

1 HAROUT MESSRELIAN (SBN: 272020)

2 MESSRELIAN LAW INC.

3 500 N. Central Ave., Suite 840

4 Glendale, CA 91203

5 Telephone: (818) 484-6531

6 Facsimile: (818) 956-1983

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff JONATHAN HENRY

8 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF ORANGE**

10 JONATHAN HENRY,

11 *Plaintiff,*

12 vs.

13 DWWCM, INC. dba SOUTH COAST
14 TOYOTA and DOES 1 to 25, inclusive

15 *Defendant(s).*

Case No.: 30-2020-01145799-CU-OE-CXC

**[PROPOSED] ORDER ON MOTION FOR
APPROVAL OF PAGA SETTLEMENT AND
DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE**

Action filed: 5/26/2020
Hearing Date: March 4, 2022
Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.
Hearing Dept: CX105, Hon. Randall J.
Sherman

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Under Labor Code section 2699(1)(2) of the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004 ("PAGA"), Plaintiff filed a Motion for Approval of Settlement under PAGA.

Plaintiff's Complaint, filed on or around May 26, 2020, seeks civil penalties on behalf of the State of California and similarly situated aggrieved employees (the "Aggrieved Employees"), as authorized by PAGA under Labor Code § 2699, in relation to alleged violations of the predicate statutes set forth in Plaintiff's Complaint and the letter to the Labor Workforce and Development Agency ("LWDA") dated January 23, 2020 (the "LWDA Letter"), on behalf of all current and former non-exempt employees of Defendant DWWCM, Inc. dba South Coast Toyota ("Defendant(s)") from March 15, 2019 through the date of approval, inclusive.

Under PAGA, in any action brought by an aggrieved employee, the Court "shall review and approve any settlement of any civil action filed pursuant to this part." Lab. Code § 2699(1)(2). Accordingly, the Court, having considered the proposed settlement set forth in the Settlement Agreement, including the proposed PAGA penalties, under Labor Code § 2699(1)(2), having considered the papers filed in support of the proposed settlement and the arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing, HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Court finds the instant Action presents a good faith dispute of the claims alleged;
2. The Court finds in favor of settlement approval, and therefore approves the Settlement of the above-captioned action, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, as amended, and each of the releases and other terms, as fair, just, reasonable, and adequate;
3. The Court finds further that Plaintiff, acting on behalf of himself, the Aggrieved Employees, and the State of California, by operation of this Order and Judgment hereby releases and forever discharge Defendants and the Released Parties (as defined in the Settlement Agreement) from any and all PAGA Released Claims (as defined in the Settlement Agreement) including penalties asserted in Plaintiff's Complaint, including any and all known and unknown

1 claims for civil penalties under the Private Attorneys General Act, California Labor Code §§ 2698,
2 *et seq.*, that arise;

3 4. The Court finds further that the foregoing release shall be binding on Plaintiff and
4 the State of California, and as a matter of law shall bar any claim under PAGA brought by any
5 person, including the Aggrieved Employees, on behalf of the State of California, as to the PAGA
6 Released Claims and Released Parties;

7 5. The Parties are directed to comply with all terms of the Settlement Agreement, and
8 Defendant is directed to make all payments required by the Settlement Agreement;

9 6. Under the Settlement Agreement, Defendant agrees to pay an all-in gross amount of
10 Eighty-Nine Thousand Five-Hundred Dollars (\$89,500.00) (the "Gross Settlement Amount"). The
11 Gross Settlement Amount is inclusive of payments to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees,
12 Settlement Administrator Costs, and Attorney's Fees and Costs. No portion of the Gross Settlement
13 Amount will revert to Defendant. Plaintiff's Counsel requests an award of attorney's fees of Twenty-
14 Nine Thousand Eight-Hundred Thirty-Three Dollars and Thirty-Three cents (\$29,833.33); and costs
15 of Nine Thousand Nine-Hundred Ninety-Six Dollars and Twenty cents (\$9,996.20). The settlement
16 administrator, Simpluris, requests administration costs of Two Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty
17 Dollars and Zero Cents (\$2,750.00). Defendant does not oppose these requests. The Court finds the
18 Gross Settlement Amount is fair, reasonable and adequate, and approves ~~each of~~ these payments in
19 part, and directs the Settlement Administrator to make ~~the above payments to~~ payments from the
20 Gross Settlement Amount as follows:

- 21 a. \$26,850.00 ~~\$29,833.33~~ in attorney's fees to Messrelian Law Inc.;
- 22 b. \$9,242.43 ~~\$9,996.20~~ in costs to Messrelian Law Inc.;
- 23 c. \$2,750.00 in administration costs to Simpluris;
- 24 d. After deducting the foregoing payments, the estimated remainder of approximately
25 \$50,657.57 ~~\$46,920.47~~ shall form the Net Settlement Amount ("NSA"). Pursuant to Labor Code
26 section 2699(i), the NSA will then be distributed 75 percent (\$37,993.18 ~~\$35,190.35~~) to the LWDA,
27 and the remaining 25 percent (\$12,664.39 ~~\$11,730.12~~) to the Aggrieved Employees on a pro rata
28 basis, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement. The Court approves these payments, and directs the

1 Settlement Administrator to issue checks to the LWDA and Aggrieved Employees, along with the
2 Notice of PAGA Settlement, as set forth in the Settlement Agreement, and to otherwise carry out its
3 duties as set forth in the Settlement Agreement; and

4 7. The PAGA Action will be ~~is hereby~~ DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE as to all
5 parties and all causes of action after the court orders that the file be closed at a Final Report Hearing,
6 currently set for December 2, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. The Court reserves exclusive and continuing
7 jurisdiction over the Action and the Parties under Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6 for the purpose of
8 supervising implementation, enforcement, construction, administration, and interpretation of the
9 Settlement Agreement.

10
11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13 Dated: **March 4, 2022**

14 
HON. RANDALL J. SHERMAN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT