

Electronically Received 01/14/2026 06:59 PM

1 John G. Yslas (SBN 187324)
john.yslas@wilshirelawfirm.com
2 Eugene Zinovyev (SBN 267245)
eugene.zinovyev@wilshirelawfirm.com
3 John Brown (SBN 233605)
john.brown@wilshirelawfirm.com
4 Gabriella Solé (SBN 346164)
gabriella.sole@wilshirelawfirm.com
5 Emily K. Borman (SBN 303180)
emily.borman@wilshirelawfirm.com
6 Courtney M. Miller (SBN 327850)
courtney.miller@wilshirelawfirm.com
7 **WILSHIRE LAW FIRM, PLC**
660 S. Figueroa Street, Sky Lobby
8 Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 381-9988
9 Facsimile: (213) 381-9989

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles
03/04/2026

David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
By: N. Navarro Deputy

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff

11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – SPRING STREET COURTHOUSE**

14 CHARLOTTE DEARDORFF, individually,
and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

15 *Plaintiff,*

16 v.

17 TUTOR PARTNERS LLC, a Maryland
18 limited liability company; DOES 1 through
19 10, inclusive,

20 *Defendants.*

Lead Case No.: 24STCV13693
[Related Case No. 24STCV21120]

*[Assigned for All Purposes to the Hon. Laura
A. Seigle, Dept. 17]*

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION AND PAGA SETTLEMENT**

Preliminary Approval Hearing:
Date: March 3, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept: 17

Action Filed: May 31, 2024

1 ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

2 Having reviewed Plaintiff Charlotte Deardorff’s (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) Motion for
3 Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement (“Motion”), the Declaration of
4 John G. Yslas, the Declaration of Charlotte Deardorff, the Declaration of Sean Hartranft, and
5 the Class Action and PAGA Settlement Agreement (“Settlement Agreement”), and good cause
6 appearing, the Court finds and HEREBY ORDERS THE FOLLOWING:

7 1. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement appears to
8 be fair, adequate, and reasonable and therefore meets the requirements for preliminary approval.
9 The Court grants preliminary approval of the Settlement and the Settlement Class based on the
10 terms set forth in the Settlement Agreement between Plaintiff and Defendant Tutor Partners
11 LLC (hereinafter “Defendant”), attached to the Declaration of John G. Yslas in Support of
12 Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action and PAGA Settlement as **Exhibit 2**.

13 2. The Settlement falls within the range of reasonableness of a settlement which
14 could ultimately be given final approval by this Court, and appears to be presumptively valid,
15 subject only to any objections that may be raised at the Final Approval Hearing and final
16 approval by this Court. The Court notes that Defendant has agreed to create a common fund of
17 \$165,000.00 to cover (a) settlement payments to Class Members who do not validly opt out; (b)
18 a \$25,000.00 allocation toward civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act, 75% of
19 which (\$18,750.00) will be paid to California’s Labor & Workforce Development Agency and
20 25% of which (\$6,250.00) will be paid to Aggrieved Employees; (c) Class Representative
21 Service Payment of up to \$10,000.00 to Plaintiff; (d) Class Counsel’s attorneys’ fees not to
22 exceed one third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount (currently estimated to be \$55,000.00),
23 and up to \$20,000.00 in costs for actual litigation expenses incurred by Class Counsel; and (e)
24 Settlement Administration Costs of up to \$6,690.00.

25 3. The Court preliminarily finds that the terms of the Settlement appear to be within
26 the range of possible approval, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 382 and
27 applicable law. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that: (1) the Settlement amount is fair
28 and reasonable to the Class Members when balanced against the probable outcome of further

1 litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues, and potential appeals; (2)
2 significant informal discovery, investigation, research, and litigation have been conducted such
3 that counsel for the Parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their respective positions;
4 (3) settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay, and risks that would be presented
5 by the further prosecution of the litigation; and (4) the proposed Settlement has been reached as
6 the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive negotiations between the Parties with the
7 assistance of a well-respected class action mediator. Accordingly, the Court preliminarily finds
8 that the Settlement Agreement was entered into in good faith.

9 4. A final approval hearing on the question of whether the proposed Settlement,
10 attorneys' fees and costs to Class Counsel, payment to the California's Labor & Workforce
11 Development Agency for its share of the settlement of claims for penalties under the Private
12 Attorneys General Act, and the Class Representative Service Payment should be finally
13 approved as fair, reasonable and adequate as to the members of the Class is hereby set in
14 accordance with the Implementation Schedule set forth below.

15 5. The Court provisionally certifies for settlement purposes only the following class
16 (the "Class"): "all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant in the State of
17 California during the Class Period."

18 6. "Class Period" means the period from January 1, 2023, through June 12, 2025.

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

27 ///

28 ///

1 8. The Court appoints as Class Representative, for settlement purposes only,
2 Plaintiff Charlotte Deardorff. The Court further preliminarily approves Plaintiff’s ability to
3 request an incentive award of up to \$10,000.00.

4 9. The Court appoints, for settlement purposes only, John G. Yslas, Eugene
5 Zinovyev, John Brown, Gabriella Solé, Emily K. Borman, and Courtney M. Miller of Wilshire
6 Law Firm, PLC, as Class Counsel. The Court further preliminarily approves Class Counsel’s
7 ability to request attorneys’ fees of up to one third (1/3) of the Gross Settlement Amount
8 (currently estimated to be \$55,000.00), and litigation costs not to exceed \$20,000.00.

9 10. The Court appoints Apex Class Action LLC as the Settlement Administrator with
10 reasonable administration costs estimated not to exceed \$6,690.00.

11 11. The Court approves, as to form and content the Class Notice, attached to the
12 Settlement Agreement. The Court finds on a preliminary basis that plan for distribution of the
13 Class Notice to Settlement Class Members satisfies due process, provides the best notice
14 practicable under the circumstances, and shall constitute due and sufficient notice to all persons
15 entitled thereto.

16 12. The Parties are ordered to carry out the Settlement according to the terms of the
17 Settlement Agreement.

18 13. Any Class Member who does not timely and validly request exclusion from the
19 Settlement may object to the Settlement Agreement.

20 14. The Court orders the following Implementation Schedule:

21

Event	Timing
Class Data: Last day for Defendant to provide Class Data to the Administrator	30 days after the Court grants Preliminary Approval of the Settlement
Class Notice: Last day for Administrator to mail the Class Notice to Class Members	14 days after receipt of the Class Data

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

<p>1 Response Deadline: Last day for Class 2 Members to submit written objections, 3 challenges to workweeks and/or pay periods, 4 and requests for exclusion</p>	<p>45 days after Class Notice is mailed out by the Administrator (with an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice was remailed)</p>
<p>5 Filing Deadline: Last day to file Motion for 6 Final Approval, Request for Attorneys' Fees 7 and Costs, and Class Representative Service 8 Payments to Plaintiff</p>	<p>16 court days before the Final Approval Hearing</p>
<p>9 Final Approval Hearing</p>	<p>_____ July 15, 2026, at _____ 9:00 a.m./p.m. in Dept. 17 of the above- referenced Court.</p>

13 15. The Court further ORDERS that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings
14 in this lawsuit, except those contemplated herein and in the settlement, are stayed.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 DATE: 03/04/2026



17 *Laura Seigle*

18 HON. LAURA A. SEIGLE
19 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
20 Laura A. Seigle / Judge