## TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

Plaintiff MANUEL GODOY ("Plaintiff") and Defendant INTERTRADE INDUSTRIES, LTD. ("Defendant") have reached terms of settlement for a putative class action.

Plaintiff has filed a motion for preliminary approval of a class action settlement of the claims asserted against Defendant in this action, memorialized in the JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT (*see* Declaration of H. Scott Leviant In Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement ["Leviant Decl."], at Exh. 1). The JOINT STIPULATION OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT, as amended with a filing date of December 16, 2021, is referred to herein as the "Agreement" or "Settlement."

After reviewing the Agreement, the Notice process, and other related documents, and having heard any argument of Counsel for respective parties, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS**:

- 1. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the proposed class action Settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382. In granting preliminary approval of the class action settlement the Court has considered the factors identified in *Dunk v. Ford Motor Co.*, 48 Cal. App. 4th 1794 (1996), as approved in *Wershba v. Apple Computer*, *Inc.*, 91 Cal. App. 4th 224 (2001) and *In re Mircrosoft IV Cases*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 706 (2006).
- 2. The Court preliminarily finds that it appears that the Settlement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious and non-collusive arms-length negotiations. The Court further preliminarily finds that it appears that the parties have conducted thorough investigation and research, and the attorneys for the parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. The Court also preliminarily finds that settlement at this time will avoid additional substantial costs, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the action. The Court preliminarily finds that the risks of further prosecution are substantial.
- 3. The parties' Settlement is granted preliminary approval as it meets the criteria for preliminary settlement approval. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness and appears to be presumptively valid, subject only to any objections that may be raised at the final approval hearing. The Settlement Class meets the requirements for conditional certification for settlement

purposes only under Code of Civil Procedure § 382. The Court finds that it is appropriate to notify the members of the proposed settlement Class of the terms of the proposed settlement.

- 4. The parties' proposed notice plan is constitutionally sound because individual notices will be mailed to all Class Members whose identities are known to the parties, and such notice is the best notice practicable. The parties' proposed Class Notice, attached to the Settlement as Exhibit A, as amended, is sufficient to inform Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, their rights under the settlement, their rights to object to the Settlement, their right to receive a payment under the settlement or elect not to participate in the settlement, and the processes for doing so, and the date and location of the final approval hearing and are therefore approved.
- 5. The following persons are certified as Class Members solely for the purpose of entering a settlement in this matter:

All individuals employed by Defendants in California and classified as "non-exempt" at any time during the Class Period (the "Class Period" is July 17, 2016 through the date upon which the Court grants preliminary approval of this Settlement, or January 1, 2022, whichever is earlier). (Settlement, ¶¶ 3-4.)

- 6. Plaintiff MANUEL GODOY is appointed as the Class Representative. The Court finds Plaintiff's counsel are adequate, as they are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation and have no conflicts of interest with absent Settlement Class Members, and that they adequately represented the interests of absent class members in the Litigation. Kane Moon, H. Scott Leviant, and Lilit Tunyan of Moon & Yang, APC, are appointed Class Counsel.
- 7. The Court appoints Phoenix Settlement Administrators to act as the Settlement Administrator, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.
- 8. Defendant is directed to provide the Settlement Administrator the names and most recent known mailing addresses of Class Members and any other information required in accordance with the Agreement (the "Class List"), no later than 15 calendar days after entry of this Order, which deadline is estimated to be **December 18, 2021**. (Settlement, ¶ 32(a).)
- 9. The Settlement Administrator is directed to mail the approved Class Notice by firstclass mail to the Class Members in accordance with the Agreement, no later than 14 calendar days after

receipt of the Class List, which deadline, due to the holiday, is estimated to be **January 3, 2021**. (Settlement, ¶ 32(b).)

- 10. Class Members will be bound by the Agreement unless they submit a timely and valid written request to be excluded from the Settlement, postmarked no later than 60 days following mailing of the Notice, or as possibly extended up to 14 additional days by operation of Paragraph 7 of the Settlement for certain re-mailed Notices.
- 11. Any request for exclusion shall be submitted to the Settlement Administrator rather than filed with the Court. Class members are not required to send copies of their Exclusion request to counsel. The Settlement Administrator shall file, or provide to Counsel for filing, a declaration authenticating a copy of every Exclusion request received by the Administrator.
- 12. A final approval hearing will be held on **June 24, 2022**, at 10:00 a.m., in Department CX105, to determine whether the settlement should be granted final approval as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to the Class Members. At that time, the Court will hear all evidence and arguments necessary to evaluate the Settlement. Class Members and their counsel may support or oppose the Settlement, if they so desire, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Class Notice and this Order. The final approval hearing may be conducted telephonically, based upon prevailing conditions related to the COVID-19 pandemic at that time.
- 13. Plaintiff shall file a Motion for Final Approval, including any request for an award of fees, costs, and an Enhancement Award to Plaintiff, no later than 16 calendar days prior to the final approval hearing. In conjunction with the filing of the final approval motion, a declaration from the Settlement Administrator on the outcome of the notice process shall be filed with the Court. At that time, the Parties shall also file responses to any written objections received by the Settlement Administrator by the Response Deadline.
- 14. As set forth in the Notice, any Class Member may appear at the final approval hearing in person (which "in person" appearance may be telephonic, as noted above) or by his or her own attorney and show cause why the Court should not approve the settlement, or object to the motion for awards of the Class Representative Enhancement Payment and Attorney's Fees and Costs. For any written comments or objections to be considered at the hearing, the Class Member must submit a

Case No.: 30-2020-01151921-CU-OE-CXC

Page 4

## PROOF OF SERVICE

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within suit; my business address is 1055 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT on the interested parties in this action by sending [ ] the original [or] [ $\checkmark$ ] a true copy thereof [ $\checkmark$ ] to interested parties as follows [or] [ ] as stated on the attached service list:

Kenneth J. Rose Robert H. Rose THE ROSE GROUP, APLC 9747 Businesspark Ave., Suite 213 San Diego, CA 92131 krose@rosegroup.us rrose@rosegroup.us Attorneys for Defendant Intertrade Industries, LTD

Counsel for Defendant

- BY MAIL (ENCLOSED IN A SEALED ENVELOPE): I deposited the envelope(s) for mailing in the ordinary course of business at Los Angeles, California. I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, sealed envelopes are deposited with the U.S. Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California.
- **[**\[ \] BY E-MAIL: I hereby certify that this document was served from Los Angeles, California, by e-mail delivery on the parties listed herein at their most recent known e-mail address or e-mail of record in this action.
- [ ] BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Pursuant to the Court's Order directing Electronic Service, the above-named document(s) has (have) been electronically served on counsel of record by an approved electronic service provider. The transmission of these documents was reported complete and a copy of the service confirmation will be maintained, along with the original document(s) and proof of service in our office.
- BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I delivered the document, enclosed in a sealed envelope, by hand to the offices of the addressee(s) named herein.
- BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: I am "readily familiar" with this firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for overnight delivery. Under that practice, overnight packages are enclosed in a sealed envelope with a packing slip attached thereto fully prepaid. The packages are picked up by the carrier at our offices or delivered by our office to a designated collection site.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this October 19, 2021, at Los Angeles, California.

H. Scott Leviant Type or Print Name

27

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

28