

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----	X	
	:	
HUMBERTO LOZADA and OKLAHOMA	:	
FIREFIGHTERS PENSION AND RETIREMENT	:	
SYSTEM Individually and on Behalf of All Others	:	22 Civ. 1479 (JPC) (GS)
Similarly Situated,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	<u>ORDER ADOPTING</u>
	:	<u>REPORT AND</u>
-v-	:	<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>
	:	
TASKUS, INC. <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
-----	X	

JOHN P. CRONAN, United States District Judge:

On September 10, 2025, Plaintiffs Humberto Lozada and Oklahoma Firefighters Pension and Retirement System filed an Unopposed Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement and Plan of Allocation, Dkt. 192, and an Unopposed Motion for Attorneys’ Fees, Litigation Expenses, and Plaintiffs’ Reasonable Costs and Expenses, Dkt. 194. On November 6, 2025, the Honorable Gary Stein, to whom this case has been referred for general supervision of pretrial proceedings and dispositive motions, issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that the Court grant Plaintiffs’ motions and enter the proposed Final Judgment, proposed Plan of Allocation Order, and proposed Fee Award Order. Dkt. 201 (“R&R”) at 28.

A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge” in a Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party submits a timely objection to any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition, the district court will conduct a *de novo* review of the contested section. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3); *see also United States v. Male Juvenile*, 121 F.3d 34, 38 (2d Cir. 1997). If no

objections are made, the district court reviews the Report and Recommendation for clear error. *See, e.g., Wilds v. United Parcel Serv.*, 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

The Report and Recommendation, citing both Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), advised that “the parties shall have fourteen days” from “the date of this Report and Recommendation to file written objections thereto,” and warned that failure to timely file such objections would preclude appellate review. R&R at 28. No objections have been filed and the time for making any objections has passed.

Notwithstanding the absence of objections, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the Report and Recommendation. Judge Stein’s analysis in the Report and Recommendation is extremely thorough, detailed, and careful, and his recommendations are well-founded and consistent with the prevailing law. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety and will separately enter the Final Judgment, Plan of Allocation Order, and Fee Award Order in substantially the form annexed to the Report and Recommendation.¹ The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to close Docket Numbers 192 and 194.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 4, 2025
New York, New York



JOHN P. CRONAN
United States District Judge

¹ The Report and Recommendation observed that it was “unclear if the notices sent to state officials” under the Class Action Fairness Act (“CAFA”) “complied with CAFA’s requirement to provide a reasonable estimate of the number of class members residing in each state and their proportionate share of the overall settlement,” but explained that “such technical noncompliance,” if any, “is not an obstacle to approval of the settlement.” R&R at 9 n.2. Paragraph 16 of the Proposed Final Judgment states that “The Court finds that TaskUs has complied in all respects with the notice requirements of CAFA,” which—in light of the Report and Recommendation’s observation with which the undersigned concurs—the Court will accordingly edit from “all respects” to “substantial respect.”