	017 100
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Richard E. Donahoo, SBN 186957; Sarah L. Kokonas, SBN 262875	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Donahoo & Associates, PC 440 W. First Street, Suite 101	
Tustin, CA 92780	
TELEPHONE NO.: 714-953-1010 FAX NO. (Optional) 714-953-1777	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): rdonahoo@donahoo.com; skokonas@donahoo.com	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiffs DINO MINTER, et al.	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Diego	
STREET ADDRESS: 330 West Broadway	
MAILING ADDRESS: 330 West Broadway CITY AND ZIP CODE: San Diego, CA 92101	
BRANCH NAME: Hall of Justice	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Dino Minter, et al.	
DINO Winter, et al. DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Bombardier Mass Transit Corporation, et al.	
NOTICE OF ENTRY OF JUDGMENT OR ORDER	CASE NUMBER: 37-2018-00059972
	37 2010 00039972
(Check one): UNLIMITED CASE (Amount demanded exceeded \$25,000) LIMITED CASE (Amount demanded was \$25,000 or less)	
TO ALL PARTIES :	
1. A judgment, decree, or order was entered in this action on <i>(date)</i> : June 16, 2023	
2. A copy of the judgment, decree, or order is attached to this notice.	
Date: June 22, 2023	1/.
Sarah L. Kokonas	Ur
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF ATTORNEY PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY)	(SIGNATURE)

1 Richard E. Donahoo, State Bar No. 186957 JUN 1 6 2023 Sarah L. Kokonas, State Bar No. 262875 2 William E. Donahoo, State Bar No. 322020 By: V. Secaur DONAHOO & ASSOCIATES, PC 440 West First Street, Suite 101 4 Tustin, CA 92780 Telephone: (714) 953-1010 5 Facsimile: (714) 953-1777 6 Email: rdonahoo@donahoo.com skokonas@donahoo.com wdonahoo@donahoo.com 8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Certified Class 9 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 10 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, HALL OF JUSTICE 11 DINO MINTER, BOBBY BAKER, CAESAR Case No. 37-2018-00059972-CU-OE-CTL 12 JIMINEZ, JAMES ADOCK, and MARK Judge: Hon. Timothy Taylor NOREM, on behalf of themselves and all Dept.: C-72 13 others similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public, CLASS ACTION 14 Plaintiffs, [PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' 15 MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY V. APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION 16 SETTLEMENT BOMBARDIER MASS TRANSIT 17 CORPORATION, NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT (NCTD); and DOES 1 Date: June 16, 2023 18 through 20, inclusive, Time: 1:30 p.m. 19 Dept.: 9 Defendants. 20 Complaint filed: November 28, 2018 Trial date: February 9, 2024 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

ORDER ON MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL

Plaintiffs have filed a Motion for Preliminary Approval of the Class Action Settlement and Approval of the PAGA Settlement reached with Defendant Bombardier Mass Transit Corporation now known as Alstom Mass Transit Corp. ("Bombardier.") On June 16, 2023, the Court held a hearing on the Motion. The Court has carefully considered the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement and Release of Claims ("Settlement Agreement") together with all exhibits thereto, all the filings related to the Settlement, the arguments of counsel, and the record in this case. The Court hereby gives its preliminary approval of the Class Settlement and its approval of the PAGA Settlement; finds that the Settlement and Settlement Agreement are sufficiently fair, reasonable and adequate to allow dissemination of notice of the Settlement to the Class Members and PAGA Releasees and to hold a final approval hearing on the Class Settlement; orders the Class Notice be sent to the Class Members and PAGA Releasees in accordance with the Settlement Agreement and this Order; and schedules a final approval hearing to determine whether the proposed Class Settlement is fair, adequate and reasonable.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. The Court has reviewed and considered the Settlement Agreement which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1 and incorporated herein.
- 2. The Court finds that the terms of the Class Settlement preliminarily appears to be fair, reasonable, and adequate, and within the range of possible approval and sufficient to warrant providing notice to the Class, when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation, given the risks relating to liability and damages. It further appears that investigation and research has been conducted such that counsel for the Parties are reasonably able to evaluate their respective positions. It further appears to the Court that the Settlement will avoid substantial additional costs by all parties, as well as the delay and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the Action, and that it will provide substantial benefits to the Class going forward. It further appears that the Settlement reasonably considers the strength of claims and risk of litigation attendant to each Subclass and treats the Class Members within each Subclass equitably relative to each other. It appears that

2.5

- 3. The Court previously certified pursuant to stipulation, and now certifies for settlement purposes, the following Class: "all non-exempt individuals employed by BOMBARDIER in California who worked in execution of the 'North County Transit District (NCTD) RFP 24617 Rail Operations and Maintenance' project during the period from June 16, 2016 to final approval of this Settlement in at least one of the defined subclasses (Maintenance of Way (MOW), Maintenance of Signal (MOS), Maintenance of Equipment (MOE)."
- 4. The Court previously appointed, and now appoints for purposes of the Settlement, Plaintiffs Dino Minter, Bobby Baker, Caesar Jiminez, James Adock, and Mark Norem as representatives of the Class.
- 5. The Court previously designated, and now designates for purposes of the Settlement, as Class Counsel Richard E. Donahoo, Sarah L. Kokonas and William E. Donahoo of Donahoo & Associates, PC. The Court preliminarily finds that, based on the work Class Counsel has done identifying, investigating, and prosecuting the claims in this action; Class Counsel's experience in handling class actions and claims; Class Counsel's knowledge of the applicable law; and the resources Class Counsel has and will commit to representing the class, that Class Counsel has represented and will represent the interests of the Class fairly and adequately.
- 6. CPT Group, Inc. is appointed as the Settlement Administrator and shall administer the Settlement in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Order and the Settlement Agreement.

 Total settlement administration costs are estimated to not exceed \$10,000.00.

- 7. The Settlement Administrator shall distribute the Class Notice attached hereto as Exhibit 2 according to the notice plan described in the Settlement Agreement and substantially in the form approved herein, no later than 14 days from receipt of Class Data from Bombardier. A declaration from the Settlement Administrator demonstrating distribution of the Class Notice shall be filed by the parties in conjunction with the motion for final approval. Defendant is directed to provide to the Settlement Administrator the Class Data as specified by the Settlement Agreement no later than 20 days of entry of this order.
- 8. The Court hereby conditionally certifies the proposed Class and conditionally finds that, solely for the purposes of approving this Class Settlement and for no other purpose and with no other effect on this litigation, the proposed Class meets the requirement for certification under Code Civil Procedure §382 and Cal. Rule of Court 3.764 on the grounds that membership in the Class and each Subclass is ascertainable; that a well-defined community of interest exists within the Class and Subclass; that a common nucleus of facts and common questions of law in the Class and each Subclass predominate over individual questions; that substantial benefits result from class certification; and that Plaintiffs and their counsel will adequately and fairly protect the interests of the Class.
- 9. It is appropriate to review a PAGA settlement to ascertain whether a settlement is fair in view of PAGA's purposes and policies. (O'Connor v. Uber Technologies, Inc. (N.D. Cal. 2016) 201 F.Supp.3d 1110, 1132–1134; Jordan v. NCI Group, Inc. (Jan. 5, 2018, No. EDCV 16-1701-JVS) 2018 U.S.Dist. Lexis 25297, pp. *3-*4; see Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. v. Kintetsu Enterprises of America (2006) 141 Cal.App.4th 46, 59, 61-62 [where the Legislature required court approval of private settlements of Prop. 65 actions brought to vindicate the public interest, court must evaluate the resulting consent decree to determine if it is "just" and "serves the public interest"].) A trial court should evaluate a PAGA settlement to determine whether it is fair, reasonable, and adequate in view of PAGA's purposes to remediate present labor law violations, deter future ones, and to maximize enforcement of state labor laws. (Williams v. Superior Court (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 546 (Williams) [PAGA "sought to remediate present violations and deter future ones"].

28

"[T]here is no requirement that the Court certify a PAGA claim for representative 10. treatment like in Rule 23" Villalobos v. Calandri Sonrise Farm LP, No. 12-CV-2615 (PSG), 2015 WL 12732709, at *5 (C.D. Cal. July 22, 2015); see also Delgado v. Marketsource, Inc., No. 17-CV-7370 (LHK), 2019 WL 4059850, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2019) ("Because a PAGA action is brought as a proxy for law enforcement agencies, there is no requirement that the Court certify a PAGA claim for representative treatment like in Rule 23 " (quoting Villalobos, 2015 WL 12732709, at *5)). With respect to the PAGA claims, the Court finds persuasive that the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA") was invited to file a response to the proposed settlement agreement in this case and elected not to file any objections or opposition, and "infers LWDA's non-response [as] tantamount to its consent to the proposed settlement terms, namely the proposed PAGA penalty amount." Echavez v. Abercrombie & Fitch Co., Inc., No. 11-CV-9754 (GAF), 2017 WL 3669607, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2017); Jennings v. Open Door Mktg., No. 15-CV-4080 (KAW), 2018 WL 4773057, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2018) ("Plaintiffs submitted the settlement agreement to the LWDA, and the LWDA has not objected to the settlement."); Jordan v. NCI Group, Inc., No. 16-CV-1701 (JVS), 2018 WL 1409590, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2018) ("Additionally, the Court finds it persuasive that the LWDA was permitted to file a response to the proposed settlement and no comment or objection has been received.")1 The Court hereby grants approval of the PAGA Settlement, including the settlement and release of the PAGA Claims, as defined in the Settlement Agreement, and the payment of One Hundred Fifty Seven Thousand Three Hundred Fifty Six Dollars (\$157,356.00) from the Gross Settlement Fund to resolve the PAGA Claims ("PAGA") which is seventy-five percent (75%) of the PAGA Payment, shall be paid to the LWDA. The remaining Sixteen Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty-Seven Dollars (\$52,452.00), which is twenty-five percent (25%) of the PAGA Payment, shall be distributed to the PAGA Releasees, based on the number of PAGA Pay Periods worked by a PAGA Releasee, as a fraction of the total PAGA Pay Periods worked by all PAGA Releasees. PAGA Releasees will not have the opportunity

Class Counsel represented to the Court that the LWDA would be notified of this proposed settlement after the Motion was submitted. See Declaration of Richard E. Donahoo dated

to opt out of, or object to the PAGA Payment and settlement and release of the PAGA Claims. The payment to the LWDA and the PAGA Releasees shall be made in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

- Class Action Settlement and Hearing Date for Final Court Approval ("the Class Notice") in substantially the form attached as Exhibit 2 to this Order. The Class Notice is sufficient to inform Class Members of the terms of the Settlement Agreement, their rights under the Settlement Agreement, their rights to object to or comment on the Settlement Agreement, their right to receive a payment or opt out of the Settlement Agreement, the process for doing so, and the date and location of the Fairness and Final Approval hearing. The Court finds that the distribution of the Class Notice in accordance with the Settlement Agreement meets the requirements of due process; is the best notice practicable under the circumstances; is reasonable and constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled thereto; and is reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise the Class Members of the proposed settlement and of their right to object or to exclude themselves as provided in the Settlement Agreement. The Parties have agreed to send the Class Notice to Class Members by regular United States Mail. The notice plan is therefore APPROVED.
- Notice for exclusions from and objections to the Class Settlement. Any Class Members shall have the right to be excluded from the Class by mailing a request for exclusion to the Settlement Administrator postmarked or sent no later than 45 days after the Settlement Administrator mails Notice to Class Members and Aggrieved Employees. Requests for exclusion must be in writing from Class Member or his/her representative that reasonably communicates the Class Member's election to be excluded from the Settlement and includes the Class Member's name, address and email address or telephone number. Any Class Member who does not request exclusion from the settlement class as provided above shall be bound by the terms and provisions of the Settlement Agreement upon its final approval, including but not limited to the releases, waivers, and covenants described in the

Settlement Agreement, whether or not such person objected to the Settlement Agreement and whether or not such person makes a claim upon the settlement funds.

- 13. Participating Class Members may appear in Court (or hire an attorney to appear in Court) to present verbal objections at the Final Approval Hearing. Non-Participating Class Members have no right to object to any of the class action components of the Settlement.
- 14. Each Class Member shall have 45 days after the Administrator mails the Class Notice (plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re-mailed) to challenge the number of Class Workweeks and Pay Periods (if any) allocated to the Class Member in the Class Notice. The Class Member may challenge the allocation by communicating with the Administrator via fax, email or mail. The Administrator must encourage the challenging Class Member to submit supporting documentation. In the absence of any contrary documentation, the Administrator is entitled to presume that the Workweeks contained in the Class Notice are correct so long as they are consistent with the Class Data.
- 15. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the Class Settlement, including the plan of allocation of the Class portion of the Gross Settlement Amount as described in the Settlement. Specifically, after all required deductions are made from the Gross Settlement Amount, the Net Settlement Fund will be distributed to Class Members. Each Class Member who does not opt-out of the Settlement will receive his/her pro rata share of the Net Settlement Fund for their Subclass based on the number of workweeks worked by the Class Members in the Subclass for Defendant during the Class Period.
- shall be construed or interpreted as or deemed to be evidence of an admission or concession by Released Parties (a) of any liability or wrongdoing by Released Parties, (b) of the appropriateness of certifying a class for purposes of litigation, (c) that Plaintiffs' claims may properly be prosecuted on a class or representative basis, (d) that any arbitration agreement maintained by Released Parties is unenforceable, or (e) of the truth of any allegations asserted by Plaintiff, members of the Class, PAGA Releasees, or any other person.

28

1

2

If the Class Settlement is not finally approved, or the Effective Date does not occur, 17. or the Settlement is terminated under its terms, then: (a) the Settlement shall be without force and effect upon the rights of the Parties hereto, and none of its terms shall be effective or enforceable; (b) the Parties shall be deemed to have reverted nunc pro tunc to their respective status as of the day immediately before the Parties entered into the Settlement Agreement, with the Parties to meet and confer regarding any discovery or case management deadlines that were pending at the time the Parties stayed litigation to; (c) Defendant and/or Released Parties shall not be obligated to pay any amount of the Gross Settlement Amount and shall be refunded any amounts paid pursuant to the Agreement but not yet spent or disbursed; (d) all Orders entered in connection with the Settlement, including the certification of the Class, shall be vacated without prejudice to any Party's position on the issue of class certification, or any other issue, in this Action or any other action, and the Parties shall be restored to their litigation positions existing on the date of execution of Settlement Agreement; and (e) the Parties shall proceed in all respects as if the Settlement Agreement and related documentation and orders had not been executed, and without prejudice in any way from the negotiation or fact of the Settlement or the terms of the Settlement Agreement. In such an event, this Court's orders regarding the Settlement, including this Preliminary Approval Order and Order Approving PAGA Settlement, shall not be used or referred to in litigation, or any arbitration or other civil or administrative proceeding, for any purpose. Nothing in the foregoing paragraph is intended to alter the terms of the Settlement Agreement with respect to the effect of the Settlement Agreement if it is not approved.

18. The Court orders the following Implementation Schedule for further proceedings:

a. Deadline for Defendant Bombardier, Inc. to
provide the Class Member List to the
Settlement Administrator

Ap

Twenty (20) Calendar Days from

Entry of Order on Preliminary

Approval

1/23

b.	Deadline for Settlement Administrator to Mail Notice to Class Members	Within Fourteen (14) Calendar Days of Receipt of the Class Member List
c.	Deadline for Postmark of Any Objection	Forty-five (45) Calendar Days from the Mailing of the Notice plus an additional 14 days for Class Members whose Class Notice is re- mailed)
d.	Deadline for the Parties' Counsel to Respond to Any Objections	Before the Date of the Final Approval Hearing
e.	Deadline for Class Counsel to file Motion for Fees and Costs	Oct. 16 , 2023
f.	Deadline for Class Counsel to file Motion for Final Approval of Class Settlement	Oct. 16, 2023
g.	Final Approval Hearing	Nov. 9 7, 2023

21. Pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in this matter other than those contemplated herein and in the Settlement Agreement are stayed.

22. The Court retains jurisdiction to consider all further applications arising out of or in connection with the Settlement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 6 16 2-3

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COUNT

Timothy B. Taylor

PROOF OF SERVICE Code Civ. Proc. § 1013a(3)

I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 440 West First Street, Suite 101, Tustin, California 92780.

On June 22, 2023, I served the foregoing document described as **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER ON MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL** on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope addressed to the parties listed on the attached service list.

- () BY MAIL: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing mail. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Tustin, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.
- () BY FACSIMILE: I transmitted a true copy from facsimile number (714) 953-1777 to the facsimile numbers listed on the attached service listed. Upon completion of transmission there were no errors reported.
- (X) BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I transmitted a true copy via electronic mail to the addresses listed on the attached service list.
- BY NEXT-DAY DELIVERY: Causing overnight delivery of the document(s) listed herein via **ONTRAC OVERNIGHT**, to the address (es) set forth on the attached service list.

Executed on June 22, 2023, at Tustin, California. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

/s/ Sarah L. Kokonas Sarah L. Kokonas

SERVICE LIST

1				
2	Bruno W. Katz	Attorneys for Defendant		
3	Leo A. Vaisburg WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN &	BOMBARDIER MASS TRANSIT CORPORATION		
4	DICKER LLP	CORFORATION		
	401 West A Street, Suite 1900			
5	San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 321-6200			
6	(619) 321-6201			
7	bruno.katz@wilsonelser.com			
8	Jeffery A. Morris	Attorneys for Defendant		
9	jmorris@dpmclaw.com Wendy L. House	NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT		
10	whouse@dpmclaw.com			
	DEVANEY PATE MORRIS & CAMERON, LLP 41955 Fourth Street, Suite 210			
11	Temecula, CA 92590			
12	Tel: (951) 262-4491			
13	Fax: (951) 262-4495			
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	2			
	PROOF OF SERVICE			