

Electronically Received 10/04/2022 11:46 AM

AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC
KASHIF HAQUE, State Bar No. 218672
SAMUEL A. WONG, State Bar No. 217104
JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, State Bar No. 280626
9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
Irvine, California 92618
Telephone: (949) 379-6250
Facsimile: (949) 379-6251
Email: jcampbell@aegislawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Edgar Quezada Gonzalez and Maria Salcedo,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

FILED
Superior Court of California
County of Los Angeles

10/20/2022

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court

By: D. Wortham Deputy

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

EDGAR QUEZADA GONZALEZ,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TITAN SENQUEST MANAGEMENT,
INC.; and DOES 1-100, inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO: 20STCV32707

Assigned for all purposes to
Hon. Elihu M Berle
Department: 6

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF PRIVATE
ATTORNEYS GENERAL ACT
REPRESENTATIVE ACTION
SETTLEMENT**

Date: October 20, 2022
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Dept.: 6

1 The Court has received and considered the joint stipulation of Plaintiffs, as individuals,
2 and on behalf of the people of the State of California and as an “aggrieved employee” acting as a
3 private attorney general under the Labor Code Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, § 2699, *et*
4 *seq.* (“PAGA”) and Defendant in the above-captioned action.

5 **NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED:**

6 The Court hereby approves the Parties’ proposed PAGA Settlement and hereby enters
7 FINAL JUDGMENT based on the terms set forth in the Parties’ Settlement in the amount of
8 \$112,500. Of this, \$37,500.00 is awarded as attorney fees paid to PAGA Employee Counsel,
9 \$13,251.70 is awarded as costs paid to PAGA Employee Counsel, and \$3,000.00 is awarded as
10 administrative costs paid to the Settlement Administrator.

11 This Judgment incorporates by reference the definitions in the PAGA Settlement
12 Agreement (“Settlement”), and all terms defined therein shall have the same meaning as set forth
13 in the Settlement.

14 This Judgment is intended to be a final disposition in its entirety of the above captioned
15 action. Without affecting the finality of this judgment in any way, the Court retains jurisdiction
16 of all matters relating to the interpretation, administration, implementation, effectuation, and
17 enforcement of the Settlement pursuant to C.C.P. § 664.6.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.



Elihu M. Berle

19
20 Dated: October 20, 2022

Elihu M. Berle / Judge

Hon. Elihu M. Berle

Judge of the Superior Court, County of Los Angeles