

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

JS-6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PETER JOHNSON, DONALD  
PETERSON, MICHAEL CURFMAN,  
ANDRE BUTLER, JOE GONZALEZ,  
COLUMBUS GRIGSBY, and  
DERRICK WHITE  
on behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, a public  
entity; LEROY BACA, as Sheriff of  
the County of Los Angeles, and  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, a public  
entity,

Defendants

Case No. CV 08-03515 DDP (SHx)  
Honorable Dean D. Pregerson

**ORDER GRANTING FINAL  
APPROVAL OF CLASS  
SETTLEMENT**

**Date:** March 23, 2015  
**Time:** 10:00 am  
**Judge:** Hon. Dean D. Pregerson  
**Courtroom:** 3

Plaintiffs PETER JOHNSON, DONALD, PETERSON, MICHAEL  
CURFMAN, ANDRE BUTLER, JOE GONZALEZ, COLUMBUS GRIGSBY, and  
DERRICK WHITE, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated  
(collectively "Named Plaintiffs") have filed, and all parties support, a Motion for

1 Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. The Class Settlement Agreement  
2 entered into by all parties is attached as Exhibit 1.

3 Classes in this case have previously been certified under Federal Rule of Civil  
4 Procedure 23(b)(2) and need not be amended for purposes of settlement. On  
5 November 24, 2014, this Court granted preliminary approval to the Class Settlement  
6 Agreement and directed notice of the settlement, its terms, and the applicable  
7 procedure and schedules. A Fairness Hearing was held on March 23, 2015 to  
8 determine whether the Class Settlement Agreement should be granted final approval  
9 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e) as fair, adequate, and reasonable.  
10 Class members were given an opportunity to comment on and object to the Class  
11 Settlement Agreement in writing and at that Fairness hearing.

12 Based on consideration of Plaintiffs' moving papers, the arguments of  
13 counsel, the objections of class members, and the proceedings in this action to date,  
14 the Court hereby finds and concludes that:

- 15 1. The Class Notice distributed to Class Members, pursuant to this Court's  
16 prior order, was accomplished in all material requests and fully met the  
17 requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, due process, and any  
18 other applicable laws.
- 19 2. The Class Settlement Agreement is fair, reasonable, and adequate in all  
20 respects. The Class Settlement Agreement provides meaningful relief and  
21 is reasonable related to the strength of Plaintiffs' and class members'  
22 claims given the risk, expense, complexity, and duration of further  
23 litigation. The Class Settlement Agreement is the result of arms-length  
24 negotiations between experienced counsel representing the interests of the  
25 Plaintiff Class and Defendants, after thorough factual and legal  
26 investigation.

27  
28

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

3. The Court has reviewed and considered the objections of class members and finds that they do not raise concerns that warrant rejecting the Class Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement is a reasonable compromise between the parties, given the risks of further litigation and the harm to the Plaintiff Class.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this litigation and all matters relating thereto, and over the Plaintiffs and Defendants. Venue is proper in the Central District of California.
- 2. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e), this Court grants final approval to the Class Settlement Agreement, incorporates the terms of the Class Settlement Agreement into this order as though fully set forth, and orders all parties to perform all of their obligations thereunder.
- 3. This order and the Class Settlement Agreement are binding against the parties, their successors in office, and their respective officers, agents, and employees, and all others acting in concert with them.
- 4. The Court retains exclusive and continuing jurisdiction over this case, the Named Plaintiffs, the Plaintiff Class, and Defendants for purposes of supervising and resolving issues relating to administration, implementation, and enforcement of the Class Settlement Agreement, its terms, or the enforcement thereof; and fashioning appropriate remedies for any violation of that Class Settlement Agreement, for three years from the effective date of the Settlement Agreement.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: March 24, 2015



The Honorable Dean D. Pregerson  
United States District Judge