

1 Raul Perez (SBN 174687)
Raul.Perez@capstonelawyers.com
2 Bevin Allen Pike (SBN 221936)
Bevin.Pike@capstonelawyers.com
3 Daniel Jonathan (SBN 262209)
Daniel.Jonathan@capstonelawyers.com
4 Trisha K. Monesi (SBN 303512)
Trisha.Monesi@capstonelawyers.com
5 CAPSTONE LAW APC
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1000
6 Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 556-4811
7 Facsimile: (310) 943-0396

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff Stephen Arrowsmith

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 FOR THE COUNTY OF SUTTER
11

12 STEPHEN ARROWSMITH, as an aggrieved
employee pursuant to the Private Attorneys
13 General Act ("PAGA"), on behalf of the State of
California and other aggrieved employees,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 SISCO ENTERPRISES, INC., a California
17 corporation; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

ENDORSED FILED
February 9, 2023
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SUTTER
CLERK OF THE COURT
By: Brenda Johnson, Deputy

Case No.: CVCS20-0000772

Assigned to the Hon. Perry Parker

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER APPROVING THE
PARTIES' PAGA SETTLEMENT
AGREEMENT AND JUDGMENT**

Filed Date: May 7, 2020

Trial Date: Not Yet Set

PAGA SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND JUDGMENT

7. The Settlement is not an admission by Defendant, nor is this Order and Judgment a

1 finding of the validity of any allegations or of any wrongdoing by Defendant. Neither this Order and
2 Judgment, the Settlement, nor any document referred to herein, nor any action taken to carry out the
3 Settlement, may be construed as, or may be used as, an admission of any fault, wrongdoing, omission,
4 concession, or liability whatsoever by or against Defendant.

5 8. This Judgment shall be binding on all Aggrieved Employees and the State of California,
6 who are hereby barred by the doctrine of res judicata from re-litigating the Settled Claims during the
7 Settlement Period, as those terms are defined by the Settlement. *See Arias v. Superior Court*, 46 Cal. 4th
8 969, 986 (2009) (holding that a judgment in a representative action brought by an aggrieved employee
9 under PAGA is binding not only on the named employee plaintiff but also on state labor law
10 enforcement agencies and any aggrieved employee not a party to the proceeding).

11 9. Without affecting the finality of the Order and Judgment, the Court shall retain exclusive
12 and continuing jurisdiction under California Code of Civil Procedure § 664.6, over the above-captioned
13 action and the parties for purposes of enforcing the terms of the Judgment and the Settlement.

14 10. This document shall constitute a judgment under California Code of Civil Procedure §
15 664.6.

16
17 **IT IS SO ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED.**

18 2/9/2023

19 Date

PERRY PARKER

Hon. Perry Parker
Sutter County Superior Court Judge