

COPY

**LAW OFFICE OF SCOTT ERNEST WHEELER**

Scott Ernest Wheeler (SBN 187998)

250 West First Street, Suite 216

Claremont, California 91711

Telephone: (909) 621-4988

Facsimile: (909) 621-4622

Email: sew@scottwheelerlawoffice.com

FILED  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT

JUL 25 2023

**THE WAND LAW FIRM, P.C.**

Aubry Wand (SBN 281207)

100 Oceangate, Suite 1200

Long Beach, CA 90802

Telephone: (310) 590-4503

Email: awand@wandlawfirm.com

BY Victoria Sanchez  
VICTORIA SANCHEZ, DEPUTY

*Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT**

CARMEN J. SANTIZO, individually, and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BPS TACTICAL, INC., a California  
corporation; and DOES 1 through 50,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: CIVDS2018001

[Assigned to Hon. Joseph Ortiz]

**[PROPOSED] PRELIMINARY  
APPROVAL ORDER**

RECEIVED  
JUN 29 2023  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO  
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT

1                                    **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL**

2            The Court now has before it, Plaintiff's unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class  
3 Action Settlement ("Motion"). After reviewing the Motion, the Class Action and PAGA Settlement  
4 Agreement and Release ("Settlement Agreement") and exhibits attached thereto, and good cause  
5 appearing therefore, the Court hereby finds and orders as follows:

6            1.        The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the settlement memorialized in the  
7 Settlement Agreement appears to be fair and adequate, and falls within the range of reasonableness,  
8 and therefore meets the requirement for preliminary approval.

9            2.        The Court conditionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class (the  
10 "Class" or "Settlement Class"):

11                        All non-exempt employees who were employed by BPS Tactical, Inc. in the State of  
12 California, at any time from August 27, 2016, through July 25, 2023 ("Class Period").

13            The Class Period is from August 27, 2016, through July 25, 2023.

14            3.        The Court conditionally approves for settlement purposes the PAGA allocation of this  
15 settlement to the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") and PAGA  
16 Members. The PAGA Period is from June 24, 2019, through July 25, 2023.

17            4.        The Court finds, for settlement purposes, that the Class meets the requirements for  
18 certification under California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 in that: (1) the Class is so numerous that  
19 joinder is impractical; (2) there are questions of law and fact that are common, or of general interest,  
20 to the Class, which predominate over any individual issues; (3) Plaintiff's claims are typical of the  
21 claims of the Class; (4) Plaintiff and Plaintiff's counsel will fairly and adequately protect the interests  
22 of the Class; and (5) a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
23 adjudication of the controversy.

24            5.        The Court appoints, for settlement purposes, Plaintiff Carmen J. Santizo as  
25 Representative for the Class.

26            6.        The Court appoints, for settlement purposes, the Law Office of Scott E. Wheeler and  
27 the Wand Law Firm P.C. as Counsel for the Class.

1           7.     The Parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the  
2 Settlement Agreement.

3           8.     The Court appoints Phoenix Settlement Administrators (“Phoenix”) as the Settlement  
4 Administrator and is ordered to carry out the administration of the settlement according to the terms  
5 of the Settlement Agreement.

6           9.     The Court approves as to form and content of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement  
7 Notice. The Court finds that the dates selected for the mailing and distribution of the Notice Packet  
8 meet the requirements of due process, provide the best notice practicable under the circumstances,  
9 and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto.

10          10.    If any Class Member objects to the Settlement Agreement, the objecting party is not  
11 required, either personally or through counsel: 1) to appear at the hearing on the motion for final  
12 approval for that party’s objection to be considered; or 2) to file or serve, or to state in the objection,  
13 a notice of intention to appear at the hearing on the motion for Final Approval of the Class Settlement.

14          11.    Phoenix, the Settlement Administrator, shall provide notice to any objecting party of  
15 any continuance of the hearing of Plaintiff’s Motion for Final Approval.

16          12.    The Parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the following  
17 implementation schedule:

Event	Date
Last day for Defendant to provide the Settlement Administrator with the Class Information	August 8, 2023
Last day for Settlement Administrator, Phoenix to mail Class Notice	August 23, 2023
Last day for Class Members to submit a dispute regarding Workweeks, Request for Exclusion, or written Objection	October 23, 2023 (60 <sup>th</sup> day is a Saturday)
Last Day for Plaintiff to file Motion for Final Approval of the Class Settlement, Attorneys’ Fees and Costs and Class Representative Service Award	Per Code.
Final Approval Hearing	December 5, 2023

13. The Court finds that the method of giving notice to the Class constitutes the best means practicable of providing notice under the circumstances. The Court further finds that the Notice Packet and the method of giving notice to the Class meet the requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 382, California Rules of Court, Rules 3.766 and 3.769, and due process under the California and United States Constitutions, and other applicable law.

14. At the Final Approval Hearing, the Court will consider whether the Settlement should be finally approved as fair, reasonable and adequate, whether a final judgment should be entered, and whether the payments provided for under the Settlement, including attorneys' fees and costs and class representative service award, should be finally approved and granted.

15. Pending the Final Approval Hearing, all proceedings in this Action, other than proceedings necessary to implement the Settlement and this Order, are stayed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED: JUL 25 2023

**JOSEPH T. ORTIZ**  
HONORABLE JOSEPH ORTIZ  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT