BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C. SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO
SAN BERNARDINO DISTRICT 1 David D. Bibiyan (Cal. Bar No. 287811) david@tomorrolaw.com Diego Aviles (Cal. Bar No. 315533) diego@tomorrowlaw.com APR 1 2 2019 1801 Century Park East., Suite 2600 Los Angeles, California 90067 Telephone: (310) 438-5555 Facsimile: (310) 300-1705 Attorneys for Plaintiff, 6 HERMILA RIOS, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO 9 10 HERMILA RIOS, on behalf of herself and all CASE NO.: CIVDS1807390 11 others similarly situated, [Assigned for all purposes to the Hon. David 12 Cohn in Dept. 26] Plaintiffs, 13 (PROPOSED) ORDER FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF CLASS 14 v. ACTION SETTLEMENT 15 NONGSHIM AMERICA, INC., a California **HEARING INFORMATION:** corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive. 16 DATE: April 12, 2019 8:30 a.m. TIME: Defendants. 17 DEPT: 26 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

On April 12, 2019, this Court considered plaintiff Hermila Rios's ("Plaintiff") Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement and Provisional Class Certification for Settlement Purposes Only ("Motion for Preliminary Approval"), Declaration of David D. Bibiyan, the Joint Stipulation Re: Class Action and Representative Action Settlement (the "Settlement Agreement"), the Notice of Proposed Class Action Settlement ("Class Notice"), and the documents submitted in support of the Motion for Preliminary Approval. David D. Bibiyan of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C. appeared for and on behalf of Plaintiff and the Plaintiff Class. Eric Nelson Lindquist of the Law Offices of Eric Nelson Lindquist and Julie M. Capell of Davis Wright Tremaine LLP appeared on behalf of defendant Nongshim America, Inc. ("Defendant"). There were no other appearances made.

Having considered the Motion for Preliminary Approval, the Declaration of David D. Bibiyan, and all supporting legal authorities and documents, the Court ordered as follows:

- 1. The definitions set out in the Settlement Agreement are incorporated by reference into this Order; all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning in this Order.
- 2. The Court certifies the following settlement class for the purpose of settlement only: all current and former non-exempt, hourly-paid employees of Defendant who worked in California from March 28, 2014 through February 17, 2019.
- 3. The Court preliminarily appoints named plaintiff Hermila Rios as Class Representative and David D. Bibiyan of Bibiyan Law Group, P.C. as Class Counsel.
- 4. The Court preliminarily approves the proposed class settlement upon the terms and conditions set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds, on a preliminary basis, that the settlement appears to be within the range of reasonableness of settlement that could ultimately be given final approval by the Court. It appears to the Court on a preliminary basis that the settlement amount is fair, adequate and reasonable as to all potential settlement class members when balanced against the probable outcome of further litigation relating to liability and damages issues. It further appears that extensive and costly investigation and research has been conducted such that counsel for the parties at this time are reasonably able to evaluate their respective positions. It moreover appears to the Court that the settlement at this time 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. It also appears that the settlement has been reached as the result of intensive, non-collusive, arms-length negotiations utilizing an experienced third party neutral.

- 5. The Court approves, as to form and content, the proposed Class Notice that has been submitted herewith.
- 6. The Court directs the mailing of the Class Notice by first-class mail to the settlement class members in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Court finds that the dissemination of the Class Notice set forth in the Settlement Agreement complies with the requirements of law, and appears to be the best notice practicable under the circumstances.
- 7. The Court hereby preliminarily approves the definition and disposition of the Gross Settlement Amount of \$1,080,000.00, which is inclusive of attorneys' fees not to exceed one-third of the Gross Settlement Amount or \$360,000.00, in addition to costs not to exceed \$15,000.00, incentive award of \$5,000.00 to the named Plaintiff, costs of claims administration of no more than \$17,500.00, and PAGA penalties in the amount of \$30,000.00, of which \$22,500.00 (75%) will be paid to the Labor Workforce and Development Agency ("LWDA") and \$7,500.00 (25%) will be paid to participating class members. Defendant shall pay the employer's share of payroll taxes on the wage portion of the settlement payments to settlement class members apart, separate from and in addition to the Gross Settlement Amount.
- 8. The Court deems CPT Group, Inc. ("CPT Group") the Claims Administrator, and payment of administrative costs, not to exceed \$17,500.00, out of the Gross Settlement Amount for services to be rendered by CPT Group on behalf of the class. The Claims Administrator shall prepare and submit to Class Counsel and Defendant's Counsel a declaration attesting to the completion of the notice process as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, including an explanation of efforts to resend any Class Notice returned undeliverable and the total number of opt-outs and objections received before and after the deadline.
- 9. The Court directs Defendant to provide the Claims Administrator with the "Class List" for Class Members providing the following information: (1) names; (2) last known home address and telephone numbers; (3) dates of employment or number of workweeks for the class

objections submitted to the Court by five (5) court days before the final approval hearing.

26

27

28

	1/18/19
1	15. A final approval hearing shall be held with the Court on at
2	a.m./p.m. in Department "S-26" of the above-entitled Court to determine: (1) whether the
3	proposed settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate and should be finally approved by the Court;
4	(2) the amount of attorneys' fees and costs to award Class Counsel; and (3) the amount of incentive
5	award to the Class Representative.
6	16. In the event the settlement does not become effective in accordance with the terms
7	of the Settlement, or the settlement is not finally approved, or is terminated, cancelled or fails to
8	become effective for any reason, this Order shall be rendered null and void and shall be vacated,
9	and the parties shall revert to their respective positions as of the commencement of the Action. The
10	parties will be free to assert any claim or defense that could have been asserted at the outset of the
11	Action.
12	
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.
14	DAVID COHN
15	Dated:, 2019 Judge of the Superior Court
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	