

Electronically Received 07/16/2025 09:40 PM

1 Arnold P. Peter (SBN: 120091)
2 apeter@peterlawgroup.com
3 Eyal Farahan (SBN: 314849)
4 efarahan@peterlawgroup.com
5 PETER LAW GROUP
6 270 Coral Circle
7 El Segundo, CA 90245
8 T: (310) 432-0500
9 F: (310) 432-0599

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs KAREN BAGUBE, JACQUELINE CARREON, GENEVA
11 CARTER, RACQUEL CHANELO, MELISSA GLAUDE, KAREN LANG, LIA
12 MCKEOWN, ANGELA POWELL and NINA ORTEZ, individuals, on behalf of
13 themselves and all others similarly situated
14

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

JACQUELINE CARREON, GENEVA
CARTER, RACQUEL CHANELO, MELISSA
GLAUDE, KAREN LANG, and ANGELA
POWELL, individuals, on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,
a division of the State of California, and
DOES 1 through 100,

Defendant.

KAREN BAGUBE, an individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS AND REHABILITATION,
a division of the State of California, and
DOES 1 through 100,

Defendant.

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
07/18/2025
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: A. Rosas Deputy

Case Nos. 19STCV09935
20STCV10154

[PROPOSED]

**JULY 8 HEARING'S ORDER
GRANTING CARREON/BAGUBE
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT; AND
FINAL JUDGMENT THEREON**

**[Exhibit A Filed Concurrently
herewith]**

Judge: The Hon. Elihu M. Berle

The Motion of the Plaintiffs in *Carreon, et al. v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, et al.* (“Carreon”), Case No. 19STCV09935 and *Bagube, et al., v. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, et al.* (“Bagube”), Case No. 20STCV10154, for final approval of the settlement agreement between the Carreon and Bagube Plaintiffs, on the one hand, and Defendant California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), on the other hand (“Settlement Agreement”), came on regularly, as ordered, for hearing before the Court on July 8, 2025 (“Hearing”). Arnold P. Peter and Eyal Farahan, appeared as Class Counsel and Deputy Attorney General Joshua C. Irwin, Office of the Attorney General, appeared on behalf of Defendant CDCR. No objectors appeared at the Hearing. The findings, conclusions and orders set forth in this Order are based on and supported by the transcript of the Hearing filed concurrently herewith as Exhibit A.

The terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and orders of the Court pertinent thereto (including the Court’s prior Order granting preliminary approval of the Settlement Agreement) are referred to collectively as the “Settlement.” On January 17, 2025, the Court entered an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of the Settlement, providing for notice of the Settlement to be given to the settlement class, and setting forth other duties prior to or in connection with the filing of a Motion for Final Approval of the Class Action Settlement (Motion). On or about April 29, 2025, Class Counsel filed that Motion, with supporting papers. CDCR supported the Motion. Subsequently, Class Counsel has filed additional papers in support of that Motion and responded to all objections to the Settlement, as shown in the Court record, and including on June 9, 2025 and June 26, 2025.

Having considered the Notice of Motion and Motion for Final Approval of the Class Action Settlement Agreement and all supporting documents; the objections to

1 the Settlement; the Class Representatives'/Class Counsel's supporting RESPONSE
2 TO OBJECTIONS, FINAL STATUS REPORT AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
3 AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
4 SETTLEMENT; argument of counsel, statements of Class Representatives, all
5 supporting declarations filed in connection thereto, the original Application for
6 Preliminary Approval of the Settlement Agreement and all related filings in support
7 thereof, and all other pleadings and papers on file in this action, the Court makes
8 the following findings and orders. The Court enters this Order pursuant to the
9 Court's authority under California Code of Civil Procedure section 382, California
10 Civil Code section 1781, California Rules of Court 3.766 and 3.769.

11 **1. FINAL APPROVAL GRANTED**

12 The Court grants final approval of the Settlement Agreement between Class
13 Representative/Plaintiffs and Defendant California Department of Corrections
14 and Rehabilitation ("CDCR") as fair, reasonable, and adequate to the
15 Settlement Class. This Order is based on the declarations, the Final Report of
16 the Administrator, and all evidence submitted in support of the Motion. In
17 addition to the written submissions, the Court considered the oral argument
18 of counsel and the presentations from the Class Representatives. The Class
19 Representatives offered meaningful comments on the fairness and adequacy
20 of the Settlement. The supporting evidence supports the Court finding the
21 Settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable, including the following:

- 22 A. The creativity and diligence of Class Counsel and CDCR Counsel has
23 produced a Settlement that provides fair, reasonable and adequate
24 compensation to Class Members, including because the Share value and
25 average awards, as set forth in the Final Report, are consistent with
26 the range of estimated per share value that was set forth in the Notice;
27

- 1 B. The Settlement contains a reasonable and equitable formula for
2 calculating individual shares and allocation of the Net Settlement
3 Amount among the Participating Class Members; and
4 C. The Settlement allowed potential Settlement Class Members to be
5 included in the Settlement and all Participating Class Members to
6 update their pregnancy information with the Settlement Administrator
7 to be as accurate as possible with reasonable effort.

8 The Court finds that appropriate Notice has been provided to the Settlement
9 Class Members and that due process has been satisfied for absent members.

10 In particular:

- 11 A. The Notice provided constitutes the best notice practicable of the
12 Settlement under the circumstances;
13 B. The Notice provided individual notice to all potential and known
14 Settlement Class Members who could be identified through reasonable
15 effort;
16 C. The Notice, as distributed by email and United States mail, and posting
17 in the CDCR's workplaces, and posted on the Settlement website open
18 to the public, provided due and adequate notice of the proceedings and
19 of the matters set forth therein to the absent Settlement Class
20 Members;
21 D. The Notice, as distributed by email and United States mail, and posting
22 in the CDCR's workplaces, and posted on the Settlement website open
23 to the public, provided a reasonable opportunity for Settlement Class
24 Members to request exclusion from the Settlement ("opt-outs"), if
25 desired;
26 E. The Notice, as distributed by email and United States mail, and posting
27 in the CDCR's workplaces, and posted on the Settlement website open
28

1 to the public, provided notice of the mechanism, via the Member's
2 Challenge form, for potential Settlement Class Members to be included
3 in the Settlement and for all Participating Class Members to update
4 their pregnancy information with the Settlement Administrator to be
5 accurate; and

6 F. The Notice, as distributed by email and United States mail, and posting
7 in the CDCR's workplaces, and posted on the Settlement website open
8 to the public, provided notice of the mechanism, via an Objections form,
9 for Participating Class Members to submit any objection to the
10 Settlement for the Court's consideration.

11 Thus, the Notice as provided fully satisfied the requirements of due process,
12 and all Settlement Class Members are subject to the Settlement Agreement, except
13 those who requested exclusion pursuant to the Notice to the Settlement Class, and
14 whose names are set forth below.

15 **2. RULINGS ON OBJECTIONS AND REQUESTS FOR EXCLUSIONS**

16 The Court finds that the Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, for the
17 reasons set forth in the Hearing transcript (see Exhibit A) and including based on
18 the following:

- 19 i. The Settlement's robust notice program resulted in only 21
20 objections and 17 opt-outs by actual Settlement Class Members,
21 following the Administrator's distribution by First Class mail to
22 about 1,100 known Settlement Class Members and about 27,500
23 potential Settlement Class Members (the specifics of which are
24 set forth in the FINAL REPORT AND DECLARATION OF
25 MARY BUTLER, PROVIDING ADMINISTRATOR'S FINAL
26 REPORT IN SUPPORT OF THE COURT GRANTING FINAL
27 FAIRNESS AND APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION

1 SETTLEMENT (“Final Report”) at paragraphs 5 through 9) and
2 distribution of the Notice by email to all current CDCR
3 employees;

4 ii. The objections were considered and overruled for lack of merit.

5 Objectors primarily contested the class period scope, share
6 allocation formulas, and the amount of compensation, none of
7 which rendered the Settlement unfair, including because the
8 objectors received a fair opportunity to exclude themselves;

9 iii. The Court specifically found the registered nurse vs. peace officer
10 allocation distinction in the Settlement’s share allocation formula
11 is justified based on job responsibilities and risk levels for peace
12 officer classifications.

13 The following seventeen (17) people are the Settlement Class Members who
14 have timely requested in writing to be excluded from the Settlement (as set forth in
15 the Final Report at paragraph 8, and in the Request for Exclusion forms received by
16 the Settlement Administrator and lodged with the Court):

- 17 1. Jennifer Cass
- 18 2. Maria A. Corrales
- 19 3. Jessica Lynn Esteves
- 20 4. Julie C. Gillam
- 21 5. Gloria H. Granillo
- 22 6. Damia Howard
- 23 7. Kimberly Ann Kaestner
- 24 8. Merrie M. Koshell
- 25 9. Mai Tuyet Le/Pham
- 26 10. Xiaofang Liu
- 27 11. Maria Del CV Martinez

12. Maria Nona A. Mendoza

13. Tammy Dillard Moijueh

14. Kristina Parsons

15. Shannon J. Siota/Ryan

16. Merie Ann Smith/Gibson

17. Elizabeth P. Wiegand

These 17 individuals are excluded from the Settlement Class Members, will not benefit from the Settlement, and are not bound by the Settlement Agreement or Judgment in this action.

3. CLASS CERTIFICATION FOR SETTLEMENT PURPOSES

The Court confirms the certification of the Settlement Class, as defined in the Settlement Agreement and prior Order Granting Preliminary Approval to Class Action Settlement, for purposes of the Settlement only (“Preliminary Approval Order”), pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and Rule 3.769 of the California Rules of Court. The Parties have complied with the Court’s orders to give notice of the Preliminary Approval Order to all Class Members in accordance with California Rule of Court 3.771(b).

4. CONFIRMATION OF PRIOR APPOINTMENT OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVES

Plaintiffs Karen Bagube, Jacqueline Carreon, Geneva Carter, Racquel Chanelo, Melissa Glaude, Karen Lang, Lia McKeown, Angela Powell, and Nina Orteza are confirmed as Class Representatives.

5. INCENTIVE AWARDS

The Court approves incentive awards in the amount of Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$7,500) to each of the Class Representatives. This amount, reduced from the originally requested amount, reflects the Court’s assessment that although the Class Representatives made commendable contributions—including

1 participating in depositions, hearings, and assisting with legal and factual
2 development—enhancements of incentive awards must remain proportionate. The
3 Court finds \$7,500 reasonable for each representative in light of the time, risk, and
4 personal sacrifices made.

5 **6. CONFIRMATION OF PRIOR APPOINTMENT AND PAYMENT**
6 **APPROVAL TO CLASS COUNSEL**

7 A. Arnold P. Peter and Eyal Farahan of Peter Law Group are confirmed as
8 Class Counsel. The Court finds that:

- 9 i. The quality of representation by Class Counsel was outstanding,
10 particularly given the high complexity and public policy implications
11 of the case.
- 12 ii. The litigation spanned over five years, included four mediations
13 with two retired judges, and required persistent advocacy to achieve
14 substantial monetary and injunctive relief.
- 15 iii. The Settlement includes significant monetary compensation and
16 follows systemic policy reform at CDCR, benefitting about 1,560
17 Participating Class Members, as set forth in the Final Report at
18 paragraphs 12 through 16. The final share value and payments will
19 be amended to reflect the reduced incentive awards and reduced cost
20 award as ordered by the Court at the Hearing, and to include the
21 interest accrued on the Settlement Fund held by the Administrator.
22 Those final amounts to be set forth in an Administrator's
23 declaration regarding the distribution of the Settlement Fund,
24 ordered to be filed no later than January 20, 2026.

25 B. Class Counsel submitted an Application for Award of Attorney Fees
26 and Costs seeking a total award of \$1,683,000 as provided by the Settlement
27 Agreement (one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount of \$5.1 million), and
28

1 consisting of a request for \$1,579,529.63 in attorney fees and \$103,470.37 in
2 costs. The Court has considered all papers filed by Class Counsel in support
3 of the Application and hereby rules as follows:

4 For the reasons set forth herein and as stated at the Hearing, the Court awards the
5 requested attorneys' fees to Class Counsel in the amount of \$1,579,529.63,
6 approximately one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount (the \$5.1 million held in
7 the Settlement Fund). The Court finds this fee fair and reasonable under the
8 percentage-of-the-fund method and supported by a lodestar crosscheck. Class
9 Counsel reported 1,754.2 hours with a lodestar of \$925,200, resulting in a modest
10 multiplier of 1.7, well within the range typically approved in similar matters. The
11 amount of \$1,579,529.63 (total fees) shall be deducted from the Gross Settlement
12 Amount prior to distribution of the Net Settlement Amount to the Participating
13 Class Members.

14 C. Class Counsel requested costs in the amount of \$103,470.37, which are
15 approved, except subject to the following reductions:

- 16 i. Public relations and communications consultant costs: disallowed
17 (\$18,956.68)
- 18 ii. Photography: disallowed (\$450)
- 19 iii. Paralegal fees: disallowed (\$6,050)
- 20 iv. Outside counsel set-off costs: disallowed (\$1,149.50)

21 Accordingly, the net approved costs are as follows: \$103,470.37 (requested) –
22 \$26,606.18 (disallowed) = \$76,864.19.

23 The amount of \$76,864.19 (total approved costs) shall be deducted from the
24 Gross Settlement Amount prior to distribution of the Net Settlement Amount to the
25 Participating Class Members.

1 accompanying Judgment, fully, finally and forever released, relinquished, and
2 discharged Defendant CDCR from all claims as provided by the terms of the
3 approved Settlement Agreement. Upon entry of this Order, all Settlement Class
4 Members shall be and are hereby permanently barred and enjoined from the
5 institution or prosecution of any and all of the claims released under the terms of the
6 Settlement Agreement.

7 **10. APPEALABLE JUDGMENT**

8 By entering this Order granting final approval of the Settlement, the Court
9 intends this to be a final Order and Judgment thereon. This Order and Judgment is
10 intended to be a final disposition of the above captioned actions in their entirety, and
11 intended to be immediately appealable. Class Counsel to give notice by having this
12 Order and Judgment posted forthwith to the Settlement website.

13 **11. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE COMPLIANCE AND FINAL FILINGS**

14 The Court sets an Order to Show Cause (OSC) regarding compliance with the
15 Order and Judgment for February 2, 2026, at 8:30 a.m. Class Counsel shall file a
16 declaration from the Settlement Administrator addressing the distribution of
17 settlement funds, and a final compliance report, no later than January 20, 2026.

18 **12. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION**

19 Pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6, this Court shall
20 retain jurisdiction with respect to all matters related to the administration and
21 consummation of the Settlement, and any and all claims, asserted in, arising out of,
22 or related to the subject matter of the lawsuit, including but not limited to all
23 matters related to the settlement and the determination of all controversies relating
24 thereto.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS SO ORDERED, AND JUDGMENT IN THE
CARREON AND BAGUBE MATTERS ARE HEREBY ENTERED THEREON.

Date: _____ Feb, 2025



Elihu M. Berle

Elihu M. Berle / Judge

THE HONORABLE ELIHU M. BERLE
Judge of the Superior Court

1 APPROVED AS TO CONTENT AND FORMAT

2 Dated: July 16, 2025

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
KELSEY LINNETT
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

3
4
5 /s/ Joshua C. Irwin

6 JOSHUA C. IRWIN
7 Deputy Attorney General
8 Attorneys for Defendant California
9 Department of Corrections and
10 Rehabilitation

11 Dated: July 16, 2025

PETER LAW GROUP

12 /s/ Arnold P. Peter

13 ARNOLD PETER
14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs JACQUELINE
15 CARREON, GENEVA CARTER,
16 RACQUEL CHANELO, MELISSA
GLAUDE, KAREN LANG, NINA
ORTIZ and ANGELA POWELL

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 *Carreon, et al. v. California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation – Case*
3 *Number: 19STCV09935*

4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES:

5 I am employed in the county of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the
6 age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 270 Coral
7 Circle, El Segundo, California 90245.

8 On July 16, 2025, I served the foregoing document(s) described as

9 **[PROPOSED] JULY 8 HEARING'S ORDER GRANTING**
10 **CARREON/BAGUBE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF**
11 **CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT; AND FINAL JUDGMENT THEREON**

12 on the interested parties in this action by submitting a true and correct copy of an
13 electronic version of the document(s) via the CaseAnywhere portal at
14 www.caseanywhere.com. Service will be deemed effective as provided for in the
15 Electronic Case Management Order.

16 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
17 that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 16, 2025, at El Segundo,
18 California.

19 /s/ Andrea Ramirez

20 _____
21 Andrea Ramirez
22
23
24
25
26
27
28