

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
CENTRAL**

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 10/10/2025

TIME: 9:30 AM

DEPT: C-71

JUDICIAL OFFICER: GREGORY W. POLLACK

CLERK: Valeria Contreras

REPORTER/ERM:

BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: D. DiValerio

CASE NO: **25CU003462C** CASE INIT.DATE: 01/21/2025

CASE TITLE: **Hampton vs Mattress Firm Inc**

CASE CATEGORY: Civil CASE TYPE: (U)Other Non-PI/PD/WD Tort

HEARING TYPE: Motion Hearing

MOVING PARTY:

APPEARANCES

Alexander E Wolf, Attorney for Plaintiff Erica Hampton, present via remote video appearance.

Eva Yang, attorney for Mattress Firm Inc, Defendant, present via remote video appearance.

The Court orally advises counsel of its tentative ruling. There is no oral argument by counsel. The Court (1) makes the following Order, (2) enters the date of this hearing for the following Order, and (3) gives Notice of Entry of the following Order:

The Court rules on the motion for final approval of class settlement as follows:

This unopposed motion is granted for the reasons stated below.

The terms of the settlement are as follows: Defendant Mattress Firm, Inc. (Defendant) will pay a gross settlement of \$6,411,000.00 to the class, which includes attorneys' fees and costs, settlement administration costs, and a representative enhancement. (Wolf Dec, ¶¶9.)

There have been no objections or opt outs. (Marra Dec., ¶¶15-16.)

Legal Standard. When faced with a motion for final approval of a class action settlement, a court's inquiry is whether the settlement is "fair, adequate and reasonable." (*Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.* (1996) 48 Cal.App.4th 1794, 1801 fn. 7 (hereafter *Dunk*).) California strongly favors settlements. (*Western Steamship Lines, Inc. v. San Pedro Peninsula Hosp.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 100, 110.)

The presumption of fairness exists where, as here "(1) the settlement is reached through arm's length bargaining; (2) investigation and discovery are sufficient to allow counsel and the court to act intelligently;

(3) counsel is experienced in similar litigation, and (4) the percentage of objectors is small. (*Dunk, supra*, 48 Cal.App.4th at p. 1802.)

The factors that courts routinely consider in reviewing a proposed settlement are: (1) the strength of the plaintiffs' case, (2) the risk, complexity, length, and expense of continued litigation, (3) the risk of maintaining class action status through trial, (4) the amount offered in settlement, (5) the stage of the proceedings and the amount of discovery already undertaken at the time of the settlement, (6) the experience and views of counsel, and (7) the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement. (*7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.* (2000) 85 Cal.App.4th 1135, 1166-1167.)

Here, Plaintiff Erica Hampton (Plaintiff) presented evidence establishing that the settlement is fair and adequate. (Wolf Dec., ¶11.) The parties engaged in arm's length negotiations and investigation. (*Id.*, at ¶¶3-4.) Finally, counsel for Plaintiff is experienced and skilled in class actions. (*Id.*, at ¶¶9-30.)

In addition, Defendant does not oppose the following proposed payments: (1) Class representative payment of \$5,000.00, (2) attorney fees and litigation costs of \$850,000.00, and (3) claims administration costs of \$79,291.00. (Wolf Dec., ¶17; Marra Dec., ¶¶20.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Gregory W. Pollack

Judge Gregory W. Pollack