		C		
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Kane Moon (SBN 249834) kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com H. Scott Leviant (SBN 200834) scott.leviant@moonyanglaw.com Mariam Ghazaryan (SBN 341119) mariam.ghazaryan@moonyanglaw.com MOON & YANG, APC 1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880 Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 232-3128 Facsimile: (213) 232-3125 Attorneys for Plaintiff	FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO SAN BEEL APR 18 2023 BY RAFAEL HERNANDEZ, DEPUTY		
8				
9 10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
11	COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO			
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	PATRICE EMERSON, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, <i>Plaintiff</i> , vs. LERETA. LLC, a limited liability company; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, <i>Defendants</i> .	Case No.: CIVSB2111028 [Assigned to Hon. David Cohn. Dept. S-2 <u>CLASS ACTION</u> [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLA ACTION SETTLEMENT Date: April 18. 2023 Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: Dept. S-26 Judge: Hon. David Cohn Action Filed: April 16, 2021 Trial Date: Not Set	-	
22 23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	Case No.: CIVSB2111028	Page 1 Emerson y. RY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMEN		

1 2

3

4

5

6

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

This matter came on for hearing on April 18. 2023, upon the Motion for Preliminary Approval of the proposed settlement of this action on the terms set forth in the JOINT STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT AND RELEASE TO SETTLE CLASS ACTION (the "Agreement") *see* Declaration of H. Scott Leviant In Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class and Representative Action Settlement ["Leviant Decl."], at Exh. 1).

After reviewing the Agreement, the Notice process, having reviewed the entire record on this
action, having heard the argument of Counsel for respective Parties, and good cause appearing, the Court
Orders as follows:

10
1. To the extent defined in the Agreement, the terms in this Order shall have the meanings
11
set forth therein.

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 Mircrosofi IV Cases*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 706 (2006).

The Court finds that the Settlement has been reached as a result of intensive, serious and
 non-collusive arms-length negotiations. The Court further finds 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 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 finds that the risks of further prosecution are substantial.

4. 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 fairness hearing.
The 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.

 Case No.:
 CIVSB2111028
 Page 2
 Emerson v. Lereta. LLC

 [PROPOSED]
 ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

1	5. The Parties' proposed notice plan is constitutionally sound because individual notices						
2	will be mailed to all Class Members whose identities are known to the Parties, and such notice is the						
3	best notice practicable. The Parties' proposed Class Notice, attached to the Settlement as Exhibit A. is						
4	sufficient to inform Class Members of the terms of the Settlement, their rights under the settlement.						
5	their rights to object to the Settlement, their right to receive a payment under the settlement or elect not						
6	to participate in the settlement, and the processes for doing so, and the date and location of the final						
7	approval hearing and are therefore approved.						
8	6. The following persons are certified as Class Members solely for the purpose of entering						
9	a settlement in this matter:						
10	All persons who have been employed by Defendant in California and classified as a non-exempt employee during the "Class Period" applicable to the operative						
11	complaint and who have not signed arbitration agreements or release agreements with Defendant. The "Class Period" is April 16, 2017 through the date the court						
12	preliminarily approves the settlement. "Participating Class Members" means all Class Members who do not submit a Request for Exclusion. (Settlement, ¶¶ 1.01(d), (h), (z).)						
13	= 1.01(d), (n), (2).						
14	7. Plaintiff PATRICE EMERSON is appointed as the Class Representative. The Court						
15	finds Plaintiff's counsel are adequate, as they are experienced in wage and hour class action litigation						
16	and have no conflicts of interest with absent Class Members, and that they adequately represented the						
17	interests of absent class members in the Litigation. Moon & Yang, APC, is appointed Class Counsel.						
18	8. The Court appoints Phoenix Settlement Administrators to act as the Settlement						
19	Administrator. pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.						
20	9. Defendant is directed to provide the Settlement Administrator the names and most						
21	recent known mailing addresses of Class Members and any other information required in accordance						
22	with the Agreement.						
23	10. The Settlement Administrator is directed to mail the approved Class Notice by first-						
24	class mail to the Class Members in accordance with the Agreement. Before mailing, the Settlement						
25	Administrator or Class Counsel shall include the appropriate dates in the Class Notice and insert the						
26	correct time and place for the Final Approval Hearing.						
27	11. Class Members will be bound by the Agreement unless they submit a timely and valid						
28	written request to be excluded from the Settlement, postmarked by the response deadline. Any request						
	Case No.: CIVSB2111028 Page 3 Emerson v. Lereta, LLC IPROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT						

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.

5 12. To be considered, Class Members must timely file and serve their written objections in
6 accordance with the Agreement.

7 13. Upon completion of the Notice process, the Settlement Administrator shall provide a
8 report of the results of that process to Counsel for all Parties.

9 14. A final approval hearing will be held on $\underline{\mathcal{A}} \ \underline{\mathcal{V5}}$, 2023. at 10 $\underline{\mathcal{I}} \ \underline{\mathcal{V}} \ \underline{\mathcal{V}}$, in Department S-26, to determine whether the settlement should be granted final approval 11 as fair, reasonable, and adequate as to the Class Members. At that time, the Court will hear all evidence 12 and arguments necessary to evaluate the Settlement. Class Members and their counsel may support or 13 oppose the Settlement, if they so desire, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Class Notice 14 and this Order.

15 15. As set forth in the Notice, any Class Member may appear at the final approval hearing
16 in person (which "in person" appearance may be telephonic) or by his or her own attorney and show
17 cause why the Court should not approve the settlement.

18 16. The Court reserves the right to continue the date of the final approval hearing without19 further notice to Class Members.

20 17. Class Counsel shall give notice to any objecting party of any continuance of the hearing
21 of the motion for final approval.

18. The Court retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or in
connection with the settlement.

In the event that the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms
of the Agreement, then this Preliminary Approval Order shall be rendered null and void to the extent
provided by and in accordance with the Agreement and shall be vacated, and, in such event, all orders
entered and releases delivered in connection herewith shall be null and void to the extent provided by and
in accordance with the Agreement, and each party shall retain his or its rights to proceed with litigation

 Case No.:
 CIVSB2111028
 Page 4
 Emerson v. Lereta, LLC

 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

of the Actions. The milenter forward velocial control is I milent to 10,00020. The column toucien see is funded it 7,000 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** lover 1 DAVID COHN Dated: 4/15/22 Hon. David Cohn SAN BERNARDINO SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE Case No.: CIVSB2111028 Page 5 Emerson v. Lereta, LLC [PROPOSED] OR DER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

	<u>`</u>	~	•		
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 pa to the within suit: my business address is 1055 W. 7 th Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.					
On the date indicated below. I served the document described as: [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTI					
by sendi	MINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS , ng [] the original [or] [✓] a true copy service list:	ACTION SETTLEMENT on the thereof $[\checkmark]$ to interested parties a	e interested parties in this a as follows [or] [] as stated		
	Jacqueline Beaumont				
	Anurita Varma CALL & JENSEN				
	610 Newport Center Dr. Ste 700				
	Newport Beach. CA92660 jbeaumont@calljensen.com				
	avarma@calljensen.com				
	Counsel for Defendant Lereta, LLC				
[]	BY MAIL (ENCLOSED IN A SE				
	 the ordinary course of business at Le practice of collection and processing 	g correspondence for mailing. Un	der that practice, sealed		
	envelopes are deposited with the U.S with postage thereon fully prepaid a	S. Postal Service that same day in t Los Angeles, California.	the ordinary course of busin		
[✔]	BY E-MAIL: I hereby certify that the delivery on the parties listed herein a this action.				
[]	BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE: Per above-named document(s) has (have electronic service provider. The tran the service confirmation will be main in our office.	e) been electronically served on co smission of these documents was	ounsel of record by an appro reported complete and a co		
[]	BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I deli offices of the addressee(s) named he		a sealed envelope, by hand t		
[]	BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY: 1	am "readily familiar" with this fi	rm's practice of collection a		
	processing correspondence for overr enclosed in a sealed envelope with a	night delivery. Under that practice packing slip attached thereto full	e, overnight packages are y prepaid. The packages are		
1	picked up by the carrier at our office declare under penalty of perjury unde		-		
	g is true and correct. Executed this Jar				
	H. Scott Leviant	26.2	Pin		
	Type or Print Name	<i>()</i> Si	ighature		
Case No	.: CIVSB2111028	Page 1	Emerson v. Lere		
	PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING PR				