THE HONORABLE LEROY MCCULLOUGH 1 Department 32 Noted for Hearing: July 14, 2023 2 With Oral Argument 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON 9 **COUNTY OF KING** 10 PCA ACQUISITIONS V, LLC, NO. 22-2-08801-0 SEA 11 Plaintiff, [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL 12 APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND V. 13 JUDGMENT TERI R KIMMONSSTRUCK, AND DOES 1-10, 14 15 Defendant. 16 and 17 TERI R. KIMMONS-STRUCK, 18 Counter-Plaintiff, 19 20 ٧. 21 PCA ACQUISITIONS V, LLC, 22 Counter-Defendant, 23 and 24 LIPPMAN RECUPERO, LLC, 25 26 Third-Party Defendant. 27

ORIGINAL

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AND JUDGMENT - 1 Case No. 22-2-08801-0 SEA

TERRELL MARSHALL LAW GROUP PLLC 936 North 34th Street, Suite 300 Seattle, Washington 98103-8869 TEL. 206.816.6603 • FAX 206.319.5450 www.terrellmarshall.com

The Court, having considered Counter-Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement between Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff Terri Kimmons-Struck and Counter-Defendant PCA Acquisitions V, LLC ("PCA") and Third-Party Defendant Lippman Recupero, LLC ("Lippman"), in the above-captioned matter (the "Action"), the Class Action Settlement Agreement and Release entered into between Plaintiffs and Defendant ("Settlement"), and the lack of objections received regarding the proposed Settlement, the record in this Action, the submissions and arguments presented by counsel, and, having held a Final Approval Hearing on Friday, July 14, 2023, finds that:

- 1. Unless defined herein, all capitalized terms in this Final Approval Order shall have the same meanings as set forth in the Settlement.
- 2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Action and over the settling parties, including the Settlement Class Members.
- 3. On April 4, 2023, the Court preliminarily approved the Settlement and granted preliminary certification of the Class as defined in the Settlement (Sub. No. 17).
- 4. Pursuant to the Court's preliminary approval order, Class Counsel distributed Notice to the Class by First Class mail. Class Counsel also established a Settlement Website providing information about the Settlement and important case documents. The Court hereby finds and concludes that the Notice was disseminated to members of the Class Members in accordance with the terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement and in compliance with the Court's preliminary approval order. The Court further finds and concludes that the Notice Plan fully satisfied CR 23(c)(2) and the requirements of due process, was the best notice practicable under the circumstances, provided individual notice to all Class Members who could be identified through reasonable effort, provided an opportunity for the Class Members to object or exclude themselves from the Settlement, and supports the Court's exercise of jurisdiction over the Class Members as contemplated in the Settlement and this Final Approval Order.
- 5. The Settlement Class Members were given an opportunity to object to the Settlement. No Settlement Class Members objected to the Settlement.

- 6. Class Members were given the opportunity to exclude themselves from the Settlement. No Class Members requested exclusion from the Settlement.
- 7. The Settlement was the result of arms-length negotiations conducted in good faith by experienced attorneys familiar with the legal and factual issues of this case.
- 8. The consideration provided by the Settlement constitutes fair value given in exchange for the release of the Settlement Class Members' Released Claims against the Released Parties. The Court finds that the consideration provided to the Settlement Class Members is reasonable, considering the facts and circumstances of the claims and defenses asserted in the action, and the potential risks and likelihood of success of pursuing trial on the merits.

## IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED THAT:

- 9. The Settlement is finally approved as fair, reasonable, adequate, just, and in compliance with all requirements of the applicable laws, and in the best interest of the Settlement Class Members. The Settlement Agreement, which shall be deemed incorporated herein, and all terms the Settlement are finally approved and shall be consummated in accordance with the terms and provisions thereof, except as amended by any subsequent order issued by the Court.
- 10. Pursuant to CR 23(b)(3), the Action is hereby certified, for settlement purposes only, as a class action on behalf of the following Class:

All persons (1) from whom Lippman on behalf of PCA collected or attempted to collect, directly or indirectly, at any time since May 20, 2018 on a claim underlying a lawsuit initiated in a Washington state court prior to March 3, 2022, or (2) to whom Lippman sent a letter at a Washington address at any time from May 20, 2021 to March 3, 2022 attempting to collect, directly or indirectly, on an alleged claim on behalf of PCA.

11. For settlement purposes only, the Court finds that the Action satisfies the applicable prerequisites for class action treatment under CR 23(a) and (b)(3).

- 12. The numerosity requirement is satisfied because there are 92 Class Members. See CR 23(a)(1); Miller v. Farmer Bros. Co., 115 Wn. App. 815, 821, 64 P.3d 49 (2003).
- 13. The commonality requirement is satisfied because there are overarching questions of law and fact common to the Class, including whether PCA and Lippman Recupero's collection practices were unfair or deceptive under the CPA. *See Smith v. Behr Process Corp.*, 113 Wn. App. 306, 320, 54 P.3d 665 (2002).
- 14. The typicality requirement is satisfied because Ms. Kimmons-Struck's daims arise from the same course of conduct that gives rise to the claims of other Class Members, and are based on the same legal theories. *See* CR 23(a)(3); *Pellino v. Brink's Inc.*, 164 Wn. App. 668, 267 P.3d 383, 392 (2011).
- 15. The adequacy requirement is satisfied because Ms. Kimmons-Struck has no interests antagonistic to the other Class Members and is represented by qualified counsel. *See Hansen v. Ticket Track, Inc.*, 213 F.R.D. 412, 415 (W.D. Wash. 2003).
- 16. The predominance requirement is satisfied because there is a "common nucleus of operative facts" to each Class Member's claim, and all Class Members were subject to the same conduct by Lippman Recupero and PCA. See CR 23(b)(3); Chavez v. Our Lady of Lourdes Hosp. at Pasco, 190 Wn.2d 507, 516, 415 P.3d 224 (2018).
- 17. The superiority requirement is satisfied because the resolution of numerous claims in one action is far superior to individual lawsuits and promotes consistency and efficiency of adjudication, particularly in a case like this one with mcdest damages. *See* CR 23(b)(3); *Chavez*, 190 Wn.2d at 518-23.
- 18. Pursuant to CR 23, the Court appoints Teri Kimmons-Struck as class representative.
- 19. Pursuant to CR 23, the Court appoints the Terrell Marshall Law Group PLLC, and the Northwest Consumer Law Center as Class Counsel.

- 20. Class Counsel shall distribute the Settlement Fund to Settlement Class Members, Class Counsel, and the class representatives as required under sections III and IV of the Settlement Agreement.
- 21. The Counter-Plaintiff and each Settlement Class Member and their respective heirs, estates, trusts, agents, and successors, resolve, relinquish, and discharge forever Counter-Defendants from all claims based on the identical factual predicate in Counter-Plaintiff's Second Amended Answer and Counterclaims, including claims for violation of Washington's Collection Agency Act or Consumer Protection Act. Counter-Plaintiff Kimmons-Struck and her respective heirs, estates, trusts, agents, and successors, additionally resolve, relinquish, and discharge forever all claims existing as of the date this agreement is fully executed, whether known or unknown, against Counter-Defendants and any person(s) acting on behalf of or through Counter-Defendants. Counter-Defendants release resolve, relinquish, and discharge forever all claims against Counter-Plaintiff Kimmons-Struck relating to the Capital One account ending in 8739. The claims released pursuant to this paragraph are compromised, settled, released, discharged, and dismissed with prejudice by virtue of these proceedings and this Final Approval Order.
- 22. To the extent permitted by law and without affecting the other provisions of this Final Approval Order, this Final Approval Order is intended by the parties and the Court to be *res judicata* and to prohibit and preclude any prior, concurrent, or subsequent litigation brought individually, or in the name of, or otherwise on behalf of, Plaintiff or any Settlement Class Member with respect to the Released Claims.
- 23. Each Settlement Class Member shall be bound by the Settlement Agreement and this order, including by the release set out in Section IX of the Settlement Agreement and in Paragraph 21 of this Order.
- 24. The Court retains jurisdiction over the parties and all matters relating to the Action or Settlement, including the administration, interpretation, construction, effectuation,

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

26 27 enforcement, and consummation of the Settlement, and this Final Approval Order. This Final Approval Order finally disposes of all claims and is appealable.

- 25. This Final Approval Order is not, and shall not be construed as, an admission by Counter-Defendants of any liability or wrongdoing in this or in any other proceeding. Counter-Defendants deny all claims asserted in the Action, all allegations of wrongdoing and liability in this Action, and maintains that it has class defenses. The existence and terms of the Settlement Agreement shall be inadmissible as evidence in any proceeding, except as necessary to approve, interpret, or enforce the Settlement Agreement.
- 26. The Court approves Class Counsel's application for \$26,000 in attorneys' fees and costs. This amount reflected less than the actual costs incurred and shall be paid separately from the Settlement Fund by Counter-Defendants. Counter-Defendants shall pay Courtapproved attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel as required under sections III and IV of the Settlement Agreement.
- 27. Class Counsel obtained an excellent result for the Settlement Class. Class Counsel's work led to the creation of a \$15,000 Settlement Fund.
- 28. The Court has considered the factors set forth in Washington Rule of Professional Conduct 1.5(a) in concluding that the requested fee is reasonable. Specifically:
  - a. The case raised novel and difficult questions of law, which demanded litigators with the skill and experience of Class Counsel.
  - b. Class Counsel's work on this matter precludec work on other matters.
  - c. The excellent results obtained, and the amount of time involved support the award.
- 29. The Court approves a service award to Ms.Kimmons-Struck in the amount of \$1,000, to be paid from the Settlement Fund.
- 30. Any uncashed check funds remaining after the 120-day period for cashing settlement checks shall be distributed to the Legal Foundation of Washington.

27