

**ENDORSED**

FILED  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF KERN

APR 04 2017

TERRY McNALLY, CLERK  
BY \_\_\_\_\_, DEPUTY

1  
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

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF KERN**

LUIS CALZADILLAS, and TREVIN	)	CASE NO. S-1500-cv-283563
RENFRO individually and on behalf of all	)	
other similarly situated current and former	)	
employees of Defendants,	)	<b>ORDER GRANTING FINAL</b>
	)	<b>APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION</b>
	)	<b>SETTLEMENT</b>
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	Date: April 4, 2016
vs.	)	Time: 8:30 a.m.
	)	Dept.: 4
Innovative Coatings Technology	)	
Corporation and DOES 1 through 50	)	
inclusive,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	

The Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Final Approval Motion") and the Motion for Award of Attorneys' Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses, and Incentive Awards ("Fees, Costs, and Incentive Award Application") came on for hearing on April 4, 2017, at 8:30 a.m., in Department 3 of the above-entitled Court. The Parties appeared through their respective counsel of record.

1 No Class Members have submitted valid requests for exclusion. No class member has  
2 objected. After reviewing all of the pleadings and evidence filed in support of the Final  
3 Approval Motion and the Attorney's Fees, Costs, and Incentive Award Application, and  
4 hearing any oral argument presented, the Court orders as follows:

5 **IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:**

6 1. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the Parties, including all Class  
7 Members, and has subject matter jurisdiction to approve the Settlement.

8 2. The Final Approval Motion and the Attorney's Fees, Costs, and Incentive Award  
9 Application are granted.

10 3. The terms of the Settlement set forth in the fully executed Joint Stipulation of  
11 Settlement and Release to Settle Class Action ("Settlement Agreement") was reached after  
12 arm's-length negotiations between experienced counsel representing the Parties, after thorough  
13 legal and factual investigation. The Settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate, consistent and  
14 in compliance with all applicable requirements of the Cal. Civ. Proc. Code, the California and  
15 United States Constitutions (including the Due Process Clause), the Cal. Rules of Court and  
16 any and all other applicable laws, and in the best interest of each of the Parties and the Class  
17 Members. The Court specifically finds that the Settlement is a fair, reasonable and adequate  
18 resolution of Plaintiffs' claims given the risk and expense, complexity, and duration of further  
19 litigation.

20 4. The Parties and their counsel are ordered to implement and to consummate the  
21 proposed Settlement according to its terms and provisions.

22 5. The terms of the Settlement are binding on all Parties and any and all Class

*Members*

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: April 4, 2017

**SIDNEY P. CHAPIN**  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIDNEY P. CHAPIN  
Superior Court Judge

25  
26  
27  
28