- 1 -

4

8

6

11

9

14

17 18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

26

27 28

## TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD:

The Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement came before this Court on August 11, 2023 in Department CX105 of the above court. The Court, having considered the papers submitted in support of the application of the parties, HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

- 1. The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Settlement Class based upon the terms set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement and Release ("Settlement Agreement") filed with the Declarations of Kevin Mahoney and Amir Seyedfarshi, as amended. All terms used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in the Settlement Agreement. The settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement appears to be fair, adequate and reasonable to the Settlement Class.
- 2. The Settlement, including the \$350,000.00 settlement amount, falls within the range of reasonableness and appears to be presumptively valid, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and applicable law, subject only to any objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing and final approval by this Court. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the settlement amount is fair and reasonable to the class members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2) significant informal discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions; (3) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the Parties with the assistance of a well-respected class action mediator. Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement Agreement was entered into in good faith.
- 3. A Final Approval Hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement, attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, and the Class Representative's Enhancement Award should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the members of the Settlement

Class is scheduled in Department CX105 on the date and time set forth in the implementation schedule in Paragraph 9 below.

- 4. The Court provisionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class (the "Settlement Class"): "All current and former hourly and/or non-exempt persons employed by Defendants in California during the Settlement Period."
- 5. The Settlement Period means the period from October 16, 2016 through November 1, 2022.
- 4. The Court preliminarily finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Settlement Class meets the requirements for certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 in that: (1) the Class Members are so numerous that joinder is impractical; (2) there are questions of law and fact that are common, or of general interest, to all Settlement Class Members, which predominate over individual issues; (3) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Settlement Class Members; (4) Plaintiff and Class Counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Settlement Class Members; and (5) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.
- 4. This Court approves, as to form and content, the Notice ("Class Notice"), in substantially the form attached to the Settlement Agreement as **Exhibit A**, **as amended**. The Court approves the procedure for Class Members to participate in, to opt out of, and to object to, the Settlement as set forth in the Stipulation of Settlement.
- 5. The Court directs the mailing of the Class Notice by first class mail to the Class Members in accordance with the Implementation Schedule set forth below. The Court finds the dates selected for the mailing and distribution of the Notice, as set forth in the Implementation Schedule, meet the requirements of due process and provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.
- 6. It is ordered that the Settlement Class is preliminarily certified for settlement purposes only.
- 7. The Court confirms Plaintiff Noemi Servin as Class Representatives, and Amir Seyedfarshi of Employment Rights Law Group, APC, and Kevin Mahoney and Laura Theriault of Mahoney Law Group, APC as Class Counsel.

- 8. The Court confirms Phoenix Settlement Administration Solutions as the Settlement Administrator.
- 9. The Court orders the following **Implementation Schedule** for further proceedings:

a.	Deadline for Defendant to Submit Class	[Within 15 calendar days after the
	Member Information to Settlement	Preliminary Approval Date]
	Administrator	
b.	Deadline for Settlement Administrator to Mail	[Within 3 business days from receipt
	Notice to Class Members	of the Class Member Information]
c.	Deadline for Class Members to Object or	[60 calendar days after mailing of the
	Request to be Excluded from Settlement	Class Notice]
f.	Deadline for Class Counsel to file Motion for	[16 Court days prior to Final
	Final Approval of Settlement and Motion for	Approval Hearing]
	Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Enhancement	
	Award	
g.	Final Approval and Fairness Hearing	December 15, 2023 at 10:00 AM

11. If any of the dates in this Implementation Schedule falls on a weekend, bank or court holiday, the time to act shall be extended to the next business day.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 15, 2023

HON. RANDALL SHERMAN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

## 

PROOF OF SERVICE
Code of Civ. Proc. § 1013a, subd. (3)

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 249 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 814, Long Beach, California, 90802.

On **August 15, 2023,** I served [X] true copies [] originals of the following document(s): **PROPOSED ORDER.** I served the document(s) on the person(s) below as follows:

Shaun J. Voigt, Esq.	Attorneys for Defendant ABRAZAR, INC.	
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP		
444 South Flower Street, Suite	Telephone:	(213) 330-4500
1500	Facsimile:	(213) 330-4501
Los Angeles, CA 90071	Email:	svoight@fisherphillips.com
John A. Mavros, Esq.	Attorneys for Defendant ABRAZAR, INC.	
Albert C. Lin, Esq.		
FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP	Telephone:	(213) 239-9800
2050 Main Street, Suite 100	Facsimile:	(213) 239-9045
Irvine, CA 92614	Email:	jmavros@fisherphillips.com
		alin@fisherphillips.com
Amir H. Seyedfarshi, Esq.		
EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS	Co-Counsel for Plaintiff NOEMI SERVIN	
LAW GROUP, APC		
6380 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1602	Telephone:	(424) 777-0964
Los Angeles, CA 90048	Email:	amir@employmentrightslawgroup.com
4		

The document(s) were served by the following means:

By e-mail: Based upon court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by
e-mail, I caused the document(s) to be sent to the persons at the electronic service addresses
listed above from the email address smarquez@mahoney-law.net. Within a reasonable time after
the transmission, no error, electronic message or any other indication that the transmission was
unsuccessful was received.

(State): I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 15, 2023, at Long Beach, California.

Samantha Marquez