JS-6

1 FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 2 July 24, 2017 3 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY: VPC DEPUTY 4 5 6 7 8 9 CASE NO.: 2:15-cv-05005-SJO-MRWx JAMES HOROSNY, et al, 10 **CLASS ACTION** 11 Plaintiffs, [PROPOSED] ORDER AND **JUDGMENT:** 12 (1) **CONFIRMING** VS. 13 **CERTIFICATION OF SETTLEMENT CLASS;** 14 (2) GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY OF 15 CALIFORNIA, LLC, et al, OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT (3) APPROVING CLASS 16 Defendants. REPRESENTATIVE 17 **ENHANCMENT PAYMENTS** (4) AWARDING CLASS COUNSEL 18 **FEES AND COSTS** 19 (5) APPROVING SETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATOR FEES 20 (6) ENTERING FINAL JUDGMENT 21 22 Courtroom: 10C (First Street Courthouse) 23 July 24, 2017 Date: Time: 10:00 a.m. 24 Hon. S. James Otero Judge: 25 26 27 28

This matter has come before the Court pursuant to Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Motion for Final Approval") and Plaintiffs' Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Costs of Administration, and Representative Enhancement Payments (ECF Doc. 78) ("Motion for Attorneys' Fee") (collectively, the "Motions").

The Court, having considered the Motion for Final Approval, the Motion for Attorneys' Fees, as well as the accompanying memoranda of points and authorities, declarations of Christopher J. Morosoff, Douglas Caiafa, Lana Lucchesi, as well as the Amended Settlement Agreement between Plaintiffs James Horosny and Jennifer Price ("Plaintiffs") and Defendant Burlington Coat Factory of California, LLC ("Burlington" or "Defendant"), and all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, and it appearing to the Court after considering the papers and the arguments in connection with the Motions, that the Settlement is fair, reasonable and adequate, and that adequate notice of the Settlement has been provided to the Settlement Class in compliance with due process, and that a Judgment approving the Settlement and an Order dismissing the Action based upon the Settlement should be entered;

## NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED:

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over this action and the Parties' Proposed Settlement under 28. U.S.C. §§ 1332(d) and 1453 pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act since the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000 and because of the complete diversity between Plaintiffs and Defendant.
- 2. For the reasons stated in the Order Preliminarily Approving Class Action Settlement and Certifying Settlement Class (ECF Doc. 77) ("Preliminary Approval Order"), the Court finds that the action meets all the requirements for class certification, and it is hereby ordered that the Settlement Class is finally approved and certified as a class for purposes of settlement of this action.
- 3. The Parties' Amended Settlement Agreement ("ASA") (attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration Douglas Caiafa) is granted final approval as it meets the criteria for

10

14 15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

- final settlement approval. The Settlement falls within the range of possible approval as fair, adequate, and reasonable, and appears to be the product of arm'slength and informed negotiation and to treat all Class Members fairly.
- Notice to Class Members of the Settlement as described in the ASA and the 4. Preliminary Approval Order, including the Merchandise Certificate and Postcard Notice, Class Notice, Summary In-Store Notice, Summary Publication Notice, Email Notice and Opt Out Notice (attached as Exhibits A, B, C, E, F and G to the ASA), were sufficient to inform Class Members of the terms of the Settlement; their rights under the Settlement; their rights to object to the Settlement; their right to receive a Merchandise Certificate with a cash option, or elect not to participate in the Settlement; the processes for receiving a Merchandise Certificate with a cash option, electing not to participate in the Settlement, or objecting to the Settlement; and the date and location of the final approval hearing. Therefore, the Court finds and determines that the Notice to Class Members was complete and constitutionally sound, because individual notices were mailed and/or emailed to all Class Members whose identities and addresses are reasonably known to the Parties, and Notice was published in accordance with this Court's Preliminary Approval Order, and such notice was the best notice practicable.
- 5. Class Members were provided with the opportunity to comment on, or object to the Settlement, as well as to elect not to participate in the Settlement. Only 51 Class Members elected to not participate in the Settlement, and no Class Member objected to the Settlement.
- 6. KCC is awarded \$1,137,000 for their services as Settlement Administrator, pursuant to the terms set forth in the ASA.
- 7. Class Representatives James Horosny and Jennifer Price are each awarded the sum of \$5,000 as a Class Representative Payment pursuant to the terms set forth in the ASA.

1 8. Class Counsel is awarded \$927,500, as attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to the 2 terms set forth in the ASA. 3 By means of this Final Order and Judgment, this Court hereby enters Final 9. 4 Judgment in this action, as defined in Rule 54, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 5 10. This action is dismissed with prejudice, each side to bear its own costs and 6 attorneys' fees except as provided by the ASA and this Final Order and Judgment. 7 The Court hereby reserves its exclusive, general and continuing jurisdiction over 11. 8 the ASA as needed or appropriate in order to administer, supervise, implement, 9 interpret or enforce the Settlement in accordance with its terms. 10 11 12 Dated: July 24, 2017 13 Hon. S. JAMES OTERO 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 15 16 17 18 19 JS-6 20 21 FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 22 July 24, 2017 23 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY: VPC DEPUTY 24 25 26 27 28