

Electronically Received 01/27/2025 04:38 PM

1 JAMIE K. SERB, ESQ. (SBN 289601)  
jamie@crosnerlegal.com  
2 NIKKI TRENNER, ESQ. (SBN 316007)  
nikki@crosnerlegal.com  
3 ZACHARY M. CROSNER, ESQ. (SBN 272295)  
zach@crosnerlegal.com  
4 **CROSNER LEGAL, PC**  
5 9440 Santa Monica Blvd. Suite 301  
Beverly Hills, CA 90210  
6 Tel: (866) 276-7637  
7 Fax: (310) 510-6429

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff PORTIA BARTLEY

9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
10 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

12 PORTIA BARTLEY, as an individual on  
13 behalf of herself and on behalf of all others  
similarly situated,

14 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 UNIVERSAL TELEVISION LLC, a New  
18 York limited liability company;  
ENTERTAINMENT PARTNERS  
19 ENTERPRISES, LLC, a Delaware limited  
liability company; and DOES 1-100,  
20 inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No.: 22STCV36428

Assigned for All Purposes to:  
~~Kenneth R. Freeman~~ Vā [ @Úas & Öä[] ]  
Dept. 14 Fí

~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER GRANTING MOTION  
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS  
ACTION SETTLEMENT

Date: July 24, 2025  
Time: 11:00 AM  
Dept.: SSC-14 Fí

**FILED**  
Superior Court of California  
County of Los Angeles

07/31/2025

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: E. Martinez Deputy

1 The Court, having read the papers filed regarding Plaintiff’s unopposed Motion for  
2 Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, and having heard argument on the motion,  
3 hereby finds and ORDERS as follows:

4 1. The Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”)  
5 attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Nikki Trenner in support of Plaintiff’s Motion for  
6 Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement, filed on or about January 27, 2025, is within the  
7 range of possible recovery and, subject to further consideration at the Final Approval Hearing  
8 described below, is preliminarily approved as fair, reasonable, and adequate. The Court, for  
9 purposes of this Order, adopts all defined terms as set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

10 2 For purposes of settlement only, the Court provisionally and conditionally certifies  
11 the following class: “all non-exempt COVID production safety team employees who worked for  
12 Defendant Universal Television LLC in California during the Class Period of June 1, 2020 to May 31,  
13 2023.”

14 3. The Court finds the Settlement Class, consisting of approximately 176 members, is  
15 so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, and that the Settlement Class is  
16 ascertainable by reference to the business records of defendant Universal Television LLC.

17 4. The Court finds further there are questions of law and fact common to the entire  
18 Settlement Class, which common questions predominate over any individualized questions of law  
19 or fact. These common questions include, without limitation: (1) whether Defendant paid  
20 Settlement Class Members for all hours worked, (2) whether Defendant provided required meal  
21 breaks on a compliant basis; (3) whether Defendant provided required rest breaks on a compliant  
22 basis; (4) whether Defendant reimbursed reasonable and necessary business expenses, (5) whether  
23 Defendant provided Settlement Class Members with proper itemized wage statements; and (6)  
24 whether Defendant timely paid Settlement Class Members all wages due upon separation of  
25 employment.

26 5. The Court finds further the claims of named Plaintiff Portia Bartley are typical of  
27 the claims of the Settlement Class, and that she will fairly and adequately protect the interests of  
28 the Settlement Class. Accordingly, the Court appoints Portia Bartley as the Class Representative,

1 and appoints her counsel of record, Jamie K. Serb, Nikki Trenner and Zachary M. Crosner, and  
2 Crosner Legal, P.C., as Class Counsel.

3           6.       The Court finds further that certification of the Settlement Class is superior to other  
4 available means for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

5           7.       The Court finds further that, in the present case, the proposed method of providing  
6 notice of the Settlement to the Settlement Class via First Class U.S. Mail to each Settlement Class  
7 Member's last known address, is reasonably calculated to notify the Settlement Class Members of  
8 the proposed Settlement and provides the best notice possible under the circumstances. The Court  
9 also finds the Notice of Class Action Settlement form is sufficient to inform the Settlement Class  
10 Members of the terms of the Settlement and their rights thereunder, including the right to object to  
11 the Settlement or any part thereof and the procedure for doing so, their right to exclude themselves  
12 from the Settlement and the procedure for doing so, their right to obtain a portion of the  
13 Settlement proceeds, and the date, time and location of the Final Approval Hearing. The proposed  
14 Notice of Class Action Settlement (Exhibit A to the Settlement Agreement) and the procedure for  
15 providing Notice set forth in the Settlement Agreement, all are approved by the Court.

16           8.       Under the terms of the Settlement Agreement, the Court approves the Parties'  
17 selection of Apex Class Action, LLC as the Settlement Administrator. The Settlement  
18 Administrator is ordered to mail the Class Notice to the Settlement Class Members via First-Class  
19 U.S. Mail as specified in the Settlement Agreement, and to otherwise carry out all other duties set  
20 forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Parties are ordered to carry out and comply with all terms  
21 of this Order and the Settlement Agreement, and particularly with respect to providing the  
22 Settlement Administrator all information necessary to perform its duties under the Settlement  
23 Agreement.

24           9.       Any member of the Settlement Class who wishes to comment on or object to the  
25 Settlement or any term thereof, including any proposed award of attorney's fees and costs to Class  
26 Counsel or any proposed representative enhancement to the Class Representative, shall have forty-  
27 five (45) days from the mailing of the Class Notice to submit his or her comments and/or objection  
28 to the Settlement Administrator, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement and Class Notice.

1 10. Any member of the Settlement Class who wishes to exclude themselves from the  
2 Settlement shall have forty-five (45) days from the mailing of the Class Notice to submit his or her  
3 Request for Exclusion to the Settlement Administrator, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement  
4 and Class Notice.

5 11. The Settlement administrator is ordered to file a declaration in advance of the Final  
6 Approval Hearing attaching and authenticating all Requests for Exclusion, if any, and further  
7 attaching and authenticating all Objections, if any.

8 12. A Final Approval Hearing is hereby set for ~~SEPTEMBER 1, 2025~~, 2025, at ~~10:00 AM~~ in Department SSC-  
9 ~~14~~ of the Los Angeles County Superior Court, to consider any objections to the Settlement,  
10 determine if the proposed Settlement should be found fair, adequate and reasonable and given full  
11 and final approval by the Court, and to determine the amount of attorney's fees and costs awarded  
12 to Class Counsel, the amount of any representative enhancement award to the Class  
13 Representative, and to approve the fees and costs payable to the Settlement Administrator. All  
14 legal memoranda, affidavits, declarations, or other evidence in support of the request for final  
15 approval, the award of attorney's fees and costs to Class Counsel, the enhancement award to the  
16 Class Representative, and the fees and costs of the Settlement Administrator, shall be filed no later  
17 than sixteen (16) court days prior to the Final Approval Hearing. The Court reserves the right to  
18 continue the Final Approval Hearing without further notice to the Settlement Class Members.

19 13. Provided he or she has not submitted a timely and valid Request for Exclusion, any  
20 Settlement Class Member may appear, personally or through his or her own counsel, and be heard  
21 at the Final Approval Hearing regardless of whether he or she has submitted a written objection.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23  
24 Dated: 07/31/2025





Judge of the Superior Court

Timothy Patrick Dillon / Judge

25  
26  
27  
28