

Electronically Received 1/29/2025 04:04 PM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Roman Otkupman, CSBN 249423
Roman@OLFLA.com
Nidah Farishta, CSBN 312360
Nidah@OLFLA.com

OTKUPMAN LAW FIRM, A LAW CORPORATION
5743 Corsa Ave., Suite 123
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: (818) 293-5623
Facsimile (888) 850-1310

Attorney for Plaintiff,
RUBEN HERNANDEZ, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated, and on behalf of the
general public

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RUBEN HERNANDEZ, on behalf of himself
and all others similarly situated, and on behalf
of the general public,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JUICERIE V, LLC, a California Limited
Liability Company, JUICERIE VII, LLC, a
California Limited Liability Company,
JUICERIE 2, LLC, a California Limited
Liability Company, BUTCHER'S
DAUGHTER HOLDCO, LLC, a Delaware
Limited Liability Company, and DOES 1
through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 24STCV00565

~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER AND JUDGMENT

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
01/22/2026
David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: N. Navarro Deputy

~~**PROPOSED**~~ **ORDER AND JUDGMENT**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. This Order and Judgment hereby approves, adopts and incorporates by reference the terms and conditions of the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement and Addendum thereto (collectively, “Settlement Agreement” or “Settlement”), together with the definitions and terms used and contained therein.

2. The Court finds it has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action and over the parties to the action, including all members of the Settlement.

3. The Class Notice fully and accurately informed Class Members of all material elements of the proposed settlement and of their opportunity to opt out or object; was the best notice practicable under the circumstances; was valid, due, and sufficient notice to all Class Members; and complied fully with the laws of the State of California and due process. The Class Notice fairly and adequately described the settlement and provided Class Members with adequate instructions and means to obtain additional information.

4. Class Members were given a full opportunity to participate in the Final Approval hearing, and all Class Members and other persons wishing to be heard have been heard. Accordingly, the Court determines that all Class Members who did not timely and properly opt out of the Settlement are bound by this Order, and are barred from pursuing, or seeking to reopen, any of the Released Claims, as defined in the Settlement Agreement.

5. No Class Members objected to the Settlement, and no Class Members opted out.

6. The Court has considered all relevant factors for determining the fairness of the Settlement and has concluded that all such factors weigh in favor of granting final approval. In particular, the Court finds that the Settlement was reached following meaningful discovery and investigation conducted by Plaintiff’s Counsel; that the Settlement is the result of serious, informed, adversarial, and arm’s-length negotiations between the Parties; and that the terms of the settlement, including the Gross Settlement Amount of \$175,500.00 are in all respects fair, adequate, and reasonable.

1 7. In so finding, the Court has considered all evidence presented, including evidence
2 regarding the strength of Plaintiff’s case; the risk, expense, and complexity of the claims presented;
3 the likely duration of further litigation; the amount offered in settlement; the extent of investigation
4 and discovery completed; and the experience and views of counsel. The Parties have provided the
5 Court with sufficient information about the nature and magnitude of the claims being settled, as well
6 as the impediments to recovery, to make an independent assessment of the reasonableness of the
7 terms to which the Parties have agreed.

8 8. Solely for the purpose of settlement, the Court finally certifies the following Class:
9 all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant who worked for Defendant in California
10 at any time during the period from September 24, 2022 through August 21, 2025.

11 9. The Court appoints Plaintiff Ruben Hernandez as Class Representative and grants a
12 Class Representative Service Payment of ~~\$10,000.00~~ ^{\$7,500.00} to Plaintiff. The Class Representative Service
13 Payment will be paid to Plaintiff in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

14 10. The Court appoints Otkupman Law Firm, A Law Corporation, as counsel for the
15 Class.

16 11. The Court awards attorney’s fees in the amount of \$57,915.00 and Plaintiff’s costs
17 of \$9,922.31. The request for an award of reasonable attorney’s fees and costs is justified in light of
18 the following facts: (1) Plaintiff’s attorneys vigorously investigated and prosecuted this case and
19 achieved a favorable result for the Class; (2) the legal issues were novel and complex; (3) Defendant
20 did not oppose the request; and (4) such other bases as offered by Plaintiff’s Attorneys. The
21 attorney’s fees and costs shall be paid in accordance with the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

22 12. The Court confirms the appointment of Apex Class Action, LLC (“Apex”) as
23 Settlement Administrator and awards \$7,000.00 in settlement administration costs to Apex.

24 13. The Court approves the PAGA Payment in the amount of \$15,500.00 to be allocated
25 as follows: seventy-five percent (75%) of this amount (i.e., \$11,625.00) shall be paid to the
26 California Labor and Workforce Development Agency (“LWDA”) and twenty-five percent (25%)
27 of this amount (i.e., \$3,875.00) shall be distributed amongst the Aggrieved Employees according to
28

1 the terms of the Settlement Agreement.

2 14. The Court approves the Net Settlement Amount of \$75,162.69 to be distributed
3 amongst the Participating Class Members in accordance with the terms and provisions of the
4 Settlement Agreement.

5 15. The Court approves the amounts as set forth in the table below:

Description	Amount
Gross Settlement Amount	\$175,500.00
Administration Costs	\$7,000.00
Class Representative Enhancement	\$10,000.00 \$7,500.00
Attorney's Fees	\$57,915.00
Attorney's Costs	\$9,922.31
PAGA Penalties	\$15,500.00
Net Settlement Amount	\$75,162.69 \$77,662.69

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14 16. The Parties and their counsel are ordered to implement and to consummate the
15 Settlement Agreement according to its terms and provisions.

16 17. Without affecting the finality of the Judgment, the Court shall retain exclusive and
17 continuing jurisdiction over the above-captioned action and the Parties, including all Settlement
18 Class Members and Aggrieved Employees, for purposes of enforcing the terms of the Judgment
19 entered herein.

20 18. This document shall constitute a judgment for purposes of California Rules of Court,
21 Rule 3.769(h).

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

19. The Court sets a ^{non-appearance case review} ~~settlement compliance hearing~~ on November 6, 2026 at 8:30 a.m./p.m. Plaintiff shall file a declaration regarding the status of the disbursement of the settlement funds by no later than October 30, 2026.

IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.

DATED: 01/22/2026



Laura Seigle

HON. JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Laura A. Seigle / Judge