23 26 27 28 <u>1</u> <u>PROPOSED</u> ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT
24 25
24
21       Trial Date:       None Set         22       23       24
21 22 23 24
<ul> <li>COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,</li> <li>Defendants.</li> <li>Action Filed: January 17, 2019 Trial Date: None Set</li> </ul>
19DOES 1 through 100,20Defendants.21Action Filed: January 17, 201921Trial Date: None Set2223244
Plaintiff,       Plaintiff,         17       vs.         18       HERBERT MALARKEY ROOFING COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,         20       Defendants.         21       Action Filed: January 17, 2019 Trial Date: None Set         23       24
Image: Similarly situated,       Assigned For All Purposes To:         15       Similarly situated,         16       Plaintiff,         17       Vs.         18       HERBERT MALARKEY ROOFING COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         20       Defendants.       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         23       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         24       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         24       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 thro
Image: Similarly situated,       Assigned For All Purposes To:         15       Similarly situated,         16       Plaintiff,         17       Vs.         18       HERBERT MALARKEY ROOFING COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         20       Defendants.       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         23       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         24       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         24       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 thro
Image: Similarly situated,       Assigned For All Purposes To:         15       Similarly situated,         16       Plaintiff,         17       Vs.         18       HERBERT MALARKEY ROOFING COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         20       Defendants.       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         22       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         23       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         24       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         24       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 thro
ODDOUNT       12       COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES         13       EDGAR RODRIGUEZ-FONSECA, an individual, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,       Case No.: 19STCV01237         15       Plaintiff,       Judge: Kenneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         16       Vs.       [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT         18       HERBERT MALARKEY ROOFING COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,       Defendants.         20       Defendants.       Action Filed: January 17, 2019 Trial Date: None Set         21       23       24
Image: Similarly situated,       Assigned For All Purposes To:         15       Similarly situated,         16       Plaintiff,         17       Vs.         18       HERBERT MALARKEY ROOFING COMPANY, a California Corporation, and DOES 1 through 100,       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Dept.: Spring Street 14         20       Defendants.       Image: Renneth R. Freeman Does 1 through 100,         21       Defendants.       Action Filed: January 17, 2019 Trial Date: None Set         22       23       24

This matter came on for hearing on October 12, 2021 at 11:00 a.m. in Department 14 of the
 above-captioned court on the Motion for an Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action
 Settlement.

The Court, having fully reviewed the Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement; the Points and Authorities and Declarations filed in support thereof; and the Joint Stipulation of Class Action and PAGA Settlement ("Settlement Agreement") and all exhibits attached thereto, including the Notice of Proposed Settlement of Class Action ("Class Notice"); and in recognition of the Court's duty to make a preliminary determination as to the reasonableness of any proposed class action settlement, and if preliminarily determined to be reasonable, to ensure proper notice is provided to class members in accordance with due process requirements, and to set a Final Fairness Hearing to consider the proposed settlement as to the good faith, fairness, adequacy and reasonableness of any proposed settlement, **HEREBY MAKES THE FOLLOWING DETERMINATIONS AND ORDERS:** 

14 The Court finds on a preliminary basis that the Settlement Agreement, incorporated in full 15 by this reference and made part of this Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action 16 Settlement, appears to be in the range of reasonableness of a settlement which could ultimately be 17 given final approval by this Court. The Court notes that Defendant Herbert Malarkey Roofing 18 Company ("Defendant") has agreed to create a Qualified Settlement Fund in the amount of 19 \$300,000 which amount will be fully funded and paid out by Defendant provided certain conditions 20 of the Settlement Agreement are met. Included within the Qualified Settlement Fund is a Net 21 Settlement Fund in the amount of approximately \$162,500. Defendant will pay out the entirety of 22 the Net Settlement Fund to Participating Class Members. It appears to the Court on a preliminary 23 basis that the settlement amount is fair and reasonable to the Class when balanced against the 24 probable outcome of further litigation relating to class certification, liability and damages issues and 25 potential appeals. It further appears that significant investigation, research, and litigation has been 26 conducted such that counsel for the parties at this time are able to reasonably evaluate their 27 respective positions. It further appears that settlement at this time will avoid substantial costs, delay,

28

2

KJTLAWGROUP 11.P 230 N. Maryland Ave. Suite 306 Glendale, CA 91206 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

and risks that would be presented by the further prosecution of the litigation. It further appears that
the proposed settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, serious, and non-collusive
negotiations between the parties.

ACCORDINGLY, GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, THE MOTION FOR AN ORDER 4 GRANTING PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT IS HEREBY 5 GRANTED, AND AS A PART OF SAID PRELIMINARY APPROVAL, THE COURT HEREBY 6 ORDERS THAT THE CLASS BE CONDITIONALLY CERTIFIED FOR SETTLEMENT 7 PURPOSES ONLY, AND THAT VACHE A. THOMASSIAN AND CASPAR JIVALAGIAN OF 8 KJT LAW GROUP LLP, AND CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS OF ADAMS EMPLOYMENT 9 COUNSEL BE CONDITIONALLY AND PRELIMINARILY APPOINTED CLASS COUNSEL. 10 MORE SPECIFICALLY, THE COURT FINDS AS FOLLOWS: 11

The Class provisionally certified by this Order for settlement purposes is as follows: "Class" and "Class Members" means all persons who, at any time between January 17, 2015 and October 12, 2021 (the date of the Court's Minute Order Conditionally Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement), worked in a non-exempt position for Defendant in the State of California.

The Court finds that (a) the Class is so numerous that joinder of all Class Members is
impracticable; (b) The claims of Plaintiff Edgar Rodriguez-Fonseca are typical of the Class
Members' claims; (c) there are questions of law and fact common to the Class, which predominate
over any questions affecting only individual Class Members; and (d) class certification is superior to
other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy and to effectuate
the Settlement.

The Court finds that the Class Notice (attached as Exhibit B to the Settlement Agreement)
comports with all constitutional requirements including those of due process.

The Court further finds that the proposed Class Notice adequately advises the Class about:
(a) the terms of the proposed Settlement and the benefits available to each Class Member; (b) each
Class Member's right to object to and/or opt out of the Settlement and the timing and procedures

12

13

14

15

16

1 for doing so; (c) the temporary and conditional certification of the Class for settlement purposes 2 only; (d) preliminary Court approval of the proposed Settlement; (e) timing and procedures for 3 distributing the settlement funds to the Participating Class Members; and (f) the date of the Final 4 Fairness Hearing as well as the rights of members of the Class to file documentation in support of or 5 in opposition to and appear in connection with said hearing.

ACCORDINGLY, GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, THE COURT HEREBY APPROVES 6 THE PROPOSED NOTICE TO THE CLASS AND FINDS that mailing to the last known address 8 to members of the Class, as specifically described within the Settlement Agreement, constitutes an effective method of notifying Class Members of their rights with respect to the Class Action and proposed Settlement.

## ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

The Class is provisionally certified as a class as defined above.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant shall within 14 calendar days after entry and 14 service of this Preliminary Order, provide the Settlement Administrator with Class DATA with (i) 15 each Class Member's full name; (ii) each Class Member's last known address; (iii) each Class 16 Member's last known telephone number; (iv) each Class Member's Social Security number; and (v) 17 each Class Member's start and end dates of employment in a non-exempt position in California.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Settlement Administrator shall, within 14 calendar 18 19 days after receiving the Class Data, and pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement, exercise 20 its best judgment to determine the current mailing address for each Class Member and then mail the 21 Class Notice to the Class by First Class, regular U.S. mail, postage pre-paid, using the most current 22 mailing address available. In the event that a Class Notice is returned to the Settlement 23 Administrator with a forwarding address, the Settlement Administrator will re-send the Class Notice 24 to the forwarding address affixed thereto. If no forwarding address is provided, then the Settlement Administrator will promptly conduct a "standard search," sometimes called, "Skip Traces" or 25 26 "Credit Header" searches, to locate a better address. If a better address is found, the Settlement 27 Administrator will promptly re-send the Class Notice. If, at any time prior to the opt out deadline,

28

L LAWGROUP ILP 230 N. Maryland Ave. Suite 306 Glendale, CA 91206 7

9

10

11

a Class Member contacts the Settlement Administrator, or if Class Counsel does so on his or her 1 behalf, to advise of a change in address, the Class Notice will be re-mailed to the address the Class 2 Member (or Class Counsel) provides. In the event the procedures set forth herein are followed and 3 the intended recipient of a Class Notice still does not receive the Class Notice, the intended 4 recipient will be a Class Member and will be bound by all terms of the Settlement and the Order of 5 Final Approval entered by the Court. 6

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any Request for Exclusion must be postmarked or delivered no later than 45 calendar days after the Class Notice is first mailed to the Class (or re-8 mailed to the Class Member), and must be received by the Settlement Administrator to be valid. 9

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any dispute submitted by a Class Member regarding the weeks of employment credited to that Class Member under the proposed Settlement must be postmarked no later than 45 calendar days after the date when the Class Notice is first mailed to the Class (or re-mailed to the Class Member), to be considered.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Class Notice will provide that Class Members who wish to 14 object to the Settlement must send to the Settlement Administrator a written statement objecting to 15 the Settlement, no later than 45 calendar days after the date the Class Notice is first mailed by the 16 Settlement Administrator. Such objection must: contain a statement of the Class Member's 17 objections, a statement advising if the objecting Class Member plans to address the Court at the 18 Settlement Fairness Hearing, and any legal briefs, papers or memoranda the objecting Class 19 Member proposes to submit to the Court. The Settlement Administrator shall file all such 20 objections with the Court prior to the Final Fairness Hearing. 21

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Final Fairness Hearing shall be held before the 22 undersigned on April 26, 2022 at 10:00 a.m., in Department 14 of the Superior Court for the State 23 of California County of Los Angeles, located at 312 N Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012 or via 24 LACourtConnect, to consider the fairness, adequacy and reasonableness of the proposed 25 Settlement preliminarily approved by this Order of Preliminary Approval, and to consider the 26 application of Class Counsel for an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, and the Class 27

28

7

10

11

12

1 || Representative Service Award.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pending final determination of whether this proposed
Settlement should be granted final approval, no member of the Class, either directly or
representatively, or in any other capacity, shall commence or prosecute any action or proceeding
asserting any of the Released Claims against the Released Parties, as defined in the Settlement
Agreement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any Party to this case, including any Class Member, in person or by counsel, may be heard, to the extent allowed by the Court, in support of, or in opposition to, the Court's determination of the good faith, fairness, reasonableness and adequacy of the proposed Settlement, the requested attorneys' fees and costs, the requested Class Representative Service Award, the payment to the California Labor & Workforce Development Agency ("LWDA Payment"), and any Order of Final Approval and Judgment regarding such Settlement, LWDA Payment, fees, costs and enhancement.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that all briefs regarding the Settlement shall be served and 15 filed in accordance with the following briefing schedule: All briefs and materials in support of an 16 Order of Final Approval and application for attorneys' fees and costs shall be filed with this Court by 17 March 25, 2022. Response briefs, if any, in opposition to objections shall be filed with this Court no 18 later than nine court days before the Final Fairness Hearing, which in this case is April 13, 2022. 19 The Settlement Administrator's report shall be filed be with this by March 25, 2022. Any objections 20 to the Settlement and briefs regarding such objections shall be filed with this Court and served in 21 accordance with the Settlement Agreement no later than 45 days, after the first mailing of the Class 22 Notices. 23

28

KJTLAWGROUP<sub>111</sub><sup>9</sup> 230 N. Maryland Ave. Suite 306 Glendale, CA 91206 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

24

25

26

2	In summary, the relevant dates w	with regard to this Preliminary Order are as follows
3		<u></u>
4	Event	Date
5	Defendant provide Class Data to Administrator	14 calendar days after entry of Preliminary Approval Order
6 7	Administrator Mail Class Notice	14 calendar days after receiving Class Data
8 9	Deadline to opt-out, object, or dispute information on Class Notice	45 calendar days after mailing of Class Notice
10	Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, including	March 25, 2022
11	Administrator's Report	
12	Deadline for Response Briefs Final Fairness Hearing	April 13, 2022 April 26, 2022 at 10:00 a.m.
13		

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, in the event of final approval and the occurrence of the Effective Settlement Date, all Participating Class Members, and their successors, shall conclusively be deemed to have given full releases of the Released Claims against the Released Parties, and all Class Members (other than opt outs) and their successors, shall be permanently enjoined and forever barred from asserting any Released Claims against any Released Party as described by the Settlement Agreement.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if for any reason the Court does not execute and file an Order of Final Approval and Judgment, or if the Effective Settlement Date does not occur for any reason whatsoever, the Settlement Agreement and the proposed Settlement which is the subject of this Order and all evidence and proceedings had in connection therewith shall be without prejudice to the status quo ante rights of the parties to the litigation as more specifically set forth in the Settlement Agreement.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pending further order of this Court, all proceedings in this matter except those contemplated herein and in the Settlement Agreement are stayed.

**KJ** LAWGROUP 11.P 230 N. Maryland Avc. Suite 306 Glendale, CA 91206

> 19 20

14

15

16

17

18

- 21 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

