		STEPHANIE BOHRER, CLERK
1	YCL LAW FIDM ADC	Buller Mayon
	JCL LAW FIRM, APC Jean-Claude Lapuyade (State Bar #248676)	DEPUTY
2	Sydney Castillo-Johnson (State Bar #343881) 5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3600	
3	San Diego, CA 92121 Telephone: (619) 599-8292	
4	Facsimile: (619) 599-8291	
5	jlapuyade@jcl-lawfirm.com scastillo@jcl-lawfirm.com	
6	ZAKAY LAW GROUP, APLC	
7	Shani O. Zakay (State Bar #277924) Jackland K. Hom (State Bar #327243)	
8	5440 Morehouse Drive, Suite 3500 San Diego, CA 92121	
9	Telephone: (619)255-9047 Facsimile: (858) 404-9203	
10	shani@zakaylaw.com jackland@zakaylaw.com	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff ALAN CARRILLO RODR	IGUEZ
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE S	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13		* ,
14	IN AND FOR THE COUNT	Y OF SAN JOAQUIN
15	ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ, an	Case No. STK-CV-UOE-2022-0003036
	individual, on behalf of himself and on behalf of all persons similarly situated,	ነት) / ! PROPOSED - ORDER GRANTING
16		PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
17	Plaintiff, v.	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION AND PAGA ACTION
18		SETTLEMENT
19	TITAN WORKFORCE, a California Corporation; and DOES 1-50, Inclusive,	Date: INIMIZA

23

20

21

22

Defendants.

24

26 27

25

28

Time:

Judge:

Dept.:

9:00 am.

10D

Hon. Barbara Kronlund

This matter having come before the Honorable Judge Barbara Kronlund of the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of San Joaquin, at Quo a.ml/p.m. on Month 1970, 2023, with Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq., of the JCL Law Firm, APC and Shani O. Zakay, Esq. of the Zakay Law Group, APLC as counsel for plaintiff ALAN CARRILLO RODRIGUEZ ("Plaintiff"), and Timothy B. Del Castillo, Esq. of Castle Law: California Employment Counsel, PC, appearing for Defendant TITAN WORKFORCE, a California Corporation (hereinafter "Defendant"). The Court, having carefully considered the briefs, argument of counsel and all the matters presented to the Court, and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. The Court preliminarily approves the Stipulation of Settlement of Class and PAGA Action Claims and Release of Claims ("Settlement Agreement" or "Agreement"), a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit "1"**. This is based on the Court's determination that the Settlement Agreement is within the range of possible final approval, pursuant to the provisions of Section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure and California Rules of Court, rule 3.769.
- 2. This Order incorporates by reference the definitions in the Agreement, and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order as set forth in the Agreement.
- 3. Subject to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Total Settlement Amount that Defendant shall pay is Six Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$650,000.00). It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount and terms are fair, adequate, and reasonable as to all Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues. It further appears that investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that settlement at this time will avoid substantial additional costs by all Parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation. It further appears that the Settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive arms-length negotiations.

- 4. The Court preliminarily finds that the Settlement appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. The Court has reviewed the monetary recovery that is being granted as part of the Settlement and preliminarily finds that the monetary settlement awards made available to the Class Members are fair, adequate, and reasonable when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to certification, liability, and damages issues.
- 5. Plaintiff seeks a Class Counsel Award in the amount of up-to one-third of the Total Settlement Amount, currently estimated at Two Hundred Sixteen Thousand, Six Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars and Sixty-Six Cents (\$216,666.66), plus reimbursement of actually incurred litigation cost in an amount of up to Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$25,000.00), and proposed Class Representative Service Award to the Class Representative, Alan Carrillo Rodriguez, in an amount of not more than Ten Thousand Dollars and Zero Cents (\$10,000.00). While these awards appear to be within the range of reasonableness, the Court will not approve the Class Counsel Award or the Class Representative Service Award until the Final Approval Hearing.
- 6. The Court recognizes that Plaintiff and Defendant stipulate and agree to certification of a class for settlement purposes only. This stipulation will not be deemed admissible in this, or any other proceeding should this Settlement not become final. For settlement purposes only, the Court conditionally certifies the following Class:

All current and former hourly-paid or non-exempt employees employed by Defendant in California during the period between Class Period [April 26, 2018, through May 10, 2023].

7. The Court concludes that, for settlement purposes only, the Class meets the requirements for certification under section 382 of the California Code of Civil Procedure in that: (a) the Class is ascertainable and so numerous that joinder of all members of the Class Members is impracticable; (b) common questions of law and fact predominate, and there is a well-defined community of interest amongst the Class Members with respect to the subject matter of the litigation; (c) the claims of the Class Representative are typical of the claims of the Class Members; (d) the Class Representative will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class Members; (e) a class action is superior to other

 available methods for the efficient adjudication of this controversy; and (f) Class Counsel are qualified to act as counsel for the Class Representative in his individual capacity and as the representative of the Class Members.

- 8. The Court provisionally appoints plaintiff Alan Carrillo Rodriguez as the representative of the Class.
- 9. The Court provisionally appoints Jean-Claude Lapuyade, Esq., of the JCL Law Firm, APC, and Shani Zakay, of the Zakay Law Group, APLC, as Class Counsel for the Class Members.
- Notice") attached to the Agreement as Exhibit "A". The Court finds that the notice appears to fully and accurately inform the Class Members and Aggrieved Employees of all material elements of the proposed Settlement, including the right of any Class Member to be excluded from the Class by submitting a written request for exclusion, and of each Class Member's right and opportunity to object to the Settlement. The Court further finds that the distribution of the notices substantially in the manner and form set forth in the Agreement and this Order meets the requirements of due process, is the most reasonable notice under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto. The Court orders the mailing of the notices by first class mail, pursuant to the terms set forth in the Agreement.
- 11. The Court hereby appoints Apex Class Action LLC, as Settlement Administrator. Within ten (10) business days after the Preliminary Approval Date, Defendant shall provide the Settlement Administrator with the Class Data, including information regarding Class Members that Defendant will in good faith compile from its records, including each Class Member's full name; last known mailing address; Social Security Number; and total number of Class Period Workweeks and PAGA Pay Periods. No later than fourteen (14) calendar days after receiving the Class Data from Defendant, the Settlement Administrator shall mail copies of the Notice Packet to all Class Members via regular First-Class U.S. Mail.
- 12. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the proposed procedure for exclusion from the Settlement. Any Class Member may individually choose to opt out of and be excluded from the Settlement as provided in the Notice by following the instructions for requesting exclusion from the

Settlement of the Released Class Claims that are set forth in the Notice. All requests for exclusion must be postmarked or received by the Response Deadline which is forty-five (45) calendar days after the Settlement Administrator mails the Notice Packets to Class Members or, in the case of re-mailed Notice, not more than fifteen (15) days from the original Response Deadline. Any such person who chooses to opt out of and be excluded from the Settlement will not be entitled to an Individual Settlement Payment under the Settlement and will not be bound by the Settlement, or have any right to object, appeal or comment thereon. Class Members who have not requested exclusion shall be bound by all determinations of the Court, the Agreement, and Judgment.

- 13. Any Class Member who has not opted out may appear at the final approval hearing and may object or express the Class Member's views regarding the Settlement and may present evidence and file briefs or other papers that may be proper and relevant to the issues to be heard and determined by the Court as provided in the Notice. Class Members will have forty-five (45) calendar days from the date the Settlement Administrator mails the Class Notice to postmark their written objections to the Settlement Administrator.
- 14. A final approval hearing shall be held before this Court on March 25,2034 at 25.00 AM/PM in Department 10D of the San Joaquin County Superior Court to determine all necessary matters concerning the Settlement, including: whether the proposed settlement of the Action on the terms and conditions provided for in the Agreement is fair, adequate and reasonable and should be finally approved by the Court; whether an Order Granting Final Approval should be entered herein; whether the plan of allocation contained in the Agreement should be approved as fair, adequate and reasonable to the Class; and to finally approve the Class Counsel Award, Class Representative Service Award, and the Settlement Administration Costs. All papers in support of the motion for final approval and the Motion for Class Counsel Award and Class Representative Service Award shall be filed with the Court and served on all counsel within twenty-eight (28) days following the expiration of the Response Deadline.
- 15. In the event the Settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms of the Agreement, or the Settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, canceled, or fails to become effective for any reason, this Settlement Agreement shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated,

1	and the Parties shall revert to their respective positions as of before entering into the Agreement. In	
2	such an event, the Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Preliminary Approval Order,	
3	shall not be used or referred to in litigation for any purpose. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to	
4	alter the terms of the Settlement Agreement with respect to the effect of the Settlement Agreement if it	
5	is not approved.	
6	16. The Court reserves the right to adjourn or continue the date of the final approval hearing	
7	and all dates provided for in the Agreement without further notice to Class Members and retains	
8	jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or connected with the proposed Settlement.	
9		
10		
11	NOV 3 0 2023	
12	Dated:	
13	JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
14	earbaba a. Kromlund	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		