly rates and hours are reasonable, and that a multiplier is warranted in this case due to the risk involved and results obtained, as well as the contingent nature of the representation.
- 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 \$10,000 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**:

7. The Agreement and Settlement are approved. Counsel and the Administrator are directed to consummate the settlement as set forth in the Agreement.

1	8. The Proposed Final Judgment is hereby approved and the Court will enter the Final		
2	Judgment herewith.		
3	9. Class Counsel shall receive attorney's fees of \$3,300,000 and cost reimbursement o	f	
4	\$123,487.75 from the settlement fund. The Administrator is also authorized to deduct the fees and		
5	costs of administration, not to exceed \$175,000, from the settlement fund.		
6	10. The Escrow Agent and Administrator are directed to issue and distribute the		
7	settlement fund, including attorney's fees, costs, administration costs, service awards, and class		
8	member payments, as provided in Section 9 of the Agreement. The manner of calculating each		
9	interested party's share of the settlement funds and the method of issuing payment shall be governed		
10	by Section 9 of the Agreement.		
11	11. All future filings in connection with this order and any notice of appeal shall be		
12	served by electronic service pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 1010.6 to avoid delay unless the		
13	filing party obtains leave of Court. Counsel for the parties herein shall be served at the following		
14	email addresses: Plaintiffs (damion.robinson@diamondmccarthy.com and JDParker@gmail.com);		
15	Defendants (jhaas@ecjlaw.com).		
16	12. The Administrator shall, upon request, provide status updates to Class Counsel,		
17	Defendant's counsel, and the Court regarding the status of payment, the rate of acceptance of the		
18	payments, and any efforts to locate members of the Settlement Class whose initial settlement		
19	payments were returned as undeliverable. The Administrator shall further provide those declarations		
20	required by Section 9.11 of the Agreement as required therein.		
21	13. The Court hereby sets a Status Conference re: Settlement Administration for		
22	, 2023 at in Department 6.		
23	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
24	Dated:		
25	The Honorable Elihu M. Berle JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT		
26			
27			
28			
	- 3 -		