2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Emil Davtyan (SBN 299363) Emil@d.law David Yeremian (SBN 226337) d.yeremian@d.law Natalie Haritoonian (SBN 324318) n.haritoonian@d.law Jonas Agle (SBN 352712) j.agle@d.law 450 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 840 Glendale, CA 91203 Telephone: (818) 962-6465 Fax: (818) 962-6469 Attorneys for Plaintiff ALBA BANKS, on behalf of herself and others similarly situated	
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF TI	HE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	FOR THE COUNT	Y OF LOS ANGELES
12	ALBA BANKS, an individual on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated,	Case No.: 23STCV25820
13	•	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
14	Plaintiff,	Assigned for All Purposes To:
15	VS.	Hon. Stuart M. Rice
16	UNITED NATIONAL MAINTENANCE, INC., a Nevada Corporation; ANAHEIM	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING (1)
17	CONVENTION CENTER, a business entity of unknown form; UNITED TEMPS, INC., a Nevada Corporation; UNITED SERVICE	PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT; (2) APPROVING NOTICE OF SETTLEMENT;
18	COMPANIES, a business entity of unknown form; and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	AND (3) SETTING HEARING FOR FINAL APPROVAL
19	Defendants.	Hearing
20		OH JAÁFFÉ Date: May 9 , 2025
21		Time: 10:30 a.m. Dept: 1
22		Берг. 1
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		-1-
	[D]	

RECITALS

On February 4, 2025, Plaintiff Alba Banks (the "Named Plaintiff"), individually and on
behalf of the Class, and Defendant United National Maintenance, Inc., United Temps, Inc., and
United Service Companies (collectively "Defendants") entered into a class action settlement, the
terms and conditions of which are set forth in the parties' Class Action and PAGA Settlement
Agreement (hereafter collectively, the "Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement"). Unless otherwise
provided in this Order, all capitalized terms shall have the same meaning as set forth in the
Settlement Agreement.

The motion of the Named Plaintiff for an order preliminarily approving the settlement of this action, approving the form notice of settlement, and setting a final approval hearing came on OH 13/FFÊ for a hearing in Department 1 of this Court on May 9, 2025.

This Court, having fully considered Plaintiff's Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support, the Declaration in support, the Settlement Agreement, the proposed form of Class Notice, and the oral argument presented to the Court, finds that: (1) the proposed settlement appears fair, reasonable and adequate, and that a final hearing should be held after notice to the Class (defined below) of the proposed settlement to determine if the Settlement Agreement and settlement are fair, reasonable, and adequate such that a Final Order and Judgment should be entered in this action based upon the Settlement Agreement and (2) the PAGA Settlement Payment is fair and adequate and the PAGA Settlement Payment should be approved.

THE COURT ORDERS AND MAKES DETERMINATIONS AS FOLLOWS: ORDER PROVISIONALLY CERTIFYING SETTLEMENT CLASS AND APPOINTMENT OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVE AND CLASS COUNSEL

1. The Court finds that certification of the following class, for settlement purposes only, is appropriate:

"all persons employed by Defendants in California and classified as a non-exempt, hourly employee who worked for Defendants at any time between October 20, 2019, to February 9, 2025."

2. The Court grants preliminary approval of the terms and conditions contained in the

11

13

15

18

20

22

23 24

8

10

12

14

16

17

19

21

25

26 27

Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that the terms of the Settlement Agreement are within the range of possible approval at the final approval hearing.

- 3. The Court preliminarily finds, for settlement purposes only, that the Class meets (i) the ascertainability and numerosity requirements; (ii) the commonality requirement because, in the absence of class certification and settlement, each individual Class Member would have to litigate core common issues of law and fact, all relating to Defendants' alleged wage-and-hour violations asserted in the action; (iii) the typicality requirement because the Named Plaintiff and the Class Members' claims all arise from the same alleged events and course of conduct, and are based on the same legal theories; and (iv) the adequacy of representation requirement because the Named Plaintiff has the same interests as all members of the Class, and she is represented by experienced and competent counsel.
- 4. The Court further finds, preliminarily and for settlement purposes only, that common issues predominate over individual issues in this litigation and that class treatment is superior to the other means of resolving this dispute. Employing the class device here will not only achieve economies of scale for Class Members with individual claims, but also conserve the resources of the judicial system and preserve public confidence in the integrity of the system by avoiding the waste and delay of repetitive proceedings. In addition, certifying the class will prevent inconsistent adjudications of similar issues and claims.
- 5. For settlement purposes only, the Court finds that the Named Plaintiff, Alba Banks, is an adequate representative and appoints her as such. The Court further finds that Emil Davtyan, David Yeremian, and Natalie Haritoonian of D.Law, Inc., have adequately represented the Named Plaintiff and the Class in this litigation, and the Court appoints them as Class Counsel.
- 6. The Court appoints Apex Class Action, LLC to perform the duties of a Settlement Administrator for the purpose of issuing the Class Notice and administering the Settlement.
- 7. The Court recognizes that certification under this Order is for settlement purposes only, and shall not constitute or be construed as a finding by the Court, or an admission on the part of Defendants, that this action is appropriate for class treatment for litigation purposes. Entry of this Order is without prejudice to the rights of Defendants to oppose class certification in the actions,

2 provided for under the Settlement to be fair and reasonable. The Court preliminarily finds that the following deductions from the Gross Settlement Amount are also fair and reasonable: (1) up to 4 5 \$133,333.33 to Class Counsel for attorneys' fees; (2) up to \$25,000.00 to Class Counsel for their litigation costs; (3) up to \$5,000.00 to Plaintiff for a Class Representative Enhancement Payment; 6 up to \$13,000.00 for the Settlement Administration Costs; and (5) up to \$20,000.00 for civil penalties under PAGA, allocated 75% to the LWDA PAGA Payment and 25% to Aggrieved 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8.

1

Employees for their Individual PAGA Payments. The estimated Net Settlement Amount is approximately \$203,666.67.

The Court preliminarily finds that the \$400,000.00 Gross Settlement Amount

9. The Court has reviewed the Settlement Agreement and the proposed Class Notice to the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds, on a preliminary basis, that the Settlement Agreement appears to be within the range of reasonableness of a settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by this Court. It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that:

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

- The settlement amount is fair and reasonable to all Class Members when a. balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to liability and damages issues;
- Extensive and costly investigation and research have been conducted such that counsel for the parties at this time are reasonably able to evaluate their respective positions;
- Settlement at this time will avoid additional substantial costs, such as those c. that have already been incurred by both parties, as well as avoid the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of this litigation; and
- d. The proposed settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive arm's-length negotiations.
- 10. The Court further approves the following representative group of employees as governed by the Settlement Agreement with respect to the PAGA Claim:

"a person employed by Defendants in California and classified as a non-exempt, hourly employee who worked for Defendants at any time between October 20, 2022,

- 11. The Court grants approval of the PAGA Settlement Payment pursuant to the terms and conditions contained in the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that the terms of the PAGA settlement are fair and reasonable and approves the PAGA settlement pursuant to Labor Code § 2699(1)(2).
- 12. Because a PAGA action is not a class action, Class Members may not opt out of, or object to, the PAGA Settlement Payment.
- 13. If the Court does not grant final approval of the Settlement Agreement, approval of the PAGA settlement will be vacated.

APPROVAL OF DISTRIBUTION OF THE CLASS NOTICE AND TIMELINE FOR SENDING CLASS NOTICE

- 14. This Court finds that the Class Notice fairly and adequately advises the potential Class Members of the terms of the Settlement and the process for the Class Members to obtain the benefits available under the Settlement Agreement, as well as the right of Class Members to opt out of the class, to file documentation in opposition to the proposed settlement, and to appear at the settlement hearing to be conducted on the date set by the Court. The Court further finds that the Class Notice and proposed distribution of such Class Notice by first-class mail to each identified Class Member at their last known address comports with all constitutional requirements, including those of due process under the United States and California constitutions, and meets the requirements of Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and California Rules of Court rule 3.766. Accordingly, good cause appearing therefore, the Court hereby approves the proposed Class Notice.
- 15. The Settlement Administrator shall, as soon as practicable cause the Class Notice to be mailed by first class mail to all known members of the Class certified by this Court in this action to the most recent address in Defendants' business records for each known member of the Class. The mailing of the Class Notices directed in this Order constitutes the best notice practicable under the circumstances and sufficient notice to all members of the Class.
- 16. The costs of settlement administration, including the cost of printing and mailing the Class Notices shall be paid from the Settlement Amount. Such costs shall be withheld from the

Settlement Agreement.

8

1

10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

OBJECTIONS TO SETTLEMENT

even if such Class Member has previously initiated or subsequently initiates individual litigation

against Defendants or other proceedings encompassed by the Settled Claims defined in the

- 18. Any member of the Class who has not timely elected to be excluded from the Class, and who wishes to object to the fairness, reasonableness or adequacy of the Settlement Agreement or the proposed settlement, or to the award of attorneys' fees and costs, shall provide to the Settlement Administrator a written statement of the objection, as well as the specific reasons, if any, for each objection. The Settlement Administrator will promptly transmit any objections it receives to Class Counsel and Defendants' counsel.
- 19. All written objections must be signed by the Class Member or the Class Member's representative and must include the information specified in the Class Notice.
- 20. A Class Member may appear either in person or through personal counsel at the Final Hearing to object to the Settlement. If represented by personal counsel, the counsel will be hired at the Class Member's expense.
- 21. Class Counsel and Defendants' counsel shall promptly furnish each other with copies of any and all objections or written requests for exclusion that come into their possession.

FINAL APPROVAL FAIRNESS HEARING

22. The Court grants Plaintiff's motion to set a settlement hearing for final approval of the Settlement Agreement on September 24, 2025, at 10:30 a.m. in Department 1 of this Court ("Final Hearing"), as set forth in the Class Notice, to determine whether the proposed settlement of this action is fair, reasonable and adequate and should be finally approved. The Court will also

28