

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE ELEVENTH JUDICIAL
CIRCUIT IN AND FOR MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

CASE NO: 2025-017619-CA-01

SECTION: CA43

JUDGE: Thomas J. Rebull

Shamar Jasher et al

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

SERVICE SPOT, LLC et al

Defendant(s)

_____ /

AMENDED PRELIMINARY APPROVAL ORDER

-

This matter, having come before the Court on Plaintiffs' Agreed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ("Motion for Preliminary Approval" or "Motion"), the Court, having reviewed and considered the Motion, the Supporting Memorandum and supporting documents, including the Class Action Settlement Agreement attached thereto, the record in these proceedings, the representations and recommendations of counsel, and the requirements of law, the Court finds that: (1) this Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the Parties to this Action; (2) the proposed Settlement Class meets the requirements of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and should be certified for settlement purposes only; (3) the persons and entities identified below should be appointed Class Representatives and Class Counsel; (4) the Settlement is the result of informed, good-faith, arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and their capable and experienced counsel, and is not the result of collusion; (5) the Settlement is within the range of reasonableness and should be preliminarily approved; (6) the proposed Notice program and proposed forms of Notice satisfy Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and constitutional due process requirements, and are reasonably calculated under the circumstances to apprise the

Settlement Class of the pendency of the FL Action, class certification, the terms of the Settlement, and Class Counsel’s forthcoming application for an award of attorneys’ fees and expenses (“Fee Application”) and request for Service Award for Plaintiffs, and Class Members’ right to opt-out of the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement, Class Counsel’s Fee Application, and/or the request for Service Award for Plaintiffs; (7) good cause exists to schedule and conduct a Final Approval Hearing, to assist the Court in determining whether to grant Final Approval of the Settlement and enter the Final Approval Order, and whether to grant Class Counsel’s Fee Application and request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs; and (8) the other related matters pertinent to the Preliminary Approval of the Settlement should also be approved.

IT IS ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. As used in this Preliminary Approval Order, unless otherwise noted, capitalized terms shall have the definitions and meanings accorded to them in the Settlement Agreement.
2. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and Parties to this proceeding pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and Fla. Stat. § 26.012(2).
3. Venue is proper in this Court.

Provisional Class Certification and Appointment of Class Representatives and Class Counsel

4. It is well established that “[a] class may be certified solely for purposes of settlement [if] a settlement is reached before a litigated determination of the class certification issue.” *Borcea v. Carnival Corp.*, 238 F.R.D. 664, 671 (S.D. Fla. 2006) (internal quotation marks omitted). In deciding whether to provisionally certify a settlement class, a court must consider the same factors that it would consider in connection with a proposed litigation class—*i.e.*, all Rule 23(a) factors and at least one subsection of Rule 23(b) must be satisfied—except that the Court need not consider the manageability of a potential trial, since the settlement, if approved, would obviate the need for a trial. *Id.*; *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 620 (1997).
5. The Court finds, for settlement purposes, that the Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 factors are present and that certification of the proposed Settlement Class is appropriate under Rule 1.220. The Court therefore provisionally certifies the following Settlement Class:

All California residents who made a reservation through Parkon.com or Cheapairportparking.org and paid a mandatory “Reservation Fee” at

checkout from July 1, 2024 to June 9, 2025.

Excluded from the Class is (1) any Judge or Magistrate presiding over this FL Action and members of their families; (2) Service Spot, LLC and TripGate LLC and their subsidiaries, parent companies, successors, predecessors, and any entity in which Service Spot, LLC and/or TripGate LLC or their parents have a controlling interest and their current or former officers, directors, agents, attorneys, and employees; (3) Persons who properly execute and file a timely request for exclusion from the Settlement Class; and (4) the legal representatives, successors, or assigns of any excluded Persons.

Specifically, the Court finds, for settlement purposes and conditioned on final certification of the proposed class and on the entry of the Final Approval Order, that the Settlement Class satisfies the following factors of Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220:

- a. Numerosity: Thousands of individuals are members of the proposed Settlement Class. The proposed Settlement Class is thus so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
- b. Commonality: “[C]ommonality requires the plaintiff to demonstrate that the class members ‘have suffered the same injury,’” and the plaintiff’s common contention must be of such a nature that it is capable of classwide resolution, *i.e.*, that determination of its truth or falsity will resolve an issue that is central to the validity of each one of the claims in one stroke. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 350 (2011). Here, the commonality requirement is satisfied. Multiple questions of law and fact centering on Defendants’ class-wide practices are common to Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class, are alleged to have injured all members of the Settlement Class in the same way, and would generate common answers central to the viability of the claims were this case to proceed to trial.
- c. Typicality: Plaintiffs’ claims are typical of the Settlement Class because they concern the same alleged practices of Defendants, arise from the same legal theories, and allege

the same types of harm and entitlement to relief. Rule 23(a)(3) is therefore satisfied. *See Kornberg v. Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc.*, 741 F.2d 1332, 1337 (11th Cir. 1984) (typicality satisfied where claims “arise from the same event or pattern or practice and are based on the same legal theory”); *Murray v. Auslander*, 244 F.3d 807, 811 (11th Cir. 2001) (named plaintiffs are typical of the class where they “possess the same interest and suffer the same injury as the class members”).

- d. Adequacy: Adequacy under Rule 1.220 relates to: (1) whether the proposed class representative has interests antagonistic to the class; and (2) whether the proposed class counsel has the competence to undertake the litigation at issue. *See Fabricant v. Sears Roebuck*, 202 F.R.D. 310, 314 (S.D. Fla. 2001). Here, adequacy is satisfied because there are no conflicts of interest between Plaintiffs and the Settlement Class, and Plaintiffs have retained competent counsel to represent them and the Settlement Class. Class Counsel regularly engage in consumer class litigation, complex litigation, and other “junk fee” litigation to this Action and have dedicated substantial resources to the prosecution of the Action. Moreover, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel have vigorously and competently represented the Settlement Class in the FL Action. *See Lyons v. Georgia-Pacific Corp. Salaried Employees Rel. Plan*, 221 F.3d 1235, 1253 (11th Cir. 2000).
- e. Predominance and Superiority: Rule 1.220 is satisfied because the common legal and alleged factual issues here predominate over individualized issues, and resolution of the common issues for the members of the Settlement Class in a single, coordinated proceeding is superior to thousands of individual lawsuits addressing the same legal and factual issues. With respect to predominance, Rule 23(b)(3) requires that “[c]ommon issues of fact and law . . . ha[ve] a direct impact on every class member’s effort to establish liability that is more substantial than the impact of individualized issues in resolving the claim or claims of each class member.” *Sacred Heart Health Sys., Inc. v. Humana Military Healthcare Servs., Inc.*, 601 F.3d 1159, 1170 (11th Cir. 2010) (internal quotation marks omitted). Here, common questions present a significant aspect of the case and can be resolved for all members of the Settlement Class in a single adjudication. In a liability determination, those common issues would predominate over any issues that are unique to individual members of the Settlement Class. Moreover, each member of the Settlement Class has claims that arise from the same or similar alleged Defendants’ practices as well as the same legal theories.

6. The Court appoints Plaintiffs Shamar Jasher and Jackie Mutshler as Class Representatives.
7. The Court appoints Philip L. Fraietta of Bursor & Fisher, P.A. as Class Counsel.

Preliminary Approval of the Settlement

8. At the preliminary approval stage, the Court's task is to evaluate whether the Settlement is within the "range of reasonableness." 4 Newberg on Class Actions § 11.26. "Preliminary approval is appropriate where the proposed settlement is the result of the parties' good faith negotiations, there are no obvious deficiencies and the settlement falls within the range of reason." *Smith v. Wm. Wrigley Jr. Co.*, 2010 WL 2401149, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Jun. 15, 2010). Settlement negotiations that involve arm's length, informed bargaining with the aid of experienced counsel support a preliminary finding of fairness. *See* Manual for Complex Litigation, Third, § 30.42 (West 1995) ("A presumption of fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness may attach to a class settlement reached in arm's-length negotiations between experienced, capable counsel after meaningful discovery.") (internal quotation marks omitted).
9. The Court preliminarily approves the Settlement, together with all exhibits attached to the Settlement Agreement, as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court finds that the Settlement was reached in the absence of collusion, is the product of informed, good-faith, arm's-length negotiations between the Parties and their capable and experienced counsel. The Court further finds that the Settlement, including the exhibits attached to the Settlement Agreement, is within the range of reasonableness and possible judicial approval, such that: (a) a presumption of fairness is appropriate for the purposes of preliminary settlement approval; and (b) it is appropriate to effectuate notice to the Settlement Class, as set forth below and in the Settlement Agreement, and schedule a Final Approval Hearing to assist the Court in determining whether to grant Final Approval to the Settlement and enter a Final Approval Order.

Approval of Class Notice and the Claims Process

10. The Court approves the form and content of the Class notices, substantially in the forms attached to the Settlement Agreement, as well as the Claim Form attached thereto. The Court further finds that the Class Notice program described in the Settlement Agreement is the best practicable under the circumstances. The Class Notice program is reasonably calculated under the circumstances to inform the Settlement Class of the pendency of the Action, certification of a Settlement Class, the terms of the Settlement, Class Counsel's Fee

Application and the request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs, and their rights to opt-out of the Settlement Class or object to the Settlement. The Class notices and Class Notice program constitute sufficient notice to all persons entitled to notice. The Class notices and Class Notice program satisfy all applicable requirements of law, including, but not limited to, Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.220 and the Constitutional requirement of Due Process.

Notice

11. Epiq shall serve as the Settlement Administrator.
12. Not later than twenty-eight (28) days after the entry of this Order, the Settlement Administrator shall implement the Class Notice program, as set forth below and in the Settlement Agreement, using the Class notices substantially in the forms attached to the Settlement Agreement and approved by this Preliminary Approval Order. Notice shall be provided to the members of the Settlement Class pursuant to the Class Notice program, as specified in the Settlement Agreement and approved by this Preliminary Approval Order. The Class Notice program shall include, to the extent necessary, direct e-mail Notice, and the Long-Form Notice, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and below.
13. The Settlement Administrator shall administer Notice as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.
14. The Administrator shall establish a Settlement Website as a means for Settlement Class members to obtain notice of, and information about, the Settlement. The Settlement Website shall be established as soon as practicable following Preliminary Approval, but no later than before commencement of the Class Notice program. The Settlement Website shall include the Settlement Agreement, the Long-Form Notice, the Preliminary Approval Order, and other such documents as Class Counsel and counsel for Defendant agree to include.
15. The Administrator is directed to perform all substantive responsibilities with respect to effectuating the Class Notice program, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

Final Approval Hearing, Opt-Outs, and Objections

16. A Final Approval Hearing shall be held before this Court on November 2, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. to determine whether to grant Final Approval to the Settlement and to enter a Final Approval Order, and whether Class Counsel's Fee Application and request for Service Awards for the Class Representatives should be granted.
17. Any person within the Settlement Class who wishes to be excluded from the Settlement Class may exercise their right to opt-out of the Settlement Class by following the opt-out procedures set forth in the Settlement Agreement and in the Notices at any time during the Opt-Out Period. To exercise the right to be excluded, a member of the Settlement Class must timely send a written request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator, and must include in any such exclusion request: (a) his/her full name, address, and current telephone number;

(b) the case name and number of this FL Action; (c) a statement that he/she made a reservation through the Websites and paid a Service Charge at checkout; (d) all grounds for the request to be excluded, with factual and legal support for the stated request, including any supporting materials; (e) the identification of any other exclusion requests he/she has filed, or has had filed on his/her behalf, in any other class action cases in the last five years; and (f) the requestor's signature. If represented by counsel, the Settlement Class Member requesting to be excluded must also provide the name and telephone number of his/her counsel.

18. Any Settlement Class Member who intends to object to this Agreement must present the objection in writing, which must be personally signed by the objector, and must include: (1) the objector's full name, address, and current telephone number; (2) an explanation of the basis upon which the objector claims to be a Settlement Class Member; (3) all grounds for the objection, including all citations to legal authority and evidence supporting the objection; (4) the name and contact information of any and all attorneys representing, advising, or in any way assisting the objector in connection with the preparation or submission of the objection or who may profit from the pursuit of the objection (the "Objecting Attorneys"); and (5) a statement indicating whether the objector intends to appear at the Final Approval Hearing (either personally or through counsel who files an appearance with the Court in accordance with the Local Rules).

Further Papers in Support of Settlement and Attorneys' Fee Application

19. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file their Fee Application and request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs fourteen (14) days before the Opt-out/Objection Deadline.
20. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file their Motion for Final Approval of Settlement not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the hearing on Final Approval.
21. Plaintiffs and Class Counsel shall file their responses to timely filed objections to the Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement, the Fee Application and/or request for Service Awards for Plaintiffs no later than fifteen (15) days before the Final Approval Hearing.

Stay/Bar of Other Proceedings

22. All proceedings in the Action are stayed until further order of the Court, except as may be necessary to implement the terms of the Settlement. Pending final determination of whether the Settlement should be approved, Plaintiffs, all persons in the Settlement Class, and persons purporting to act on their behalf are enjoined from commencing or prosecuting (either directly, representatively or in any other capacity) against any of the Released Parties any action or proceeding in any court, arbitration forum, or tribunal asserting any of the Released Claims.
23. Based on the foregoing, the Court sets the following schedule for the Final Approval Hearing and the actions which must take place before and after it:

Event	Deadline
Deadline to Disseminate Notice (“Notice Date”)	March 19, 2026 (28 days after entry of Preliminary Approval Order)
Deadline to File Motion for Service Awards, Attorneys’ Fees, Costs, and Expenses	April 20, 2026 (14 days before Opt-out/Objection Deadline)
Opt-out/Objection Deadline	May 4, 2026 (45 days after Notice Date and not sooner than 14 days after filing of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Service Awards, Attorneys’ Fees, Costs and Expenses)
Deadline to File Motion for Final Approval of Settlement	October 16, 2026 (at least 15 days before hearing on Final Approval)
Final Approval Hearing	November 2, 2026 at 9:00 A.M.
Deadline to Submit Claim	December 17, 2026 (45 days after Final Approval Hearing)

-

DONE and **ORDERED** in Chambers at Miami-Dade County, Florida on this 26th day of February, 2026.



2025-017619-CA-01 02-26-2026 11:00 AM

Hon. Thomas J. Rebull

CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE
Electronically Signed

No Further Judicial Action Required on **THIS MOTION**

CLERK TO **RECLOSE** CASE IF POST JUDGMENT

Electronically Served:

- Philip L. Fraietta: pfraietta@bursor.com
- Philip L. Fraietta: ecf-notices@bursor.com
- Robert Stephen Galbo: galbor@gtlaw.com
- Robert Stephen Galbo: burkek@gtlaw.com
- Robert Stephen Galbo: MIALitDock@gtlaw.com
- Paul B. Derby: pderby@skiermontderby.com
- Nancy Ginart: ginartn@gtlaw.com
- Stephen A. Beck: sbeck@bursor.com
- Stephen A. Beck: ecf-notices@bursor.com
- Stephen A. Beck: sbeck@ecf.courtdrive.com
- Philip L. Fraietta: pfraietta@bursor.com
- Philip L. Fraietta: pfraietta@ecf.courtdrive.com
- Philip L. Fraietta: jglatt@ecf.courtdrive.com